United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 171 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 20, 2025 No. 85

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.

Give our Senators this day, precious God, reverence to realize Your presence, humility to know their own need, trust to ask for Your help, and obedience to accept whatever You require.

Lord, walk with them as they work. Help them to remember that there is no purity without vigilance, no learning without study, and no mastery without discipline. Remind them also that there is no true joy without service, no discipleship without devotion, and no crown without a cross.

Inspire our lawmakers to be willing to pay the price required to honor You and to do Your will. Strengthen their resolve to always choose the right and refuse the wrong.

We pray in Your Holy 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. MORENO). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

The assistant 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 Iowa.

RURAL COMMUNITY HOSPITAL DEMONSTRATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, rural hospitals in America are under the gun. Some of them are closing. We have about 90 rural hospitals in the State of Iowa.

For a change, I have some good news for rural hospitals. For years, I have been pressing the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services—CMS, for short—to open applications for the 10 unfilled spots in a program that we call Rural Community Hospital Demonstration. This program allows Medicare to test innovative payment models to support rural hospitals. It boosts the financial viability for rural hospitals that are too large to be critical access hospitals and yet too small to benefit from Medicare's hospital inpatient prospective payment system. Currently, the program is helping four rural hospitals in Iowa—in Fort Dodge, Grinnell, Newton, and Spirit Lake.

For years, I have heard excuses from the executive branch for why they wouldn't fill the open spots with interested rural hospitals. So earlier this year, I asked CMS Administrator Dr. Oz to fill the open spots in this rural hospital program. Finally, on May 14, Dr. Oz announced that 10 new hospitals will be added to the Rural Community Hospital Demonstration Program. Also, hospitals that applied but were not selected will be put on a wait list if other spots open up.

Until this time, CMS has been underutilizing this program and ignoring interested rural hospitals. I appreciate the Trump administration taking action to help rural America this way through helping a few more rural hospitals.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

CLEAN AIR ACT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, this week, we are going to be moving to take up Congressional Review Act resolutions to overturn Clean Air Act preemption waivers the Environmental Protection Agency granted to California that allow California to dictate emission standards for the whole country, effectively imposing a nationwide electric vehicle mandate.

Now, Clean Air Act waivers are nothing new. The Clean Air Act allowed for waivers to address specific pollution problems, and over the decades, a number of them have been granted.

But the waivers the Biden EPA handed to California on the Biden administration's way out the door go far beyond the scope Congress contemplated in the Clean Air Act. The waivers in question allow California to implement a stringent electric vehicle mandate, which, given California's size and the fact that a number of other States have signed on to California's mandate, would end up not just affecting the State of California but the whole country.

Under California's electric vehicle mandate, automakers around the country would be forced to close down a substantial part of their traditional vehicle production, with serious consequences: diminished economic output, job losses, declining tax revenues. And that is just the start.

Consumers around the country would face fewer choices, higher prices, and reduced automobile availability, and our already shaky electric grid would quickly face huge new burdens from the surge of new electric vehicles—if, of course, automakers were able to ramp up production as fast as California wants them to, and charging stations, which typically take several years to approve, could be built in time.

Our Nation is already facing serious problems on the energy supply front. We are, to quote a Washington Post headline from last March, ''running out of power,'' as the surge in demand and the premature retirement of fossil fuel-fired powerplants push us to the brink. Our electric grid is simply not in a position to absorb a huge surge in electric vehicles.

Unfortunately, that didn't seem to register with President Biden, who implemented a nationwide electric vehicle mandate that the Trump EPA is currently working to undo.

But while the Biden EPA's EV mandate was bad, California's is much worse. And if we don't act, the consequences to our economy, to consumers, and to our electricity supply could be devastating.

The House has already passed a CRA resolution to repeal California's mandate, and the situation is so grave that not just Republicans but 35 Democrats supported this repeal.

But here in the Senate, Democrats are attempting to derail a repeal by throwing a tantrum over a supposed procedural problem. The California waivers are not rules, Democrats claim, and thus the Congressional Review Act cannot be used to repeal them.

Let's be very clear. The EPA has submitted the waivers to Congress as rules, which is all that Congress has ever needed to decide to consider something under the Congressional Review Act.

The House, as I said, passed a Congressional Review Act resolution of disapproval—a resolution that garnered 35 Democrat votes in the House and was passed without objection from the House Parliamentarian. And there can be no question that these waivers are rules in substance, given their widespread effects.

But it is true that we are facing something of a novel situation because, for the first time ever, the Government Accountability Office has decided to insert itself into the process and affirmatively declare that an Agency rule submitted to Congress as a rule is not a rule.

It is an extraordinary deviation from precedent for an Agency that should be defending Congress's power instead of constraining it. And, frankly, I think we need to act to ensure that this intrusion into the Congressional Review Act process doesn't become a habit and that the Senate doesn't end up transferring its decision-making power on CRA resolutions to the Government Accountability Office. That is why this week I intend to bring the question of GAO's unprecedented interference to the floor.

But, in the meantime, I want to make one thing very clear: This debate is not about destroying Senate procedure—or any other hysterical claim the Democrats are making. And I have to say that my colleagues' newfound interest in defending Senate procedure is touching, if a touch surprising.

After all, it was only last year that the Democrats were planning to destroy one of the bedrocks of the Senate, the legislative filibuster. And, of course, the Democrats' concern about overruling the Parliamentarian is a bit unexpected, given the Democrats' documented history of attempting to do exactly that. But I am glad to see Democrats demonstrating an interest in safeguarding the Senate.

However, the fact of the matter is that their purported concerns here are entirely misplaced. We are not talking about doing anything to erode the institutional character of the Senate.

In fact, we are talking about preserving the Senate's prerogatives. And I would like to see Senators from both parties vote to uphold the Senate's rights under the Congressional Review Act, even if Democrats support the California Green New Deal rule in question.

The California waivers rules are an improper expansion of a limited Clean Air Act authority and would endanger consumers, our economy, and our Nation's energy supply, and I look forward to overturning these rules in the very near future.

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.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on SALT—that is, the State and local tax deduction—in the fall on the campaign trail on Long Island and in his Truth Social account, Donald Trump said this:

> I will turn it around, get SALT back, lower your Taxes, and so much more. I'll work with the Democrat Governor and Mayor, and make sure the funding is there to bring New York State back to levels it hasn't seen for 50 years.

And on Long Island, Donald Trump went further. He promised to ''cut taxes for families, small businesses, and workers, including restoring the SALT deduction, saving thousands of dollars for residents of New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and other high-cost states,'' promising that once he restored SALT, ''jobs and factories will pour back into New York. I know how to do it better than anybody has ever known how to do it, and we can do it so easily.''

This was obviously met with raucous praise. After all, it was he, Donald Trump, who created this disaster when he put SALT caps in during his first term in his tax bill that year.

I was incredibly skeptical about Donald Trump's promise on Long Island; after all, this was the arsonist promising to put out the fire.

Since then, many New York House Republicans have made the same promise, parroting then-Candidate Trump almost every week since he has taken office. They even formed a little SALT Caucus in the House. So some may be shocked—shocked—to hear that just a few moments ago, right here in the Capitol, President Trump completely—completely—reversed himself. Now, Donald Trump is against this proposal that he and many New York House Republicans campaigned on. He reportedly said this morning he will not raise the SALT cap because ''we don't want to benefit Democratic governors.''

President Trump came to the Capitol apparently to send a message to New York Republicans. He is reversing himself and breaking his promise on SALT, just as I long warned he would do. Donald Trump apparently says he now opposes SALT because it would only benefit Democratic Governors. What about New York taxpayers? What about the police and firemen and teachers who are paying higher taxes because of SALT on Long Island and the Hudson Valley, throughout New York State, or the millions of taxpayers across the country impacted by Trump's illogical move to do this in his first term?

Does Donald Trump give a damn about middle-class New Yorkers, particularly in the suburbs who are paying more taxes because of the SALT cap? Apparently not.

When Trump came to Long Island and talked a big game about restoring SALT relief, I called it a farce. It was actually a lie. And today, he has proved himself a liar and has seemingly played New York Republicans for fools.

If New York Republicans don't stand up to Donald Trump right now, they will look like fools. They have said over and over again that they are going to fight this horrible SALT cap, which hurts so many New Yorkers, so many in their own districts. They have said they will fight to the end. Will they stand up now to Donald Trump or cave while disappointing millions of New Yorkers?

ASHLI BABBITT

Mr. President, on the Babbitt settlement, I am deeply disappointed that the Republican leader did not condemn the Trump administration's most recent attack on our beloved Capitol Police. I am appalled and disgusted at the disrespect the Trump administration is showing to the Capitol Police by awarding $5 million to the family of

Ashli Babbitt, who broke into the U.S. Capitol on January 6. And I am appalled and disgusted at the thought that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle support Trump's decision.

Awarding the family of an insurrectionist $5 million is an insult to first responders, those who were in the Capitol, and those everywhere. It sends a sickening message to police and all other first responders throughout the country: When it matters most, Donald Trump will turn his back on you.

FENTANYL

On fentanyl, Donald Trump promised on the campaign trail he would hold the Chinese Government accountable to stop the fentanyl crisis. Over 100 days into office, Donald Trump has failed on both accounts.

Meanwhile, Donald Trump has also handed over all leverage to China through his stupid trade war. Now he is trying to gut key State Department programs that curb the flow of fentanyl into America.

Today, I join three of my colleagues in demanding Secretaries Rubio and Bessent use all possible diplomatic tools to push the People's Republic of China to take immediate action to stop the flow of fentanyl into America. This administration should also scrap the misguided 91-percent cut—91 percent—to the State Department's international narcotics control and enforcement programs included in the President's budget proposal.

Instead of working to hold China accountable and stop this crisis in its tracks, the Trump administration had to wage a destructive trade war with China and blame allies like Canada for our fentanyl problem. And now Donald Trump's budget is trying to gut key programs that could actually do something about the problem.

Specifically, I urge the Trump administration to, first, push the Chinese Government to do three things: Do a better job policing illicit fentanyl and precursor chemical trafficking; increase precursor scheduling; and stop the illicit financing of precursor chemicals in China. We need commitments on all three points. Second, the Trump administration must use every diplomatic tool available to stop the flow of fentanyl into America. Finally, the Trump administration must immediately end cuts to programs that actually address the fentanyl crisis.

When I met with President Xi 2 years ago, I told him directly about the devastating impact of the opioid crisis on American families. I demanded to President Xi that the Chinese Government take immediate action to cut off the supply of precursor chemicals that are fueling this crisis.

Some steps were taken, some important steps, but much more is needed from the Chinese Government, and the President and his team should be working with the PRC to get these concessions and cooperation rather than the current strategy: destroying our influence and competition with the PRC abroad.

TARIFFS

Mr. President, across the country, companies like Walmart and Mattel and Target and Ford are starting to do exactly what many economists feared in response to Donald Trump's stupid tariff policy: They are raising their prices. And the American people are paying more.

But does Donald Trump listen? Of course not. He almost never listens except to what he wants to hear. Instead of backing off his tariffs, Donald Trump tells companies to ''eat the tariffs.'' Those are his words. He tries to bully and berate companies simply when they want to be transparent with their customers.

Of course, businesses will raise prices because of the tariffs. What on Earth does Donald Trump expect? Donald Trump blaming businesses for raising prices due to tariffs is like setting fire to a building and then blaming the fire department.

For someone who fancies himself a shrewd businessman, Donald Trump doesn't seem to understand the pain his trade war has created for businesses. Perhaps it is hard for Donald Trump to hear their concerns from inside his luxury Qatari jet.

BUDGET RECONCILIATION

On reconciliation, Donald Trump can meet with House Republicans as many times as he likes, but he won't change the fundamental problem of their bill. It kills jobs—U.S. jobs, explodes the deficit, and overwhelmingly helps the rich.

First, on jobs. Donald Trump and Republicans want to reward billionaires by taking an ax to clean energy investments America needs to meet our energy demands of the future. Under Donald Trump, China is overtaking the United States. Republicans' attacks on clean energy investments mean the U.S. will cede our leadership on clean energy to Chinese companies. Clean energy is the future. We need it to meet our energy needs. And Republicans who squander the future will regret it. They are letting China become No. 1 on one of the most important industries in the world: energy.

Second, if Republicans make Trump's tax cuts permanent, they will add over $50 trillion to the debt in the next 30 years. Our children, our grandchildren will be condemned to a lifetime of higher interest rates, higher costs, diminished potential.

Meanwhile, Republicans keep saying their tax scam will lift Americans across the board. This is false, and we have the data to show it. According to a study by Wharton, under the Republican plan, the top 10 percent of Americans will get 65 percent of the benefit of the value of the tax breaks. Many Americans making less than $51,000 a year would see their incomes go down. Many working families in the first income quantile will take a $1,000 hit. The national debt will increase by $4.6 trillion over the next decade. That is in addition to, again, the potential $50 trillion over the next three decades if these tax giveaways are made permanent.

That is the formula for the Republican's ''big, beautiful bill'': billionaires win; working families lose.

EQUINOR

Finally, on Equinor, yesterday, after weeks of fierce backlash, the Trump administration backed off its unjustified work stop order for Equinor's Empire Wind off the coast of Long Island.

I am really glad the administration backed off. For weeks, I worked with Governor Hochul and Equinor and pushed Secretary Lutnick to release their report explaining the work stop order. They told Equinor they must stop. They said, you didn't meet environmental assessments and they wouldn't tell them why. They couldn't even answer. They were so frustrated, they were ready to leave, even though we invested billions and billions already in the ground to build these turbines which could provide up to 800,000 families with cheaper electricity.

Well, the reversal is good. It will save more than 1,000 good-paying New York jobs on Long Island and on Staten Island, and it will preserve billions in private investment.

What kind of country encourages companies to invest in America and then, all of a sudden, makes them lose $4, $5 billion they have already sunk into the ground without giving a reason for it?

A few days later and this project could have been scrapped entirely—a disaster for New York's economy and for the entire wind and energy industry.

The work stop announced was rotten the moment it was issued. The administration never gave a real explanation for its many claims that Equinor permits were rushed. This order seemed more like a broadside against the wind industry than anything else.

This episode should serve as a warning to other industries: Donald Trump may try to push you, but if you push back, he will back off. I say that to all the wind and solar folks who are producing and about to produce good, clean, low-cost energy. Donald Trump and the Republicans in the House, and maybe in the Senate, are threatening them by cutting off tax breaks we were able to get done in the IRA.

Now that this order is lifted, billions of dollars in private investment will once again flow into New York. Thousands of New Yorkers and offshore wind supply chain workers across the country can get back to work. Construction can continue on a project that will power half a million homes and proceed on one of the biggest, most significant offshore wind projects in the country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEEHY). The majority whip.

ELECTRIC VEHICLES

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, first, I would like to associate my remarks

with those made earlier today by the majority leader Senator THUNE. That is because Democrats have this delusional dream of eliminating gas-powered vehicles in America. They want to force-feed electric vehicles to every man and woman who drive in this country.

Well, Republicans are ready to use the Congressional Review Act to end this Democratic electric vehicle fantasy. The California EV rules that we are going to be voting on are expensive and economically destructive to our Nation. EVs currently make up 7 percent of the market of vehicles in this country and sales are plummeting.

What the Democrats want to do—want to happen to this country—is impossible to meet. They want 35 percent of all lightweight vehicles sold in America next year to be electric vehicles—35 percent. And by year 2035, they want it to be 100 percent of all vehicles.

Well, the House of Representatives, including 35 Democrats, including some from California, have voted to say no, they wanted to end this mandate. They were right to do so. That is what the Senate is going to be taking up.

Democrats in the Senate continue to cling onto the pillar of their Green New Deal. That is a deal that the American people rejected in November and rejected by electing a Republican President, a Republican House, a Republican Senate; and we are here to do the will of the American people.

RUSSIA

Mr. President, on another matter, I come today to call for an end of Russia's war in Ukraine. President Trump is committed to peace. He has repeatedly said his mission is to stop the killing. Yesterday's phone call with Vladimir Putin, I believe, was a decisive step to do just that.

After 3 years of bloodshed, Russia and Ukraine have now begun necessary talks for a cease-fire that will end the war. This breakthrough wouldn't be possible without President Trump's strength and leadership. President Trump is a master dealmaker. We know that. He has united our allies in Europe and Ukraine behind his vision for lasting peace. Real leadership ends wars. Real leadership saves lives, and that is what we are seeing today from President Trump.

Yet as President Trump forges peace, Putin continues to sow chaos. Putin is a brutal dictator. That is who he is. He lies, he cheats, he disregards the lives of his own country's citizens, and the attacks of war continue.

Russian soldiers continue to attack Ukrainian citizens. This weekend's massive drone attack—one of the largest of the war—was a deliberate attack on innocent people—not combatants, but innocent people. We cannot forget Vladimir Putin's brutality.

Russia faces a stark choice: peace or crippling sanctions. President Trump has spoken forcefully of swift and severe consequences if Russia fails to honor a cease-fire. There is a bipartisan group in this Senate. We agree—over 70 have already signed onto a bill to expand sanctions and tariffs on Russia, crippling sanctions, crushing sanctions.

Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM of South Carolina and RICHARD BLUMENTHAL of Connecticut are leading the charge. It includes 500-percent tariffs on anyone who buys oil, gas, or uranium from Russia. Energy is the cash cow of Putin's war machine. Cut it off, the Russians cannot continue to fight.

Russia's biggest customer is communist China. The next is India. They will be hit very hard. Europe, too, must act. Last year, Europe spent $23 billion on Russian oil and gas. It is more than Europe sent in aid to Ukraine. Europe has somewhat reduced their dependency on Russian energy projects, partially buying American. They must do better; they must do more. Europe must go further faster to take back its security and its future.

So America stands ready. Energy security is national security. Affordable, reliable American energy is a source of our strength as a nation. We in America are an energy superpower; and under President Trump's leadership, we are actually acting like it. Vladimir Putin doesn't respond to statements. He only responds to strength.

If Russia stalls, the Senate will act decisively to move to bring lasting peace. It is time to end the killing. It is time to end the war in Ukraine.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

GENIUS ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, yesterday, the Senate voted to begin consideration of the modestly named GENIUS Act, a bill that would regulate stablecoins, a form of cryptocurrency.

Crypto is known as a volatile investment and more unpredictable than traditional financial assets like stocks and bonds. Last month, the value of Bitcoin, a type of crypto, dropped to $76,000, but it shot up to more than $100,000 last week.

Supporters of the GENIUS Act say that is where stablecoins come in. They argue that stablecoins are tied to the value of the dollar, for example, so they never lose their value.

The name ''stablecoin'' makes it sound secure, doesn't it? But the name is misleading. In 2023 alone, stablecoins deviated from their underlying asset more than 600 times. That does not sound like stability to me.

While I agree with supporters of the GENIUS Act that crypto and stablecoins need to be regulated, I have genuine concerns about the bill.

One is the amount of illicit finance that stablecoins could support. A recent report found that crypto facilitated $51 billion in illicit transactions, and stablecoins accounted for 63 percent of all illicit crypto transactions.

Many illegal crypto transactions involve crypto ATMs. You might have seen one at your grocery store or gas station, although you may not realize it. They allow you to trade in cash for cryptocurrency. But they also are a frequent tool of scammers and fraudsters who prey on Americans, especially senior citizens. We receive phone calls in our offices back in Illinois on a regular basis from senior citizens who have been scammed out of thousands of dollars.

Here is how it works: A scammer will call an unassuming victim, pretending to be from the government or the victim's bank.

Let me stop right there and say what I tell people over and over again. The government is not going to call you on the phone. If anyone calls you on the phone and represents that they are part of Social Security or some other Federal Agency, it is most likely a scam. That is the starting point.

A scammer calls this unassuming victim and creates a scenario—an emergency scenario—in their mind. The scammer tells the victim that they owe money for skipping jury duty or unpaid taxes or that their bank account is frozen. The scammer warns the victim they have to pay urgently or else the fines will escalate or the victim may face jail time if they don't move quickly.

The scammer tells the victim not to worry; they can simply drive to the nearest crypto ATM, make their payment, and everything will be just fine. The scammer walks them through the steps of inserting cash in the machine, purchasing cryptocurrency, and sending it to the scammer's digital wallet. Once that happens, the money is gone, with no way to get it back and little hope of tracing the transaction to the scammer.

All throughout the scam, the fraudster will stay in constant contact with the victim to keep them from ever getting a moment to take a breath, calm down, consult a trusted friend, or maybe realize what is really going on.

In 2023, scammers used crypto ATMs to cheat victims out of $114 million, mainly senior citizens.

I first found out about these scams after reading an article in the Illinois Times, a newspaper publication in Springfield, IL. The article told the story of a vape shop owner in Springfield who was being paid $300 a month to have a crypto ATM machine on his premises. One day, the owner noticed a panicked elderly woman enter the shop and hurriedly feed thousands of dollars into the crypto ATM while talking on the phone the whole time. The vape shop owner learned that the woman was scammed out of $5,000 before he stepped in to stop her from putting more money into the machine.

Later, the owner removed the crypto ATM from the store, but there was no

way for the woman to get her money back. That owner said: I just couldn't in good conscience allow more and more senior citizens to come in and use that machine after being scammed.

This same story has repeated itself countless times across the country. An 80-year-old man in Texas lost thousands of dollars to a scammer who claimed he needed to pay bail to get his son out of jail. The man claimed:

I was scared, I hit the panic button and I let my panic take control of my good judgment.

In South Carolina, a retired couple lost $320,000 over several months to a scam involving crypto ATMs.

Last month, a retired woman in Wisconsin lost $24,000—her entire life savings—when scammers convinced her to use a crypto ATM, claiming it was the only way to protect her bank account from fraudulent activity. Since the scam, the woman has said:

Sometimes I wake up and I shiver because I can still hear [the scammer's] voice. It is probably something I will never get over.

Just this month, the sheriff's office in Walton County, FL, reported that a resident was cheated out of $129,000 by a scammer claiming to be from their bank.

Crypto ATM operators will claim that their kiosks give banking and crypto access to the ''unbanked''—often those in minority and low-income communities who have historically been locked out of the banking system—but in reality, the elderly and the unbanked are the most vulnerable to scams involving crypto ATM fraud.

The crypto ATMs charge high fees, ranging from 7 percent to 20 percent, and have fewer consumer protections, if any, for the users.

States such as Nebraska, Arizona, and Connecticut have passed legislation to crack down on these scams. It is time for Congress to do the same.

It has been predicted that the result of the so-called GENIUS Act will be a dramatic increase in crypto activity. That means a dramatic exposure to fraud.

Let's make sure this amendment which I am going to offer to the GENIUS Act is adopted to protect innocent victims. I can tell you for sure, you are going to hear from senior citizens and others who have lost their life savings. That is why I am pushing for a vote on my amendment to the GENIUS Act. It creates commonsense guardrails to prevent crypto ATM fraud and empower law enforcement to combat these scams. My amendment, based on the Crypto ATM Fraud Prevention Act, would require crypto ATM operators to warn consumers about scams, provide live customer support, and develop comprehensive anti-fraud policies. With my amendment, fewer Americans will be cheated out of their entire retirement savings in just a few days, and ATM operators will no longer be able to simply turn a blind eye to the fraud at their kiosks.

These scams have already harmed thousands of Americans and cheated them out of their life savings. Enough is enough.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle: Listen to the people you represent, particularly the senior citizens, who are losing their life savings to these scams, and realize that with 30,000 crypto ATMs across the country, more and more of this will occur. We need to support this amendment that provides commonsense guardrails to stop scammers in their tracks and protect hard-working Americans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS). The Senator from Indiana.

MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the worth of a nation can be measured by what it honors and what it neglects. In a quiet spot among the rolling hills of Monroe County, IN, the statue of a young soldier keeps watch over a lonely cemetery. The Doughboy stands at parade rest, campaign hat atop his head, canteen and trench digger on his cartridge belt, Springfield rifle by his side. Nearby, a wreath, ringed with red white and blue flowers, rests on a grave.

It was Americans like Private Thomas Forest Riddle who helped win the Great War but not without terrible, terrible sacrifice.

As we prepare to observe Memorial Day this year, we honor all Americans who have risked their lives and, in many cases, given their lives for our liberty. In April 1917, America formally entered what we now call World War I, after votes in this building—in this building. And 2 months later, Private Riddle, a 21-year-old farm boy from Unionville, IN, reported for duty. He visited a recruiting station right down the road in Martinsville, next door to where I live today.

The first doughboys deployed in the summer of 1917, but it wasn't until the following year that the hastily mobilized and inexperienced American Expeditionary Force, known as AEF, arrived in numbers, and Private Riddle was assigned to Company D—Delta Company—of the 12th Machine Gun Battalion, Fourth Division.

In June 1918, the battalion packed into the *Aquitania*, and it sailed for France. That spring, the Germans determined to split the allied lines and make one final push toward Paris. Private Riddle helped halt the enemy's march and proved the AEF's mettle.

When the American Army launched its largest offensive on the front, running from the Argonne Forest to the Meuse River, it was Private Riddle among the 1.2 million soldiers who broke the German Army's spirit and forced its government to surrender.

The Americans initial arrival at the front was greeted with joy from civilians and soldiers alike. A British nurse recalled the dignity of their march, the self-assurance on their faces. They were, she said, ''so God-like, so magnificent, so splendidly unimpaired in comparison to the tired, nerve-wracked men of the British Army.''

But make no mistake, they were not gods. They were hurriedly trained, untested boys, asked to accomplish the seemingly impossible. And they did so at enormous cost.

During that offensive, over 26,000 of them laid down their lives—the single deadliest campaign in our Nation's history. The survivors suffered terribly too. You see, the sheer devastation of World War I and the trauma faced by those who fought it was unprecedented. We forget today: miserable trenches and never-ceasing artillery assaults, the terror of tanks and aerial bombardments, battle through barbed wire, at the point of a bayonet, and the mental and physical trauma that accompanied it all—the exhaustion, the confusion, the tremors, the nightmares.

Private Riddle survived Chateau Thierry and Meuse-Argonne, but he was a casualty still. Gassed, shell-shocked, he returned to Unionville, IN, in February 1919, weakened, in the midst of an influenza epidemic, and he was immediately stricken by the virus.

Sick, he laid in bed delirious, reliving the horrific battles in broken sentences, recounting the shock of exploding shells. He passed on February 21, 1919. In an incredible tragedy, Thomas's younger brother Raymond had died the day before, also taken by influenza. They were preceded in death by a sister Amanda a month before.

It was their grandmother who paid $500 for a sculptor to create the likeness of Private Riddle in limestone to stand near his and Raymond's graves in the cemetery behind Pleasant View Baptist Church in Unionville. She did this, no doubt, so her grandson's sacrifice for our Nation, which landed his name in the Indiana Gold Star Honor Roll, would never be forgotten.

So today, we resolve to never forget. Whether they be in country churchyards or on the National Mall, we build tributes to our soldiers for the same reason we celebrate Memorial Day. Monuments and a day of national reflection are reminders of our enduring debt. But they are more than that. They are warnings, too. If we should ever forget our fallen, we will, in time, cease to be free.

Sadly, that warning is not always heeded. In the summer of 2004, vandals snuck into Pleasant View Cemetery and smashed the statue of Private Riddle to pieces, breaking it at the knees, severing its head. It wasn't simply the destruction of a piece of art; knowingly or not, it was the desecration of a promise.

We don't glory in war, but we do honor the glorious deeds of the men and women who, at the last resort, are called to defend our liberties. The memory of those who do so is as sacred as our flag.

We stake our Republic on our promise to honor them always and, of course, to care for those they leave behind and to do everything in our power to prevent future Americans from joining their ranks.

It has been alleged throughout history that republics are ungrateful, self-obsessed, self-absorbed, selfish, self-regarding. America has subsequently proven otherwise. If you ever doubt this, visit Pleasant View Cemetery in Monroe County, IN. You see, the people of Unionville were heartbroken when the monument of Private Riddle was knocked down. So Edith Clark, the cemetery's caretaker, paid $600 to have the sculpture restored and resurrected. Then the community held a bake and yard sale to help her recover the cost.

Patriotism—never forget.

Today, he shows wear. The brim of his hat is broken; the bayonet from his rifle is lost; part of his ear is missing; so are a few fingers. But Private Thomas Forest Riddle stands once more, and his memory remains. His watch continues, and America's gratitude goes on.

So today, we remember Private Riddle and all who have given their lives for our freedom on this grand Memorial Day.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, the first stanza of the national anthem ends with:

> O say does that star-spangled banner yet wave o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave?

We sing this part as a declaration, but if you read the lyrics of the Star-Spangled Banner, the sentence actually ends with a question mark. Francis Scott Key intended the line to be sung as a question rather than a statement. That is fitting because while our freedom may seem concrete, it is never a guarantee. Our freedom depends on brave men and women who are willing to answer the call to defend our great country.

Over the years, our national anthem took on a feeling of confidence and assurance rather than uncertainty. That is thanks to the millions of men and women who have answered the call to serve, some of whom made the ultimate sacrifice.

Next week, we recognize Memorial Day. It is not just another long weekend, but it is time to honor our fallen soldiers and reflect on their sacrifices. Today, I would like to recognize two such heroes from my State of Alabama: Michael Hosey and Jason Barfield and their families.

For U.S. Army SSG Michael Wesley Hosey, there was never a question in anyone's mind as to what he wanted to do when he grew up. Every career day, he would always dress up as a soldier. Michael loved reading about history, and he loved our country, so much so that his friends and family gave him the nickname ''Merican,'' with an ''m.'' That is ''American'' without an ''a.''

Because Michael was only 17 when he graduated from Clay-Chalkville High School, his dad, also named Michael, had to sign his permission for him to enlist in the Army. As a Vietnam veteran, the elder Michael knew all too well what his son was signing up for. Yet the Hosey family supported Michael's decision to serve his country. There is no question that this courageous young man also came from a courageous family.

Michael graduated from boot camp 3 days after 9/11. He had a gift for learning languages quickly and planned to use this talent to become a communications intelligence specialist. This ability to quickly pick up on a new language, combined with his outgoing personality, made Michael a favorite with the local Afghans.

Members in Michael's unit recall him quickly receiving a dinner invitation from one of the local families shortly after moving into the area. Michael had a giving heart and continued to earn the trust of the locals, especially all the kids.

His sister Laurie recalls him always asking his family to send candy when they sent him a package. At first, she found this odd because Michael wasn't a big candy eater. But they would always send Skittles or gum. She later realized Michael wasn't asking for candy himself but to share with all the kids in the country.

Sadly, Michael lost his life on September 17, 2011, during Operation Enduring Freedom, 1 week before his 28th birthday.

When sharing the story, Laurie wants us to remember that freedom is not free. It is a reality that her and Michael's parents—Condi and the older Michael—still carry with them every single day.

For Marine LCpl Jason Barfield of Ashford, AL, he also was born with a strong desire to serve his country.

His father Ray is a disabled Army veteran and Jason's great-grandfather, also named Jason, was killed in World War II.

Jason lived his life with the goal of making a difference. His mom Kelli says that Jason believed that there was good in everyone. Even if you couldn't find it at first, that just meant to dig a little bit deeper.

Jason lived by the motto that ''Every day is a good day.''

He also had a gift for music and was in the band at Ashford High School. He enjoyed singing in church, playing the saxophone, and was teaching himself to play the piano. Jason's hard work and talents earned him a 4-year band scholarship to Huntington College. He chose to forgo the scholarship to enlist in the Marines because he wanted to be part of the best.

Kelli remembers asking Jason's recruiter about the dangers that he was signing up for and the sinking feeling when the recruiter replied:

> No, ma'am, I can't guarantee that he'll come home.

Jason surprised his family for Christmas in 2010 and spoke about his new goal to reenlist in the military and become a chaplain. The Barfields didn't know this would be their last holiday that they would spend together. Jason was killed in action on October 24, 2011, at the young age of 22.

Sensing the danger that was ahead of Jason, he pushed eight of his fellow marines, a native translator, and a K–9 out of the way from the booby trap explosion that would claim his own life.

Jason's platoon Sergeant Gunney Thrash said:

> His name and his actions for his fellow Marines will outlive all of us.

Jason was a hero. He makes all Alabamans proud.

Michael Wesley Hosey and Jason Barfield are two young men who never got to start a family or fully pursue their dreams. We are forever grateful and indebted to them for their sacrifice that gives us the assurance to sing the national anthem, not with a question mark, but with a declaration that we are the ''land of the free and the home of the brave.''

I am reminded of the words in John 15:13: Greater love has no one than this, than to lay down one's life for his friends.

We may never have met Michael or Jason, yet they courageously were willing to give their lives for their fellow Americans. We will continue to share their stories to ensure their sacrifices are never, ever forgotten.

As Memorial Day approaches, I hope we take time to honor Americans that have fallen, along with the great families who have been left behind. May we never forget that freedom is not free.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. PADILLA. Madam President, I want to begin by saying happy anniversary. Happy anniversary.

Thirty-two years ago today, President Clinton signed the National Voter Registration Act into law. The so-called Motor Voter Act—that is what it became known as—made commonsense and unprecedented strides to registering more eligible Americans to vote. Imagine that—taking advantage of the fact that motor vehicle agencies and other State and local government offices that interact with Americans every single day can easily, efficiently, securely assist U.S. citizens with one of the most fundamental rights: registering to vote and participating in our elections.

A little over 3 years after it was signed into law—on May 24, 1996, more precisely—I proudly completed my own training as a deputy registrar in Los

Angeles County, which qualified me to register voters in my own community. Nearly two decades later, I was sworn in as California's 30th secretary of state, becoming the chief elections officer to the most populous and most diverse State in the Nation. Just earlier this year, I was proud to become the ranking member of the Senate Rules and Administration Committee, with jurisdiction over Federal elections. So it would be an understatement for me to say that I am proud to bring my decades of elections administration experience to the discussions and deliberations of this body.

Throughout my time in public service, I have seen personally that one of the single greatest ways to increase not just civic engagement more broadly but voter registration and voter participation more specifically is to meet Americans where they already are. Motor Voter tried to do exactly that—registering voters at State departments of motor vehicles and other public agencies, including State colleges and universities, military recruitment offices, and others.

That is a good thing for our democracy because we should all believe in that most basic of lessons that I believe we all learned in high school civics class—that our democracy works best when its many eligible people participate.

One other place that the National Voter Registration Act can and should extend to is naturalization ceremonies, giving new, eligible U.S. citizens the information they need to register to vote should they want to.

If you have never had the opportunity to attend one before, I can tell you personally that there are few experiences that give you more of that patriotic feeling than inside the four walls of a naturalization ceremony. If you ever had doubts or questions about what it means to be an American, I encourage you to ask a newly naturalized citizen.

When I served as California's secretary of state, it was such an honor to speak at a number of these ceremonies. Part of the sacredness of the experience that I felt was standing up on the stage, looking out at the audience, and being told by the USCIS personnel how many countries were being represented there. Maybe it was dozens of people, maybe it was hundreds of people representing literally dozens or hundreds of countries. So walking into the auditorium, walking into the convention center hall, there were immigrants from countries all over the world, but upon taking that oath and leaving that ceremony, they were all U.S. citizens.

While some people get to that point of naturalization, having been in the country for a couple of years, some after several decades, some coming from working-class families and others from very wealthy families, some families who have been here just a few years and others who have been here maybe multiple generations—maybe some of these new citizens never had a chance to go to college or even high school. Others were there with not just bachelor's and master's degrees but Ph.D.s, maybe multiple degrees. The one thing that was constant for everybody was that as a U.S. citizen, you now had the right to vote. And in our elections, not only does every vote count, but every vote counts equally. Think about that. How beautiful is that?

As I think about the people who go through the process, I can't help but also think about my parents because they went through the naturalization process. When I see the dozens or hundreds of immigrants becoming citizens, I envision what their preparation was like because it was very similar, no doubt, to what my parents did—taking classes, studying, showing up at every important appointment, filling out all those forms. On the day they finally take the oath of allegiance, they earn the full benefits of U.S. citizenship.

So it was an honor and a privilege to be able to address those audiences as secretary of state and encourage them not just to get involved in the community but to register to vote and exercise their new right to vote. And, of course, I would do it on a nonpartisan basis.

But the statistics tell us that registration amongst naturalized citizens still lags behind other voters. During the 2022 election, only 61 percent of naturalized citizens were registered to vote compared to 70 percent of native-born Americans.

So the data tells us that we have a responsibility to do more here. That is why today I am asking my colleagues to pass the Including New Voters in the Electorate Act, also known as the INVITE Act.

My bill would use the powers of the National Voter Registration Act to designate USCIS field offices as voter registration Agencies, effectively giving our field staff not just the opportunity but the duty to help new, eligible U.S. citizens register to vote. Rather than just hand out a form, it would empower USCIS personnel to actually assist new citizens in completing and returning their voter registration forms.

I can predict what some of the counterargument might be, so let me just say to everyone who regularly expresses concern about ''noncitizens voting,'' I would suggest, what better place to make sure citizens are registered than at a naturalization ceremony?

With the flexibility to work with State and local agencies however they see fit, my bill would take those spaces that are so crucial to our democracy and turn them into catalysts for democratic participation because the responsibilities that come with citizenship don't end upon taking the oath of citizenship; that is just the beginning.

I urge all of my colleagues, Republican and Democrat, to join me in supporting this commonsense bill to invest in and strengthen our democracy.

Notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of my bill, which is at the desk. I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I want to thank my friend and colleague the senior Senator from the State of California for his passion in pursuing what is itself a laudable goal, which is helping newly sworn-in, newly naturalized U.S. citizens to register to vote. But I have no choice but to object to this unanimous consent request, this effort to pass it without further debate—without any debate today.

I want to point out that this is a bill that hasn't gone through any of the regular processes. It is therefore inappropriate for us to consider it at this point.

Look, the bill itself was just barely introduced. It hasn't had a hearing, hasn't had a markup before the Senate Judiciary Committee on which we both serve or otherwise, nor has there been any debate on this topic.

No doubt it is important to make sure that our newly naturalized citizens have the opportunity to register to vote, but that puts the cart before the horse in many regards. If we haven't done our homework, we could cause problems.

No one disputes the fact—at least no one disputes the fact now that there are, in fact, noncitizens voting in Federal elections. No one disputes that there are already laws on the books making it a crime for noncitizens to vote in U.S. elections. U.S. Federal elections are for U.S. citizens and no one else, and it is a crime to do otherwise.

We have had some of these discussions over the last year, and in the months leading up to the 2024 general election, there were a lot of unsubstantiated claims made to the effect that noncitizens don't vote. We know now that that is not true. There have been a number of documented instances from this last general election alone in which that happened. This reflects the fact that we often do a poor job of making sure noncitizens don't vote.

On the current voter registration form, the Federal voter registration form, there is just a box, a little box that one checks for the applicant to indicate whether he or she is a U.S. citizen. Provided that he or she checks that box and later signs the form for a driver's license, that person can then obtain voter registration in the same State in which he or she has applied for a driver's license. All we have to go on is that person's word as to citizenship.

No one asks for documentary proof of citizenship—no.

One might ask: Why? Why has no one asked for this, especially if it is a known problem?

Well, this dates back to an interpretation of the 1993 National Voter Registration Act, the NVRA, which is also sometimes referred to as the Motor Voter law. It was a decision by the U.S. Supreme Court that interpreted provisions of the NVRA as prohibiting the State officials administering that form, receiving that form, from asking for any kind of proof of citizenship.

Now, that interpretation was, in my view, wrong. I agree with Justice Alito's dissent in that case saying that the statute contains no such requirement; there is nothing in there prohibiting States from doing that. Nonetheless, that ruling stands, remains on the books today, prohibiting State officials, when receiving those forms, from doing any verification, requesting any proof as to citizenship.

That is why I, last year, introduced a bill called the SAFE Act that would amend the National Voter Registration Act to make clear what I believe was already clear but that the Supreme Court got wrong, allowing State officials to request proof of citizenship at the time these documents are submitted and setting requirements for that to happen.

The SAFE Act identifies, establishes, and outlines acceptable documentation for proving citizenship, and it requires the States to set up alternative verification processes for citizens who don't have the normal, necessary, contemplated documentation, including for those instances—very, very common instances—in which a woman marries and thereafter changes her name to a married name not evident on any birth certificate she may have.

When you contemplate the many dozens of women who support the SAVE Act in this Chamber and in the other and who voted for it in the other Chamber, who were part of the process of drafting this bill—they and I and the others who were involved in its drafting, we all went out of our way to make sure that these documentation standards were not unduly onerous. In fact, if anything, they are less onerous than those requirements, those documentation standards that already exist in other areas of the law.

Take, for example, labor and employment. Anytime any American citizen starts a new job as an employee, he or she is required to fill out a form called the I–9. The I–9 form requires an American citizen to provide proof of citizenship. And if you are not an American citizen, then you have to provide proof of your work eligibility, providing proof of your visa and the documentation that goes along with that.

Now, just as it is true that married women who have changed their name to their married name, a married last name that is different than that found on their birth certificate—just as women every single day across this country are able to start a new job without that being an impediment, we have made sure that the SAVE Act would leave things the same way. If anything, we made it easier in the context of casting this sacred, important vote and registering to become eligible to cast such a vote.

The legislation, the SAVE Act, also compels States to purge noncitizens from voter rolls and establishes Federal penalties for intentionally registering noncitizens to vote in Federal elections.

Over the last 4 years, many, many millions upon millions of illegal aliens have entered our country's borders, and of those, a nonzero but ultimately unknown number of them were improperly registered to vote. No one disputes that this has happened. They don't now; they didn't last summer; they don't now because the proof is there, and it remains undisputed.

At a time when trust in voting is as important as it has ever been, if not more so, we must stop any avenue for foreign election interference, and we need to pass the SAVE Act.

Voting is both a sacred right and an important responsibility that accompanies American citizenship, and allowing people—people of other countries, people of other countries who are not citizens of our country—to violate the law and to access our elections and vote in our elections contrary to the law is a great blow to our security and to our self-governance.

The House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed the SAVE Act a few weeks ago, and now it is our turn to pass the SAVE Act and that we must do.

In light of the foregoing and in light of the fact that, if we were to take a step like that contemplated and proposed by my friend and colleague—and he is both, the senior Senator from California—without putting in place these additional safeguards that we need in the SAVE Act, safeguards that are no more intrusive—and, in fact, if anything, are less intrusive—than those already in existence in everyday events like starting a new job, I must object, and I hereby do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from California.

Mr. PADILLA. Madam President, I think I tried to make the point clear. While I respect where my colleague from the State of Utah is coming from, I just fundamentally disagree.

The National Voter Registration Act, which this body passed on a bipartisan basis back in 1993, was designed to expand voter registration opportunities by making it easier for eligible Americans to register when they interact with government Agencies, plain and simple, and that is all this bill seeks to do, by designating USCIS as a voter registration entity under the NVRA.

And the point is simple. When anybody goes to apply for a driver's license or a State ID, as you are filling out those forms, you do add name, date of birth, your address, you are signing all that same information for a driver's license or an ID that you are putting on the voter registration card or form when you are registering to vote.

And yes, you do sign as to the accuracy of the information under penalty of perjury. So it is not just the check the box nonchalantly; you are signing under penalty of perjury. And there have been occasions when people are charged with false registration or improper registration. So the laws are working. The instances of ineligible voters voting are very, very rare, but they happen. That means our laws are working.

So we will keep trying to work on the INVITE Act, but I encourage my colleague to think about not just the spirit of this proposal but the context of the success of the NVRA over the last several decades.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 22

Mr. LEE. Madam President, we need to remember a couple of things. First, when someone has gone through the process of immigrating to the United States, they have completed a journey—perhaps a lengthy odyssey—of moving to the United States, applying for and ultimately obtaining U.S. citizenship. They have provided a lot of documentation. They have done a lot of things to make that happen.

And it would be an insult to those who are U.S. citizens, whether naturalborn or naturalized citizens, to make it easy for people to cheapen that, to undermine it, to dilute that by coming in and saying: You know, I am filling out my driver's license application, and all I have to do here is check a box—check a box, sign my name saying, yes, I am a U.S. citizen.

Well, you know, that is not an option in other areas where citizenship is required. It is absolutely not an option, for example, in applying for a passport, which is one of the documents that can be provided and often is provided when someone completes the process of filling out an I–9 and thereby establishing their work eligibility as a U.S. citizen. One of the forms that they can provide to help establish that is a U.S. passport.

But regardless of what combination of identification they use, they do have to establish their citizenship. Why? Well, because that is the law. There are very good reasons why we have those laws in place to make sure that, when someone starts a job, they are either a U.S. citizen or they have a visa with some type of work authorization in it.

So it makes zero sense, for something as significant and important to the very foundations of our constitutional Republic as the right to vote, that we could just so lightly cast aside the need to verify citizenship when we go out of our way in other contexts, like starting a new job, to make sure that they prove it.

So, sure. My friend and colleague points out, when people fill out that driver's license application, they do have to check that box, and they do have to sign their name, but why make it so that someone could lie, especially when read against the backdrop of the Supreme Court ruling 12 years ago, concluding—wrongly, in my view but concluding nonetheless, and that decision is on the books—that not only do they not have to prove citizenship, but no State official, when receiving the driver license application form, may even inquire, even if they have reasons to doubt that the person has committed something or otherwise—they can't ask, even if there has been a wave in that State or in that area or across the country of noncitizens registering to vote and that State wants to make a decision—you know, we really ought to provide some degree of documentation—they are not allowed to do any of that.

So this is filling that gap, and it is important to do that.

To that end, Madam President, notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 22, the SAVE Act, which is at the desk. I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from California.

Mr. PADILLA. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I reserve the right to object not for the first time on this proposed SAVE Act, not even for the second time on this proposed SAVE Act.

This is an item that my colleague has brought up repeatedly here before the Senate. So I won't repeat the arguments and explanations that I have made in prior objections to the SAVE Act but to suggest it is a solution in search of a problem. Audit after audit, review after review, investigation after investigation has demonstrated that the instances of ineligible immigrants voting in elections is exceedingly, exceedingly, exceedingly rare, which, again, means that our current laws are working.

And to suggest that birth certificates be required for a certain task when it is already secure—we could have—I would be walking around with my birth certificate in my pocket.

A passport is another acceptable form of documentation for citizenship. Half the American public doesn't have a current, valid passport because not everybody travels abroad on a regular basis. So they are unnecessary. Our current laws are working, and, therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, with great respect to my friend and colleague the distinguished senior Senator from California, he has suggested that the SAVE Act, which merely requires some type of proof of citizenship when someone registers to vote in U.S. elections—that the SAVE Act itself is a solution in search of a problem.

My friend also suggests that no documentary proof of citizenship is or should be made necessary, even considering the Supreme Court's ruling that States are not even allowed to request such documentation where they may deem it necessary. He suggests that this is the case because, as he puts it, the occurrence of noncitizens voting in U.S. elections is not only rare, but it is exceedingly, exceedingly, exceedingly rare, as he puts it.

I don't know exactly what that means, but I do know that, taken to its logical conclusion, that same logical leap could and would lead us to all kinds of outcomes that we would never dream of. There are all sorts of things that may be rare by some standard or another. Sure, it is true that most of the people voting in U.S. elections are not noncitizens. In fact, I would say that they would be a small, small, small minority of those casting votes because most people here in the United States, most people voting in U.S. elections, are, in fact, U.S. citizens.

But taken to its logical conclusion, that would suggest that there is no need for TSA, which, actually, I would be fine with for all sorts of reasons. But taken to its logical conclusion, it would suggest there is no need for you to identify yourself when you go through TSA because instances of terrorism are exceedingly rare or instances of people boarding an airplane in somebody else's name are exceedingly rare. Sure, that happens.

Taken to its logical conclusion, it would also suggest that because instances of people starting a job, beginning employment in the United States as an American citizen or as a noncitizen pretending to be an American citizen, are exceedingly, exceedingly, exceedingly rare, as he puts it, therefore we should require no documentary evidence of either U.S. citizenship on one hand or work eligibility with a visa on the other hand.

I could go on and on. But it is not an answer to the need for the SAVE Act, to the demand that 80-plus percent of the American people agree with, which is noncitizens shouldn't vote in U.S. elections. It is not an answer to that demand, to that widely held bipartisan supermajority view, not an answer to that to suggest that because noncitizen voting is rare, we need not require any proof of citizenship ever.

Why? Well, there are so many reasons why, but here is the simplest one. When we make that easy, more people would do it. Some elections are decided by large margins; others are decided by, to use his words, exceedingly, exceedingly, exceedingly small margins.

We would be doing ourselves and the American people and the American Republic and the U.S. Constitution a grave, grave disservice if we didn't take that risk very seriously.

Foreign election interference and meddling in our system is a real threat. We need to take it seriously. It is tragic and unfortunate.

In fact, it is shameful that we haven't passed the SAVE Act. This is not the end of this issue. I will be back. We will get this passed. But between now and whenever we do get it passed, the American people are taking on a risk because of this body's unwillingness to act.

And it is not this body. Let's face it. It is Members of this body on one side of the aisle, and not on the other, who are willing to incur this risk.

That, tragically, is a sacrifice they are willing to make. We, tragically, are a sacrifice they are willing to make. Let's not let them continue to make it. Let's pass the SAVE Act.

(Mr. MORENO assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARSHALL). The Senator from Vermont.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 224

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, all of us are extremely concerned—and I mean all of us: Senator RISCH and all the Republican colleagues and me and all of the Democratic colleagues—about the suffering and famine that are upon the folks in Gaza.

Today, I am here to offer a resolution for consideration on which 46 Senators on our side agree. Although we have not had signatories on the Republican side, I know that my colleagues on the Republican side are very concerned about the devastating absence of food, medicine, and baby formula for 2 million Palestinians who are living in Gaza.

It has been 74 days since aid trucks were allowed to transit into Gaza. That is a decision that the Israeli Government has made under Prime Minister Netanyahu. What does alarm me is that it is very clear under international law and it is very clear on prior actions that this U.S. Senate has taken that in a conflict, as a tactic of war, starving a civilian population is illegal, impermissible, and just wrong, absolutely wrong.

As an indication of the suffering, this is one young child who died in her parents' arms, Janan Al-Saqafi. That was due to no food, no baby formula to feed this young person.

The U.N. has released a report that indicates that if food is not brought into Gaza within the next 48 hours, 14,000 more infants will die, and they will die in the arms of their mother or father.

So this question of should aid get in—obviously it should. It is not right for aid to be withheld as an instrument of war. Regrettably, that appears to have been a decision that has been made by the Israeli Government. It is not right, it is not necessary, it is not helpful, and it is extraordinarily harmful to innocent children and to innocent mothers.

My hope is that this Senate would pass a resolution making very clear our concern about the well-being of innocent Palestinians in Gaza. The food those Palestinians in Gaza need is right on the other side of the border. It is there. All it needs is to be transported from where it is into Gaza and then distributed.

I want to just quote a Palestinian about how dire that situation is. In the words of a Palestinian:

Believe it or not—

This is, by the way, at a moment when bombs are still dropping, where people who have been relocated a dozen times are having to relocate again, where the two remaining hospitals in Khan Younis have been bombed, where there is no security whatsoever.

This is what a Palestinian said that sums it up:

Believe it or not, people no longer care about bombs, rockets, or even death. What consumes them now is food. How to find it. How to feed their children. It is impossible to describe how hard life has become. People walk around in a daze, dizzy from malnutrition and despair. People are confused, anxious, and exhausted. They are literally dying of hunger. At this point, they would accept anything just to survive. People are fainting in the streets. They look like skin and bones, pale and dizzy. If you saw them, you would break down and cry.

Those are the words of a Palestinian in Gaza.

Mr. President, we have to feed those people. The food is there. We all want those innocent people to survive and avoid famine. Let us do every single thing we can to persuade the Israeli Netanyahu Government to get that food in to people who desperately need it.

At this point, I yield to my colleague Senator VAN HOLLEN from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, first, I want to thank my friend and colleague the Senator from Vermont Mr. WELCH for offering this resolution.

I just want to focus on the resolution itself for a moment because you would think this is something we could all agree on.

I am just reading the resolved clause here:

Resolved, That the Senate—(1) is gravely concerned with—(A) the humanitarian crisis and acute suffering of the Palestinian civilians in Gaza; and (B) the suffering of the hostages and hostage families.

That is section 1 of the resolved clause.

Senator WELCH has said and I think we all acknowledge the terrible humanitarian disaster that Palestinian civilians are suffering under right now. Trump just acknowledged it the other day. He said that a lot of people are starving.

Cindy McCain said:

Families in Gaza are starving while the food they need is sitting at the border.

Fifty-seven children have already died from malnutrition, and the reports are that 14,000 Palestinian children in Gaza are at imminent risk of death if they don't get more food.

Just yesterday, after 78 days of a total siege and blockade on any food coming into Gaza, a trickle of food began to get in, primarily because European countries began to say very loudly that what was happening was unacceptable, that it was a violation of international law.

We are also hearing from the hostage families the urgency of putting an end to this conflict and resolving this to make sure their loved ones can come home.

I was very glad to see Steve Witkoff be able to bring home Edan Alexander. Now we have to bring back the rest of the hostages.

The hostage families overwhelmingly have been calling on Prime Minister Netanyahu and his government to end the conflict, end the suffering on all sides, and bring their loved ones home.

I want to just read the second part of this resolution because it does what I understand so many of the hostages' families have been saying we should do.

[C]alls on the White House, Department of State, and other relevant United States Government agencies to urgently use all available diplomatic tools to bring about the release of the hostages, an immediate cessation of the blockade on food and humanitarian aid for Palestinian civilians, and a durable end to the conflict in Gaza.

Those are part 1 and part 2 of the resolved clause that I just read.

I want to thank Senator WELCH because he has written this in a way that you would think not a single Senator would object to the words in this resolution. So I do urge my colleagues to support it.

Let's put an end to the suffering and starvation of Palestinian civilians in Gaza. Let's get the hostages home. Let's work to end this conflict in a way that ensures no more October 7ths and ensures security and dignity for both Israelis and Palestinians alike.

I yield back to the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Thank you again, the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. President, notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 224; further, that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, look, first of all, we have no disagreement with the suffering that is going on in Gaza. The problem we have here is, as we heard from both of these speakers, not one word was said as to whose fault this is. This is the fault of a group of people, and that group of people is Hamas. I heard them mention Israel several times. This is not Israel's fault. I heard them mention us, the United States. This is not our fault.

I couldn't agree more with Senator WELCH when he talks about the fact that we want an immediate cease-fire and for people to be fed there and things to get better there. It is so simple. It is so easy. It is totally in the hands of Hamas. If they release the hostages, they lay down their arms, and they surrender, not one more bullet will be fired, and there will be scads of trucks coming into Gaza. That is how this ends.

But can we end it? No. If we send trucks in—the Senator knows. The Senator has seen the intelligence on some of this. When we send food and trucks in there, who eats? The soldiers eat. The Hamas soldiers eat. They starve the women, and they starve the children.

Not only do they starve them; they use them as human shields. And they set up their facilities—their military facilities—in hospitals, in schools, in mosques, in all kinds of places that they then wring their hands and say: Oh, my gosh, we have been attacked.

Look, this is despicable. This is horrible. This is criminal. It is beyond human understanding how human beings could treat other human beings the same way, especially when you are related to them, as they are in Palestine.

So I agree that this needs to stop, but the first thing that needs to be said is that this is the fault of Hamas, and it is not our fault. And it doesn't matter if we roll trucks in there tomorrow. That food would be taken. It would be stolen. It would be distributed by Hamas to their fighting soldiers, and the dying and the suffering of the women and children would continue.

This thing is badly aimed. It does not, in any way, lay the fault where it belongs, and that is at the feet of Hamas. So based on all that—I share your objective—this gets us nowhere. And worse than that, it doesn't point out where the problem is.

Madam President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. LUMMIS). Objection is heard.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Madam President, I want the Senator from Idaho, the esteemed chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, to know that when it comes to condemning Hamas for what it did on October 7, for what it has done to the Palestinians in Gaza on an ongoing basis, I join you in condemning Hamas.

And this resolution does not get into the question of fault. It gets into the question of suffering. It gets into the question of the suffering of innocent people who, at times, have been victimized by Hamas but whose families are hungry, who are starving. And the point of this resolution is to say: Let's help them avoid starvation by supporting the delivery of the food and the

medicine and the baby formula that they need.

This, in no way, is going to solve the conflict. That is a point the Senator made, and he has got a point to be made. But if we do all we can to facilitate the delivery of aid, it means that we are doing all we can to ease the suffering of innocent families who have been victimized.

My view is that we should do all we can to alleviate the suffering, especially for these infants, these children, these women, and peace-loving Palestinians who want nothing more than to live in peace in their neighborhood.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Madam President, I want to respond to that.

First of all, I commend the Senator for his appreciation for the suffering that is going on. It is horrible. It is despicable. You have seen the photos. You have seen the video. It is a horrible, horrible situation.

One of the difficulties I have with this is that he is correct; this resolution does not assign fault, nor does it talk about fault. And that is one of the biggest problems I have with this. If this is going to be resolved, fault must be identified. The conditions on the ground have to be identified. And how this is going to be resolved has to be identified, none of which is considered in here. It is simply a suggestion that simply taking food there is going to resolve this problem, and we have done that. We have food there. It is ready to go in.

As I said, three things need to happen, and it is in the hands solely of Hamas—not in Israel, not in Netanyahu, not in our President, not in the people of the United States' hands. It is in the hands of Hamas. And that is, if they simply release the hostages, lay down their arms and surrender, it is over. The food flows in. There is not another bullet fired. That is all that has to happen. But what has to be recognized in this is how this is going to end. There is only one way this can end, and that is with complete and total destruction of Hamas.

This is very similar to what the United States of America and its allies did in the late 1930s. We decided that the Nazis were so bad that they could not exist as a military force, as a political force, or as a cultural force, and we decided they needed to be eliminated.

That is what Israel decided it has to do to protect itself. That is what it is doing.

But Hamas can stop this. They can stop it in a minute, and they are not showing any signs of that. So what is going to happen is this fight is going to go on until the last Hamas falls.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

NO TAX ON TIPS ACT

Ms. ROSEN. Madam President, hard-working families in Nevada and all across this country are struggling to make ends meet because of rising costs on everything, from groceries to housing, all of which has been made worse by Donald Trump's tariffs that are driving prices even higher.

Nevadans, our families, we are being squeezed, and they need real relief. They need us to work together to lower costs for them. That is why I introduced the No Tax on Tips Act alongside Senator TED CRUZ from Texas, which would eliminate Federal income taxes on tipped wages.

For so many service and hospitality workers, tips aren't extra; it is part of their income that they use to make ends meet. Tips are how Nevadans pay their rent, cover their groceries, take care of their families, their kids.

And Nevada has more tipped workers per capita than any other State. So this bill would mean immediate financial relief for countless hard-working families.

No tax on tips was one of President Trump's key promises to the American people, which he unveiled in my State of Nevada. And I am not afraid to embrace a good idea wherever it comes from. So I agreed we need to get this done.

This is not a time for politics. It is a time for progress for hard-working Americans. This bipartisan bill is a good idea that has support from Democrats and Republicans. So we should pass it as soon as possible without any poison pills.

The problem is that the House Republicans have included a version of the No Tax on Tips Act in their bigger budget bill—a bill that cuts Medicaid, SNAP, and other programs families rely on, to give more tax breaks for billionaires and the ultrawealthy.

So we shouldn't be forcing working families to choose between keeping their healthcare or keeping their tips, which is why we want this bipartisan bill to pass on its own—on its own—not part of a harmful, extreme budget bill.

If we are serious about providing service employees with financial relief, let's do it now. Let's do it today because the American people, they get sick and tired of Washington games.

So let's pass this bill without playing politics, without taking away healthcare and food assistance from families who need it the most. Let's pass it by itself.

That is why I am calling on the Senate to pass the bipartisan No Tax on Tips Act right here, right now, as a stand-alone bill. We are going to cut taxes for real hard-working Americans, for Nevadans, for everyone, not just for billionaires. We are going to cut taxes on service workers' tips without cutting Medicaid or SNAP. And let's get this done with strong guardrails so CEOs and the ultrawealthy don't exploit loopholes meant to help working people. Let's pass it today.

Nevadans sent me here to fight for them, and so I am going to keep working to lower costs, to raise wages, and to make sure people who power our economy—our working families—can keep more of what they earn. And through this bipartisan bill, it shows that I am not going to allow Washington gridlock and partisanship to block a bill without a fight. That is why we are going to pass it today, taking matters into my own hands, with the support of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, to pass our bipartisan No Tax on Tips Act by unanimous consent.

And so, notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of S. 129 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 129) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate the application of the income tax on qualified tips through a deduction allowed to all individual taxpayers, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Ms. ROSEN. Madam President, I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The bill (S. 129) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

S. 129

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 ''No Tax on Tips Act''.

SEC. 2. DEDUCTION FOR QUALIFIED TIPS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) DEDUCTION ALLOWED.—Part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating section 224 as section 225 and by inserting after section 223 the following new section:

''SEC. 224. QUALIFIED TIPS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There shall be allowed as a deduction an amount equal to the qualified tips received during the taxable year that are included on statements furnished to the employer pursuant to section 6053(a).

''(b) MAXIMUM DEDUCTION.—The deduction allowed by subsection (a) for any taxpayer for the taxable year shall not exceed $25,000.

''(c) QUALIFIED TIPS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified tip' means any cash tip received by an individual in the course of such individual's employment in an occupation which traditionally and customarily received tips on or before December 31, 2023, as provided by the Secretary.

''(2) EXCLUSION FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES.—Such term shall not include any amount received by an individual in the course of employment by an employer if such individual had, for the preceding taxable year, compensation (within the meaning of section

414(q))(4) from such employer in excess of the amount in effect under section 414(q)(1)(B)(i).''.

(2) PUBLISHED LIST OF OCCUPATIONS TRADITIONALLY RECEIVING TIPS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) shall publish a list of occupations which traditionally and customarily received tips on or before December 31, 2023, for purposes of section 224(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by paragraph (1)).

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by redesignating the item relating to section 224 as relating to section 225 and by inserting after the item relating to section 223 the following new item:

''Sec. 224. Qualified tips.''.

(b) DEDUCTION ALLOWED TO NON-ITEMIZERS.—Section 63(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting ''and'', and by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) the deduction provided in section 224.''.

(c) NON-APPLICATION OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS FOR ITEMIZERS.—

(1) DEDUCTION NOT TREATED AS A MISCELLANEOUS ITEMIZED DEDUCTION.—Section 67(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (11), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (12) and inserting '', and'', and by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(13) the deduction under section 224 (relating to qualified tips).''.

(2) DEDUCTION NOT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT UNDER OVERALL LIMITATION.—Section 68(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting '', and'', and by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) the deduction under section 224 (relating to qualified tips).''.

(d) WITHHOLDING.—The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) shall modify the tables and procedures prescribed under section 3402(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to take into account the deduction allowed under section 224 of such Code (as added by this Act).

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2024.

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF CREDIT FOR PORTION OF EMPLOYER SOCIAL SECURITY TAXES PAID WITH RESPECT TO EMPLOYEE TIPS TO BEAUTY SERVICE ESTABLISHMENTS.

(a) EXTENSION OF TIP CREDIT TO BEAUTY SERVICE BUSINESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 45B(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(2) APPLICATION ONLY TO CERTAIN LINES OF BUSINESS.—In applying paragraph (1) there shall be taken into account only tips received from customers or clients in connection with the following services:

''(A) The providing, delivering, or serving of food or beverages for consumption, if the tipping of employees delivering or serving food or beverages by customers is customary.

''(B) The providing of beauty services to a customer or client if the tipping of employees providing such services is customary.''.

(2) BEAUTY SERVICE DEFINED.—Section 45B of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) BEAUTY SERVICE.—For purposes of this section, the term 'beauty service' means any of the following:

''(1) Barbering and hair care.

''(2) Nail care.

''(3) Esthetics.

''(4) Body and spa treatments.''.

(b) CREDIT DETERMINED WITH RESPECT TO MINIMUM WAGE IN EFFECT.—Section 45B(b)(1)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''as in effect on January 1, 2007, and''; and

(2) by inserting '', and in the case of food or beverage establishments, as in effect on January 1, 2007'' after ''without regard to section 3(m) of such Act''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2024.

Ms. ROSEN. Madam President, before I yield my time to the Senator from Texas, I just want to say this is great news for Nevada. Our bill just passed. Our hospitality and service staff are working harder than ever while being squeezed by rising costs. This bill is not the be-all and end-all, but it is going to offer immediate financial relief while the Senate continues to work to lower costs and find other avenues of relief for hard-working families.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I remember, as a kid in Sunday school, thinking what it would have been like to live in Israel in the age of the apostles, in the time of miracles. And yet, perhaps we have been transformed to another time of miracles.

Yesterday, I was at the White House, where President Trump signed into law bipartisan legislation—my legislation—the TAKE IT DOWN Act, which I authored with Senator AMY KLOBUCHAR to protect women, to protect teenage girls, to protect young people online from nonconsensual intimate images.

We saw both parties come together and pass landmark legislation, and just a moment ago, 24 hours later, we saw the same thing happen.

So I thank my colleague from Nevada for moving for this to pass by unanimous consent. And I want everyone to reflect on what you just saw happen because it is consequential.

Last year, in the midst of the Presidential campaign, President Trump, at a rally in Las Vegas, announced his policy proposal of no tax on tips. And the Presiding Officer will recall that, the week after he announced that, he came and had lunch with the Republican Senators, and he told us the backstory of where the idea came from.

He said he was sitting at a hotel in Las Vegas, getting ready to go to his rally, and he said he was having lunch there. And he said a waitress came by, and he said: She was beautiful; she was beautiful—which I believe him. And he said she was complaining about the burden and the paperwork of paying taxes on tips and how challenging it was.

And he said he pulled out a pad of paper, and he just wrote on the pad of paper: No tax on tips.

He said: What do you think of this?

And she said: Great.

And he went to the rally, and he announced it. And as he told us, the entire crowd went nuts.

Now, I have to say, when he announced that policy, I thought that was policy genius. The next week, I drafted legislation to implement no taxes on tips, and I introduced it in the Senate the very next week. And within days, both Senators from Nevada joined my bill as cosponsors.

As the Senator from Nevada just described, she told me on the floor—she said 25 percent of all workers in the State of Nevada are tipped workers. And this is commonsense, bipartisan tax reform.

Look, I think we ought to be fighting for waiters and waitresses. We ought to be fighting for bartenders, taxicab drivers, Uber drivers. We ought to be fighting for beauticians and nail salon workers. We ought to be fighting for all the men and women who are working and working hard. We ought to be fighting for casino workers. Sorry to leave them out. As a longtime poker player, I certainly don't want to leave them out. But we ought to be fighting for blue-collar workers across this country.

And I will say, I have been urging—I have urged the House of Representatives and I have urged the White House that we should take up No Tax on Tips in the House and pass it. And I said: Look, if the House passes it, I think there is a very real chance the Senate will pass it. It is bipartisan legislation.

And what we just saw is the Senate passing No Tax on Tips 100 to 0. Every Democrat voted yes. Every Republican voted yes. And, by the way, the backstory—just kind of pulling the curtain back on how this process operates—the way the process operates is, when you are seeking to pass something by unanimous consent, you circulate what is called a hotline, and every Senator gets the chance to say: Are you going to object?

And on the Republican side, every Senator said: Nope, good by me.

And on the Democrat side, every Senator said: Nope, good by me.

And so this is now passed, and we are sending it to the House of Representatives.

Here is the good news. With what we just saw now, the certainty that we will see No Tax on Tips become the law of the land, I think, is very close to 100 percent. As the Senator from Nevada mentioned, it is included in the House's One Big Beautiful Bill, and whether it passes freestanding or as part of the bigger bill, one way or another, No Tax on Tips is going to become law and give real relief to hard-working Americans.

So I am proud of what the Senate just did, and I commend Democrats and Republicans, even at a time of partisan division, coming together and agreeing on this commonsense policy. I think that is terrific for workers in all 50 States.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ERNST). The Senator from Georgia.

EVYATAR DAVID

Mr. OSSOFF. Madam President, Evyatar David has always loved music, singing, and playing instruments with his brother Ilay and his sister Yaela at Shabbat dinners. Evyatar dreams of becoming a music producer one day, and that love of music led Evyatar to the Negev Desert for the Nova Music Festival on October 7, 2023. For months, he had been looking forward to a weekend of music and friends. But instead, Evyatar, is now, as I speak these words on the Senate floor, living his 591st day of captivity in a Hamas dungeon under Gaza.

His brother Ilay told me recently that another hostage, recently freed, brought him a message from Evyatar that Evyatar misses most of all playing music with his family. Instead, Evyatar has been starved and kept in chains with a bag over his head. He and his best friend Guy Gilboa-Dalal have been held together and tortured together.

Evyatar and Guy both have younger sisters, older brothers, parents, friends whose lives are shattered by their absence.

This is Evyatar before, but recent photos show a man abused and malnourished. And he was recently taken to witness the release of other hostages and then returned to captivity simply to torment him.

I first met Evyatar's brother Ilay when he visited Atlanta and then hosted Ilay in my office here in the Senate, and I was inspired by the tenacity of his hope and his relentless effort to ensure his brother is not forgotten. And today I rise to demand Evyatar's freedom and to demand yet again the release of all hostages held in Gaza.

Many of us in Atlanta's Jewish community, including Ohr HaTorah, Beth Jacob, B'nai Torah, and now all of the synagogues of the Atlanta Rabbinical Assembly have decided to adopt Evyatar's case, to call relentlessly for his immediate release and to ensure he is not forgotten or left for dead.

This 24-year-old man has now spent two birthdays in brutal captivity, where he remains right now at this moment, but he belongs at home with his family.

Evyatar, you are not forgotten.

Free Evyatar David. Free him now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 217

Ms. ALSOBROOKS. Notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 217 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; 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. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CRAPO. I would like to make some remarks. If my colleague is going to make some remarks, I would yield to her first.

Ms. ALSOBROOKS. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAPO. I am reserving the right to object. I will object, and we can make our remarks after.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. ALSOBROOKS. Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., Secretary of Health and Human Services, is presenting a clear and present danger to the health and well-being of the American people. He oversees 13 Agencies that are critical to U.S. health policy and the health of our Nation. One such Agency, the National Institutes of Health, is the world's leading Agency for public health research, and I am proud to represent many of the scientists who work there as the Senator from Maryland. This is the place that the Nation looks to for discoveries in public health. This is where the world looks to to fight global health crises. This is the beacon of American exceptionalism.

Over the last 40 years, NIH has helped reduce deaths from heart disease by 75 percent, deaths from stroke are down 75 percent, and NIH funding has led the fight to save countless lives with groundbreaking discoveries. NIH is the greatest credit to sustaining medical research in history.

But now, we are dealing with an administration that is a direct threat to our health. Since Donald Trump has taken office, NIH has fired 1,300 employees and has canceled more than $2 billion in Federal research grants. He wants to cut the NIH budget by 40 percent, and these cuts would be carried out by Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., one of the most unqualified individuals that we have seen to hold that position.

Secretary Kennedy took an oath to faithfully discharge the duties of the office in which he was about to enter, and to this point, he has utterly failed and is making Americans sicker.

Look at what he has done in just 4 months. We are currently watching the largest single measles outbreak in our Nation in 25 years—25 years. There are 1,000 cases, and one-third of them are children younger than 5 years old. Three people have died, including two young children.

For years, Secretary Kennedy, without an ounce of medical training, has spread lies and conspiracy theories about safe and effective vaccines—vaccines that literally prevent measles. A qualified HHS Secretary would highlight the effectiveness of vaccines and urge people to continue getting vaccinated. A capable Secretary would have some sense of compassion for suffering children. The Secretary we have, instead, chose to downplay the deaths and encourage untested treatments. This is dangerous. Americans will get sicker, and, in fact, they already have.

Our Nation has made incredible gains in IVF and infertility treatment, raising the birth rate through IVF dramatically over the last 30 years, but just last month, Secretary Kennedy fired the entire team at CDC who works on IVF and infertility research. Secretary Kennedy fired most of the employees at the CDC's Division of Reproductive Health, which helps to promote healthy pregnancies. Secretary Kennedy fired staff at the Maternal and Child Health Bureau, which oversees important programs that support children and pregnant women.

Countless women across the country have become mothers thanks to the incredible advancements in IVF, and a good number of this President's women supporters supported him because he vowed to make the treatment more accessible. How dare this man take that away from them.

Our Nation has made great progress in the fight to eliminate HIV and AIDS, building on an understanding of how to treat the virus and getting closer to finding a cure—until now. Secretary Kennedy has now cut funding for dozens of HIV-related research grants.

Did you know that there is a National Firefighter Registry that was set up to study the link between the hazards of the job and firefighters developing cancers? Well, that registry has now been taken down at Secretary Kennedy's bidding.

This is part of a heartless trend. They are destroying what decades of research has built. The billions in funding cuts and thousands of staff cuts threaten the race to find cures for Alzheimer's, ALS, cancer, and other devastating illnesses. The impact will be felt far beyond our borders, and it will be generational.

For decades, we have taken the lead on the global stage in research and development. We have taken the lead in fighting global health challenges. Many of the world's brightest researchers come here to join the fight. The top research agencies around the world partner with us. Public health is a responsibility that we must lead. R.F.K. is singlehandedly destroying that reputation, setting us back potentially decades.

The eyes of the world are on us. Most look to us to lead; some look for us to stumble. But they are watching to see what we do. Having Secretary Kennedy as the face of our Nation's health and research operation sends a terrible

message to the rest of the world and a terrifying one to the American people. He is in over his head, he cannot do the job, and he needs to step down for the health of our Nation.

To my colleagues, we took an oath as well. We have a duty—a duty—to do what is right, and we know that R.F.K., Jr., is not right for America.

I want to thank my colleague and partner here in Maryland, Senator VAN HOLLEN, as well as Senators WYDEN and WARREN, for joining me in this effort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, I want to explain the reason for my objection.

This is another of many attempts that have been made to stop the efforts of President Trump and his Cabinet and the rest of the administration in downsizing our bloated bureaucracy and trying to bring a little bit of control to the amazing growth of our Federal Government without causing the damage that is always alleged that is being done.

From groundbreaking biomedical advancements through the NIH to critical healthcare coverage for America's most vulnerable patients, the Department of Health and Human Services oversees many of the Federal Government's most essential functions. But far too often, these programs fall short of their well-intended purpose.

Bureaucratic overreach has resulted in the loss of trust from many Americans. Waste, fraud, and abuse have contributed to excessive spending without meaningful improvements in outcomes, and that is driving our national debt now to $37 or $38 trillion.

Secretary Kennedy has committed to addressing these failures. He has made himself and his staff available to Congress and the American people to restore faith in our institutions. When issues have arisen, Secretary Kennedy has worked quickly to remedy the problem. In fact, in recent days, Secretary Kennedy has appeared before two Senate committees to have an open, transparent conversation about the Department's efforts.

Last week, the Senate Finance Committee moved to advance more nominees who will assist in the Department's management and communication with Congress.

Secretary Kennedy and his team deserve time to deliver on the promise of putting patients first, promoting transparency, and following the science.

For these reasons, I objected to the request.

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

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each: myself, Senator WHITEHOUSE, and Democratic Leader SCHUMER.

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

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I rise today with my colleagues to make very, very clear—not just to our Republican colleagues but to history—exactly what is at stake. Let there be no doubt. Senate Republicans are threatening to go nuclear on Senate procedure to gut California's Clean Air Act waivers.

But this isn't just about California's climate policies, and this isn't just about the scope of the Congressional Review Act. This isn't even just about eliminating the legislative filibuster. No. What Republicans are proposing to do would go far beyond just eliminating the filibuster. If they insist on plowing forward, Federal Agencies will now have unilateral power to trigger privilege on the Senate floor with no institutional check from the legislative branch.

Just as EPA has submitted California's waivers with full knowledge that they are not actually rules, other Agencies will now be free to submit any type of action, going back to 1996. Think licenses, permits, leases, loan agreements, drug approvals. There would be no limit.

Now, we have been safe from this kind of abuse until now because the Senate has a process in place for the Government Accountability Office to help the Senate Parliamentarian determine privilege for the purposes of the CRA. But Republicans are now threatening to throw that process out. And the consequences of throwing the rule book out the window will be very, very serious, but it is not too late to turn back.

Republicans must understand exactly what they are doing. So, today, I think it is important to establish some facts about the process that protects the Senate from Agencies that try to game the system.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. President, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, is it correct that the then-Senate Parliamentarian, in 2008, in coordination with bipartisan Senate leadership and committee staff, developed a Senate procedure for determining what qualifies for expedited consideration under the Congressional Review Act when an Agency fails to submit an action to Congress and that a precedent under that procedure was first established in 2012?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Based on information that is publicly available, yes, that is correct.

Mr. PADILLA. And is it correct that that procedure, which uses a GAO determination as to the nature of the Agency action, whether or not it is a rule, has been implemented numerous times by Senators on both sides of the aisle, including one occasion where a GAO letter gave rise to a joint resolution of disapproval which became law?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Based on information that is publicly available, yes, that is correct.

Mr. PADILLA. I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I join the ranking member of the Rules Committee with a parliamentary inquiry of my own.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, is it true that unless a piece of legislation is privileged under a rule or a statutory provision or is the subject of a unanimous consent agreement, motions to proceed to that legislation are generally fully debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. That is correct. And for those of you following this at home, ''fully debatable'' means 60 votes are required to end debate, which Republicans do not have.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. President, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Is it commonplace for Senate offices and for whichever Senator is presiding over the Senate to consult with the Parliamentarian to determine whether and in what manner expedited procedures apply under a host of statutes, including the War Powers Act, the National Emergencies Act, the Congressional Budget Act, and the Congressional Review Act?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Again, for those of you following this at home, that means that this is the commonplace way in which the Senate operates and when it becomes the Parliamentarian's call on a matter and not anyone else's call.

So in the Congressional Review Act matter before us, here is what happened: Both sides drafted written memoranda to the Parliamentarian. Both sides presented oral arguments to the Parliamentarian. The Parliamentarian asked questions of both sides, and the Parliamentarian, our neutral referee, reached a decision.

That all took place here in the Senate—actually, over there in the L.B.J. Room. The GAO was not even in the room when the arguments were made. And that decision, the decision of the Parliamentarian, is what is now at hand in what is about to happen here in the Senate.

And with that, let me note the presence on the floor of the Democratic leader and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, is it true that the Parliamentarian advised leadership offices that the joint resolutions of disapproval regarding the California waivers at issue does not qualify

for expedited consideration under the Congressional Review Act?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. While the chair has no personal knowledge of those circumstances, the Parliamentarian has advised me that such advice was given.

Mr. SCHUMER. Thank you, Mr. President.

Before I yield, I want everyone to understand what the essence of my question was. This week, the Republicans want to use a legislative tool known as the CRA in an unprecedented way: to repeal emissions waivers that the fossil fuel industry has long detested.

The CRA has never been used to go after emission waivers like the ones in question today. The waiver is so important to the health of our country, and particularly to our children, to go nuclear on something as significant as this and to do the bidding of the fossil fuel industry is outrageous.

And we just heard in response to my inquiry just now that the Parliamentarian affirmed this, that these California waivers are not—not—eligible for the expedited procedures that the CRA affords.

That means that legislation to repeal these waivers should be subject to a 60-vote threshold in the Senate. To use the CRA in the way that Republicans propose is going nuclear—no ands, ifs, or buts.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

CLEAN AIR ACT

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I wonder if any other Member of this Chamber grew up like I did where on a pretty regular basis, we would be sent home from grade school because of the intensity and dangers of smog that settled over the San Fernando Valley, the city of Los Angeles.

How many of you grew up to more reports of unhealthy air quality in the air quality index or hazardous air quality forecast for that particular day than it was just clean air?

But that is the case for far too many Californians, still to this day. But it is the reason why decades ago Congress recognized both California's unique air quality challenges and its technical ingenuity and granted California special authority to do something about it.

And thanks to the bipartisan Clean Air Act of over 50 years ago, California has had that legal authority to set its own emission standards, to petition and be granted waivers to be able to show leadership—for over 50 years—because Congress recognized, rightfully so, that air quality in West Virginia or Wyoming is different than it is in Southern California, that there are fewer cars on the road in Salt Lake City than there are in Los Angeles, and because California was, and still is, the center of innovation in the United States.

Yet in 2025, it appears that Republicans want to overturn half a century of precedence in order to undermine California's ability to protect the health of our residents.

By using the Congressional Review Act to revoke California's waivers that allow us to set our own vehicle emissions standards, Republicans seem to be putting the wealth of the Big Oil industry over the health of our constituents.

What happened? You know, nearly 60 years ago, it was Republican Governor Ronald Reagan who established the State Air Resources Board in California. And 3 years later, it was Republican President Richard Nixon who signed amendments to the Clean Air Act, fulfilling promises he made in that year's State of the Union, that clean air should ''be the birthright of every American.''

I wonder if Governor, future-President Reagan and President Nixon would recognize their own party today.

I also want to take a moment to speak to parents of young children, not just in California but across the country, because parents are rightfully concerned about the safety of what our children eat, what medications they take.

You know, as parents, we have some level of control over certain things like the food we give our kids or the medications that we provide, but some things that we can't control as parents include the quality of the air they breathe outside. We can't individually control the toxic nitrogen oxides, the carbon monoxide, the sulfur dioxide, the benzene, and particulate matter that flood into our air and into our children's lungs.

Now, unless industry were to somehow decide to suddenly just do the right thing, it is incumbent upon government to act. And that is what California has done. But, of course, this discussion debate is more than just about public health. California's emissions standards also represent ambitious but achievable steps to cut carbon emissions and fight the climate crisis.

We have taken a stand because we know transportation is the single largest contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and California has been proud to set the example for other States who may choose to follow suit.

Now, I use the word ''choose,'' and I will use it repeatedly, because over and over again in this debate, I have heard some arguments coming from Republicans that I think are misleading the American public. I hear arguments like, well, California ''isn't simply setting a stricter standard for itself; it's setting a new national standard.''

Or California's ''emission standards would become de facto national ones.''

So I want to be clear. California has not and cannot force our emission standards on any other State in the Nation. As much as I may love that authority, that does not exist.

But, yes, over a dozen other States have voluntarily followed in California's footsteps, not because they were forced to, but because they chose to in order to protect their constituents, their residents, and protect our planet.

And the truth is, they do have a tremendous blueprint to follow. California is now the fourth largest economy in the world and the largest contributor to the Federal Treasury. California didn't get there by sticking our head in the sand as the clean energy transition blossomed elsewhere. We leaned in, and we proved that what is good for the air is good for business. What is good for the planet and public health is good for the economy.

But, meanwhile, the cost of inaction continues to hit Americans where it hurts the most: in our wallets. In 2021, the Natural Resources Defense Council estimated that air pollution from fossil fuels cost Americans an average of $2,500 a year in medical bills—or over $820 billion in total.

So, no, this isn't just about Republicans defending against some California power grab or fighting on behalf of the little guy, which brings me to my final point—because it is not just why Republicans are trying to undermine California's climate leadership; it is how they are trying to do it.

Now, I have been very clear on where I stand on the filibuster that has been applied counterargument in several conversations here amongst colleagues. Yes, I do support lowering the threshold to move to pass a bill from a supermajority to a simple majority—but only after there has been an opportunity for amendments and debate—in an effort to stop the endless partisan gridlock that prevents so much more progress that the American people deserve.

I have voted to make that rule change and codify it in the Senate rules; but in 2022, when we did so, Republicans opposed it, and they defended the filibuster and the 60-vote threshold as sacred.

Today, as the ranking member of the Senate Rules Committee, I want to make sure everyone understands exactly what Republicans are trying to do here, now.

The Clean Air Act passed this body under regular order by a vote of 88–12 in 1967. The Landmark Clean Air Act amendments passed the Senate 89–11 in 1990 by overwhelming bipartisan support.

But now Republicans are trying to pass these bills that strike at the heart of the Clean Air Act's provision for California on a simple majority 50-vote threshold, bypassing the filibuster.

Republicans certainly must know that they don't have the votes to amend the Clean Air Act under regular order. If they did, they would choose that path. They also know that Congress doesn't have the authority to amend the Clean Air Act through the Congressional Review Act.

Don't just take my word for it; they heard it from the independent, nonpartisan Government Accountability Office—not just once but twice. And

they heard it from the Senate Parliamentarian who told them they could not move forward.

So what Republicans are now trying to do is truly unprecedented, and it is about far more than simply California's clean energy policies. Republicans are threatening to vote on whether or not to overrule the Senate Parliamentarian.

Republicans are effectively saying that whenever the Parliamentarian rules against them, they can simply disregard her to bypass the filibuster and pass legislation on a simple majority vote. So, no, this isn't some one-off change to the rules; this is throwing out the rule book entirely. Because if they can ignore the Parliamentarian here, then why not on an upcoming tax bill or on their efforts to gut healthcare for many Americans or whatever the latest overreach is called for by President Trump?

This goes way beyond the filibuster. The Trump administration could send an endless stream of nonrule actions to Congress, going back to 1996, including vaccine approvals, broadcast licenses, merger approvals, and any number of government decisions that apply to President Trump's long list of enemies.

All it would take is a minority of 30 Senators to introduce related bills, and the Senate would be bogged down voting on Agency grocery lists all day long. Is that how we want to spend our days here at the Senate, voting on every vaccine approval because Secretary Kennedy decides to send them to Congress?

So to my Republican colleagues, I should also say this: The old adage says ''what goes around comes around,'' and it won't be long before Democrats are once again in the driver's seat here, in the majority once again. And when that happens, all bets would be off because of the precedent you could be setting here at this moment.

Think mining permits. Think fossil fuel project approvals. Think LNG export licenses or offshore leases, IRS tax policies, foreign policy, every Project 2025 or DOGE disruption. Every Agency action that Democrats don't like—whether it is a rule or not and no matter how much time has passed—would be fair game if Republicans set this new precedent.

So I suggest that we all think long and hard and very carefully about this. And I would urge my colleagues—all my colleagues—to join me, not just in defending California's rights to protect the health of our residents, not just in combatting the existential threat of climate change, but in maintaining order in this Chamber.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, let me start with just a quick overview of the Congressional Review Act which brings us here to the floor today.

Under the American legal system, administrative Agencies can make rules, and there is a very robust process for doing so. The Agency often gives a notice of proposed rulemaking so the world will know what they are considering doing and then solicit comment from affected stakeholders, the public, a wide variety of people.

So you start with an Agency that seeks to make a rule. They have to follow the processes of the Administrative Procedures Act, which is a very careful statute, well-policed by the courts, with a very robust precedent around that. And at the end of the day, the Agency creates a rule, and they adopt the rule.

Now, you could always appeal that rule to a court, but what Congress decided many years ago was that in that situation where an Agency had gone through the APA process and had promulgated a rule, that there would also be a congressional review of that rule, not just a court.

And the filing of the rule here in Congress triggers a period of review in which Senators or Members of the House can call up the Congressional Review Act and seek to disapprove the rule.

So this whole thing was originally designed and—for all the decades since the Congressional Review Act was first passed—has always been to address Agency rulemaking under the Administrative Procedures Act.

Well, the fossil fuel industry pretty much runs the Republican Party here in Washington. And for a long time, it has objected to California having clean air standards that many States, including my State, voluntarily follow because it is good for the health of our people to have clean air; it is good to have less smokestack emissions, less exhaust emissions.

But it means less gas sales for the fossil fuel industry. Efficient cars may mean lower costs for consumers, but those lower costs for consumers are lower sales for the fossil fuel industry.

So the majority here has decided to jump outside that tradition that it takes a rule developed by an Agency to kick off the Congressional Review Act.

In this case, again, for decades, pursuant to a statute, California has had the right to set emissions standards, and it was never done by rule; it was always done by an Executive action—in this case, called a waiver. And what is now being done is a real violence to that distinct and clear process.

This breaks the Congressional Review Act in at least three ways: First, it breaks the time limits of the Congressional Review Act. Again, in the ordinary course, a rulemaking goes through its ordinary process under the APA; and when it is done, it then comes here to the Senate, and we have got a short period of time in which to make a determination whether to try to disapprove it or not.

Under the proposal that is threatened here, you will be able to take any Executive decision in decades and simply by dropping it into the Federal Register, making that submission, and sending it to Congress, let the majority party say: OK, we are going to overrule that. Not a rulemaking, nothing done under the Administrative Procedures Act, just an Executive decision. So the window back in time outside of the ordinary 60 days is the first thing that they broke.

The second thing that they break is that it has to be a rule. Like I said, pretty much any Executive action could be plowed through the process that is being created here. And so however settled the reliance on a particular permit or a particular license or a particular Executive decision from years ago, it is all up for grabs under this.

And the third, of course—other than breaking open the time horizon of the Congressional Review Act and breaking open the subject matter horizon of the Congressional Review Act—is to clear out the police of the Congressional Review Act, and that is the Parliamentarian, who made what, in my view, was not a difficult decision, to say: This is not a rule, never was a rule. Year after year, administration after administration, Congress after Congress, California has used this waiver, and it was never a rule. And now, the Parliamentarian's plain, clear, obvious decision that this was not and is not and never was a rule is what they are planning to overturn.

So you are breaking open the time horizon; you are breaking open the subject matter boundary; and you are knocking out the neutral police officer who is supposed to keep us living by the rules. This does not end well.

By the way, I have heard it said that the argument from the other side is going to be they are not overruling the Parliamentarian; they are overruling the Government Accountability Office. Well, if that is what they wanted to do, there are ways to do that. If the Government Accountability Office says that the law says a certain thing and we disagree, we can go back and change that law. We can amend it so that it is clear what it is that we want the law to say and correct the GAO decision that way. We can pass a joint resolution that does the same thing. We could even pass a simple Senate resolution.

But guess what. All of those things are fully debatable. And as I said earlier, ''fully debatable'' means what? It means 60 votes to end debate, meaning that the minority party gets a vote, gets consideration.

They don't want that. They want to ram this thing through for their fossil fuel donors. Period. End of story. They don't care what they break. But, please, don't pretend that you are overruling GAO.

My team, along with Senator PADILLA's team, was in the L.B.J. Room making those arguments to the Parliamentarian. There was robust debate. We filed briefs. Questions were asked. The whole thing was a very vigorous contest, and she ruled—and she ruled.

And GAO was not even in the room. That stage was long since passed.

The reason we are here is to overrule the Parliamentarian. The reason for overruling the Parliamentarian is to get a simple majority to get around this.

There are other ways this could have been done too. EPA didn't have to do it this way. EPA could have gone through the Administrative Procedures Act and done a proper rulemaking. We could have amended the Clean Air Act and had a proper debate about this on the Senate floor. EPA would have followed regular Administrative Procedures Act order. The debate about the Clean Air Act would have followed regular Senate order. But no.

Or the fossil fuel industry could have gone to California and said: Hey, things have changed a little bit. We would like to figure out a way to work with you. You change your rule. They are the real principal party here; Rhode Island follows the California standard. They could have gone and negotiated with the sovereign State of California instead of coming here to just roll the State using a sneaky parliamentary maneuver and choosing to go nuclear to do that.

So this is not a great day in the history of the Senate. We are opening up a Pandora's box of multiple abuses, and let me just point out that there actually are a lot of legitimate CRA, Congressional Review Act, targets out there—many dozens of decisions that have been made in this Congress that lend themselves to a proper use of the Congressional Review Act.

And, guess what, it takes 30 signatures to bring one of those up. The minority can do that.

So if the majority wants to start playing CRA games, well, even under existing CRAs, where we don't need a 51-vote majority, we can start bringing up CRAs of our own, expedite them to the floor, have vote after vote after vote after vote after vote.

There are ways in which we can respond. I intend to work with my leadership to make sure what the best way is but don't think that this nuclear option gets deployed here, gets deployed for the fossil fuel industry, gets deployed against a sovereign State, and gets deployed to make air dirtier and water dirtier, and we just walk away as if nothing happened. That is not what will follow.

I yield the floor.

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. President, here we are, the moment that we have been warning about, the moment the majority and its Members used to say, under their leadership, would never come. And yet here we are, the week our colleagues may push to go nuclear and override the Parliamentarian, killing the filibuster, and going against their word to unwind 60 years of precedent and policy.

And no matter what anyone says, that is what is happening. Our colleagues will be overturning the Parliamentarian to end California's right to cleaner air. The majority promised:

We can't go there.

I am old enough to remember just when it was they said it because it was their majority leader just 19 weeks ago—19 weeks ago.

But not to worry, the majority says, this is not what this is about, they claim. Instead, we have heard the majority try to dress this up as an attack on the nonpartisan Government Accountability Office, saying that their unprecedented action was preceded, almost warranted, by the GAO's actions.

Yes, my colleagues Senator WHITEHOUSE, Senator PADILLA, and myself went to the GAO to ask for their guidance on whether this expedited measure, called the CRA, could be used to target California's waiver, California's right to establish stronger clean air standards.

And, yes, the GAO responded, affirming that this expedited process, this CRA, does not apply, that these are not rules; that if they want to strike down California's clean air rules, they can do so but not in this summary fashion, not without 60 votes.

That is the ruling that the Parliamentarian has reaffirmed and which the majority now wants to strike down.

But let's be clear. Going to the GAO was nothing out of the ordinary. In fact, it was exactly what both parties have done when adjudicating this issue for decades. There are Senators serving in this Chamber, Republicans and Democrats, who have made use of the exact same process by going to the GAO. There have been more than 20 different opinions delivered by the GAO at the request of Republican Senators and Members of Congress in the last three decades, more than 20 times.

And in the cases where the GAO found that the CRA may not apply, this expedited process may not apply, that decision has stood. They did not move forward and respected the rulings of the GAO and the Parliamentarian until now.

So what does all of this mean? What it means is, California has established clean air standards. It was given a waiver under the Clean Air Act to do so. It has done so for decades. Those standards have been adopted voluntarily by other States and, as a result, in California and many other States, we have cleaner air to breathe—until now—until now when the majority has decided to abolish the filibuster so that they could eradicate California's clean air standards so that they could use a summary process that doesn't apply here to get over the hurdle that they require 60 votes in order to do this.

And I urge my colleagues and the American people not to be distracted by suggestions that nothing is going on here, nothing new is going on here, no precedent is being set here because it is; and that is to eliminate the filibuster in the service of the oil industry—in the service of the oil industry.

Whether it is an attack on the GAO or the Parliamentarian, the new ground we find ourselves in today is dangerous, both in the effects it will have on California and on this body—in California, in particular, because it means that this Congress is abolishing the filibuster so that Californians will have to breathe dirtier air. That is what this is about. They want to abolish the filibuster so that polluters can pollute more and Californians have to breathe dirtier air because they know they don't have the votes for it otherwise.

And taken together, my colleagues are embarking on a path that will forever change the Senate. It will not just mean dirtier air for California and dirtier air for all the other States that have adopted California's higher standard; it will also mean that the filibuster is gone for a whole range of things.

Now, I represent a State that makes up 1 out of every 10 Americans. It is the fourth largest economy in the world. So 1 out of every 10 Americans is going to be deeply impacted, and, of course, if you add all of the other States that have adopted this higher standard for their citizens, it may be more like 1 out of every 5.

But it is more than that as well because what we have at stake is also a State's ability, its right to make its own laws and to protect its own citizens without having this body overturn that right.

This week's vote is shortsighted because it is going to have devastating impacts for our Nation's health, but it is more than that. And it should send a chill down the spine of legislators in every State and communities across the country, regardless of their political affiliation, because the Senate is now setting a new standard and one that will haunt us in the future, and it will haunt those States whose Senators vote to go down this path.

Make no mistake, today it is California and our ability to set our own air quality standards, but tomorrow it can be your own State's priorities made into a target by this vote to open the Pandora's box of the Congressional Review Act.

That oil drilling lease that one of your States got approved? That can be on the chopping block with the simple majority now if the filibuster is eliminated. That license for a new energy hub? Gone with a simple vote of this body. That new community grant? Gone with a simple vote of this body. That is fair game now if the majority adopts this tact. This vote to expand the power of this expedited process called the Congressional Review Act will be used to target Democratic and Republican priorities alike.

I moved to Los Angeles in 1985. I remember what it was like to breathe the air in Los Angeles in the 1980s. I have seen images of what the air was like in Los Angeles in the 1970s and the 1960s and the 1950s. We are a basin. And with

all of that automobile traffic and all of that congestion and our geography and topography, it means that exhaust gets trapped, that smog gets trapped. There are times when you can't see the hills in front of you. There are times when you can't see down the street—at least there used to be.

There is a reason why California got this waiver decades ago because there were unique challenges facing places like Los Angeles, and so California acted to protect its own citizens.

But if your State acts to protect your citizens—whether it is from dirty air that can give you lung cancer or whether it is pollutants in the water that can give you all other kinds of cancer—do we really want this body, on a simple majority vote, to be able to eviscerate what the States are doing to protect their own citizens?

I urge my colleagues again not to abandon States' rights in the Senate this week because this may be a policy that you agree with today, but the thing is about a slippery slope, you can be the one who starts down the slope, but you don't get to be the one who decides where it stops.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

REMEMBERING DOMINICK J. RUGGERIO

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Rhode Island's Senate President Dominick Ruggerio of North Providence, RI, who passed away on April 21, 2025, after a long and courageous battle with cancer. As the longest serving member of the Rhode Island State Senate, Donny was affectionately known as the ''Dean'' of the senate.

I first met Donny as a young man when we both attended La Salle Academy in Providence, RI. We played high school football together, and indeed he was a remarkable gentleman then, both on and off the field. One of the things we discovered is that—Donny was about 6 feet 2 inches. He was a wide receiver. He would be running down the field, looking at the goal line with nothing in front of him, catch the ball, and then he would trip over me. I was a defensive halfback. So we got to know each other pretty well.

He was one of the nicest gentlemen you could ever meet. He was especially kind and reached out to the younger players on the team, you know, encouraging us and also acting as sort of a custodian in making sure we got a chance and we weren't mistreated. Throughout his entire life, Donny carried that spirit to raise others up and provide opportunities for all.

Then I later had the privilege of serving with him in the Rhode Island State Senate from 1985 to 1990. Once again, he paved the way for me with his advice and assistance. Indeed, his quiet commitment to the people of Rhode Island had always been an inspiration to me and, frankly, to anyone who ever met him.

Donny was a strong advocate for organized labor and joined the Laborers' International Union of North America as a field representative and organizer, eventually becoming administrator of the New England Laborers' Labor-Management Cooperation Trust.

Donny started his public service long before we linked up again in the State senate. He began working for the late Lieutenant Governor Thomas DiLuglio and then the Rhode Island Public Transit Authority. His career continued in public service in the 1980s, when he was elected as representative of House District 5 in Providence, RI. Four years later, he succeeded his father-in-law, Majority Leader Rocco Quattrocchi, to Rhode Island Senate District No. 4, beginning his 40-year tenure in the Rhode Island State Senate.

In that role in the senate, Donny served as vice chairman of the senate labor committee, senate majority whip, deputy majority leader, and majority leader. In 2017, he was honored by his colleagues with his election to the Office of Senate President. The hallmark of Donny's leadership style was to have an open-door policy which encouraged colleagues and constituents and elected officials to become engaged. He devoted his life to improving our community, to strengthening public health and public safety, and to creating new opportunities for all Rhode Islanders to thrive. He made significant strides toward improving the lives of working Rhode Islanders, and he is credited with spearheading efforts to preserve pensions and raise the minimum wage.

In the face of recent, incredible, and ultimately insurmountable health challenges, Donny valiantly sought reelection last November in his beloved community and was returned by his senate colleagues to his post of senate president after he won reelection. He led the senate with tenacity and unwavering dedication.

Throughout his decades of public service to his constituents in North Providence and Providence and to the entire State of Rhode Island, he was strongly committed to fulfilling his responsibilities, obligations, and tasks with a sense of accountability, decency, and honor. He led his life with purpose and served the people of Rhode Island extremely well.

Donny leaves behind a devoted family, and I express my heartfelt condolences to the Ruggerio family: his children Charles Ruggerio and his wife Jillian and Amanda Fallon and her husband William; his grandchildren Ava Ruggerio, Mia Ruggerio, Natalie Fallon, and Jameson Fallon; his sister Lisa Aceto and brother-in-law James Aceto; and his nieces and nephews.

I will miss Donny's friendship, his unwavering advocacy for our State and the people who make it a special place. Rhode Island is much better today because of senate President Ruggerio's leadership and dedication. He inspired us all and will continue to do so.

I yield the floor to my colleague from Rhode Island, Senator WHITEHOUSE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I join my senior Senator today to honor our friend Dominick Ruggerio, who was both president and the dean of the Rhode Island Senate.

President Ruggerio, who passed away last month, was affectionately known as ''Donny.'' He leaves behind his children Amanda and Charles and four beloved grandchildren.

Donny was a graduate of two great Rhode Island institutions—La Salle Academy and Providence College. At La Salle, Senator REED was his schoolmate and teammate on the football team.

After finishing college, Donny served as a policy aide for former Lieutenant Governor Tom DiLuglio, who was a Rhode Island classic in his own right. Donny went on to spend many years with Laborers' Local Union 271, serving in multiple leadership roles.

Donny's career in public service continued when he was elected to the Rhode Island House of Representatives, in 1981, where he stayed for a few years until making the jump to the Rhode Island Senate, in 1984, where then-State Senator JACK REED was again his teammate in the State senate.

The senate was Donny's home. For over four decades, he was the champion for the residents of District 4, which includes parts of North Providence and Providence. After holding several leadership positions in the senate, he was elected by his peers to serve as Rhode Island's senate president in 2017. His legacy at the statehouse will be defined by his decades of forceful advocacy for working people and his practical, highly effective style of legislating.

He never forgot his background as a laborer and never stopped working to create opportunities for working men and women. To that end, he fought for a higher minimum wage and for specific projects that would create union, family-supporting jobs. He also led the charge to eliminate lead pipes, making our tap water safer to drink for Rhode Islanders.

Among his many accomplishments was his work to address the State's opioid crisis. He created a fund to support statewide opioid treatment, recovery, prevention, and education programs and shaped a law to ensure that filling a prescription for lifesaving anti-overdose medication would not create a barrier for Rhode Islanders getting life insurance.

I am grateful, in particular, for Donny's leadership on climate. He sponsored legislation that put Rhode Island on a path to 100 percent renewable energy by 2033. When that legislation was signed into law, it was the most aggressive statewide energy standard anywhere in the country.

Donny was beloved by his lifelong North Providence community, and he was always a pleasure to work with. In a profession that is not always gentlemanly, he was always a gentleman. He

took pride in the senate being a place where people had, as he would say, always been able to disagree without being disagreeable.

So I thank Senate President Ruggerio for his dedicated and successful service to our State. I offer my condolences to his family. We will miss him.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

GENIUS ACT

Mr. REED. Mr. President, on a different topic, I note that the Senate this week has started debate on the GENIUS Act. This bill establishes a regulatory framework for so-called stablecoins, which are representations of dollars recorded on a blockchain.

The GENIUS Act could be the most significant banking bill that Congress has considered since the Wall Street reform legislation that passed after the 2008 financial crisis. There are a number of, I believe, fundamental problems with the GENIUS Act in terms of national security, consumer protection, and systemic risk.

I am so pleased that the majority leader has said that we will have an open amendment process, and I look forward to filing a series of amendments to address the problems in the bill. I hope that, together, we can come up with a much better version.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUSTED). The Senator from North Carolina.

SAVE OUR SEAS 2.0 AMENDMENTS ACT

Mr. BUDD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 40, S. 216.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 216) to amend the Save Our Seas 2.0 Act to improve the administration of the Marine Debris Foundation, to amend the Marine Debris Act to improve the administration of the Marine Debris Program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. BUDD. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

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

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

Mr. BUDD. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate on the bill, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 216) was passed as follows:

S. 216

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 ''Save Our Seas 2.0 Amendments Act''.

SEC. 2. MODIFICATIONS TO THE MARINE DEBRIS PROGRAM OF THE NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Marine Debris Act (Public Law 109–449) is amended—

(1) by inserting before section 3 the following:

''Subtitle A—NOAA And Coast Guard Programs''; and

(2) by redesignating sections 3 through 6 as sections 101 through 104, respectively.

(b) GRANTS, COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS, CONTRACTS, AND OTHER AGREEMENTS.—Section 101(d) of the Marine Debris Act (33 U.S.C. 1952(d)), as redesignated by this Act, is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading by striking ''AND CONTRACTS'' and inserting ''CONTRACTS, AND OTHER AGREEMENTS'';

(2) in paragraph (1) by striking ''and contracts'' and inserting '', contracts, and other agreements'';

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking ''part of the'' and inserting ''part of a''; and

(ii) by inserting ''or (C)'' after ''subparagraph (A)''; and

(B) in subparagraph (C) in the matter preceding clause (i) by inserting ''and except as provided in subparagraph (B)'' after ''subparagraph (A)''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(7) IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS.—With respect to any project carried out pursuant to a contract or other agreement entered into under paragraph (1) that is not a cooperative agreement or an agreement to provide financial assistance in the form of a grant, the Under Secretary may contribute on an in-kind basis the portion of the costs of the project that the Under Secretary determines represents the amount of benefit the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration derives from the project.''.

SEC. 3. MODIFICATIONS TO THE MARINE DEBRIS FOUNDATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle B of title I of the Save Our Seas 2.0 Act (Public Law 116–224) is transferred to appear after section 104 of the Marine Debris Act (Public Law 109–449), as redesignated by this Act.

(b) STATUS OF FOUNDATION.—Section 111(a) of the Marine Debris Act (Public Law 109–449), as transferred by this Act, is amended, in the second sentence, by striking ''organization'' and inserting ''corporation''.

(c) PURPOSES.—Section 111(b) of the Marine Debris Act (Public Law 109–449), as transferred and redesignated by this Act, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3) by inserting ''Indian Tribes,'' after ''Tribal governments,''; and

(2) in paragraph (4) by striking ''title II'' and inserting ''subtitle C''.

(d) BOARD OF DIRECTORS.—

(1) APPOINTMENT, VACANCIES, AND REMOVAL.—Section 112(b) of the Marine Debris Act (Public Law 109–449), as transferred by this Act, is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (5) as paragraphs (2) through (6) respectively;

(B) by inserting before paragraph (2), as redesignated, the following:

''(1) RECOMMENDATIONS OF BOARD REGARDING APPOINTMENTS.—For appointments made under paragraph (2), the Board shall submit to the Under Secretary recommendations on candidates for appointment.'';

(C) in paragraph (2), as redesignated, in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''and considering'' and inserting ''considering''; and

(ii) by inserting ''and with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce,'' after ''by the Board,'';

(D) by amending paragraph (3), as redesignated, to read as follows:

''(3) TERMS.—Any Director appointed under paragraph (2) shall be appointed for a term of 6 years.'';

(E) in paragraph (4)(A), as redesignated, by inserting ''with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce'' after ''the Board''; and

(F) in paragraph (6), as redesignated—

(i) by inserting ''the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development,'' after ''Service,''; and

(ii) by inserting ''and with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce'' after ''EPA Administrator''.

(2) GENERAL POWERS.—Section 112(g) of the Marine Debris Act (Public Law 109–449), as transferred by this Act, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A) by striking ''officers and employees'' and inserting ''the initial officers and employees''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(B)(i) by striking ''its chief operating officer'' and inserting ''the chief executive officer of the Foundation''.

(3) CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER.—Section 112 of the Marine Debris Act (Public Law 109–449), as transferred by this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER.—

''(1) APPOINTMENT; REMOVAL; REVIEW.—The Board shall appoint and review the performance of, and may remove, the chief executive officer of the Foundation.

''(2) POWERS.—The chief executive officer of the Foundation may appoint, remove, and review the performance of any officer or employee of the Foundation.''.

(e) POWERS OF FOUNDATION.—Section 113(c)(1) of the Marine Debris Act (Public Law 109–449), as transferred by this Act, is amended in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(1) by inserting ''nonprofit'' before ''corporation''; and

(2) by striking ''acting as a trustee'' and inserting ''formed''.

(f) PRINCIPAL OFFICE.—Section 113 of the Marine Debris Act (Public Law 109–449), as transferred by this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) PRINCIPAL OFFICE.—The Board shall locate the principal office of the Foundation in the National Capital Region, as such term is defined in section 2674(f)(2) of title 10, United States Code, or a coastal shoreline community.''.

(g) BEST PRACTICES; RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Section 113 of the Marine Debris Act (Public Law 109–449), as transferred by this Act and amended by subsection (e), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) BEST PRACTICES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Foundation shall develop and implement best practices for conducting outreach to Indian Tribes and Tribal Governments.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The best practices developed under paragraph (1) shall—

''(A) include a process to support technical assistance and capacity building to improve outcomes; and

''(B) promote an awareness of programs and grants available under this Act.

''(i) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act may be construed—

''(1) to satisfy any requirement for government-to-government consultation with Tribal Governments; or

''(2) to affect or modify any treaty or other right of any Tribal Government.''.

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 118(a) of the Marine Debris Act (Public Law 109–449), as transferred by this Act, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''and $2,000,000 for fiscal year 2025'' after ''through 2024''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and State and local government agencies'' and inserting '', State and local government agencies, regional organizations, Indian Tribes, Tribal organizations, and foreign governments''.

(i) REAUTHORIZATION.—Section 9(a) of the Marine Debris Act (Public Law 109–449) is amended by striking ''for'' the first place it appears and all that follows through ''carrying out'' and inserting ''for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2029 for carrying out''.

SEC. 4. TRANSFERS.

(a) SAVE OUR SEAS 2.0 ACT.—Subtitle C of title I of the Save Our Seas 2.0 Act (Public Law 116–224) is transferred to appear after section 119 of the Marine Debris Act (Public Law 109–449) as transferred and redesignated by this Act.

(b) MARINE DEBRIS ACT.—The Marine Debris Act (Public Law 109–449) is amended—

(1) by transferring sections 7, 8, 9 (as amended), and 10 to appear after section 127, as transferred by this Act, and redesignated as sections 131, 132, 133, and 134, respectively; and

(2) by inserting before section 131, as so transferred and redesignated, the following:

''Subtitle D—Administration''.

SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 131 of the Marine Debris Act (Public Law 109–449), as transferred and redesignated by this Act, is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1);

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), and (7) as paragraphs (5), (6), (7), (11), (12), and (13), respectively;

(3) by inserting before paragraph (5), as so redesignated, the following:

''(1) CIRCULAR ECONOMY.—The term 'circular economy' has the meaning given such term in section 2 of the Save Our Seas 2.0 Act (Public Law 116–224).

''(2) COASTAL SHORELINE COMMUNITY.—The term 'coastal shoreline community' means a city or county directly adjacent to the open ocean, major estuaries, or the Great Lakes.

''(3) EPA ADMINISTRATOR.—The term 'EPA Administrator' has the meaning given such term in section 2 of the Save Our Seas 2.0 Act (Public Law 116–224).

''(4) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term 'Indian Tribe' has the meaning given that term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).'';

(4) by inserting before paragraph (11), as so redesignated, the following:

''(9) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION.—The term 'nonprofit organization' has the meaning given such term in section 2 of the Save Our Seas 2.0 Act (Public Law 116–224).

''(10) POST CONSUMER MATERIALS MANAGEMENT.—The term 'post-consumer materials management' has the meaning given such term in section 2 of the Save Our Seas 2.0 Act (Public Law 116–224).'';

(5) by inserting after paragraph (13), as so redesignated, the following:

''(14) TRIBAL GOVERNMENT.—The term 'Tribal Government' means the recognized governing body of any Indian or Alaska Native Tribe, band, nation, pueblo, village, community, component band, or component reservation, individually identified (including parenthetically) in the list published most recently as of the date of the enactment of the Save Our Seas 2.0 Amendments Act pursuant to section 104 of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 5131).

''(15) TRIBAL ORGANIZATION.—The term 'Tribal organization' has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).

''(16) UNDER SECRETARY.—The term 'Under Secretary' has the meaning given such term in section 2 of the Save Our Seas 2.0 Act (Public Law 116–224).''; and

(6) in paragraph (13), as so redesignated—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) as subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E); and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B) Indian Tribe;''.

(b) TRANSFER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2(7) of the Save Our Seas 2.0 Act (Public Law 116–224) is transferred to section 131 of the Marine Debris Act (Public Law 109–449), inserted after paragraph (7) (as redesignated), and redesignated as paragraph (8).

(2) REDESIGNATION.—Section 2 of the Save Our Seas 2.0 Act (Public Law 116–224) is amended by redesignating paragraphs (8) through (11) as paragraphs (7) through (10), respectively.

(c) NON-FEDERAL FUNDS.—Paragraph (8)(D) of section 131 of the Marine Debris Act (Public Law 109–449), as transferred and redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking ''(as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304))''.

SEC. 6. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Sections 1 and 2 of the Marine Debris Act, sections 101, 102, and 104 of the Marine Debris Act, as redesignated by this Act, and section 133 of the Marine Debris Act, as transferred and so redesignated by this Act, are amended by striking ''Administrator'' and inserting ''Under Secretary''.

(b) SECTION 103.—Section 103 of the Marine Debris Act is amended by—

(1) striking ''Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration'' and inserting ''Under Secretary'';

(2) striking ''Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency'' and inserting ''EPA Administrator''; and

(3) in subsection (e)(3) by striking ''section 3'' and inserting ''section 101''.

(c) SECTION 123.—Section 123 of the Marine Debris Act, as transferred and so redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking ''title I'' and inserting ''subtitle B''.

(d) SECTION 133.—Section 133 of the Marine Debris Act, as transferred and so redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking ''sections 3, 5, and 6'' and inserting ''sections 101, 103, and 104''.

(e) SECTION 134.—Section 134 of the Marine Debris Act, as transferred and so redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking ''Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency'' and inserting ''EPA Administrator''.

(f) TRIBAL GOVERNMENT.—Subtitle A of the Marine Debris Act, as designated in this Act, is amended by striking ''tribal government'' and inserting ''Tribal Government''.

Mr. BUDD. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

SECURING SEMICONDUCTOR SUPPLY CHAINS ACT

Mr. BUDD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 67, S. 97.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 97) to require SelectUSA to coordinate with State-level economic development organizations to increase foreign direct investment in semiconductor-related manufacturing and production.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. BUDD. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 97) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

S. 97

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 ''Securing Semiconductor Supply Chains Act''.

SEC. 2. SELECTUSA DEFINED.

In this Act, the term ''SelectUSA'' means the SelectUSA program of the Department of Commerce established by Executive Order 13577 (76 Fed. Reg. 35715).

SEC. 3. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Semiconductors underpin the United States and global economies, including manufacturing sectors. Semiconductors are also essential to the national security of the United States.

(2) A shortage of semiconductors, brought about by the COVID–19 pandemic and other complex factors impacting the overall supply chain, has threatened the economic recovery of the United States and industries that employ millions of United States citizens.

(3) Addressing current challenges and building resilience against future risks requires ensuring a secure and stable supply chain for semiconductors that will support the economic and national security needs of the United States and its allies.

(4) The supply chain for semiconductors is complex and global. While the United States plays a leading role in certain segments of the semiconductor industry, securing the supply chain requires onshoring, reshoring, or diversifying vulnerable segments, such as for—

(A) fabrication;

(B) advanced packaging; and

(C) materials and equipment used to manufacture semiconductor products.

(5) The Federal Government can leverage foreign direct investment and private dollars to grow the domestic manufacturing and production capacity of the United States for vulnerable segments of the semiconductor supply chain.

(6) The SelectUSA program of the Department of Commerce, in coordination with other Federal agencies and State-level economic development organizations, is positioned to boost foreign direct investment in domestic manufacturing and to help secure the semiconductor supply chain of the United States.

SEC. 4. COORDINATION WITH STATE-LEVEL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATIONS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Executive Director of SelectUSA shall solicit comments from State-level economic development organizations—

(1) to review—

(A) what efforts the Federal Government can take to support increased foreign direct investment in any segment of semiconductor-related production;

(B) what barriers to such investment may exist and how to amplify State efforts to attract such investment;

(C) public opportunities those organizations have identified to attract foreign direct investment to help increase investment described in subparagraph (A); and

(D) resource gaps or other challenges that prevent those organizations from increasing such investment; and

(2) to develop recommendations for—

(A) how SelectUSA can increase such investment independently or through partnership with those organizations; and

(B) working with countries that are allies or partners of the United States to ensure that foreign adversaries (as defined in section 8(c)(2) of the Secure and Trusted Communications Networks Act of 2019 (47 U.S.C. 1607(c)(2))) do not benefit from United States efforts to increase such investment.

SEC. 5. REPORT ON INCREASING FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT IN SEMICONDUCTOR-RELATED MANUFACTURING AND PRODUCTION.

Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Executive Director of SelectUSA, in coordination with the Federal Interagency Investment Working Group established by Executive Order 13577 (76 Fed. Reg. 35,715; relating to establishment of the SelectUSA Initiative), shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report that includes—

(1) a review of the comments SelectUSA received from State-level economic development organizations under section 4;

(2) a description of activities SelectUSA is engaged in to increase foreign direct investment in semiconductor-related manufacturing and production; and

(3) an assessment of strategies SelectUSA may implement to achieve an increase in such investment and to help secure the United States supply chain for semiconductors, including by—

(A) working with other relevant Federal agencies; and

(B) working with State-level economic development organizations and implementing any strategies or recommendations SelectUSA received from those organizations.

SEC. 6. NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this Act. The Executive Director of SelectUSA shall carry out this Act using amounts otherwise available to the Executive Director for such purposes.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. BUDD. 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. 237 and S. Res. 238.

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

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

Mr. BUDD. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, that 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.'')

MORNING BUSINESS

TRIBUTE TO BRUCE NELSON

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today I want to pay tribute to an outstanding Iowan who has devoted the last three decades teaching the next generation at Waterloo Christian School in Waterloo, IA.

Bruce Nelson is retiring from his role there as the director of music. Waterloo Christian opened its doors in 1973, educating generations of students—kindergarten through 12 grade—with a curriculum designed to inspire students to reach their full potential in academics, fine arts, athletics, and spiritual development.

As the director of music, Mr. Nelson inspired his students to explore their God-given talents through music. By all accounts, he filled the halls of Waterloo Christian with music, harmony, and laughter that will echo for many years to come. His work was literally music to the ears of faculty, staff, students, families, and residents of the Cedar Valley community who attended performances he orchestrated for the last 33 years.

After countless hours conducting, leading, instructing, and building an outstanding fine arts program at Waterloo Christian, Mr. Nelson is hanging up his baton.

I had the opportunity to attend the annual Patriotic Program earlier this month. I was impressed by the performance and enjoyed the song selection. It put a smile on my face to see the joyful faces of the students who were performing one last time under the guidance of their musical maestro at Waterloo Christian.

The accolades of alumni speak volumes. Mr. Nelson inspired many of them to pursue careers in music. His legacy includes making ''music cool,'' showing his students how to worship Christ, celebrate patriotism, and entertain others with their musical talents.

It is obvious Mr. Nelson captured the intangible skillset of an outstanding teacher, especially a music teacher. He taught his students that practice makes perfect. He challenged, inspired, and paved the way for them to gain confidence and become talented vocalists and musicians.

Mr. Nelson made a lasting mark on Waterloo Christian and his iconic red blazer and sense of humor will be missed. Over the years, I would often joke that I would hire him to introduce me at events because each time he did, I would get a standing ovation.

Mr. Nelson has earned many standing ovations of his own over his 33 years leading quartet harmonies, ensembles, choral pieces, and the treasured Christmas and patriotic programs.

Bruce, as you take your final bow, Barbara and I congratulate you on your retirement and thank you for your many years of ministry to the next generation. You have served as a good shepherd to your flock of students, guiding them to worship the Lord through musical excellence.

RECOGNIZING ''ASSAULT ON AMERICAN DIPLOMACY''

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, since the start of his second term, President Trump has upended the international world order and America's leadership on the global stage. He and his allies are working decisively to erode the values that are central to our Nation. Notably, retired diplomats, military leaders, national security experts, and even former Trump administration officials have denounced these actions as undermining our democratic norms and traditions, and I would like to highlight one such open letter from former U.S. leaders.

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:

THE ASSAULT ON AMERICAN DEMOCRACY: A CALL TO ACTION

As American diplomats around the world and national security leaders here at home, we saw no greater cause than serving our fellow citizens. We swore to support and defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic. Foreign and domestic. None of us thought the second part of that phrase would ever come into play—until now.

American global leadership has depended on many factors, including political, economic, and military power. But most important was the moral foundation for that power—America as an example to others. Though our actions didn't always live up to our ideals, we stood for simple but powerful ideas that people everywhere embraced: democracy, equality, individual liberty, and human rights.

That moral foundation is now in grave danger. The challenge comes from within, as President Trump and his administration have assaulted the pillars of our democracy here at home and our strength around the world.

Internationally, Trump has questioned the value of long-standing alliances in Europe and Asia. On our borders, he has poisoned ties with our closest neighbors. He has undermined the bedrock principle of world peace that sovereign borders will be respected. The United States now seeks to lay claim to Greenland, the Panama Canal, and Canada, greenlighting other countries to proceed as they see fit, most notably Russia in Ukraine. The global economic order that

ushered in a period of unparalleled prosperity for Americans is being undermined by Trump's senseless tariffs and war on legally binding trade agreements. America as the first responder to global humanitarian crises becomes a distant memory with the dismantling of USAID.

Domestically, Trump is aggressively eliminating constraints on his power and fomenting fear. He is intimidating independent media outlets with frivolous lawsuits. Our universities are retreating from freedom of speech because of explicit threats to withdraw federal monies. Our law firms are being bludgeoned into denying representation to anyone whom this administration does not like. Our medical research centers are seeing an exodus of experts forced out by an administration that does not believe in basic science. Congress and the Department of Justice threaten to impeach sitting judges that rule against the government. Federal trade unions have been shut down by executive order. State governments that challenge the administration face cuts in federal funding. A racist, misogynistic and homophobic mindset is leading to the erasure of history and national heroes at our cultural institutions. In a country with a proud history of immigration, legal residents are being illegally deported for expressing an opinion. People are whisked off the street by masked officials in unmarked cars or sent off to imprisonment abroad without due process. Trump talks publicly about an unconstitutional third term without a word of concern from his own party.

American democracy and American security are inextricably linked; weaken one and the other inevitably begins to fail. As patriots and public servants from both parties who worked to protect America over many decades, we see that link unraveling at lightning speed. Many of us have served in countries where democratically elected leaders followed a path to autocracy, and we know this crisis requires an urgent and unified response. As a result, we call for the following:

—Former senior officials, including presidents, secretaries of state, secretaries of defense, and chiefs of staff of our military services must jointly and publicly challenge the administration's dangerous policies and dismantling of essential institutions.

—Business leaders must condemn Trump's disastrous trade policy which is plunging the global economy into chaos and disrupting supply chains that support millions of jobs.

—Medical institutions, like the CDC, NIH, and major research centers around the country must defend science with non-partisan funding of medical investigation and warn of the dangers of abandoning global engagement on pandemic prevention.

—Universities and media must protect free speech. Without a unified stance, they will be picked off one-by-one and first amendment rights for every American will be in peril.

—Our largest law firms must remain guardians of the rule of law by resisting administration pressure to undermine the legal system of checks and balances which is so fundamental to our democracy.

—Finally, politicians on both sides of the aisle who believe in the core values of our constitution must actively oppose the administration's efforts to undermine our national security, our freedoms, and our democracy. Waiting passively for the electoral calendar to fight back does nothing more than give the administration additional time and running room to impose its authoritarian stamp ever more securely on government and on all of us.

No American should be silent. No American who cares about our freedoms, our institutions, and our identity as a nation can afford to be a bystander. Each of us in different walks of life must do what we can—speak out, mobilize, defend our way of life. The moment requires nothing less. We must recognize the seriousness of what is taking place and act collectively to restore our democracy and our security. If we do not, the American ideals of liberty, prosperity, and equality will quickly become relics of the past.

Bernadette Allen, US Ambassador, retired; Rand Beers, Former Deputy Homeland Security Advisor; Mark Bellamy, US Ambassador, retired; John Beyrle, US Ambassador, retired; James Bishop, US Ambassador, retired; Charles Blaha, Senior Foreign Service Officer, retired; Anne Bodine, Senior Foreign Service Officer, retired; Avis Bohlen, US Ambassador, retired, Former Assistant Secretary of State; Michele Bond, US Ambassador, retired, Former Assistant Secretary of State; Paul L. Boyd, Senior Foreign Service Officer, retired.

Aurelia Brazeal, US Ambassador, retired; Sue Bremner, Senior Foreign Service Officer, retired; Steven Browning, US Ambassador. retired, Former Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State; David Buckley, Former Inspector General, Central Intelligence Agency; Susan F. Burk, Former Special Representative of the President; Peter Burleigh. US Ambassador, retired; Scott Busby, Former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State; Prudence Bushnell, US Ambassador, retired; John Butler, Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy, retired; Constance Carrino, Senior Foreign Service Officer, USAID, retired; Steven Cash, Former Senior Advisor, DHS, Former Chief Counsel to Senator Feinstein, Former CIA Officer.

Asha Castleberry-Hernandez, Senior Executive Service, DOD, retired; Judith Chammas, Senior Foreign Service Officer, retired; Phillip Chicola, Senior Foreign Service Officer, retired; Roberta Cohen, Former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State; Ellen Conway, Senior Foreign Service Officer, retired; Frances Cook, US Ambassador, retired; Sarah Cook, Senior Foreign Commercial Service Officer, retired; Thomas Countryman, Former Assistant Secretary of State; Ruth Davis, US Ambassador, retired, Former Director General of the US Foreign Service; David Davison, Senior Foreign Service Officer, retired.

Greg Delawie, US Ambassador, retired; Christopher Dell, US Ambassador, retired; Anne E. Derse, US Ambassador, retired; Vicki Divoll, Former General Counsel, Senate Select Committee on Intelligence; Mary Draper, Senior Foreign Service Officer, retired; Melvin Dubee, Former Deputy Staff Director, Senate Select Committee on Intelligence; Martha Duncan, Senior Executive Service, DOD, retired; William Eacho, Former Ambassador to Austria; William Eaton, US Ambassador, retired; Luigi Einaudi, US Ambassador, retired.

Jonathan Elkind, Former Assistant Secretary of Energy; Nancy Ely-Raphel, US Ambassador, retired; Gregory Engle, US Ambassador, retired; Joseph Fallone, Captain, US Navy, retired; John Feeley, US Ambassador, retired, Former Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State; Gerald Feierstein, US Ambassador, retired, Former Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State; Jeffrey Feltman, US Ambassador, retired, Former Assistant Secretary of State; Mark Fitzpatrick, Former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State; Kathleen Fitzpatrick, US Ambassador, retired; Mike Fitzpatrick, US Ambassador, retired.

Karen Freeman, Senior Foreign Service Officer, USAID, retired; Bennett Freeman, Former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State; Susan Kosinski Fritz, Senior Foreign Service Officer, USAID, retired; Laurie Fulton, Former US Ambassador to Denmark; Julie Furuta-Toy, US Ambassador, retired; Rosemary Gallant, Senior Foreign Commercial Officer, retired; Melvin Gamble, Senior Intelligence Officer, CIA, retired; William Garvelink, US Ambassador, retired; Brian Goldbeck, Senior Foreign Service Officer, retired; Juan Gonzalez, Former Special Assistant to the President.

Rose Gottemoeller, Former Undersecretary of State; Deborah Graze, Senior Foreign Service Officer, retired; Eric Green, Former Special Assistant to the President; Jennifer Gregg, Senior Intelligence Officer, retired; Laura Griesmer, Senior Foreign Service Officer, retired; Anne Gruner, Senior Intelligence Officer, CIA, retired; Sheila Gwaltney, US Ambassador, retired; Brent Hartley, US Ambassador, retired; Patricia Haslach, US Ambassador, retired; William Haugh, Senior Foreign Service Officer, retired.

John Heffern, US Ambassador, retired; Robert Herman, Former Policy Planning Staff, Department of State; Catherine Hill-Herndon, Senior Foreign Service Officer, retired; Heather Hodges, US Ambassador, retired; Elizabeth Hopkins, Senior Foreign Service Officer, retired; Sharon Houy, Former Chief of Staff, Defense Intelligence Agency; Jeff Hovenier, US Ambassador, retired; Vicki Huddleston, US Ambassador, retired; Robert Hutchings, Former Chairman, National Intelligence Council; Charles Ikins, Colonel, US Marine Corps, retired.

Robert Jackson, US Ambassador, retired, Former Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary; Susan Jacobs, US Ambassador, retired; Ali Jalili, Senior Foreign Service Officer, retired; Oliver John, Senior Foreign Service Officer, retired; Kathy Johnson, Senior Foreign Service Officer, retired; Deborah Jones, US Ambassador, retired; Beth Jones, US Ambassador, retired, Former Assistant Secretary of State; John Jones, US Ambassador, retired; Denis Kaufman, Senior Chief Petty Officer, US Navy, retired; Richard Kauzlarich, US Ambassador, retired, Former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State.

Yvonne Keeler, Senior Intelligence Officer, CIA, retired; Ian Kelly, US Ambassador, retired; Herbert Kemp, Colonel, US Air Force, retired; Laura Kennedy, US Ambassador, retired; Patrick Kennedy, US Ambassador, retired, Former Under Secretary of State; Donald Kerrick, Lieutenant General, U.S. Army, retired, Former Deputy National Security Advisor; Scott Kilner, Senior Foreign Service Officer, retired; Harold Hongju Koh, Former Legal Adviser to the Secretary of State, Former Assistant Secretary of State; Christopher Kojm, Former Chair, National Intelligence Council; James Kovar, Senior Foreign Service Officer, retired.

Thomas Krajeski, US Ambassador, retired; Anne Kremidas, Senior Foreign Service Officer, retired; James Kunder, Former Deputy Administrator, U.S. Agency for International Development; Daniel Kurtzer, US Ambassador, retired, Former Assistant Secretary of State; Anthony Lake, Former National Security Advisor; Eileen Laubacher, Rear Admiral, US Navy, retired; James Lawler, Senior Intelligence Officer, CIA, retired; Suzan LeVine, Former US Ambassador to Switzerland; Dawn Liberi, US Ambassador, retired; Carmen Lomellin, US Ambassador, retired.

Frank Loy, Former Under Secretary of State; Deborah Malac, US Ambassador, retired; Eileen Malloy, US Ambassador, retired, Former Deputy Assistant Secretary State; Angela Maloney, Senior Foreign Service Officer, retired; Noah Marnet, Former US Ambassador to Argentina; Lawrence Mandel, Senior Foreign Service Officer, retired; Steven Mann, US Ambassador, retired;

Niels Marquardt, US Ambassador, retired; Dennise Mathieu, US Ambassador, retired; Deborah McCarthy, US Ambassador, retired;

Bill McCulla, Senior Foreign Service Officer, retired; Nancy McEldowney, US Ambassador, retired; Former National Security Advisor to the Vice President; Michael McFaul, Former US Ambassador to Russia; Elizabeth McKune, US Ambassador, retired; James Melville, Jr., US Ambassador, retired; Leo Michel, Senior Executive Service, DoD, retired; Thomas Miller, US Ambassador, retired; Derek Mitchell, Former US Ambassador to Burma (Myanmar); Luis Moreno, US Ambassador, retired; Joseph Myers, Former Chief Risk Officer, US International Development Finance Corporation; James Nealon, US Ambassador, retired.

Brian H. Nilsson, Former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State; Suzanne Nossel, Former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State; Joseph Nye, Former Assistant Secretary of Defense; Geoffrey Odlum, Senior Foreign Service Officer, retired; Ted Osius, US Ambassador, retired; Maurice S. Parker, US Ambassador, retired; David Passage, US Ambassador, retired; Michael Pelletier, US Ambassador, retired; Robert Perry, US Ambassador, retired; David Petri, Commander, US Navy, retired; James Petti, US Ambassador, retired.

Annie Pforzheimer, Senior Foreign Service Officer, retired; Randal Phillips, Senior Intelligence Officer, CIA, retired; William Piekney, Senior Intelligence Officer, CIA, retired; Steven Pifer, US Ambassador, retired; Michael Polt, US Ambassador. retired; Former Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State; Michael Posner, Former Assistant Secretary of State; Ned Price, Former Spokesperson, Department of State; Charles Ray, US Ambassador, retired; Helen Reed-Rowe, US Ambassador, retired; Stacy Rhodes, Senior Foreign Service Officer, USAID, retired.

Susan Rice, Former National Security Advisor, Former U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations; John Ries, Senior Foreign Service Officer, retired; Thomas Robertson, US Ambassador, retired; Enrique Roig, Former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State; Peter Romero, US Ambassador, retired, Former Assistant Secretary of State; Jeremy Rosner, Former Special Assistant to the President; Leslie Rowe, US Ambassador, retired; Eric Rubin, US Ambassador, retired, Former President, American Foreign Service Association; Richard Sanders, Senior Executive Service, DoD, retired; Janet Sanderson, US Ambassador, retired.

Teresita Schaffer, US Ambassador, retired; Mark Schneider, Former Assistant Administrator, USAID, Former Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State; Eric Schwartz, Former Assistant Secretary of State; Kyje Scott, US Ambassador, retired; Tod Sedgwick, Former US Ambassador the Slovak Republic; Michael Senko, US Ambassador, retired; Mattie Sharpless, US Ambassador, retired; Dana Shell Smith, US Ambassador, retired; Dilpreet Sidhu, Former Executive Secretary of the National Security Council; Emil Skodon, US Ambassador, retired.

Adrian Snead, Former Counsel and Foreign Policy Advisor to Senator Jeffrey Merkley; Sylvia Stanfield, US Ambassador, retired; Gregory Starr, Former Assistant Secretary of State; Adam Sterling, US Ambassador, retired; Clyde Taylor, US Ambassador, retired; Harry Thomas, US Ambassador, retired, Former Director General of the Foreign Service; Linda Thomas-Greenfield, US Ambassador, retired, Former U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations; Susan Thornton, Former Assistant Secretary of State; Thomas Tiernan, Senior Foreign Service Officer, retired; Charles Uphaus, Senior Foreign Service Officer, retired.

Kurt van der Walde, Senior Foreign Service Officer, retired; Alexander Vershbow, US Ambassador, retired, Former Deputy Secretary General of NATO, Former Assistant Secretary of Defense; Shari Villarosa, US Ambassador, retired; Patricia Wagner, Senior Commercial Service Officer, retired; Alexander Watson, Former Assistant Secretary of State; Linda Watt, US Ambassador, retired; John Wecker, Senior Foreign Service Officer, retired; Bruce Wharton, US Ambassador, retired; Kevin Whitaker, US Ambassador, retired; Pamela White, US Ambassador, retired.

Stephanie Williams, Senior Foreign Service Officer, retired, Former Special Advisor to the UN Secretary General; Bisa William, US Ambassador, retired; Jonathan Winer, Former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State; David Thomas Wolfson, Senior Foreign Service Officer, retired; Marcia Wong, Former Deputy Assistant Administrator, USAID; Kenneth Yalowitz, US Ambassador, retired; Stephen Young, US Ambassador, retired; Marie Yovanovitch, US Ambassador, retired, Former Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State; Jane Zimmerman, Former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State; Ricardo Zuniga, Former Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State.

TRIBUTE TO ANDREW SCHIFF

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Andrew Schiff, an extraordinary community leader, who after 17 years of service, will retire from his role as chief executive officer of the Rhode Island Community Food Bank.

In helping meet the basic needs of Rhode Island's most vulnerable people, Andrew has led the Rhode Island Community Food bank through some challenging times. He took the helm at the food bank back in May 2007, mere months before the Great Recession began, and continued to lead the organization through the COVID–19 pandemic and beyond. During Andrew's tenure, demand for food assistance has increased—but so has the food bank's capacity to help. Indeed, Andrew helped double the amount of food distributed to those in need each month by the food bank and its 147 member agencies.

During the COVID–19 pandemic, when hunger in Rhode Island jumped by 41 percent in a matter of months, Andrew and the food bank were there to help, serving over 70,000 Rhode Islanders each month by the end of 2020. More than that, Andrew helped keep Rhode Island's local growers and harvesters afloat buy developing new partnerships to deliver locally produced food to those in need.

Demand for food assistance in Rhode Island and across the Nation remains high as pandemic-era assistance programs have ended. But under Andrew's leadership, the Food Bank has stepped up to the plate and now serves a record number of Rhode Islanders—over 84,000 people each month. That is a tremendous statistic but isn't the whole of Andrew's work.

Recognizing that those in need also deserve the dignity of choice in their food, Andrew has also focused on expanding the food bank's offerings of healthy and culturally relevant foods to ensure that Rhode Islanders receiving food bank assistance have access to foods they are familiar with and that suit their tastes. Andrew has also advocated on the State and Federal levels to expand other food access programs, like the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP); the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children, (WIC); and access to universal school meals, to ensure that no Rhode Islander goes hungry.

Before joining the food bank, Andrew was assistant director at Project Bread—the Walk for Hunger, an anti-hunger organization in Boston, director of professional services at Jewish Family and Children's Service in Boston, and director of mental health at the Neponset Health Center in Massachusetts. He attended Haverford College as an undergraduate and received his Ph.D. in clinical psychology from Emory University.

As a result of his years of effort to alleviate hunger, countless Rhode Islanders have ended the day with full stomachs, and the State as a whole is better off. I join many others in thanking Andrew for his work and distinguished service to our State. I wish him and his family all the best as he embarks on this next chapter.

TRIBUTE TO DANNY REMINGTON

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I rise as chairman of the Select Committee on Ethics and on behalf of the members of the committee and its staff to pay tribute to Danny Remington, the committee's director of IT and operations, as he retires after 30 years of Senate service and almost 29 of those years with the committee. Danny joined the staff in October of 1996, hired by then-committee Chairman MCCONNELL. In total, Danny served with 10 committee chairmen, five staff directors, and dozens of Senate colleagues who will remember his steady demeanor and willingness to assist with any task. Danny's tenure spans decades of technological advancement and process improvement. Joining the committee in a world of floppy disks and years before the office had an internet connection, Danny transitioned the committee into 21st century, or at least 20th century, technology while maintaining an enduring commitment to the core principle of confidentiality that guides all the committee's work. Beyond the technical achievements, Danny represented the committee well throughout the Senate community by establishing connections with his fellow staff members, whether they worked for the Architect of the Capitol, the Sergeant at Arms, Secretary of the Senate, another committee, or a Member office.

As Danny retires, he looks forward to spending more time with his family, his wife Theresa, and their grown sons

Ryan and Reece coaching volleyball and enjoying some well-deserved time on the beach in Ocean City, MD. On behalf of the members and staff of the Select Committee on Ethics, I thank Danny for his decades of service and commitment to the U.S. Senate. I offer my sincere best wishes and gratitude to Danny and his family as he begins his retirement. Thank you, Danny.

TRIBUTE TO KYLE ABRAMS

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a long-time member of my staff Kyle Abrams, who has spent more than 4 years on my team during my time in the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate. Throughout her service, Kyle has been steadfast in her commitment to constituents across the State of California and been a truly dedicated public servant.

Prior to joining my office, Kyle served as an intern for Senator KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND and the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee and joined my House office as an intern in 2021. We immediately recognized her immense talent and asked her to take on the role of scheduler. Being a scheduler is no easy feat, and being a good scheduler requires patience, organization, and grace—all of which Kyle has in abundance. With her intelligence, personal skills, and strategic thinking, Kyle quickly took on the additional roles of director of scheduling, policy adviser, and most recently, senior adviser, all at a young age and in the midst of a campaign for Senate.

It has been a true pleasure to watch Kyle progress through her various roles on my staff, and to see her mentor junior staff. I am grateful for the responsibilities she took on during the transition from the House to Senate, ensuring that everything went smoothly, and that I could deliver for the people of California without interruption.

Kyle will be leaving my office to start her first year at Harvard Law School. She will be joining a tradition of excellence at my alma mater, and I am eager to see what she will accomplish far beyond the classroom.

In my almost 24 years in Congress, I have learned the important lesson that every member is only as good as their staff and seldom as good as that. We could not do our jobs for our constituents without them and their labors, and my staff have been laser focused on providing the highest level of service for the great people of southern California in the House and now the whole State of California in the Senate. Kyle is no exception; I extend my utmost gratitude for the time she has spent on my team, and I am looking forward to seeing all she will go on to achieve in this next chapter.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING MECKDEC DAY

● Mr. BUDD. Mr. President, I rise today in celebration of MeckDec Day. On May 20, 1775, exactly 250 years ago, the citizens of Mecklenburg County took a bold and unprecedented step by adopting the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence. This historic document, believed to be the first declaration of its kind, signaled the beginning of America's quest for independence from the oppressive rule of the British Crown. In the wake of the Battle of Concord, a committee of concerned citizens gathered and declared that Mecklenburg County's ties to Great Britain were hereby dissolved. Their courage laid the groundwork for the fight for liberty that would shape our Nation's future.

North Carolina honors this pivotal moment in our history by featuring the date of the Mecklenburg Declaration—May 20, 1775—prominently on our State flag, alongside another key milestone: April 12, 1776, the date of the Halifax Resolves. The Halifax Resolves, adopted by the North Carolina Provincial Congress, marked the first official action by an American Colony calling for independence from the British Crown. This bold resolution laid the groundwork for the presentation of the Declaration of Independence to the Continental Congress less than 3 months later, solidifying North Carolina's leadership in the fight for American liberty.

On May 22, 2025, the Charlotte Museum of History in Mecklenburg County, NC, will officially celebrate the 250th anniversary of the Mecklenburg Declaration.

The Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence, issued in Charlotte, NC, on May 20, 1775, reads as follows:

Resolved—That whosoever directly or indirectly abets or in any way, form or manner, countenances the invasion of our rights, as attempted by the Parliament of Great Britain, is an enemy to his country, to America, and the rights of man.

Resolved—That we, the citizens of Mecklenburg County do hereby dissolve the political bands which have connected us with the mother county and absolve ourselves from all allegiance to the British crown, abjuring all political connection with a nation that has wantonly trampled on our rights and liberties and inhumanly shed the innocent blood of Americans at Lexington.

Resolved—That we do hereby declare ourselves a free and independent people, that we are and of right ought to be, a sovereign and self-governing people under the power of God and the general Congress; to the maintenance of which independence, we solemnly pledge to each other our mutual co-operation, our lives, our fortunes, and our most sacred honor.

Resolved—That we do hereby ordain and adopt as rules of conduct all and each of our former laws, and the crown of Great Britain cannot be considered hereafter as holding any rights, privileges, or immunities amongst us.

Resolved—That all officers, both civil and military in this county, be entitled to exercise the same powers and authorities as heretofore; that every member of this delegation shall henceforth be a civil officer, and exercise the powers of a justice of the peace, issue process, hear and determine controversies according to law, preserve peace, union and harmony in the county, and use every exertion to spread the love of liberty and of country, until a more general and better organized system of government be established.

Resolved—That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted by express to the President of the Continental Congress assembled in Philadelphia, to be laid before that body.

Signers were: Abraham Alexander, Chairman, John McKnitt Alexander, Secretary, Ephraim Brevard, Hezekiah J. Balch, John Phifer, James Harris, William Kennon, John Foard, Richard Barry, Henry Downs, Ezra Alexander, William Graham, John Queary, Hezekiah Alexander, Adam Alexander, Charles Alexander, Zaccheus Wilson, Waightstill Avery, Benjamin Patton, Matthew McClure, Neill Morrison, Robert Erwin, John Flenniken, David Reese, John Davidson, Richard Harris, Thomas Polk, and Duncan Ochiltree.

I invite you to join me in commemorating the 250th anniversary of a defining moment in our Nation's path to independence.●

TRIBUTE TO LUPE WISSEL

● Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, with my colleagues Senator JIM RISCH and Representatives MIKE SIMPSON and RUSS FULCHER, I congratulate Lupe Wissel, of Eagle, ID, on her outstanding career of advocacy for senior citizens and veterans.

Lupe is retiring from serving most recently for nearly 10 years as State director of AARP, Idaho. Prior to joining AARP, Lupe dedicated more than 14 years to working for the U.S. Senate. This includes her service of more than 10 years as staff director for the U.S. Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs and her prior service as staff director for the U.S. Senate Special Committee on Aging. A proud alum of Boise State University, she was also appointed by former Idaho Governor Dirk Kempthorne to serve as director for the Idaho Commission on Aging. And, previously, she devoted 21 years to serving as assistant regional manager/rehabilitation counselor III at the Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. In all, Lupe has spent more than four decades in public service, advocating for seniors, veterans, and people with disabilities.

Lupe has used her immense experience to inform her tireless, measured, and well-informed advocacy for seniors. She has provided trusted counsel to our congressional delegation as we have worked on issues of importance to Idaho seniors. She helped administer AARP-hosted tele-townhalls, ensuring Idahoans across our great State had opportunities to voice their views on issues before Congress. Throughout, she has been kind, efficient, professional, effective, and sincere to her cause.

Lupe's service to others stretches beyond her employment; she has also

supported efforts in her communities and Idaho through service in leadership positions for various organizations. This includes service on boards and commissions for the Pacific Region National Rehabilitation Association, Idaho Hispanic Commission, Idaho State Independent Living Council, Mountain Home Chamber of Commerce, Idaho Public Television, and Saint Alphonsus Health Systems.

When announcing the search for Lupe's replacement, AARP shared, ''During her tenure with AARP, Wissel guided the Idaho staff and a deep cadre of volunteers—who are committed to helping the 50+ live their best lives and thrive as they age. Wissel has also been instrumental in AARP's expansion of resources for veterans through increased access to information and services, and educational programs. She also led the development and delivery of AARP's community programs, advocacy and information for its more than 187,000 members in Idaho.''

As we honor Lupe for her remarkable work and wish her well in her next chapter, we also recognize she truly leaves big shoes to fill. Her leadership and impactful championing will be greatly missed, and we thank her for her strong backing of Idaho seniors and our country's veterans as she has shaped sound policy for Americans throughout her commendable career.●

RECOGNIZING THE QUILTED FOREST

● Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, as chair of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I recognize an outstanding Iowa small business that exemplifies the American entrepreneurial spirit. This week, it is my privilege to recognize The Quilted Forest of Forest City, IA, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

Founded in 1998, Shelley and Dan Robson opened The Quilted Forest in Forest City, IA, to create a one-stop shop for quilting kits, fabrics, and original pattern designs. In 2004, Shelley launched Pieced Tree Patterns, a pattern design company that now sells custom quilt patterns nationwide. By 2009, the Robsons expanded into an 8,000-square-foot store on Forest City's Main Street. The Quilted Forest has a variety of products online and in store, with thousands of different fabric and pattern designs, as well as gifts and quilt kits. A dedicated team of four community-based employees supports the shop's daily operations, website design, and inventory management.

As the business grew on Main Street, so did its digital presence. In 2012, Quilt Sampler magazine named The Quilted Forest as one of the top 10 quilt shops in the United States. Furthermore, on July 4, 2021, Shelley had the idea to start a YouTube channel to share her passion with more people while connecting with other small businesses. In less than 2 years, a project gained viral attention, propelling the channel's rapid growth. Today, The Quilted Forest YouTube channel has over 120,000 subscribers from around the world. Shelley's videos feature tutorials, museum tours, and project ideas for new and experienced quilters. One project Shelley has worked on is a State quilt block of the month to celebrate the United States' 250th birthday in 2026.

The Quilted Forest is very active in the Forest City community. The business is a member of the Forest City Chamber of Commerce, and Shelley formerly served a term as president on the chamber board. Through the chamber, the company participates in the community's Holiday Sip and Shop, a night to explore and shop Forest City's Main Street businesses. The Quilted Forest also participates in the All Iowa Shop Hop, a statewide event where participants collect passport stamps by visiting different stores across the State to win prizes, discover new items, and purchase unique fabrics. Beyond its retail presence, The Quilted Forest gives back by donating quilts to new mothers at the Mason City Hospital, as well as supporting fundraisers and local organizations across northern Iowa and southern Minnesota. In March, The Quilted Forest celebrated its 28th anniversary.

I want to congratulate the Robsons and the entire team at The Quilted Forest for their dedication to creativity to share their love of quilting with the Forest City community and beyond. I look forward to seeing their continued growth and success.●

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE GARRISON

● Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Mr. George Garrison of Joplin, MO, for his storied career of public service and for his 95th birthday.

Born on April 15, 1930, in Joplin, MO, George attended Joplin High School, where he played baseball and football. His passion and talent led him to play class D professional baseball, and while he had signed a contract to play Triple-A professional baseball—fulfilling a dream—he was actually drafted by the U.S. Army in January 1952. Shortly after being drafted, George married his high school sweetheart Barbara on February 1, 1952.

Like many young men his age, George was deployed to Korea. He served with the U.S. Army's 7th Infantry Division, 47th Field Artillery Battalion, where he drove the battalion commander to and from the frontlines. After 20 months of brave service to our country, including his deployment, George retired as a corporal in the U.S. Army and returned home to his beloved wife in Missouri.

After his military career, George went back to school and finished his degree in education. He became a public school teacher and coach in Raymore, MO; where he taught industrial arts, history, physical education, and coached basketball and track. Having played sports himself, he was dedicated to the betterment of his students and the character building that comes through sports.

Following his tenure in Raymore, George and Barbara moved back to Joplin where Geroge taught at Webb City High School. Both the ninth grade basketball and football teams he coached in 1957 led undefeated seasons. George then went on to become an assistant principal at Webb City Junior High School, and the couple moved to Webb City. Given his years of teaching and coaching for the Webb City School District and his proven leadership skills, in 1967, George was tapped as assistant superintendent. After 27 years of service in public education, George retired in 1984.

In addition to his decades of work with students and parents, George served as chairman of the Webb City Park Board, where he led the city in purchasing the land for the city's well-known King Jack Park, where he has since watched his grandkids play baseball and softball.

Whether in Joplin or Webb City, George has faithfully served his church—first as a charter member at Fellowship Bible Church in Joplin, where he helped in the youth group, and then as a deacon, Sunday school teacher, member of the choir, and of course, the softball coach, at Emmanuel Baptist Church in Webb City.

George has been happily married for 73 years and enjoys spending time with his three daughters, who all reside in Webb City, MO; his seven grandchildren; and his three great-grandchildren, with two more on the way. I thank George for his military service, his work in the Missouri public school system, and I wish George all the best upon reaching this impressive milestone of 95 years.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:18 p.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. 217. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to make permanent the pilot program authorized by the Communities Helping Invest through Property and Improvements Needed for Veterans Act of 2016, and for other purposes.

H.R 1147. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes.

H.R 1263. An act to require a strategy for bolstering engagement and cooperation between the United States, Australia, India, and Japan and to seek to establish a Quad Inter-Parliamentary Working Group to facilitate closer cooperation on shared interests and values.

H.R 1286. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to seek to enter into an agreement with a federally funded research and development center for an assessment of forms that the Secretary sends to claimants

for benefits under laws administered by the Secretary, and for other purposes.

H.R 1364. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide clarification regarding the inclusion of medically necessary automobile adaptations in Department of Veterans Affairs definition of ''medical services''.

H.R 1453. An act to amend the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act to require reporting regarding clean energy demonstration projects, and for other purposes.

H.R 1578. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to promote assistance from persons recognized by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for individuals who file certain claims under laws administered by the Secretary.

H.R 1815. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to take certain actions in the case of a default on a home loan guaranteed by the Secretary, and for other purposes.

H.R 1823. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Comptroller General of the United States to report on certain funding shortfalls in the Department of Veterans Affairs.

H.R 2201. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve claims, made under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, regarding military sexual trauma, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 217. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to make permanent the pilot program authorized by the Communities Helping Invest through Property and Improvements Needed for Veterans Act of 2016, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1147. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1263. An act to require a strategy for bolstering engagement and cooperation between the United States, Australia, India, and Japan and to seek to establish a Quad Inter-Parliamentary Working Group to facilitate closer cooperation on shared interests and values; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 1286. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to seek to enter into an agreement with a federally funded research and development center for an assessment of forms that the Secretary sends to claimants for benefits under laws administered by the Secretary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1364. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide clarification regarding the inclusion of medically necessary automobile adaptations in Department of Veterans Affairs definition of ''medical services''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1453. An act to amend the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act to require reporting regarding clean energy demonstration projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 1578. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to promote assistance from persons recognized by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for individuals who file certain claims under laws administered by the Secretary; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1815. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to take certain actions in the case of a default on a home loan guaranteed by the Secretary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1823. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Comptroller General of the United States to report on certain funding shortfalls in the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2201. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve claims, made under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, regarding military sexual trauma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–976. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the status of all extensions granted by Congress regarding the deadlines for the commencement of construction of Commission-licensed hydropower projects, including information about any delays by the Commission with respect to extensions and the reasons for such delays; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–977. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Perfluoroalkyl and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances Data Reporting and Recordkeeping under the Toxic Substances Control Act; Change to Submission Period'' (FRL No. 7902.2–01–OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–978. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Quality Plans; California; Tehama County Air Pollution Control District; New Source Review'' (FRL No. 10286–02–R9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–979. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; WA; Southwest Clean Air Agency; Revisions to Excess Emissions, Startup, Shutdown, and General Requirements'' (FRL No. 12413–02–R10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–980. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Nitrogen Oxide Budget Program'' (FRL No. 12551–02–R5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–981. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Alabama; Administrative Corrections and VOC Definition'' (FRL No. 12570–02–R4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–982. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Colorado; Interim Final Determination to Stay and Defer Sanctions in the Denver Metro/North Front Range 2008 Ozone Nonattainment Area'' (FRL No. 12746–02–R8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–983. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Texas; New Source Review Updates for Project Emissions Accounting'' (FRL No. 10676–03–R6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–984. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Michigan; Attainment Plan for the Detroit 2010 Sulfur Dioxide Nonattainment Area'' (FRL No. 10788–02–R5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–985. A communication from the Section Chief, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revenue Procedure: Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit, or abatement; determination of tax liability'' (Rev. Proc. 2025–20) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2025; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–986. A communication from the Director of the Regulations and Disclosure Law Division, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Emergency Import Restrictions on Categories of Archaeological and Ethnological Material of Lebanon'' (RIN1685–AA32) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2025; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–987. A communication from the Senior Bureau Official, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to Malaysia in the amount of $14,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 25–016) received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–988. A communication from the Senior Bureau Official, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to the UAE in the amount of $50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 23–031) received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–989. A communication from the Senior Bureau Official, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to

section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license amendment for the export of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to Germany, the Republic of Korea, and Singapore in the amount of $50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 25–021) received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–990. A communication from the Senior Bureau Official, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license amendment for the export of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services and the manufacture of significant military equipment abroad to Japan, Australia, and Singapore in the amount of $100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 25–023) received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–991. A communication from the Senior Bureau Official, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of firearms, parts, and components controlled under Category I of the U.S. Munitions List to Colombia in the amount of $1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 24–113) received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

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. 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. 419. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to reauthorize grants to support law enforcement officers and families, and for other purposes.

By Mr. GRASSLEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 539. A bill to reauthorize the PROTECT Our Children Act of 2008, and for other purposes.

By Mr. GRASSLEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 911. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to include certain retired law enforcement officers in the public safety officers' death benefits program.

By Mr. GRASSLEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 1316. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide that COPS grant funds may be used for local law enforcement recruits to attend schools or academies if the recruits agree to serve in precincts of law enforcement agencies in their communities.

By Mr. GRASSLEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

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.

By Mr. GRASSLEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1595. A bill to establish standards for trauma kits purchased using funds provided under the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WICKER for the Committee on Armed Services.

Adam Telle, of Mississippi, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army.

*Matthew Napoli, of Virginia, to be Deputy Administrator for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, National Nuclear Security Administration.

*Richard Anderson, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Air Force nominations beginning with Joseph L. Abrams and ending with Joseph M. Yabes, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 28, 2025.

Air Force nominations beginning with Margaret E. Abbott and ending with Rachael L. Voigt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 28, 2025.

Air Force nominations beginning with Amara B. Adams and ending with Robert D. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2025. (minus 1 nominee: Anita T. Sims)

Army nominations beginning with Matthew D. Brandt and ending with Dejene G. Kassaye, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 28, 2025.

Army nomination of Missy L. McNeill, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Domanique M. Abner and ending with 00003259357, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2025.

Army nominations beginning with Edwin A. Abrazado and ending with 0003102153, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2025.

Army nominations beginning with Jessica S. Abbott and ending with 0003390902, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2025.

Army nominations beginning with Ross O. Anderson and ending with 0002422513, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2025.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Nathan C. Hess and ending with Christopher S. Lambert, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 14, 2025.

Marine Corps nomination of Edward R. Rogers II, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Navy nomination of Wendell C. Eldridge, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Eric M. Beall, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Alexandra K. Holland, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Isabel M. Bernal and ending with John J. W. Yun, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 12, 2025.

Space Force nomination of Zachary R. Eagle, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

*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. MCCORMICK (for himself and Ms. ALSOBROOKS):

S. 1808. A bill to permit a registered investment company to omit certain fees from the calculation of acquired fund fees and expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. MOODY (for herself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. LEE, Mr. BUDD, Mr. MORENO, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 1809. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking or transmitting video of defense information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 1810. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for charitable donations to nonprofit organizations providing education scholarships to qualified elementary and secondary students; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. SCHMITT):

S. 1811. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to prohibit graduate medical schools from receiving Federal financial assistance if such schools adopt certain policies and requirements relating to diversity, equity, and inclusion; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

S. 1812. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the inadmissibility of certain aliens seeking citizenship for children by giving birth in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina:

S. 1813. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for charitable donations for the creation or expansion of charter schools; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mr. GALLEGO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KELLY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs.

MURRAY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1814. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for a code of conduct for justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. KELLY):

S. 1815. A bill to provide targeted funding for States and other eligible entities through the Social Services Block Grant program to address the increased burden that maintaining the health and hygiene of infants and toddlers, medically complex children, and low-income adults or adults with disabilities who rely on adult incontinence materials and supplies place on families in need, the resultant adverse health effects on children and families, and the limited child care options available for infants and toddlers who lack sufficient diapers and diapering supplies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. FETTERMAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CASSIDY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. LUMMIS, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. KIM, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CORNYN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. SMITH, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BUDD, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. SHEEHY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. WARREN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. KELLY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. COONS, and Mr. HAWLEY):

S. 1816. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish requirements with respect to the use of prior authorization under Medicare Advantage plans; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHMITT:

S. 1817. A bill to amend section 235 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to treat inadmissible aliens more consistently regardless of their country of nationality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1818. A bill to significantly lower prescription drug prices for patients in the United States by ending government-granted monopolies for manufacturers who charge drug prices that are higher than the median prices at which the drugs are available in other countries; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Ms. ALSOBROOKS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. WELCH):

S. 1819. A bill to increase the penalties for various violations of Federal law; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1820. A bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 and other laws to clarify appropriate standards for Federal employment discrimination and retaliation claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TILLIS:

S. 1821. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a tax on income from litigation which is received by third-party entities that provided financing for such litigation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 1822. A bill to provide for a study on the consolidation of food safety agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. MULLIN (for himself, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. SCHMITT, Mr. COTTON, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. BUDD, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. LANKFORD, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 1823. A bill to authorize livestock producers and their employees to take black vultures to prevent death, injury, or destruction to livestock, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. ERNST, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. FETTERMAN, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. Res. 236. A resolution calling for the return of abducted Ukrainian children before finalizing any peace agreement to end the war against Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. COONS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PETERS, Ms. SLOTKIN, and Mr. PADILLA):

S. Res. 237. A resolution honoring the service and memory of Army Staff Sgt. Jose Duenez Jr., Army Staff Sgt. Edvin F. Franco, Army Staff Sgt. Troy S. Knutson-Collins, and Army Pfc. Dante D. Taitano of the 1st Armored Brigade Combat Team, 3rd Infantry Division, who died during a recovery mission in support of a regularly scheduled training exercise while serving in Lithuania; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. HUSTED):

S. Res. 238. A resolution congratulating the students, parents, teachers, and leaders of charter schools across the United States for making ongoing contributions to education and supporting the ideals and goals of the 26th Annual National Charter Schools Week, to be held May 11 through May 17, 2025; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 167

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 167, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to punish criminal offenses targeting law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

S. 275

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 275, a bill to improve the provision of care and services under the Veterans Community Care Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 315

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. KIM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 315, a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to issue a rule requiring access to AM broadcast stations in passenger motor vehicles, and for other purposes.

S. 339

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 339, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of multi-cancer early detection screening tests.

S. 410

At the request of Mr. WARNOCK, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 410, a bill to amend titles 10 and 38, United States Code, to improve benefits and services for surviving spouses, and for other purposes.

S. 539

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 539, a bill to reauthorize the PROTECT Our Children Act of 2008, and for other purposes.

S. 554

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE) were added as cosponsors of S. 554, a bill to enhance bilateral defense cooperation between the United States and Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 556

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE) 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. 726

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. KIM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 726, a bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to require the safe storage of firearms, and for other purposes.

S. 857

At the request of Mr. CURTIS, the name of the Senator from California

(Mr. SCHIFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 857, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the exclusion for certain conservation subsidies to include subsidies for water conservation or efficiency measures, storm water management measures, and wastewater management measures.

S. 911

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 911, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to include certain retired law enforcement officers in the public safety officers' death benefits program.

S. 1168

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1168, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage of portable ultrasound transportation and set up services under the Medicare program.

S. 1241

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. KIM), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1241, a bill to impose sanctions and other measures with respect to the Russian Federation if the Government of the Russian Federation refuses to negotiate a peace agreement with Ukraine, violates any such agreement, or initiates another military invasion of Ukraine, and for other purposes.

S. 1379

At the request of Mr. LUJÁN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1379, a bill to ensure consumers have access to data relating to their motor vehicles, critical repair information, and tools, and to provide them choices for the maintenance, service, and repair of their motor vehicles, and for other purposes.

S. 1404

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1404, a bill to combat organized crime involving the illegal acquisition of retail goods and cargo for the purpose of selling those illegally obtained goods through physical and online retail marketplaces.

S. 1467

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1467, a bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to prevent consumer reporting agencies from furnishing consumer reports under certain circumstances, and for other purposes.

S. 1541

At the request of Mr. KELLY, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1541, a bill to support the national defense and economic security of the United States by supporting vessels, ports, and shipyards of the United States and the U.S. maritime workforce.

S. 1552

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1552, a bill to promote and protect from discrimination living organ donors.

S. 1563

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) 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. 1568

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. MORENO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1568, a bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to modify standards for general service lamps, and for other purposes.

S. 1593

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. ALSOBROOKS) 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. 1705

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S. 1710

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. KIM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1710, a bill to improve family and medical leave for military families, and for other purposes.

S. 1777

At the request of Mr. PADILLA, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. SCHIFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1777, a bill to amend the California Desert Protection Act of 1994 to expand the boundary of Joshua Tree National Park, to redesignate the Cottonwood Visitor Center at Joshua Tree National Park as the ''Dianne Feinstein Visitor Center'', and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 46

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 46, a 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 ''California State Motor Vehicle and Engine Pollution Control Standards; Heavy-Duty Vehicle and Engine Emission Warranty and Maintenance Provisions; Advanced Clean Trucks; Zero Emission Airport Shuttle; Zero-Emission Power Train Certification; Waiver of Preemption; Notice of Decision''.

S. RES. 212

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE) were added as cosponsors of 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.

S. RES. 224

At the request of Mr. WELCH, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. ALSOBROOKS), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 224, a resolution calling for the urgent delivery of humanitarian aid to address the needs of civilians in Gaza.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 236—CALLING FOR THE RETURN OF ABDUCTED UKRAINIAN CHILDREN BEFORE FINALIZING ANY PEACE AGREEMENT TO END THE WAR AGAINST UKRAINE

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. ERNST, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. FETTERMAN, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 236

Whereas the United States Government is working to bring an end to Russia's war against Ukraine and restore peace in Europe;

Whereas, as of April 16, 2025, Ukrainian authorities have received at least 19,546 confirmed reports of unlawful deportations and forced transfers of Ukrainian children to the territory of the Russian Federation, the Republic of Belarus, or Russian-occupied Ukrainian territory;

Whereas, as of April 16, 2025, Ukraine and its partners have managed to return 1,274 abducted Ukrainian children from the Russian Federation, the Republic of Belarus, or occupied Ukrainian territory;

Whereas Russia's abduction and Russification of Ukrainian children demonstrates the

intent of the Government of the Russian Federation to erase the Ukrainian nation and identity;

Whereas the Government of the Russian Federation has changed its adoption laws since the full-scale invasion of Ukraine in 2022 for the purpose of forcibly adopting children abducted from Ukraine in order to raise them as Russian citizens, erased of their Ukrainian names, language, and identity;

Whereas, on June 16, 2022, Russian authorities announced that children born in occupied Ukrainian territories after the February 24, 2022, invasion will be deemed Russian citizens, in violation of Ukrainian law and the Fourth Geneva Convention;

Whereas the Department of State's 2024 Trafficking in Persons Report found that Russia recruits or uses child soldiers as defined under the Child Soldiers Prevention Act, is documented as having a state-sponsored policy or pattern of human trafficking, and is among the worst hubs for human trafficking in the world;

Whereas the United States has sanctioned at least 32 individuals and three entities of the Russian Federation and its occupying forces and the Republic of Belarus for being involved in the abduction and re-education of Ukrainian children and human rights violations of Ukrainian minors;

Whereas Maria Lvova-Belova, Children's Rights Commissioner for the President of Russia, admitted to abducting and forcibly transferring Ukrainian children and facilitating forced adoptions to Russian families;

Whereas the unlawful deportation or transfer of protected people constitutes a grave breach of the Geneva Convention (IV) relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, Article 147, done at Geneva August 12, 1949;

Whereas forcibly transferring children of one group to another group is a violation of Article II(e) of the Genocide Convention, of which the Russian Federation is a party; and

Whereas hundreds of thousands of children still reside in the occupied territories of Ukraine, where they face attempts at Russification by occupation authorities; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the Government of the Russian Federation's abduction, forcible transfer, and facilitation of the illegal deportation of Ukrainian children;

(2) notes with concern that the invasion of Ukraine by the Russian Federation has significantly increased the risks of children being exposed to human trafficking and exploitation, child labor, sexual violence, hunger, injury, trauma, deprivation of education and shelter, and death;

(3) supports bringing the war in Ukraine to a peaceful and just conclusion; and

(4) urges that all Ukrainian children abducted by the Government of the Russian Federation be returned before finalizing any peace agreement.

SENATE RESOLUTION 237—HONORING THE SERVICE AND MEMORY OF ARMY STAFF SGT. JOSE DUEÑEZ JR., ARMY STAFF SGT. EDVIN F. FRANCO, ARMY STAFF SGT. TROY S. KNUTSON-COLLINS, AND ARMY PFC. DANTE D. TAITANO OF THE 1ST ARMORED BRIGADE COMBAT TEAM, 3RD INFANTRY DIVISION, WHO DIED DURING A RECOVERY MISSION IN SUPPORT OF A REGULARLY SCHEDULED TRAINING EXERCISE WHILE SERVING IN LITHUANIA

Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. COONS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PETERS, Ms. SLOTKIN, and Mr. PADILLA) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 237

Whereas four United States soldiers, Army Staff Sgt. Jose Dueñez Jr., Army Staff Sgt. Edvin F. Franco, Army Staff Sgt. Troy S. Knutson-Collins, and Army Pfc. Dante D. Taitano, were all members of the 1st Armored Brigade Combat Team of the 3rd Infantry Division stationed at Pabrade training ground, Lithuania, since February 2025;

Whereas these four United States soldiers were part of a rotational deployment of 3,500 members of the United States Armed Forces as part of the United States-led NATO Operation Atlantic Resolve to enhance deterrence along the NATO alliance's eastern flank;

Whereas the bodies of these four United States soldiers were found on March 31 and April 1, 2025, after a tragic accident while conducting a mission to repair and tow an immobilized vehicle when their heavy recovery vehicle sank in a bog;

Whereas the accident triggered a complex and weeklong recovery effort with hundreds of allied United States, Lithuanian, Polish, and Estonian personnel and equipment to finally extract them from the mud;

Whereas in the spirit of allied solidarity, thousands of Lithuanians, including Lithuanian President Gitanas Nauseda, joined a farewell ceremony on April 3, 2025, in a moving gesture to mourn the deaths of these four United States soldiers before their bodies were returned to the United States;

Whereas Staff Sgt. Dueñez Jr., 25, of Joliet, Illinois, was a M1 Abrams tank system maintainer with more than seven years in the Army, whose decorations included the Army Commendation Medal with oak leaf cluster, Army Achievement Medal with two oak leaf clusters, Army Good Conduct Medal, and National Defense Service Medal;

Whereas Staff Sgt. Franco, 25, of Glendale, California, was a M1 Abrams tank system maintainer who served in the Army for more than six years, whose awards and decorations included the Army Commendation Medal with oak leaf cluster, Army Achievement Medal with oak leaf cluster, Army Good Conduct Medal, National Defense Service Medal; and Global War on Terror Service Medal;

Whereas Staff Sgt. Knutson-Collins, 28, of Battle Creek, Michigan, was an artillery mechanic with more than seven years in the Army whose awards and decorations included the Army Commendation Medal with oak leaf cluster, Army Good Conduct Medal, Army Achievement Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, and Master Technician Badge;

Whereas Pfc. Taitano, 21, of Dededo, Guam, was a M1 Abrams tank system maintainer who served in the Army for nearly two years and was the recipient of the Army Commendation Medal; and

Whereas these four United States soldiers served with distinction, upheld the highest traditions of the United States Army, and were part of a critical allied NATO mission to protect freedom from Russian aggression: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the memory and service of Army Staff Sgt. Jose Dueñez Jr., Army Staff Sgt. Edvin F. Franco, Army Staff Sgt. Troy S. Knutson-Collins, and Army Pfc. Dante D. Taitano for their dedicated service to the United States and its NATO allies;

(2) expresses gratitude for the hundreds of brave United States, Lithuanian, Polish, and Estonian personnel involved in a complex effort to recover the remains of Army Staff Sgt. Jose Dueñez Jr., Army Staff Sgt. Edvin F. Franco, Army Staff Sgt. Troy S. Knutson-Collins, and Army Pfc. Dante D. Taitano;

(3) recognizes the outpouring of nationwide sentiment by the people of Lithuania in appreciation of the heroism of these four United States soldiers and the continuing close alliance of their nation with the United States; and

(4) reaffirms the importance of continued Western leadership in enhancing deterrence in the Baltic region.

SENATE RESOLUTION 238—CONGRATULATING THE STUDENTS, PARENTS, TEACHERS, AND LEADERS OF CHARTER SCHOOLS ACROSS THE UNITED STATES FOR MAKING ONGOING CONTRIBUTIONS TO EDUCATION AND SUPPORTING THE IDEALS AND GOALS OF THE 26TH ANNUAL NATIONAL CHARTER SCHOOLS WEEK, TO BE HELD MAY 11 THROUGH MAY 17, 2025

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. HUSTED) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 238

Whereas charter schools are public schools that do not charge tuition and enroll any student who wants to attend, often through a random lottery when the demand for enrollment is outmatched by the supply of available charter school seats;

Whereas high-performing public charter schools deliver a high-quality public education and challenge all students to reach their potential for academic success;

Whereas high-quality public charter schools promote innovation and excellence in public education;

Whereas public charter schools throughout the United States provide millions of families with diverse and innovative educational options for the children of those families;

Whereas high-performing public charter schools and charter management organizations are increasing student achievement and attendance rates at institutions of higher education;

Whereas public charter schools are authorized by a designated entity and—

(1) respond to the needs of communities, families, and students in the United States; and

(2) promote the principles of quality, accountability, choice, high-performance, and innovation;

Whereas, in exchange for flexibility and autonomy, public charter schools are held accountable by the authorizers of the public charter schools for improving student achievement and for sound financial and operational management;

Whereas public charter schools are required to meet the student achievement accountability requirements under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) in the same manner as traditional public schools;

Whereas public charter schools often set high expectations for students to ensure that the public charter schools are of high quality and truly accountable to the public;

Whereas 45 States, the District of Columbia, Guam, and Puerto Rico have public charter schools;

Whereas, as of the 2021 to 2022 school year, approximately 8,000 public charter schools served approximately 3,700,000 children in the United States;

Whereas enrollment in public charter schools grew from 660,000 students in 2002, to 3,700,000 students in 2021, a more than five-fold increase in 20 years;

Whereas, in the United States—

(1) in 270 school districts, more than 10 percent of public school students are enrolled in public charter schools; and

(2) in at least 26 school districts, at least 30 percent of public school students are enrolled in public charter schools;

Whereas high-quality public charter schools improve the achievement of students enrolled in the charter schools and collaborate with traditional public schools to improve public education for all students;

Whereas public charter schools—

(1) give parents the freedom to choose public schools;

(2) routinely measure parental satisfaction levels; and

(3) must prove the ongoing success of the charter schools to parents, policymakers, and the communities served by the charter schools or risk closure;

Whereas a 2023 report from the Center for Research on Education Outcomes at Stanford University found significant improvements for students from low-income backgrounds in public charter schools, and when compared to peers in traditional public schools, each year those students completed the equivalent of 16 more days of learning in reading and 6 more days of learning in math; and

Whereas the 26th Annual National Charter Schools Week is scheduled to be celebrated the week of May 11 through May 17, 2025: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the students, families, teachers, leaders, and staff of public charter schools across the United States for—

(A) making ongoing contributions to public education;

(B) making impressive strides in closing the academic achievement gap in schools in the United States, particularly in schools with some of the most disadvantaged students in both rural and urban communities; and

(C) improving and strengthening the public school system throughout the United States;

(2) supports the ideals and goals of the 26th Annual National Charter Schools Week, a week-long celebration to be held May 11 through May 17, 2025, in communities throughout the United States; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to hold appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities during National Charter Schools Week to demonstrate support for high-quality public charter schools.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2228. Mr. RICKETTS (for himself and Ms. LUMMIS) 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 2229. Mr. MARSHALL (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1582, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2230. Mr. MARSHALL (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1582, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2231. Mr. SCHIFF submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1582, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2232. Mr. SCHIFF submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1582, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2233. Mr. SCHIFF submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1582, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2234. Mr. SCHIFF submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1582, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2235. Mr. BENNET 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 2228. Mr. RICKETTS (for himself and Ms. LUMMIS) 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 4(c), add at the end the following:

(8) EXPEDITED CERTIFICATIONS OF EXISTING REGULATORY REGIMES.—The Stablecoin Certification Review Committee shall take all necessary steps to endeavor that, with respect to a State that, within 180 days of the date of enactment of this Act, has in effect a prudential regulatory regime (including regulations and guidance) for the supervision of digital assets or payment stablecoins, the certification process under this paragraph with respect to that regime occurs on an expedited timeline after the effective date of this Act.

SA 2229. Mr. MARSHALL (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) 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. _____. COMPETITION IN CREDIT CARD TRANSACTIONS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Credit Card Competition Act of 2025''.

(b) AMENDMENTS.—Section 921 of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act (15 U.S.C. 1693o–2) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (3), (4), and (5), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) COMPETITION IN CREDIT CARD TRANSACTIONS.—

''(A) NO EXCLUSIVE NETWORK.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Credit Card Competition Act of 2025, the Board shall prescribe regulations providing that a covered card issuer or payment card network shall not directly or through any agent, processor, or licensed member of a payment card network, by contract, requirement, condition, penalty, technological specification, or otherwise, restrict the number of payment card networks on which an electronic credit transaction may be processed to—

''(I) 1 such network;

''(II) 2 or more such networks, if—

''(aa) each such network is owned, controlled, or otherwise operated by—

''(AA) affiliated persons; or

''(BB) networks affiliated with such issuer; or

''(bb) any such network is identified on the list established and updated under subparagraph (D); or

''(III) subject to clause (ii), the 2 such networks that hold the 2 largest market shares with respect to the number of credit cards issued in the United States by licensed members of such networks (and enabled to be processed through such networks), as determined by the Board on the date on which the Board prescribes the regulations.

''(ii) DETERMINATIONS BY BOARD.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—The Board, not later than 3 years after the date on which the regulations prescribed under clause (i) take effect, and not less frequently than once every 3 years thereafter, shall determine whether the 2 networks identified under clause (i)(III) have changed, as compared with the most recent such determination by the Board.

''(II) EFFECT OF DETERMINATION.—If the Board, under subclause (I), determines that the 2 networks described in clause (i)(III) have changed (as compared with the most recent such determination by the Board), clause (i)(III) shall no longer have any force or effect.

''(B) NO ROUTING RESTRICTIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Credit Card Competition Act of 2025, the Board shall prescribe regulations providing that a covered card issuer or payment card network shall not—

''(i) directly or through any agent, processor, or licensed member of the network, by contract, requirement, condition, penalty, or otherwise—

''(I) inhibit the ability of any person who accepts credit cards for payments to direct the routing of electronic credit transactions for processing over any payment card network that—

''(aa) may process such transactions; and

''(bb) is not on the list established and updated by the Board under subparagraph (D);

''(II) require any person who accepts credit cards for payments to exclusively use, for transactions associated with a particular credit card, an authentication, tokenization, or other security technology that cannot be used by all of the payment card networks that may process electronic credit transactions for that particular credit card; or

''(III) inhibit the ability of another payment card network to handle or process electronic credit transactions using an authentication, tokenization, or other security technology for the processing of those electronic credit transactions; or

''(ii) impose any penalty or disadvantage, financial or otherwise, on any person for—

''(I) choosing to direct the routing of an electronic credit transaction over any payment card network on which the electronic credit transaction may be processed; or

''(II) failing to ensure that a certain number, or aggregate dollar amount, of electronic credit transactions are handled by a particular payment card network.

''(C) APPLICABILITY.—The regulations prescribed under subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall not apply to a credit card issued in a 3-party payment system model.

''(D) DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL SECURITY RISKS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Credit Card Competition Act of 2025, the Board, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe regulations to establish a public list of any payment card network—

''(I) the processing of electronic credit transactions by which is determined by the Board to pose a risk to the national security of the United States; or

''(II) that is owned, operated, or sponsored by a foreign state entity.

''(ii) UPDATING OF LIST.—Not less frequently than once every 2 years after the date on which the Board establishes the public list required under clause (i), the Board, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall update that list.

''(E) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph—

''(i) the terms 'card issuer' and 'creditor' have the meanings given the terms in section 103 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1602);

''(ii) the term 'covered card issuer' means a card issuer that, together with the affiliates of the card issuer, has assets of more than $100,000,000,000;

''(iii) the term 'credit card issued in a 3-party payment system model' means a credit card issued by a card issuer that is—

''(I) the payment card network with respect to the credit card; or

''(II) under common ownership with the payment card network with respect to the credit card;

''(iv) the term 'electronic credit transaction'—

''(I) means a transaction in which a person uses a credit card; and

''(II) includes a transaction in which a person does not physically present a credit card for payment, including a transaction involving the entry of credit card information onto, or use of credit card information in conjunction with, a website interface or a mobile telephone application; and

''(v) the term 'licensed member' includes, with respect to a payment card network—

''(I) a creditor or card issuer that is authorized to issue credit cards bearing any logo of the payment card network; and

''(II) any person, including any financial institution and any person that may be referred to as an 'acquirer', that is authorized to—

''(aa) screen and accept any person into any program under which that person may accept, for payment for goods or services, a credit card bearing any logo of the payment card network;

''(bb) process transactions on behalf of any person who accepts credit cards for payments; and

''(cc) complete financial settlement of any transaction on behalf of a person who accepts credit cards for payments.''; and

(2) in subsection (d)(1), by inserting '', except that the Bureau shall not have authority to enforce the requirements of this section or any regulations prescribed by the Board under this section'' after ''section 918''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Each set of regulations prescribed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System under paragraph (2) of section 921(b) of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act (15 U.S.C. 1693o–2(b)), as amended by subsection (b) of this section, shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date on which the Board prescribes the final version of that set of regulations.

SA 2230. Mr. MARSHALL (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) 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. _____. COMPETITION IN CREDIT CARD TRANSACTIONS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Credit Card Competition Act of 2025''.

(b) AMENDMENTS.—Section 921 of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act (15 U.S.C. 1693o–2) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (3), (4), and (5), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) COMPETITION IN CREDIT CARD TRANSACTIONS.—

''(A) NO EXCLUSIVE NETWORK.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Credit Card Competition Act of 2025, the Board shall prescribe regulations providing that a covered card issuer or payment card network shall not directly or through any agent, processor, or licensed member of a payment card network, by contract, requirement, condition, penalty, technological specification, or otherwise, restrict the number of payment card networks on which an electronic credit transaction may be processed to—

''(I) 1 such network;

''(II) 2 or more such networks, if—

''(aa) each such network is owned, controlled, or otherwise operated by—

''(AA) affiliated persons; or

''(BB) networks affiliated with such issuer; or

''(bb) any such network is identified on the list established and updated under subparagraph (D); or

''(III) subject to clause (ii), the 2 such networks that hold the 2 largest market shares with respect to the number of credit cards issued in the United States by licensed members of such networks (and enabled to be processed through such networks), as determined by the Board on the date on which the Board prescribes the regulations.

''(ii) DETERMINATIONS BY BOARD.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—The Board, not later than 3 years after the date on which the regulations prescribed under clause (i) take effect, and not less frequently than once every 3 years thereafter, shall determine whether the 2 networks identified under clause (i)(III) have changed, as compared with the most recent such determination by the Board.

''(II) EFFECT OF DETERMINATION.—If the Board, under subclause (I), determines that the 2 networks described in clause (i)(III) have changed (as compared with the most recent such determination by the Board), clause (i)(III) shall no longer have any force or effect.

''(B) NO ROUTING RESTRICTIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Credit Card Competition Act of 2025, the Board shall prescribe regulations providing that a covered card issuer or payment card network shall not—

''(i) directly or through any agent, processor, or licensed member of the network, by contract, requirement, condition, penalty, or otherwise—

''(I) inhibit the ability of any person who accepts credit cards for payments to direct the routing of electronic credit transactions for processing over any payment card network that—

''(aa) may process such transactions; and

''(bb) is not on the list established and updated by the Board under subparagraph (D);

''(II) require any person who accepts credit cards for payments to exclusively use, for transactions associated with a particular credit card, an authentication, tokenization, or other security technology that cannot be used by all of the payment card networks that may process electronic credit transactions for that particular credit card; or

''(III) inhibit the ability of another payment card network to handle or process electronic credit transactions using an authentication, tokenization, or other security technology for the processing of those electronic credit transactions; or

''(ii) impose any penalty or disadvantage, financial or otherwise, on any person for—

''(I) choosing to direct the routing of an electronic credit transaction over any payment card network on which the electronic credit transaction may be processed; or

''(II) failing to ensure that a certain number, or aggregate dollar amount, of electronic credit transactions are handled by a particular payment card network.

''(C) APPLICABILITY.—The regulations prescribed under subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall not apply to a credit card issued in a 3-party payment system model.

''(D) DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL SECURITY RISKS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Credit Card Competition Act of 2025, the Board, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe regulations to establish a public list of any payment card network—

''(I) the processing of electronic credit transactions by which is determined by the Board to pose a risk to the national security of the United States; or

''(II) that is owned, operated, or sponsored by a foreign state entity.

''(ii) UPDATING OF LIST.—Not less frequently than once every 2 years after the date on which the Board establishes the public list required under clause (i), the Board, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall update that list.

''(E) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph—

''(i) the terms 'card issuer' and 'creditor' have the meanings given the terms in section 103 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1602);

''(ii) the term 'covered card issuer' means a card issuer that, together with the affiliates of the card issuer, has assets of more than $100,000,000,000;

''(iii) the term 'credit card issued in a 3-party payment system model' means a credit card issued by a card issuer that is—

''(I) the payment card network with respect to the credit card; or

''(II) under common ownership with the payment card network with respect to the credit card;

''(iv) the term 'electronic credit transaction'—

''(I) means a transaction in which a person uses a credit card; and

''(II) includes a transaction in which a person does not physically present a credit card

for payment, including a transaction involving the entry of credit card information onto, or use of credit card information in conjunction with, a website interface or a mobile telephone application; and

''(v) the term 'licensed member' includes, with respect to a payment card network—

''(I) a creditor or card issuer that is authorized to issue credit cards bearing any logo of the payment card network; and

''(II) any person, including any financial institution and any person that may be referred to as an 'acquirer', that is authorized to—

''(aa) screen and accept any person into any program under which that person may accept, for payment for goods or services, a credit card bearing any logo of the payment card network;

''(bb) process transactions on behalf of any person who accepts credit cards for payments; and

''(cc) complete financial settlement of any transaction on behalf of a person who accepts credit cards for payments.''; and

(2) in subsection (d)(1), by inserting '', except that the Bureau shall not have authority to enforce the requirements of this section or any regulations prescribed by the Board under this section'' after ''section 918''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Each set of regulations prescribed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System under paragraph (2) of section 921(b) of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act (15 U.S.C. 1693o–2(b)), as amended by subsection (b) of this section, shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date on which the Board prescribes the final version of that set of regulations.

SA 2231. Mr. SCHIFF 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:

On page 55, line 16, strike ''involving'' and all that follows through line 23, and insert the following:

may—

(A) serve as an officer of a payment stablecoin issuer;

(B) serve as a director of a payment stablecoin issuer; or

(C) be a shareholder of a payment stablecoin issuer.

SA 2232. Mr. SCHIFF 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 in section 4, insert the following:

[(____)] DISCLOSURE RELATING TO PAYMENT STABLECOINS.—Section 13104 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (5)(B), by inserting ''payment stablecoins (as defined in section 2 of the GENIUS ACT),'' after ''commodities futures,''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(9) PAYMENT STABLECOINS.—The identity and category of value of any payment stablecoin (as defined in section 2 of the GENIUS Act) issued by, purchased by, sold by, or held by the reporting individual during the preceding calendar year.'';

(2) in subsection (b)(1)(B), by striking ''(3) and (4)'' and inserting ''(3), (4), and (9)''; and

(3) in subsection (d)(1)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''(3), (4), (5), AND (8)'' and inserting ''(3), (4), (5), (8), AND (9)''; and

(B) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''(3), (4), (5), and (8)'' and inserting ''(3), (4), (5), (8), and (9)''.

SA 2233. Mr. SCHIFF 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. [_____]. ACTS AFFECTING A PERSONAL FINANCIAL INTEREST.

Section 208 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) For purposes of subsection (a), the term 'financial interest' includes an interest in the issuance, purchase, sale, or holding of a payment stablecoin, as defined in section 2 of the GENIUS Act.''.

SA 2234. Mr. SCHIFF 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. [_____]. PUBLIC OFFICIAL CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''public official'' means any individual described in section 13103(f) of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) the term ''special Government employee'' has the meaning given that term in section 202(a) of title 18, United States Code.

(b) REQUIREMENT.—A permitted payment stablecoin issuer shall ensure that no public official shall profit from the issuance of payment stablecoins of the permitted payment stablecoin issuer.

(c) CERTIFICATION.—

(1) INITIAL CERTIFICATION.—To receive approval as a permitted payment stablecoin issuer under section 5, each payment stablecoin issuer applicant shall submit to the Director of the Office of Government Ethics and the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator of the permitted payment stablecoin issuer, or, in the case of a State qualified payment stablecoin issuer, the State payment stablecoin regulator of the permitted payment stablecoin issuer, a certification that no public official has a financial interest related to a particular matter in which the public official participates personally and substantially as a Government officer or employee, including as a special Government employee, from the issuance of payment stablecoins of the permitted payment stablecoin issuer.

(2) RECERTIFICATION.—Not later than the 180 days after the approval of an application under section 5 or 90 days after the issuance of the first payment stablecoin by a permitted payment stablecoin issuer, whichever is earlier, and on a quarterly basis thereafter, each permitted stablecoin issuer shall submit a certification to the Director of the Office of Government Ethics and the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator of the permitted payment stablecoin issuer, or, in the case of a State qualified payment stablecoin issuer, the State payment stablecoin regulator of the permitted payment stablecoin issuer, a certification that no public official has a financial interest related to a particular matter in which the public official participates personally and substantially as a Government officer or employee, including as a special Government employee, from the issuance of payment stablecoins of the permitted payment stablecoin issuer.

(3) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE.—The Director of the Office of Government Ethics shall make the certifications submitted under paragraphs (1) and (2) publicly available through databases maintained on the official website of the Office of Government Ethics.

(d) PENALTIES.—

(1) APPROVAL REVOCATION.—The primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator or State payment stablecoin regulator of a permitted payment stablecoin issuer that does not submit a certification pursuant to subsection (c) shall revoke the approval of the payment stablecoin issuer under section 5.

(2) CRIMINAL PENALTY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Any person that submits a certification pursuant to subsection (c) that is false shall be subject to the criminal penalties set forth under section 1001 of title 18, United States Code.

(B) REFERRAL TO ATTORNEY GENERAL.—If a Federal payment stablecoin regulator or State payment stablecoin regulator has reason to believe that any person has violated subsection (c), the applicable regulator shall refer the matter to the Attorney General or to the attorney general of the host State of the payment stablecoin issuer.

SA 2235. Mr. BENNET 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. ____. PROHIBITED FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED ELECTION.—The term ''covered election'' means an election for the office of—

(A) President;

(B) Vice President;

(C) United States Senator;

(D) United States Representative;

(E) Delegate to Congress; or

(F) Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico.

(2) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—The term ''covered individual'' means—

(A) the President;

(B) the Vice President;

(C) a United States Senator

(D) a United States Representative;

(E) a Delegate to Congress;

(F) a Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico; or

(G) a candidate in a covered election.

(3) COVERED INVESTMENT.—The term ''covered investment'' means any digital asset.

(4) DIGITAL ASSET.—The term ''digital asset'' means any digital representation of value that is recorded on a cryptographically secured distributed ledger or any similar technology.

(5) PROHIBITED FINANCIAL TRANSACTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''prohibited financial transaction'' means—

(i) any issuance, sponsorship, or endorsement of a covered investment;

(ii) any purchase, sale, holding, or other conduct that causes a covered individual to obtain a covered investment;

(iii) any acquisition of any financial interest comparable to an interest described in clause (i) or (ii) through synthetic means, such as the use of a derivative, including an option, warrant, or other similar means; or

(iv) any acquisition of any financial interest comparable to an interest described in clause (i) or (ii) as part of an aggregation or compilation of such interests through a mutual fund, exchange-traded fund, or other similar means.

(6) QUALIFIED BLIND TRUST.—The term ''qualified blind trust'' means a qualified blind trust (as defined in section 13104(f)(3) of title 5, United States Code) that has been approved in writing by the applicable supervising ethics office under subparagraph (D) of such section 13104(f)(3).

(b) PROHIBITED FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS.—Except as provided in subsection (c), a covered individual may not engage in any prohibited financial transaction during—

(1) the period beginning on the date of filing as a candidate in a covered Federal election and ending on the date of the covered Federal election;

(2) the term of service of the covered individual; and

(3) the 1-year period beginning on the date on which the service of the covered individual is terminated.

(c) QUALIFIED BLIND TRUST.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—During any of the periods described in subsection (b), for each covered investment owned by a covered individual, the covered individual shall place the covered investment in a qualified blind trust, including by establishing a qualified blind trust for that purpose, if necessary.

(2) QUALIFIED BLIND TRUST REQUIREMENTS.—A qualified blind trust may not be established for purposes of complying with this section without the prior approval of the applicable supervising ethics office. With respect to any such trust so approved, the applicable trustee—

(A) shall divest of any such instrument placed in the trust not later than 6 months after the trust is established;

(B) shall certify to the applicable supervising ethics office on an annual basis that the trustee has not provided any information on the trust's assets or transactions to the applicable covered individual; and

(C) may not have a close personal or business relationship with the applicable covered individual.

(d) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) SUPERVISING ETHICS OFFICES.—Each supervising ethics office shall make available on the public website of the supervising ethics office a copy of any qualified blind trust agreement of each covered individual.

(2) AMENDMENT.—Section 13101(18) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(E) the Federal Election Commission for a candidate in an election for the office of President, Vice President, United States Senator, United States Representative, Delegate to Congress, or Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico.''.

(e) LIABILITY AND IMMUNITY.—For purposes of any immunities to civil or criminal liability, any conduct comprising or relating to a prohibited financial transaction under this section shall be deemed an unofficial act and beyond the scope of the official duties of the relevant covered individual.

(f) CIVIL PENALTIES.—

(1) CIVIL ACTION.—The Attorney General may bring a civil action in any appropriate district court of the United States against any covered individual who violates subsection (b).

(2) CIVIL PENALTY.—Any covered individual who knowingly violates subsection (b) shall be subject to a civil monetary penalty of not more than $250,000.

(3) DISGORGEMENT.—A covered individual who is found in a civil action under paragraph (1) to have violated subsection (b) shall disgorge to the Treasury of the United States any profit from the unlawful activity that is the subject of that civil action.

(g) CRIMINAL PENALTIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for a covered individual to—

(A) knowingly violate subsection (b); and

(B) through such violation—

(i) causes an aggregate loss of not less than $1,000,000 to 1 or more persons in the United States; or

(ii) benefits financially, through profit, gain, or advantage, directly or indirectly through any family member or business associate of the covered individual, from a prohibited financial transaction.

(2) PENALTY.—A covered individual who violates paragraph (1) shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned for not more 18 than years, or both.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. BUDD. Mr. President, I have seven 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 Tuesday, May 20, 2025, at 9:30 a.m., to receive testimony in open and closed session.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 20, 2025, at 10 a.m., to consider a nomination.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 20, 2025, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 20, 2025, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a business meeting and hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 20, 2025, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 20, 2025, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

The Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 20, 2025, at 4:45 p.m., to receive testimony in open session.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 21, 2025

Mr. BUDD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, May 21; 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, morning business be closed, and the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 66, S. 1582, the GENIUS Act, postcloture, and that all time on the motion to proceed expire at 11:30 a.m.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BUDD. 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 7:07 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, May 21, 2025, at 10 a.m.