



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 171

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 20, 2025

No. 85

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

May 20, 2025.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MARIANETTE MILLER-MEEKS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

MIKE JOHNSON,

*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2025, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

### REMEMBERING MIKE LYCZAK

(Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mike Lyczak.

Mike grew up in the Little Village community in Chicago. Like many of us, his politics were shaped by firsthand experience—fighting discrimination, Chicago machine politics and rule, and standing up for working people.

Mike wasn't just a political strategist. He was a founding architect of

multiethnic, multiracial coalitions and solidarity in Chicago. He helped build the 22nd Ward Independent Political Organization, pouring his energy into electing Rudy Lozano and Harold Washington and into building a movement that could outlast any one campaign.

Mike's love for history and model-making reflected his meticulous mind. His wit brightened every room. He was a beloved husband to the late Caroline Downs and a devoted father to Benjamin Lyczak.

Mike will be deeply missed, but his legacy of courage and solidarity will live on in all of us.

Rest in power, Mike "Lizard" Lyczak.

### REPUBLICAN TAX SCAM

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak against the Republican budget, a cynical plan that gives tax breaks to billionaires while ripping away healthcare and food from working families like those I represent.

This Republican tax scam would kick nearly 14 million Americans off their healthcare, leaving them without coverage.

□ 1015

Mr. Speaker, in my district, a mother working nights and caring for her family by day told us that she doesn't know how they will survive if Medicaid is cut.

Her child relies on it for epilepsy medication. Without it, there is no safety net. It is just fear and uncertainty. This budget slashes Medicaid and SNAP, taking food from children, from seniors, from veterans, and people with disabilities. Even Republican Senators called it morally wrong.

In my district alone, 278,000 people rely on these programs. Republicans want to take that away. We can't allow them to continue to loot this country dry. America was not built for billion-

aires to hoard wealth while kids go hungry. Tax them fairly and fully now.

### OPPOSING DOUBLE TAX ON REMITTANCES

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the Trump administration's double tax on remittances. This is part of a broader war on working-class immigrants that punishes those who contribute the most to our national economy.

When immigrants send money home, they are not just helping loved ones. They are keeping entire communities afloat in countries like Mexico, Nigeria, and the Philippines.

By cutting off vital support to families abroad, this tax deepens poverty. It weakens stability. It drives more people to migrate out of desperation. Instead of asking the ultrawealthy to pay what they owe, they are shifting the burden to the people who can least afford it.

Undocumented immigrants alone pay \$580 billion in Federal, State, and local taxes to our country, more than some of the ultrarich who claim patriotism but hide under their wealth and abuse the system.

It is a double standard that undermines our economy and our values. This isn't just bad policy. It is an unjust double tax on the very people who power our economy and our communities.

### HONORING DANNY RYAN

(Mr. LYNCH of Massachusetts was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, this morning I take the floor of the people's House in memory of the late Danny Ryan, or "Budzo" to those who were lucky enough to have known him.

Danny Ryan passed away earlier this month. His absence, like his presence, has left a profound impact on all the people and communities he touched throughout his nearly 82 years of life.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2149

Danny Ryan was born in the Savin Hill section of Dorchester in the city of Boston, Massachusetts, and remained devoted to the community throughout his life.

He was involved in Dorchester youth sports. Danny volunteered in youth soccer before it was popular, and coached Little League. He was a huge supporter of the Boys & Girls Clubs of Dorchester. He coached girls' basketball.

Danny performed a thousand other acts of kindness, often with his special needs family members Michael or Rocco in tow, the kinds of things that would turn a cluster of three-deckers with people speaking seven different languages into a single community.

Danny's official title was court officer for the Boston Municipal Court. For over 30 years, Budzo's job was to stand in court at the judge's elbow, ostensibly as security. In reality, he was a witness as every sad, sorry, or sinister episode on the court's calendar that day proceeded to judgment.

That experience put Danny in a position to see humanity at its worst moments day after day and arraignment after arraignment: Abject poverty, broken families, homelessness, domestic violence, gang violence, much of it was fueled by a desperate lack of opportunity and a numbing level of substance abuse. It was enough to make anyone lose hope.

While the court may have rendered judgment, Danny Ryan did not. It appeared to have the opposite effect on Danny. It seemed to open his heart. Many believed that it was through that experience that Danny found his true purpose in life. He figured it out. He often recited the fact that 90 percent of the cases that came before the court and 90 percent of the sentenced individuals had underlying substance abuse issues that were really at the root of their offensive behavior.

He had this idea that if he could just get at the source of that substance abuse disorder and fix that problem, the other stuff either went away or became more manageable.

Danny didn't just preach sobriety. He lived by example. Danny was sober for over 51 years, and he was extremely proud and grateful to be part of the wider recovery community.

For over 15 years, Danny was on the board of directors for the Gavin Foundation, a hugely successful substance abuse treatment program. He played a big role in helping the Gavin Foundation expand and diversify their services into different populations across the city and to the city of Quincy.

During AA meetings, Danny was always the first to welcome new members and offer them help and guidance on their journey. There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that Danny Ryan helped keep families together and saved hundreds of lives. He became transformed into someone whose purpose and passion in life was for helping others.

No matter what their situation, he treated everyone with dignity and re-

spect. If someone needed help, meeting them or going halfway was never enough. He made it his business to go out of his way to assist those in need.

Danny was a proud graduate of Boston College High School and a recipient of their Paul J. Hunter Man for Others Award. It is given to people who demonstrate high moral character and a strong sense of service to others. That was Danny. In fact, one of his favorite mottoes to live by was: Try to help three people a day.

Danny and his wife, Dorothy, have four beautiful daughters: Melissa, Shannon, Danielle, and Kasey. He was a proud husband, father, grandfather, and was blessed with eight grandchildren.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I pray that Danny Ryan's life and his work might serve as an example to us all.

#### REPUBLICAN BUDGET BILL

(Ms. JOHNSON of Texas was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in complete outrage, not just in opposition, to this Republican budget bill. Behind the talking points, behind the smug press conferences, very deep in the fine print, it is all there.

Mr. Speaker, 13.7 million Americans will lose their healthcare, and millions of families will see their food assistance taken away. That is not my opinion. Those are the numbers from the Congressional Budget Office.

Republicans tell you: Don't worry. No one is losing coverage. We are not cutting SNAP.

Understand they are lying to you, and they know it. This bill is so shameful that they are moving forward at 1 a.m. in the morning, tonight, in the dead of night.

Why? They are doing that because they hope we are asleep. They don't want us paying attention. They don't want us to know what they are, in fact, truly doing. They hope we are not watching, and they hope no one notices until it is too late.

Texans are paying attention, and I am here to sound the alarm on this outrageous bill. In Texas, over 5 million people depend on Medicaid. They are children with disabilities, working moms, and aging parents in nursing homes. These cuts will lead to fewer doctors, longer wait times, and hospitals closing. Yes, people will die because they can't get the care that they need.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you about Stephanie, a mom from Richardson, Texas. Her son was born with spina bifida. His entire life depends on the care they get through an emergency Medicaid waiver. This is his equipment, his treatment, and his survival. Republicans in this Chamber will take that care away from Stephanie's 11-year-old son.

For what? Why are we doing this? Why are we causing so much pain

across so many families in this country who depend on support for basic needs?

It is so that Trump and his friends can have a huge tax cut.

The other thing that is deeply concerning is we have an incredibly large deficit, and all the Republicans peacock around, parading about how atrocious the deficit is. This bill is going to add \$4 trillion to the deficit. It is not conservative. It is not principally, financially prudent, responsible legislation. It is outrageous and borderline criminal against the people of this country.

Let's talk about food assistance. Mr. Speaker, one in seven Texans rely on SNAP at a time when Trump's tariffs have made groceries more expensive than ever. Republicans want to take food off the tables of families who are just trying to get by.

This isn't about fiscal responsibility. It is about cruelty. It is about choosing hedge fund managers and people like Elon Musk over hungry kids.

Budgets are moral documents, and this one being put up by House Republicans is morally bankrupt. I will not vote for a bill that abandons families like Stephanie's and lets kids go hungry or that sells out our most vulnerable neighbors just to pay for another tax break for those who definitely do not need one.

Mr. Speaker, if you are a Member of this body who claims to care about life, liberty, or your own constituents, you should not vote for it either. If you show me your budget, I will show you your values.

Republicans have made their values crystal clear. They value a handful of wealthy people in this country over the millions of hardworking families who depend on the United States Government.

#### HONORING STACY DAVIS GATES

(Mrs. RAMIREZ of Illinois was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate an educator, a force for justice, an unapologetic champion of our Chicago communities, and my friend, Stacy Davis Gates.

Stacy is a high school social studies teacher, a South Sider, a wife, and a mother. For many, she is best known as president of the Chicago Teachers Union and executive vice president of the Illinois Federation of Teachers.

Stacy's leadership has called us to bargain for our collective good and to think about how organized labor can win bold campaigns that build the schools, the communities, and the city that our children deserve.

In 2019, she helped lead a 15-day strike and negotiated a historic contract that ensured a nurse and a social worker in every Chicago public school. She secured sanctuary protections for immigrant families and supported students and families experiencing homelessness.

Putting Chicago's children at the center of everything she does, she has worked to build a collective of community, and she has elected to create opportunities for our communities, at times confronting corporate and charter interests head-on. She always puts our children at the center of what she does.

□ 1030

On behalf of the Illinois' Third Congressional District, it is my sincere honor to commend Stacy Davis Gates for her dedication to educational equity in our city, in our State, and in our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank and congratulate Stacy.

HONORING LABOR ORGANIZERS KEITH KELLEHER  
AND MADELINE TALBOTT

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my friends and constituents, Madeline Talbott and Keith Kelleher, for a lifetime of labor organizing, community solidarity, and deep love.

Madeline Talbott spent 37 years building ACORN and Action Now with thousands of dues-paying members, helping to found the Fight for \$15 in Chicago: a campaign that grew nationally and eventually brought \$15 an hour to over 22 million workers across the country.

Keith Kelleher founded ULU Local 880 and eventually became president of SEIU Healthcare Illinois, Indiana, Missouri, and Kansas and international vice president of SEIU. He built the largest union local in Chicago and Illinois, from only 7 dues-paying members in 1983 to over 90,000 home care, childcare, and healthcare members today.

Madeline and Keith have been partners in love and organizing since 1979. They have left a lasting mark on community, labor, and political organizing. They have trained hundreds of people to ensure the movement continues. They have raised an incredible family, including their two daughters, Aileen and Ryan, who continue their organizing legacy.

On behalf of Illinois' Third Congressional District, it is my privilege to commend Madeline Talbott and Keith Kelleher for their exceptional contributions as organizers, and their exceptional commitment to our fight for justice.

Mr. Speaker, I thank and congratulate them.

CONGRATULATING VICTOR GOMEZ, ILLINOIS  
STATE TEACHER OF THE YEAR

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my constituent from Wheaton, Victor Gomez, for his achievement as one of 2025 Illinois State Teachers of the Year.

An educator in East Leyden High School, Victor Gomez is a passionate teacher, who for 6 years has transformed the lives of his students.

Through his commitment to bilingual education, he has created more welcoming and culturally competent

classrooms where students are challenged and inspired to pursue their goals.

Mr. Gomez is also a mentor to aspiring bilingual educators. In partnership with Elmhurst University and the Noyce PRIDE STEM Teacher Scholars program, he empowers educators from diverse backgrounds to bring their wisdom, their voice, and their experience into the profession.

As a fluently bilingual Latina daughter of immigrants, I know the importance of having teachers and mentors who looked and sounded like me.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Illinois' Third Congressional District, it is my privilege to commend Victor for nurturing equity in our classrooms, encouraging leadership in our communities, and building educators who reflect the diversity of our multiracial and multicultural democracy.

I congratulate Victor again on winning Illinois State Teacher of the Year. "Congratulations"; "felicidades."

#### HONORING JOHN BROWN, ABOLITIONIST

(Mrs. SYKES of Ohio was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mrs. SYKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer a resolution honoring one of the most uncompromising voices for freedom in American history, abolitionist John Brown, on the occasion of the 225th anniversary of his birth.

Born on May 9 in the year 1800 in Connecticut, John Brown was a man who did not simply believe in the cause of abolition. He lived for it. He fought for it. Ultimately, he died for it.

From 1844 to 1854, John Brown and his family lived in Akron, Ohio, where he partnered in business with Colonel Simon Perkins, the son of the city's founder. In fact, the house that John Brown lived in was on the same street where I grew up. It was just a few hundred yards away. It was a constant and present reminder in my life to fight for what is right.

John Brown was so much more than a businessman. He was a freedom fighter. His home in Akron became a stop on the Underground Railroad where he harbored enslaved people who had escaped and sought safety and a new life in a more enlightened part of the world.

Later, in Springfield, Massachusetts, Brown used his wool warehouse as another station on the Underground Railroad. He offered dignity, protection, and skills to those who escaped slavery and freed men, including how to farm and sustain themselves in a new life free from bondage.

He used his wool business as a means to travel, to connect, and to advance the cause of abolition across State lines.

However, when Congress passed the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850, which made it a Federal crime to aid a runaway slave and compelled even free States to enforce slavery, Brown took a very bold step.

He organized the League of Gileadites, encouraging African Americans to train in arms to defend their freedom against re-enslavement. He made clear: Freedom was not a privilege. It was a right worth defending.

In 1855, Brown and his sons traveled to Kansas, a territory torn by violent conflict over whether it would enter the Union as a free or a slave State. There he joined anti-slavery forces in what came to be known as Bleeding Kansas. He believed that slavery could not be voted away or reasoned away, it had to be confronted.

In October of 1859, John Brown led one of the most daring and polarizing actions in American history.

At Harpers Ferry, Virginia, he led a raid on the United States arsenal, intending to initiate a slave revolt. Although the raid ultimately failed and Brown was captured, tried, and executed, he succeeded in forcing a divided nation to confront the moral crisis of slavery.

Mr. Speaker, John Brown's methods remain the subject of debate, but the righteousness of his cause is not. He understood what so many were unwilling to admit, that slavery was a profound evil, this country's original sin, and that waiting for gradual change meant accepting the continued suffering of millions.

The House of Representatives now has the opportunity to formally recognize his legacy. This resolution honors and commemorates the 225th anniversary of John Brown's birth and recognizes the generational impact that John Brown had on the abolitionist movement and his enduring contributions to ending slavery in the United States of America. John Brown's life reminds us that moral courage often requires action, uncomfortable, unpopular, and even dangerous action. His legacy belongs not only to our past but to our ongoing struggling for justice today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

#### MEDICAID AND SOCIAL SECURITY CUTS

(Mr. ESPAILLAT of New York was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, tonight in the middle of the night and in darkness, away from the view of the American people, hidden in some committee room in the Capitol, the Rules Committee will meet. They are scheduled to meet at 1 a.m. in the morning when Americans are sleeping and when families are resting awaiting the next day.

They are scheduled to meet to discuss at length Medicaid cuts. More than one-half of the residents in the district that I have the privilege to represent, the 13th Congressional District, encompassed by Harlem, east Harlem, Washington Heights, Inwood, and the northwest Bronx, more than

one-half—close to 500,000 of my constituents—are Medicaid recipients. They receive primary and emergency healthcare. Almost 4 million residents in New York City, one-half of the city, rely on Medicaid.

Mr. Speaker, this discussion that will be held in the middle of the night when most Americans will not be tuned in is a life-and-death discussion about cuts to perhaps the most important Federal program that impacts the daily health and life of people across the country, the Medicaid program.

Again, over 3 million New York City residents are also enrolled in the New York State Medicaid Pharmacy program, the so-called OTC program, the Over-the-Counter program, which allows coverage of prescription drugs and certain over-the-counter medication and goods, including food. So this is a life-and-death discussion that our Republican colleagues are having in the middle of the night after promising the American people that Medicaid will be safe from deep cuts.

Republicans have spent time and will spend time delivering a bill that will devastate—again, Mr. Speaker, will devastate Medicaid enrollment rates. This, again, will happen in the middle of the night. They are scheduled to meet at 1 a.m. in the morning.

Mr. Speaker, 14 million Americans will lose their healthcare, and safety net hospitals will be in danger of closing. Yes, even senior homes, nursing homes, will be facing severe cuts and potential closing, and people could die. This is a life-and-death discussion, Mr. Speaker. All of this is to pay for severe tax cuts for the very wealthy.

The bill will require harsh work requirements for Medicaid recipients. It will force people who are ill or sick to go to work to receive the benefits that the program offers that will terminate coverage for millions of low-income Americans including seniors, children, and veterans.

Republicans also have introduced a \$300-million cut to the SNAP program, yes, on food stamps, which would impact 300,000 people in my district, many of them children and seniors who rely on the benefit to eat.

Mr. Speaker, 35 percent of them are children.

This will be the largest cut to the Food Stamp Program in our Nation's history. In the middle of the night, Republicans will cut Medicaid and will cut food stamps when people are not watching. This is nothing more than a GOP tax scam that gives billions of dollars in tax breaks to millionaires and gives nothing back to working-class families but empty stomachs and Medicaid debt to the working class.

Mr. Speaker, the billionaire wins and families lose with this bill. Let's fight back.

#### PROTECTING AMERICAN MARITIME RESEARCH

(Ms. McBRIDE of Delaware was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Ms. McBRIDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the ANCHOR Act, a bipartisan bill to protect American maritime research and strengthen our national security.

The University of Delaware's research vessel, the *Hugh R. Sharp*, is a floating lab used by scientists and students to study everything from our ocean health to fisheries and coastal storms.

All of this is happening right off of the coast of Delaware. Right now, these vessels are often running on outdated technology, and that makes them sitting ducks for cyberattacks from hackers and foreign adversaries.

That is why I am proud to cosponsor the ANCHOR Act, which directs the National Science Foundation to develop a plan to upgrade cybersecurity and communications across the U.S. academic research fleet, including the *Sharp*. This is because a secure country relies on secure labs, even the ones at sea.

Protecting the *Sharp* and our entire academic research fleet helps Delaware track sea level rise and protect our coastal communities. This is a big deal for the lowest lying State in the Nation.

That is why I have also submitted a \$1.5 million funding request to make sure the *Sharp* gets the upgrades that it needs.

The ANCHOR Act passed out of committee with bipartisan support, and I urge my colleagues to vote to get it over the finish line.

#### BETRAYING OUR VETERANS

Ms. McBRIDE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, I joined veterans, families, and care providers to celebrate 75 years of service at the Wilmington VA Medical Center, a facility that provided 338,000 appointments last year alone. That is visits to a primary care doctor, a dentist, and drug and alcohol counseling. Every single one of those visits is fulfilling a sacred promise that the government has made to show up for those who have sacrificed for all of us.

As we head into Memorial Day weekend, we must recognize the responsibility that we have as elected officials, not just on Monday but every day of the year, to honor those who have given their last full measure of devotion by fulfilling our commitment to all of those who have served our country.

Our country has long recognized the value of service by promising our veterans that no matter who sits in the Oval Office or behind this dais, they will be cared for and protected.

However, today, that promise is in jeopardy. Nearly 6,000 veterans have already been summarily fired by the Trump administration, and now they are pushing a plan to lay off 80,000 of the very workers who process benefits and facilitate lifesaving care through the VA. Moreover, if that weren't enough, as I speak, congressional Republicans are continuing to advance a budget that would slash support for

veterans, even further undermining healthcare, housing assistance, and food support.

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear: We don't support veterans by handing them a folded flag with one hand and cutting their lifelines with the other. More than 1.6 million veterans rely on Medicaid for their health coverage.

If House Republicans succeed in their slash-and-burn proposal, it will mean real harm for veterans and their families. My constituents are warning me, and they are right, that cuts to SNAP, Medicaid, and VA services will fall hardest on disabled and aging veterans, especially in rural areas and communities of color.

House Republicans have chosen to unilaterally pursue a budget that puts tax cuts for billionaires ahead of care for the people who wore the uniform. That is not just bad budgeting, it is a betrayal of our promise.

□ 1045

Delaware's veterans and veterans across this country don't need slogans. They need support. They need stable housing. They need accessible healthcare. They need us to keep our promise to them. Veterans who fought for our country should not be forced to fight for the coverage and assistance that they earned long ago.

I didn't come to Congress to sanction cruelty. I came to keep our word, to ensure that the veterans I met at the Wilmington VA and the tens of thousands more across Delaware are treated not as political props but as patriots deserving dignity.

This Memorial Day, I urge my colleagues to follow the famous charge of President Lincoln. Any Nation that does not honor its heroes will not long endure. No mission is more important or righteous.

#### INCREASING MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

(Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to shine light on a critical subject that impacts each one of us, as well as the ones we love: mental health.

Established by Congress in 1949, May was designated as Mental Health Awareness Month to increase awareness of the importance of mental health and wellness.

Mental health is about more than just illness. It is about well-being, resilience, and the ability to cope with various challenges we experience day to day. These challenges don't discriminate. They impact people of every age, background, and community. Many suffer in silence out of fear of being judged or misunderstood.

For many years, this topic was highly stigmatized, but this is, fortunately, changing. This month, I am honored to bring attention to it. Mental Health Awareness Month is part of that

change and a reminder to prioritize rest, connection, and the things that contribute to our overall wellness.

In our great Buckeye State, we are grateful to have multiple resources available to help Ohioans in times of need. The Ohio Department of Mental Health and Addiction provides resources and readily available services with their Ohio CareLine available 24 hours a day and 7 days a week to offer emotional support. By simply dialing 988, anyone in our Nation can access the national mental health hotline, which offers free and confidential support from trained counselors around the clock.

I thank our local mental health providers, support workers, and first responders for the critical work they do to intervene in times of need. Without their timely response and attentive care, our region could not be the healthy and supportive place it is today.

I recognize our local police officers, who are often the first ones on the scene of an emergency and the first wave of assistance for someone experiencing a mental health emergency. They are heroes, lifesavers, and an irreplaceable cornerstone in our communities who help Ohioans live their lives to the fullest.

With agriculture being the backbone of southern Ohio, our region is home to countless farmers, ranchers, and producers who work hard to secure our Nation's food supply and put food on our families' tables. They work long hours out in the fields, often on their own, trying to turn a crop and a profit in a challenging farming economy.

Being isolated from the resources that are available in more urban areas, farmers and farming families are facing a significant mental health challenge. With 96 percent of farms in Ohio's Second Congressional District being family farms, this demonstrates how close to home this issue hits my district.

With the devastatingly high rate of mental health challenges and substance abuse issues across our country, where a person lives shouldn't dictate their ability to access critical healthcare services.

Tragically, Ohio's Second Congressional District has the highest rate of unintentional drug overdoses in our entire State, which is often linked to mental health challenges. That is why I was proud to introduce the Rural Wellness Act in March of this year, which will reauthorize the prioritization of grants for telemedicine projects addressing behavioral and mental health, including substance abuse. These grants are part of the United States Department of Agriculture's Rural Development's Distance Learning and Telemedicine Program. It will make mental health care services more accessible to those who need them.

Congress should pass this bill to deliver critical care to farmers and rural

families who so desperately need it. However, in order to access telehealthcare services, Congress must also prioritize broadband expansion for our Nation's rural areas.

Rural families desperately need telehealthcare services. These are only accessible if families have internet access. Large swaths of my district lack access to high-speed internet, which means rural families are isolated from critical healthcare options, as well as business and education opportunities that could support families and alleviate some of the stress that providers are feeling.

Congress must tackle this problem holistically. In this case, getting broadband to our rural families could make the difference between life and death. All in all, expanded broadband access would lead to significant mental health benefits in our rural communities.

As we recognize Mental Health Awareness Month, may each of us take a moment to prioritize wellness and reach out to those around us who might need a helping hand.

I thank each friend, family member, teacher, community leader, or public servant who has lent their support to someone experiencing mental health challenges for their service. It is because of people like them that communities are safer, healthier, and more supportive places to live.

#### SUPPORTING AGRITOURISM

(Mr. SUBRAMANYAM of Virginia was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the more than 28,000 farms that engage in agritourism across the country, 1,500 of which are in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Agritourism, for those who don't know, is exactly what it sounds like. We are bringing tourists to farms or agricultural venues and offering experiences related to farming, rural life, and food.

From wineries like Stone Tower in Leesburg, farm breweries like Wheatland Spring in Waterford, you-picks like Great Country Farms in Bluemont, and llama and alpaca farms like Double 8 Alpaca & Llama Ranch in Purcellville, agritourism offers growing opportunities for farms to diversify their revenues, connect with our communities, and become more resilient.

Agritourism isn't just a trend or fad. It is an economic imperative for many farmers.

In Virginia alone, agriculture is our number one industry, but the majority of farmers are not full-time farmers. They need ways to pay for taxes and maintenance of their land, and agritourism has helped families across Virginia do just that.

This isn't just happening in Virginia. Agritourism is now a billion-dollar industry across the country, and it keeps growing. It is revitalizing local, rural,

and small-town workforces. The tourist dollars are also expanding hotels, restaurants, and businesses nearby.

These farms also offer unique educational and recreational opportunities for children and families and help connect the public to our food systems. That is what I love about agritourism. It is a win-win for everyone. Farmers get to share their work and support their farm, and visitors learn about where their food comes from, who grows the flowers they send on Mother's Day, and so much more.

This year, my family picked tulips from Burnside Farms in Nokesville. We ate strawberries at the Strawberry Festival this past weekend at Wegmeyer Farms in Lincoln. We visited Cox Farms for their delicious cider donuts.

For many farmers, there is a lot of uncertainty about Federal resources available to them and where they should go to ask questions about agritourism. Since agritourism is a form of nontraditional farming, the Federal Government simply hasn't done much to help the industry, which is why I am proud to work with Congressman NEWHOUSE to introduce the bipartisan AGRITOURISM Act, which will ignite the industry and provide a one-stop shop of resources like grants, loans, and technical assistance for farmers who want to participate in agritourism.

These resources will attract private investment not only in agritourism but also support tourism and hospitality industries in rural areas, which will keep our farms and rural communities strong, resilient, and thriving.

I also plan to relaunch the bipartisan Agritourism Caucus with Congressman DAVID ROUZER to highlight the progress of this industry and how we can continue to promote it. This was first championed by my predecessor, Congresswoman Jennifer Wexton.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to sign on to this bill and join the caucus when we relaunch it so that we can champion agritourism for farmers and rural communities across America.

#### EFFECTS OF MOODY'S DOWNGRADE

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Mr. Speaker, Moody's, a credit rating firm, downgraded America's credit rating this past weekend. What does this mean? It is like when your credit score goes down. It will make it more expensive for a country to borrow money, and the interest rate on our \$36 trillion debt will go up.

How much do we spend on interest right now? In 2024, we paid \$892 billion in interest payments. That is 13 percent of our budget. That is more money than we spent on law enforcement, education, science, and transportation combined.

Now, it is going to get worse because this one big, beautiful bill coming up is going to explode the deficit so we can give tax cuts to billionaires and the largest corporations while also slashing Medicaid, food assistance, and

other programs American families depend on.

There is no fiscal responsibility in this bill, and this bill will add \$5 trillion to the Federal debt.

This credit downgrade should be a warning to reverse course. Instead, we seem to be heading straight for fiscal disaster, and we need to stand up to this.

#### RECOGNIZING WINNERS OF 2025 FOURTH DISTRICT CONGRESSIONAL SPEECH COMPETITION

(Mr. ALFORD of Missouri was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the winners of our 2025 Fourth Congressional District speech competition for the great State of Missouri. This is our second year to do this. It is a great competition.

Our next winner is Lucas Tate, who is a junior at Odessa High School. Lucas wrote: "Freedom is a word that rings loud in the hearts of many Americans. We all know what freedom is. We all know what the absence of freedom feels like, but what does it mean to stand up for your freedom? Standing up for your freedom is not always loud, not always quiet. Standing up for your freedom is swimming against the school, looking for those who may follow. It is a war cry against the face of tyranny and injustice. It is a tough battle, one that we as Americans must be proud to face every day because, simply, it is American."

Our next winner is Tanner Gill, who is in ninth grade at Raymore-Peculiar High School. Tanner wrote: "Standing for freedom means protecting the rights and values that make America strong. In our country, this means making sure that people have justice, fairness, and the ability to speak freely. Everyone can help by being active in their community and standing up for what is right. Around the world, the U.S. supports freedom by helping people who live under unfair governments by promoting democracy. As a leader, America has a responsibility to set an example and defend human rights. Standing for freedom isn't just about words. It is about action. By respecting our history and working to protect freedom, we help make the world a better place."

Our next winner is Riley Olendorff, who is a junior at Glasgow High School. Riley wrote: "Standing for freedom is having courage, integrity, and speaking out against injustice. Freedom includes protecting the rights of others, even when it may be hard and challenging. We have to be able to defend our rights for ourselves and others when there is risk of being taken away. Freedom is not just about personal choices, advocating for fairness, and presenting different opinions now and for future generations. Past history has presented sacrifices from leaders and soldiers who defend our na-

tions. True freedom grows when people are willing to stand up for themselves and others. As an American, I am fortunate enough to live in a free country, and I stand for what freedom means."

I thank everyone who participated in this year's congressional speech competition, and I congratulate our winners.

#### RECOGNIZING ALEWEL'S COUNTRY MEATS

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Missouri's Fourth Congressional District May Small Business of the Month, Alewel's Country Meats.

What better month to highlight this amazing small business than National Beef Month?

What began as a small downtown grocery store in 1932, Alewel's has grown into a fixture of Warrensburg's local community.

This federally inspected meat processing and retail facility developed old German recipes to create quality fresh meats and homemade specialty products.

Randy Alewel, the third-generation CEO of Alewel's Country Meats, has expanded the facility four times now.

Today, we congratulate Alewel's Meats and thank them for their contributions to Missouri and the Fourth Congressional District.

#### RECOGNIZING RICK FULLERTON

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize our May Veteran of the Month, Mr. Rick Fullerton of Independence, Missouri. He is a World War II vet and lives at the Missouri Veterans Home in Warrensburg in our district.

Mr. Fullerton attended Smith-Cotton High School in Sedalia and graduated in 1945. That September, he began his service in the U.S. Army Air Corps. He served as an accountant in Mobile, Alabama, and he is so proud of the fact that he was instrumental in making sure our servicemen got paid for their sacrifices.

Mr. Fullerton created a wonderful family with his wife, Betty, and 2 children, 4 stepchildren, 13 grandchildren, and 8 great-grandchildren.

I am proud to honor Mr. Fullerton on the floor today, and I thank him for his service to our great Nation.

#### THANKING EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES PERSONNEL

(Mr. PATRONIS of Florida was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. PATRONIS. Mr. Speaker, in honor of National EMS Week, I rise today to thank the great men and women of the emergency medical services.

As the former CFO and State fire marshal for the State of Florida, I saw these men and women firsthand in action during major events, such as during the aftermath of Hurricanes Michael, Ian, Idalia, Helene, and Milton, and, of course, the tragic building collapse of Champlain Towers in Surfside.

The mental and physical fortitude that these heroes display daily is inspiring. It is a testament to who they are as individuals.

The theme for National EMS Week is "We Care for Everyone."

God chooses special angels among us to serve, to heal, and to care for those who are sick or injured.

□ 1100

They rush into danger at a moment's notice without hesitation, giving hope to those who need it the most.

These heroes work 24/7 365 days a year, missing holidays, birthdays, and other special occasions to ensure our communities are safe.

On behalf of a grateful nation and myself, I thank EMS workers. I thank these Americans in the EMS field for all that they do.

As long as I have a voice in Washington, D.C., I will always support our EMS professionals and every first responder working to serve our local communities, the State of Florida, and our great country.

#### RECOGNITION OF JUDGE REMINGTON

Mr. PATRONIS. Mr. Speaker, I end on a solemn note as we honor the life of Honorable Circuit Judge Tom Remington, who passed away on May 7, 2025, in Pensacola, Florida.

Tom dedicated over 60 years of his life serving our Nation and our State, first as an artillery and infantry officer in Vietnam, where he earned the Combat Infantryman Badge, two Purple Hearts, two Bronze Stars with Valor, and the Silver Star. His service was featured on the History Channel and in books like "Hill 875" and "Dak To."

After his military service, Tom graduated from Florida State University College of Law, joined the Florida bar in 1971, and gained courtroom experience as both a public defender and as assistant State's attorney.

In 1995, he became a partner in the renowned law firm of Smith, Anchors, and Remington, serving as general counsel to longtime Okaloosa County Sheriff Larry Gilbert.

Tom was appointed to the circuit court by Governor Lawton Chiles and served over 20 years in Okaloosa and Walton Counties. He held numerous leadership roles, including chief judge and officer in various legal organizations. Known for his humble and principled approach to justice, Tom was deeply respected and affectionately called "T.R."

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of northwest Florida, my wife, Katie, and I offer condolences to his wife, Dinah; the Smith Remington firm; and children, Scott, Mary, and Sara.

I urge all in Florida's District One to join us in honoring Judge Remington's remarkable commitment to service.

#### CONGRATULATING KADYN KULZER

(Mrs. FISCHBACH of Minnesota was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Kadya Kulzer from Paynesville on being awarded the State FFA Degree, the FFA's highest honor.

Kadya has been a member of the Paynesville FFA since seventh grade and has been a great chapter officer for the past 2 years. She has demonstrated years of commitment to the FFA chapter in Paynesville.

Kadya plans to attend college to earn a degree in exercise science and eventually pursue a career as a chiropractor. I am sure she will excel in her career, just as she has excelled in the FFA.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Kadya on her hard work and dedication to the FFA and the community.

#### CONGRATULATING DOROTHY VANDENDRIESSCHE

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Dorothy Vandendriessche of Marshall, Minnesota, on receiving the Minnesota Woman of the Year Award at the Catholic Women's convention. This award recognizes significant and outstanding contributions made by a councilwoman in areas of service to the church, the Council of Catholic Women, her parish, and the community. This honor is given to women who serve as an inspiration to others.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Dorothy on this outstanding achievement and for her contributions to her community and her church.

#### CONGRATULATING MASON MILLER

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Mason Miller of Ada, Minnesota, on signing a free-agent contract with the Detroit Lions.

Mason signed in all 16 games of the NDSU Bison season last year and was named a first team All-American. Mason played an important role propelling the Bison to their tenth FCS National Championship.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mason on this incredible accomplishment and wish him well as he begins the next chapter of his life.

#### UPDATE ON CALIFORNIA'S HIGH-SPEED RAIL

(Mr. LAMALFA of California was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, once again, I am here to address the situation of California's wasteful spending. A new bit of information has come out that the interim segment of high-speed rail is going to be built between a town called Merced down to another one near Bakersfield called Shafter. This segment would end in an almond orchard out there in the middle of nowhere. The price for that segment has gone up to about \$38.5 billion, just for this segment, which is going to be in a low-population area comparatively when the whole concept of California High-Speed Rail was one that would go from San Francisco to L.A., the population centers.

The original cost, I will remind you too, when it was placed on the ballot in front of the voters, was that it would be \$33 billion to build the entire system from San Francisco to L.A., not just that 150-mile segment between Merced and Shafter.

Who is being shafted in this deal? Those being shafted, of course, are the taxpayers, as always, since in their quest to not let this go, to not let it die, they are going to continue to seek more and more money for this project.

Now, in the 17 years since this was passed and placed on the ballot in front of the voters—and it won by a very narrow margin, 2 or 3 percent—it was to have an initial \$9 billion bond of State money to go towards the \$33 billion, and then the rest would be raised from the private sector, that price is today seen as \$128 billion. In those 17 years, they have only managed to raise \$17 billion or so towards the project, in 17 years. Since the project is about \$110 billion or so short, where are they going to get \$110 billion more when it took 17 years to raise \$17 billion? Where is that going to come from?

California has a scheme called the cap-and-trade tax that taxes the privilege of making carbon dioxide if you are a manufacturer or some other large entity that produces carbon dioxide as a byproduct of your industry. Let me remind you, carbon dioxide is only 0.04 percent of the atmosphere.

All of these things are being done to cut carbon, including this whole rail project itself, which is supposed to be a big carbon saver, yet they are chasing a goal that is incredibly small and incredibly out of touch.

Here we are. They are going to come to Washington asking for more and more money. So far two Democrat Presidents have given the project about \$3.5 billion on one occasion each. They are going to fall far short of raising \$110 billion more since cap-and-trade, as I mentioned, in California only brings in about a billion per year on taxation on CO<sub>2</sub>. If they manage to get a couple \$3.5 billion segments from the U.S. Government, it is a long ways from getting done.

We should be solving other issues in California instead of building this dream rail system running through the middle of communities, having to take so much land by eminent domain, messing up farmland, messing up the middle of the cities that it is going through, having to take out a high school in one case, and a rendering plant in another case. These are all things that are making it actually worse for people, just so they can have the idea of, oh, we have to be like China and have a high-speed rail system.

It isn't working out in California. It won't work out. The price is horrendous. The tickets themselves for people to be able to ride the train are going to be a lot more expensive than what they are trying to tell us they will be, especially when you have low-cost airline

tickets like Southwest and others going back and forth pretty often.

Why don't we solve other problems, like California's water issues, the water supply? For that kind of money, you could build 26 new dams that would hold who knows how many acre-feet, how many millions of acre-feet. Let's just try and build two or three dams that will hold 3, 4, 5, 6 million acre-feet and solve California's water problems, solve California's continued transfer of agricultural water to fish supplies. We could actually get something useful done.

People that use the roads and the highways and freeways would probably like to see some of the potholes fixed, for example, that always get worn into the right lane of a freeway. Maybe we could get some of those fixed. Maybe we could add lanes here and there where there is more dense traffic with a fraction of that money.

No one is going to ride this thing for the cost and for the time it takes to still get back and forth between San Francisco and L.A., and they don't have a car at the other end. You might as well take the airplane and save money and get there even faster.

Mr. Speaker, of all the things we could be investing in, whether it is water supply or managing our forests better so we don't have to burn them down every year and suffer with air quality that we have—each year there is a million-acre fire, including the Dixie Fire in my district about 4 years ago that hit this town. The smoke plume hit this town because we don't manage the forest.

There are so many other things we could be doing besides high-speed rail.

#### RECOGNIZING EMPIRE HIGH SCHOOL'S SOFTBALL TEAM

(Mr. CISCOMANI of Arizona was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. CISCOMANI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Empire High School's softball team for winning the 3A State Title.

The Ravens scored a run in the bottom of the eighth inning to defeat Yuma Catholic 1-0, earning their second straight State title and the fourth title in the last 10 years.

This victory caps off an amazing season for the Ravens who finished with an incredible record of 28 wins and only 1 loss.

I congratulate Coach Shannon Woolridge, the players, and everyone who played a part in this special season. They have made their school and community incredibly proud.

The Ravens should enjoy this victory they earned. Congratulations to the Ravens.

#### CONGRATULATING SALPOINTE WOMEN'S TENNIS TEAM

Mr. CISCOMANI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Salpointe's women's tennis team for winning the Division II State Championship game.



In a thrilling set of matches, Salpointe defeated Canyon del Oro by a score of 5–2.

This is the first State championship since 2011 for Coach Theresa Spurduto. I know it must have meant a lot to be crowned as a champion once again.

Congratulations to all of the coaches, players, family members, and everyone who played a part in this special season. They have made their school and community incredibly proud. Go Lancers.

CONGRATULATING CATALINA FOOTHILLS  
DIVISION II CHAMPIONS

Mr. CISCOMANI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Catalina Foothills Falcons boys' tennis team for winning the Division II State Championship game.

In a thrilling set of matches, the Falcons beat the number two ranked Notre Dame in a decisive manner by a score of 5–0.

This victory earned Coach Ben Loeb a remarkable milestone, 20 high school State championships. This State championship marked the Falcons' 10th title in 11 years. Now, that is impressive.

I congratulate and thank Coach Loeb, the players, and everyone who played a part in this special season. They made their school and community extremely proud.

I say to the Falcons, enjoy this victory. You earned it.

CONGRATULATING PUSCH RIDGE DIVISION III  
WOMEN'S TENNIS TEAM

Mr. CISCOMANI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Pusch Ridge Christian Academy Lions' women's tennis team for winning the Division III State championship game.

From starting this season with a loss in Nogales, this remarkable team overcame adversity and roared back to be crowned champions.

I congratulate Coach Andy Fetsis, all the players, and everybody who played a part in this special season. They should know that they have made their school and their community incredibly proud.

I say to the Lions, enjoy this victory. You earned it.

CONGRATULATING BUENA HIGH SCHOOL COLTS  
ALL-STATE TITLE

Mr. CISCOMANI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Buena High School Colts relay team on a remarkable achievement, winning the All-State Title in the 4 by 400 relay race.

After securing the Division II last year, they faced off against top schools from across the State and came out victorious and took the top honor, adding yet another trophy to their cabinet. What a remarkable achievement.

I congratulate and thank Coach Thomas; the relay squad, Ricardo Brooks, Armani Ramirez-Sperle, Vijay Carrier, and Jayden Thomas; and everyone who played a part in this remarkable season. They have made their school and the Sierra Vista community incredibly proud.

Congratulations to the Colts. May they enjoy this State championship. They earned it.

RECOGNITION OF MAY AS  
WILDFIRE AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize May as Wildfire Awareness Month.

For many States and regions around the Nation, our forests play a critical role in supporting communities and the rural economy. Our Nation's forests provide us with homegrown timber, essential for wood products, such as lumber, flooring, furniture, pulp and paper, biomass, and so much more.

The U.S. forest products industry employs more than 925,000 Americans, generating a payroll of nearly \$80 billion nationwide.

□ 1115

Harvest on national forestland is also critical for supporting rural school districts through county payments derived from timber sales.

Our forests also provide countless recreational opportunities, such as camping, hiking, fishing, and many other activities available in the great outdoors.

However, many of our Federal forestlands remain unhealthy and continue to be at risk of catastrophic wildfire due to severe overgrowth and decades of mismanagement. Consequently, the United States has continued to see some of the largest and most intense wildfires in history over the past few decades.

During that time, these incredibly destructive wildfires have led to significant property loss; recovery costs; and, in some cases, the loss of human life.

I visited some of the afflicted areas, including Paradise, California, where the devastating Camp fire occurred in 2018. It is our responsibility as elected officials to do everything that we can to make sure that tragedies like this do not occur again.

Wildfires are truly an urgent crisis that must be immediately addressed, and Congress must do more to better support the Forest Service, our firefighters, and rural communities in forested areas.

Between 2013 and 2022, we saw an average of 61,000 wildfires annually with an average of 7.2 million acres impacted each year.

So far this year, we have seen more than 25,000 wildfire incidents with more than 1 million acres burned before fire season ever began.

The wildfires we witnessed in Los Angeles this year were just the latest reminder of the devastation that can occur when we don't proactively manage our forests and do everything possible to prevent them from breaking out in the first place.

Make no mistake that the wildfire crisis is just that, a crisis that must urgently be addressed. The good news is that, with the right management, we can do so much more to improve the

health of our forests and combat the wildfire and forest health crisis head-on.

This means using all of the tools in the toolbox. That includes mechanical thinning, prescribed fire, and cross-boundary authorities. That also includes expanded use of good neighbor agreements, stewardship contracts, and other innovative agreements to maximize management possibilities through partnerships between stakeholders, private forest owners, Tribes, and local, State, and Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the forestry title that passed out of the Agriculture Committee last year which was crafted to expand those tools and authorities and encourage the Forest Service to do more productive management. Such reforms will enable the agency to improve forest health, reduce the threat of wildfire, increase the pace and scale of restoration, and ultimately protect communities, property, and lives.

Many of these concepts can be found in the Fix Our Forests Act, which was passed on a bipartisan basis this past January.

Additionally, I applaud the recent actions by the Trump administration to dramatically scale up the management across the National Forest System.

Encouraging this ramp-up will enable the Forest Service to better manage, support local counties and economies through increased sustainable harvest levels, address invasive species and forest health, and ultimately reduce the severity and instances of wildfires.

During this Wildfire Awareness Month, it is important that Members understand the great challenges that our Nation has with wildfire and that there are many steps that the Federal Government can take to proactively mitigate it.

Perhaps most importantly, we must also recognize the dedication and sacrifices of our wildland firefighters to act when disaster strikes and keep communities safe.

Mr. Speaker, I thank our firefighters, first responders, and all who are working to confront this crisis as we recognize Wildfire Awareness Month.

RECOGNIZING WASHINGTON ARMY  
NATIONAL GUARD 1ST BATTALION,  
161ST INFANTRY REGIMENT

(Mr. BAUMGARTNER of Washington was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. BAUMGARTNER. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to mark Memorial Day, a time to honor those who gave their lives in defense of our country, I rise today to recognize the enduring service and sacrifice of the Washington Army National Guard's 1st Battalion, 161st Infantry Regiment.

For nearly 90 years, this unit has called the city of Spokane home. Once stationed downtown, it now stands watch near the banks of the Spokane



River at the Readiness Center next to the Spokane Falls Community College. Yet, its role has never changed: to stand ready in defense of our Nation and in service to our State.

The 161st Infantry carries a storied legacy. They fought with honor in the Philippine Insurrection, stood guard along the southern border during the Pancho Villa raids, and served in France during World War I. These citizen soldiers served with distinction across the Pacific in World War II, and deployed multiple times as part of the 81st Brigade Combat Team during the global war on terrorism. Their battle streamers reflect the best of American valor and commitment.

Yet, just as importantly, they have answered the call at home, mobilizing in the face of wildfires; floods; snowstorms, and most recently, the COVID-19 pandemic. When Washingtonians needed their help, the Guard was there.

These are our neighbors, our coworkers, and our sons and daughters. For generations, they have trained and deployed from Spokane, not just for war but for peace, safety, and recovery.

On this Memorial Day, we thank them. We remember those who laid down their lives in uniform, and we honor the Spokane Readiness Center as a pillar of strength in both our Nation's defense and our local community.

May their legacy never be forgotten, and may our gratitude be as enduring as their service.

#### HONORING THE HOLSTINE FAMILY AND HEROES HOMESTEAD

Mr. BAUMGARTNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Heroes Homestead, a grassroots nonprofit founded by marine veteran Andrew Holstine and his wife, Danielle.

My family and I recently participated in their annual 5K walk in Spokane. This wasn't only a walk; it was a community coming together to honor service, support healing, and walk alongside veteran families who have borne the burden of war long after coming home.

Andrew served in the Marines and survived a tragic Osprey crash in 2000 that claimed the lives of 19 fellow marines, including his best friends. The invisible wounds he carried didn't just affect him, but they impacted his whole family. After years of struggle, the Holstines left everything behind to create something new: a place for veterans and their families to heal together.

Heroes Homestead was born from that journey. The 5K and the community fair was part of a growing movement to restore purpose, connection, and joy to those who have served and those who stood by those who have served.

They have a national vision: healing centers near every U.S. military hub.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Holstines and all who participated in the 5K. This is what serving veterans looks like.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDOWELL). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 22 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STRONG) at noon.

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, You loved us first and You loved us perfectly. Help us to experience and appreciate the depth of Your love today.

May we know that You intend for us to live a life that is fruitful and fulfilling. And with that knowledge, may we yield to Your intention by trusting in Your direction.

May we understand that You desire for us to honor one another as brothers and sisters, together, Your own children. And with that understanding, may we obey Your commandments to love one another, trusting in Your perfect will for Your people.

Thus submitting ourselves to You, obeying Your law, and trusting in Your grace plan, may we live our lives that they would reflect the selfless love You have shown and with which You uphold us daily.

We pray that You would be pleased with our efforts and that Your name be glorified this day and always.

It is in Your loving name we pray.

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House the approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1 of rule I, the Journal stands approved.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina 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.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests

for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

#### TRUMP AID TO UKRAINE

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, history indicates President Donald Trump would have prevented the invasion of Ukraine by war criminal Putin as part of the Putin scheme to resurrect the failed Soviet Union by annexing Belarus, occupying Moldova, invading Georgia and then Ukraine, supported by the Chinese Communist Party and the Iranian terrorists.

In his first term, Trump deterred mass murder by providing Javelin missiles to Ukraine, troops to Poland, and stopping Nord Stream 2 funding of the Putin war machine.

America has correctly provided \$185 billion to stop the mass murder by Putin. Funds have been monitored by 29 inspectors general with a Trump executive order resulting this week in a report of the most accountable aid ever for the people of Ukraine.

The vast majority of defense spending of Ukraine has been in the United States. With Trump encouragement, Europe has provided \$199 billion for Ukraine to successfully defend itself. As a percent of GDP, 19 European countries exceed the American GDP spent on Ukraine.

In conclusion, God bless our troops as the global war on terrorism continues. Trump is reinstituting existing laws to protect American families with peace through strength, revealing that Putin lies, insulting Trump with massive drone attacks Saturday and Sunday before the Monday phone call with Putin as Putin continues murdering civilians of Ukraine.

#### ANTOINETTE BROWN BLACKWELL

(Mr. MORELLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the 200th anniversary of the birth of Antoinette Brown Blackwell, a trailblazer born in my district in Henrietta, New York, and the first woman ordained as a mainstream Protestant minister in the United States.

Antoinette dedicated her life to justice, equality and faith. She captivated audiences as a lecturer on women's rights and temperance and preached wherever she was welcome. In 1850, she proudly stood at the first National Women's Rights Convention.

Committed to voting rights, she lobbied President Theodore Roosevelt for suffrage and remained a steadfast advocate for women. At age 95, she cast her very first vote, proof her decades of advocacy helped transform our Nation.

She was a minister, a reformer, a writer, and, above all, a woman of

courage and conviction. We remember Antoinette Brown Blackwell not just for what she achieved but for the path she paved for generations to follow.

Let us honor her on her 200th birthday and follow in her footsteps as we fight to protect every American's right to vote.

#### ONE BIG, BEAUTIFUL BILL

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I have news for insomniacs. Republicans have scheduled a Rules Committee meeting on their one big, beautiful bill at 1 o'clock in the morning.

This is the bill that will cause millions of Americans to lose their healthcare and nutrition assistance in order the pay for tax breaks for billionaires. Who does that?

Why are they meeting at 1 o'clock in the morning? It turns out their big, beautiful bill is really a big, ugly bill.

Republicans don't want you, the American people, to know what they are doing. Tune in tonight at 1 a.m. Call your Congressperson and tell them to vote "no" on this garbage. Watch as Democrats fight like hell to protect you, the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their comments to the Chair.

#### NATIONAL MILITARY APPRECIATION MONTH

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of National Military Appreciation Month.

This month, we pause to honor the brave men and women of our Armed Forces, past and present, who have worn the uniform of the United States of America.

Our military has stood for freedom throughout our history in times of peace and peril. They do not ask for recognition. They do not serve for applause. They serve because they believe in something bigger than themselves. They serve out of duty, honor, and love of country.

This month is to remember our POWs and MIAs, to support our Gold Star families, to stand with our veterans, and to thank those currently serving.

Mr. Speaker, we stand by our veterans, and we reaffirm our duty to provide our servicemembers with the support they have earned, both in uniform and after.

May God protect our servicemembers and their families this month and every month. We honor and thank them. We will never forget their service and their sacrifice.

#### RETIREMENT OF MAYOR TYRONE ECHOLS

(Ms. BUDZINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BUDZINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mayor Tyrone Echols of Venice, Illinois, and to congratulate him on his retirement after more than 40 years in office.

As a graduate of Madison High School and Southern Illinois University, Mayor Echols is a true son of downstate Illinois. He has dedicated his career to serving our community.

Before he was elected mayor, Mayor Echols worked as a city alderman, a union steward for the International Union of Operating Engineers, and a legislative aide to the State Representative Jim McPike. He also proudly led as president of the Illinois chapter of the National Conference of Black Mayors.

As mayor, he prioritized bringing new business opportunities to Venice and making sure that his door was always open to constituents.

His dedication to public service is truly an inspiration, and I am honored to call him my friend.

I thank Mayor Echols for all he has done for our community and congratulate him on his retirement.

#### EDESIA NUTRITION

(Mr. MAGAZINER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for the 12th time to call on the Trump administration to restore funding for lifesaving food aid for malnourished children across the globe.

Edesia Nutrition in North Kingstown, Rhode Island, manufactures this nutritional paste which has saved millions of lives. When the Trump administration began, funding for this program went away. There are kids literally starving around the world, while thousands of boxes of this lifesaving food aid sit in a warehouse in Rhode Island.

When we abandon our commitment to helping solve malnutrition around the world, we are not just hurting those children who are hungry. We are hurting our own credibility as a country. Our adversaries like China are happy to step into the void we have left to make those countries beholden to them.

Make no mistake. China's help doesn't come for free. It comes with a price. This is not just about doing the right thing for these starving children around the world. It is about maintaining America's position of leadership globally.

Restore the funding. Restore the food aid. I will speak every day until this is done.

#### COMMEMORATING MILTON F. FITCH, SR.

(Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, there was standing room only at Wilson Community College in Wilson, North Carolina. It was so touching. Residents and family came from far and near in support of the Fitch family in renaming the Wilson Post Office in commemoration of Mr. Milton F. Fitch, Sr.

Mr. Fitch was not just one of the first African-American mail carriers. He was an eastern North Carolina icon and a great American.

He served our country honorably in World War II, returning home to raise his family and make a difference in his community. Indeed, he did exactly that.

He and his wife, Cora, embedded a legacy of service into their children, Jerry, Toby, Patricia, Christine, and Ernestine.

We are grateful to the U.S. Postal Service for working with us, the North Carolina delegation, and all of the communities who came out in support.

Eastern North Carolina and America are better because of Milton F. Fitch, Sr. His name, now etched in the Wilson community, will inspire all who enter the post office to realize the endless possibilities that await us in eastern North Carolina.

#### ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 430

*Resolved*, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE: Ms. Ansari.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY: Mr. Green of Texas.

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES: Ms. Lee of Nevada.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY: Mr. Foster.

Mr. AGUILAR (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 13, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY RELATING TO THE REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS UNDER THE BANK MERGER ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 31, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO "REVIEW OF FINAL RULE RECLASSIFICATION OF MAJOR SOURCES AS AREA SOURCES UNDER SECTION 112 OF THE CLEAN AIR ACT"; AND WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(A) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 426 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 426

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 13) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency of the Department of the Treasury relating to the review of applications under the Bank Merger Act. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to commit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 31) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Review of Final Rule Reclassification of Major Sources as Area Sources Under Section 112 of the Clean Air Act". All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to commit.

SEC. 3. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of May 23,

2025, relating to a measure providing for reconciliation pursuant to title II of H. Con. Res. 14.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

□ 1215

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 426 provides for consideration of S.J. Res. 13 under a closed rule, with 1 hour of debate each, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services, or their designees, and provides for one motion to recommit.

Additionally, the rule provides for consideration of S.J. Res. 31 under a closed rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, or their designees. It provides for one motion to commit.

Finally, the rule provides for the flexibility to consider a rule related to reconciliation on the same day it is reported from the Rules Committee in order to expeditiously enact President Trump's agenda.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of the underlying legislation.

The rule before us presents an important opportunity for Congress to continue its work to reverse the last-minute attempts at regulatory overreach by the former Biden-Harris administration.

The rule includes consideration of S.J. 13, to provide for congressional disapproval of a Biden-era Office of the Comptroller of the Currency regulation titled "Business Combinations Under the Bank Merger Act."

In September of 2024, the OCC and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, FDIC, revised their approach to evaluating bank merger applications. The updated rule restricts a bank's ability to scale, manage risk effectively, and broaden product offerings, ultimately discouraging mergers altogether.

By dismantling a longstanding standard, and eliminating automatic approval for certain applications, the Biden administration's actions risk stifling competition and innovation in the financial sector. These changes will

delay strategic decisionmaking among financial institutions and limit access to innovative financial services for everyday Americans.

For small- and mid-sized banks in particular, the rule imposes additional red tape and bureaucratic hurdles that hinder their ability to merge and compete with larger financial institutions. Despite what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle may claim, the Biden administration's rule strengthens the dominance of the largest market players while undermining smaller, community-focused institutions, limiting consumer choice and consumer access.

We should strive for a regulatory environment that is streamlined, balanced, and rooted in practical oversight, one that protects consumers without obstructing innovation and competition. What we don't need are more Biden-era regulations that distort the market and smother opportunity with overreach.

S.J. Res. 13 will ensure that future bank regulators cannot repeat this ill-conceived rulemaking, and that financial institutions can continue to make strategic, innovative decisions that will ultimately benefit American consumers.

Also, the rule provides for consideration of S.J. Res. 31, providing for congressional disapproval of the rule submitted by the Biden EPA relating to review of final rule classification of major sources as area sources under the Clean Air Act.

Section 112 of the Clean Air Act lays out stringent compliance standards for facilities emitting over 10 tons of a single hazardous air pollutant, or 25 tons of an aggregate. Facilities below those thresholds are classified as area sources and subject to more flexible requirements.

In 2020, under President Trump, the EPA adopted a more rational approach allowing facilities that significantly reduced their emissions to be reclassified as area sources. This commonsense change rewarded emissions improvements and reduced unnecessary regulatory burdens on American manufacturers and energy producers.

To no one's surprise, the Biden administration reversed course by reimposing the outdated and rigid "once in, always in" policy. This framework permanently locks facilities into strict major-source status, even if they make substantial efforts to reduce harmful emissions. That is not only unfair, it discourages environmental progress.

Whom did the Biden administration hurt?

They hurt the chemical manufacturing sector, which includes thousands of mid-sized companies representing hundreds of thousands of jobs. These companies have invested millions in cleaner technologies and equipment upgrades. Under this Biden-era EPA rule, their investments will not be rewarded with a lighter regulatory touch. In fact, despite upgrades

to reduce emissions, they will continue to face the same higher regulatory costs.

Moreover, there is the pulp and paper industry, a critical employer in States like Georgia, Wisconsin, and Maine. Mills that switch to cleaner fuels or have implemented advanced scrubber systems will receive no regulatory relief under the Biden-era EPA's "once in, always in" rule. In a sector that already faces stiff foreign competition and very narrow margins, the Biden administration heaped further unnecessary burdens onto this industry, jeopardizing the jobs of thousands of American workers in the process.

Additionally, there is the independent and smaller scale refiner that often lack the scale of larger competitors but serve critical regional fuel markets. They may have made substantial environmental progress in reducing hazardous air pollutant emissions, but the Biden-era "once in, always in" rule locks them into compliance regimes that do not reflect their improved emissions profile.

Finally, let's not forget our small and rural manufacturing facilities in communities across this country, including in my own district in New York's southern tier. These facilities include metal fabricators and food processors, many of whom have taken proactive steps to cut emissions in very good faith. Under the Biden-era EPA "once in, always in" rule, these improvements to reduce hazardous emissions do not matter. They will still be treated with the same costly and burdensome regulatory regime. Simply put, the Biden EPA and its "once in, always in" rule not only disincentivizes innovation and cleaner operations, but it also threatens plant closures and kills jobs.

Mr. Speaker, you would have to be more concerned with appeasing environmental extremists than protecting American workers to support this punitive and counterproductive regulatory framework.

Through S.J. Res. 31, House Republicans stand up for the American workers and job creators. The CRA, ensures regulatory fairness and restores real incentives for emissions reduction. Without this CRA, even the most environmentally responsible facilities are punished, trapped under heavyhanded rules that do not reflect their cleaner operation.

Upon returning to office, President Trump and House Republicans focused on restoring commonsense governance: prioritizing American jobs, economic strength, and practical solutions. S.J. Res. 31, like other measures undoing ill-advised Biden-era policies, represents a decisive step in the right direction.

Let's get back to smart, forward-thinking policies that actually serve the American people, not far left activists and D.C. bureaucrats.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today for a rule on two measures, two lousy measures doubling down on the Republicans' agenda to help big banks and big polluters.

S.J. Res. 13 is a gift-wrapped giveaway to Wall Street, plain and simple. It would make it easier for big banks to get even bigger, hurting small businesses and communities in the process.

S.J. Res. 31 is even worse, a blatant handout to big polluters, putting corporate profits ahead of our constituents' health and safety.

This isn't new, Mr. Speaker. That has been the Republican playbook all Congress long: Help the polluters. Help the banks. Help Wall Street, and help the CEOs. They want to help everyone except the working people who actually need it.

Mr. Speaker, you may ask: Why?

I would say: Follow the money. Look at the donations.

One of the things we need to get serious about in this Congress and hopefully when Democrats take control of the House after the next election, this will be a priority, and that is campaign finance reform.

All this excessive money from big industries, from big banks, from corporations, and from people like Elon Musk pollute this Chamber in a way where the needs and the wants of regular people get put to the side.

It is disgraceful, if we are being honest here, Mr. Speaker. As bad as these two bills are—and I can't emphasize enough that they are really bad—they are just the warm-up act. In fact, this is filler. We weren't even supposed to be dealing with these bills. We were supposed to be dealing with the budget reconciliation bill. Mr. Speaker, because of the disarray within the Republican Conference, all of a sudden, these bills appeared.

That is because in just over 13 hours, Mr. Speaker, the House Rules Committee will meet starting at 1 o'clock in the morning to debate a bill that steals from the American people so they can help out the billionaire donors who write them big checks.

Now, let me ask: If this bill is so great, so big, and so beautiful as Donald Trump says it is, then why the hell are we debating it in the middle of the night?

Why not debate it in broad daylight where the American people can tune in and hear what it is really about?

We all know the answer.

I encourage the American people to pay attention to what is happening very, very, very early in the morning here in the United States Capitol. Watch what happens in the Rules Committee at 1 o'clock in the morning.

To all the insomniacs out there: Tune in at 1 o'clock in the morning and watch what unfolds in that committee.

Republicans do not want you to pay attention to their tax scam.

Hell, Trump doesn't even want Republicans to pay attention to what is in this bill. Mr. Speaker, he told you guys to close your eyes and vote for this garbage.

Republicans were ordered not to say a word in committee, just fall in line and rubber-stamp it.

Now listen to this: Now they are sneaking a change into the rules buried in the fine print of this rule to give themselves same-day authority to bring the bill to the floor with a moment's notice. This bill is over 1,000 pages long.

They want to ram it through the Rules Committee, potentially changing it, and we know that there are changes coming, and then vote on it just hours later. It is a bill that adds trillions to the deficit and kicks millions of people off their healthcare.

Republicans once bragged about requiring 72 hours to review legislation.

Mr. Speaker, do you remember that?

Now Republicans are ready to toss that promise in the trash to serve Trump's demands.

If my colleagues in the Freedom Caucus vote for this rule, then they will have reached a new height of hypocrisy. It is unbelievable to me that they cry and whine about passing bills without the time to read them, and then they come down here and support ramming a bill through committee in the middle of the night and bringing it straight to the floor.

It is unbelievable and hypocritical.

Let's be real, Mr. Speaker. This budget reconciliation bill is a disaster. It is unpopular, and it is indefensible. This is all about massive and huge tax breaks to billionaires paid for by stealing from working Americans. That is not hyperbole. That is just the truth. It rips away Medicaid from parents and grandparents. It slashes food assistance for children. The biggest cut in food assistance in history is contained in this bill. It drains resources from the moms and dads all to fund giveaways for those at the very, very top.

Any backroom deals made in the next few hours to twist arms and to buy votes will only make this terrible bill even worse.

This is not what democracy looks like. This is what corruption looks like. Shame on every single person who votes to advance that awful process by torching any semblance of a fair process.

A vote for this rule is a vote to allow Republican leadership to jam this bill through the House without enough time to even read it. There is zero transparency and zero respect for this institution or the Members here. Just close your eyes and vote for it. That is what Trump told Republicans to do: Close your eyes and vote for it.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve a hell of a lot better than this rushed, reckless process. They deserve leaders who work for them, not for the billionaires.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WIED). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

□ 1230

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the budget reconciliation bill is the work of 11 committees that have gone through full markup, that went through the full bipartisan process.

I sat through 27 hours in the Energy and Commerce Committee. I know full well that I had a front seat to the longest markup, just as my colleague did with his service on the Agriculture Committee.

That is not what we are here debating. Despite what some of my colleagues across the aisle are saying, the CRA that we are discussing right now is addressing standards for major and area sources that will actually promote cleaner and more environmentally conscious operations among manufacturers, refiners, and energy producers.

The rule implemented by the Biden administration reflects a flawed approach, one that eliminates incentives for voluntary emission reductions and imposes excessive regulatory burdens without delivering clear environmental benefits.

Under this policy, facilities that successfully reduce their actual or potential hazardous air pollutant emissions below the major source threshold are still prohibited from reclassifying as area sources. This means that even after substantial improvements, these facilities remain subject to the strictest and costliest regulatory framework forever, indefinitely.

This not only increases operational costs but also removes a key incentive for companies to invest in cleaner technologies and practices, something we should all be encouraging.

For example, take a chemical plant that emits hazardous air pollutants like benzene or formaldehyde. Under the Biden-era rule, if they invest millions in cutting-edge emissions control systems that reduce their pollution below the regulatory threshold, they get no relief from the major source permitting burdens.

The Biden-era rule entangles them in permanent red tape, discouraging innovation and undermining progress.

Under the Trump-era rules that S.J. Res. 31 would pave the way for, companies would have a financial incentive to invest in pollution control since doing so would actually reduce their compliance costs and regulatory delays. The result is cleaner air, a cleaner environment.

The reality is that most of these companies and the people who run them live in the very communities affected by emissions. They have every reason to care about cleaner air and healthier environments.

What they need is smart, flexible policy, not arbitrary and capricious restrictions that stifle growth and reduce competitiveness. S.J. Res. 31 would restore a proven framework that recognizes and rewards emissions reduction. It allows regulatory classifications to reflect a facility's current environmental impact, not a legacy status based on past emissions.

This flexibility fosters continuous improvement and aligns environmental goals with economic incentives. This is not about weakening protections. It is the contrary, actually. It is about applying regulation in a way that actually works, delivering clean air, encouraging innovation, and maintaining the strength of America's industry.

Mr. Speaker, this is a commonsense path forward to a cleaner, more sustainable future, one that supports jobs, growth, and the environment.

This should be a no-brainer for my colleagues who claim to be the champions of effective environmental policy. Let's not be fooled by their rhetoric. The reality is that many on the other side of the aisle are beholden to a vocal and uncompromising wing of the environmental lobby, groups that would rather see American workers laid off, manufacturing plants shut down, and entire communities economically gutted than support balanced, commonsense regulatory reforms.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, just a couple of things. First of all, I want to correct the record. The gentleman said that this budget reconciliation bill reflects a full, fair, and open process in all the committees of jurisdiction. I hate to tell him, but I am on the Agriculture Committee, and the chairman actually cut off debate when there were dozens of amendments still yet to be offered. That is not a full, open, and fair process. Maybe by Republican standards it is, but by most people's standards, it isn't.

The gentleman is on the Rules Committee. We are debating the rule, so I have a question for my Rules Committee colleague. This rule contains a fast-track process for the Republican tax scam, this so-called budget reconciliation bill. We all know that deals are being made behind closed doors, changes are still being negotiated—big changes, we are told. I would like to know if the majority will commit to ensuring a Congressional Budget Office score is available on the final bill before it moves forward.

We need to know the impact on our constituents, not only how much it will cost, but how many people will lose their healthcare and how quickly they will lose their healthcare.

Those are legitimate questions that, quite frankly, Democrats not only want to know but Republicans should want to know, as well.

Can I get the gentleman to kind of give us some assurances that we know the impact? Will he commit to ensuring a Congressional Budget Office score is available on the final bill before it moves forward?

I am happy to yield to him.

I guess we are not going to get an answer.

I mean, I guess we all know why they don't want the nonpartisan, expert analysis to be made available before a vote on this bill. This vote is a monstrosity. This vote is going to throw at least 14 million people off their healthcare. This is going to constitute the largest cut in food assistance in history. People are going to see their nutrition benefits reduced, which will impact children, senior citizens, veterans, and those with disabilities.

It is relevant to what we are talking about here today because in this rule you provide the authority to immediately bring the budget reconciliation bill to the floor without giving people any time to debate the bill, to be able to analyze the bill, for CBO to do their work on this, or for us to even know what the impact is going to be on our constituents from something this big.

By the way, I hear Republicans say that they have this deadline. There is no deadline. There is nothing magic about having to pass this bill by tomorrow or the next day.

You could do this right. You could actually have a Rules Committee hearing in markup in the light of day. You could do it when you come back after the Memorial Day recess.

People should ask the question: Why are they rushing so quickly? Why are they doing everything they can to jam this through before people have a chance to understand the full impacts of this bill?

The reason why is that they don't want the American people to know what they are doing. They are ashamed of what is in this bill—again, throwing people off healthcare, throwing people off food assistance. Why? It is to give a tax cut to billionaires. Give me a break.

We are here to help lift up people in this country, to be there for people who are struggling. Instead, this Republican Congress is about enriching those who are well-off and well-connected.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are hearing a lot of dramatic words from my friend and colleague across the aisle about the reconciliation process. Let's take a moment to remind them of what they did when they were in the majority.

During the 117th Congress, when a Democratic-led House considered the last reconciliation bill, also known as the Build Back Better Act, the process was a little messy, to say the least. The gentleman talks about CBO scores, and it is certainly something that we are working very hard on.

Mr. MCGOVERN, in a meeting on November 4, 2021, was reading the manager's amendment to be self-executed. His response to not having a CBO score was:

I know my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will do everything they can to slow this process down. I will also assure the gentleman, as he knows, that this cannot become law and will not move forward in the Senate without a CBO score, and that will have to happen.

Regardless if we do have a JTC score or a CBO score or what that score says, I don't think any of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will vote for this bill at the end of the day.

People in glass houses really shouldn't throw stones here.

In fact, this process on their side of the aisle was so messy that two separate rules had to be passed out of the Rules Committee, each one self-executing a new manager's amendment as negotiations were ongoing and changes continued to be made. It was constantly a shifting landscape and, frankly, chaos at times.

I know that the gentleman from Massachusetts won't let facts get in the way of a good story. He pounds the table over the use of same-day authority. The reality is that the first rule for Build Back Better extended what is essentially a martial law procedural lockdown of the House floor, granting broad, same-day authority that allowed the majority to jam through changes without proper scrutiny.

Let's not forget the second rule for that bill was brought to the floor and voted on the very same day. It was reported from the Rules Committee, exactly the kind of tactic our colleagues are now clutching their pearls while opposing.

The fact is that governing is hard. The process is rarely a smooth one, but the American people elected President Trump, a Republican majority in the House of Representatives, and a Republican majority in the United States Senate, and gave us unified government with a clear expectation for Congress to deliver on this agenda.

The Rules Committee will continue to use the tools at its disposal to facilitate the passage of historic legislation, just as our colleagues did when they were in charge.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am really confused after listening to the gentleman from New York complain about same-day authority. In this bill, the Republicans put in same-day authority to be able to jam this tax scam through.

The gentleman didn't answer my question. I guess he is basically saying that, no, the Republicans will not commit to a CBO score for people to be able to know what, in fact, the bill will do and the impacts the bill will have.

I mean, this bill is so awful that I can't imagine any Democrat voting for

it, but it is so awful that I would like to think some Republicans who have a conscience wouldn't vote for it either.

I would like to think it would matter to Republicans that 14 million Americans will lose their healthcare. What if that number went up to 20 million or 30 million? Is there any number that will be so high that maybe some Republicans might pause and say, wait a minute, maybe we should not go down this road? I mean, this is crazy.

By the way, the difference in legislation that we are talking about, the Build Back Better bill, I remind the gentleman, was about helping people. This bill is about screwing people. There is a difference here.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 2753, the Hands Off Medicaid and SNAP Act, which would block the Republican budget from cutting Medicaid or SNAP benefits and kicking people off these lifesaving programs.

While we vote on two measures that would give even more power to big banks and large industrial polluters, Republicans are trying to jam their multitrillion-dollar budget scam down our throats in the dead of night by holding a hearing at 1 o'clock in the morning in the Rules Committee, hoping the American people won't notice.

Shame on my Republican colleagues.

The American people are noticing, and they are pissed off that working families are going to have to foot the bill for massive tax cuts for multimillionaires, wealthy heirs, and corporations.

Republicans claim they don't want to cut critical benefits for working people. I have heard many of you do press conferences and sign on to letters. Now, here is the chance to prove it by voting for my amendment to bring up the Hands Off Medicaid and SNAP Act.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment into the RECORD, along with any extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BOYLE) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding time to discuss our proposal.

Late Sunday night, the House Budget Committee, on which I serve as ranking member, passed out, with only Republican votes, a draconian tax bill that cuts almost 14 million Americans off their healthcare and ensures a few million more lose their food assistance.

You might ask yourself why. The reason is, in order to help pay for tax cuts for billionaires.

Interestingly, we were originally supposed to pass this on Friday, but on

Friday, around lunchtime, enough hard-line conservative members on the Budget Committee withheld their votes and voted "no," not because they objected to 14 million Americans losing their healthcare, not because they objected to millions more losing their food assistance, but because they looked at those numbers and said: Well, that is a good start.

□ 1245

We want those numbers to go up. We want even more people to lose their healthcare and more people to lose their food assistance.

The vote went down Friday. We come back Sunday night, and suddenly the vote is called again. I raised the question as a parliamentary inquiry. I simply asked: What has changed? What deals have been made? The American people deserve to know. We, as Members, on both sides of the aisle, deserve to know before casting our votes.

I was assured that nothing had changed. There were no agreements made.

Then the very next Republican speaker, who is one of those hard-line conservatives, gave the game away and said he was flipping his vote because of the agreements that were made. Backroom deals deny the American people the transparency that they deserve.

One of the things we keep hearing on the other side of the aisle is that we need to get this done, otherwise taxes will go up on the American people. Apparently, the President said that today while he was here in this building. It is completely false.

Just this past week, Democrats introduced an amendment that would ensure the extension of the tax cuts for every American making under a billion dollars. Every Democrat voted yes. Every Republican voted no. This really is about the tax cuts for billionaires.

Now, the President has also said: he would "love and cherish Medicaid."

My Republican friends, all of those included who have said that they would protect Medicaid, they have an opportunity to prove it. Right now at the well of the House Chamber is a discharge petition that would force a vote on my legislation, the Hands Off Medicaid and SNAP Act. It would stop permanently these outrageous cuts from happening. It would preserve healthcare.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it would ensure these cuts do not happen. Right now we have 211 signatures, all from Democrats. We just need a few Republican Members to sign that discharge petition, and we will be able to love and cherish Medicaid as well as SNAP. That is all it would take, just a few Republican Members to save healthcare for millions and millions of Americans and save food assistance for millions more.



I think it is clear, Mr. Speaker, the difference in priorities between this side of the aisle and the other side. It is the Members on this side of the aisle that are fighting to save healthcare for the American people, and it is our friends on the other side of the aisle who are fighting for the billionaire class.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, our friends on the other side of the aisle, they love to cherry-pick the facts when it comes to the timing of committee proceedings, especially in reference to the Rules Committee's upcoming meeting. They bemoan the late start and the timing of tonight's meeting. Yet, they actively ensured one committee markup after another for the legislation before us tonight, they ran hours and hours, if not days on end.

Why did those markups run as long as they did? They ran that long because Democrats engaged in the legislative process, which is their right.

The same principle applies to the Rules Committee. On this committee we have a long tradition of meeting late into the evening to complete our work. This isn't new, and it is not unique to our current majority. It is simply how the legislative process operates when the House has its full agenda.

We need only look at the Committee's operations under Democratic control to see a long history of meetings in the dark of night. Under Democratic control of the Rules Committee, we have seen things like House Resolution 587, which the report was filed at 3:46 a.m. House Resolution 481, the report was filed at 2:09 a.m. House Resolution 597, the report was filed at 3:43 a.m. House Resolution 903, the report was filed at 2:25 a.m. For House Resolution 445 in the 116th Congress, the Committee adjourned at 12:20 a.m.

Late-night sessions are not partisan anomalies and unique to the Democrats. These are precedents that Democrats themselves have maintained for years.

Let's be clear, this is the way the Rules Committee has operated when necessary, regardless of which party holds the gavel. It is about getting the work done. In fact, tonight we may not be reporting in the dark of night at all but rather as the new day has begun. I expect Mr. MCGOVERN to take full advantage of our unlimited debate rules in the Rules Committee to make sure that that happens, and I see my second sunrise in a couple of weeks here.

I invite my colleagues to set aside the theatrics and focus on the work at hand, and I encourage my colleagues on the other side to prove me wrong.

Once again, my colleagues across the aisle are doing what they do best. They spread misinformation, and they try to sow fear into the hearts of the most vulnerable in this country about Republicans' work through the budget reconciliation process.

Let's set the record straight. President Trump and House Republicans are working to strengthen and secure and sustain Medicaid.

Democrats, through their reckless spending and unwillingness to enact commonsense guardrails themselves, have worked to undermine this critical program. We are laser-focused on protecting the absolute most vulnerable among us, Americans with disabilities, pregnant women, children, and our beloved seniors, by putting in place commonsense guardrails to ensure that those truly in need always get the care that they deserve. That means making sure that precious Medicaid resources go to the living, breathing Americans who actually need the care, not bureaucratic bloat, fraud, or people that have come into this country illegally and have been put on this system.

We are also ensuring Medicaid's long-term sustainability by rolling past costly Biden-era regulations that are driving up the program's price tag by hundreds of billions of dollars.

Let's be clear, Medicaid should always serve American citizens first and foremost, and that is why reinforcing citizenship verification, another commonsense step that the American people believe in, not only protects the program but saves the taxpayers tens of billions of dollars.

Yes, we are, reintroducing Clinton-era work requirements. One of the most popular things Bill Clinton achieved in his Presidency, and he worked with Congress to get it done, was bringing commonsense work requirements to social welfare programs.

It would only apply to able-bodied adults without dependents. It is something that we should all be able to agree on. If you can work, you should work. It is a step that was once broadly bipartisan, but today, our Democratic colleagues would rather let Medicaid spiral into insolvency with no solution in sight than support a basic principle that if you are able to work, you should.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard noise from across the aisle, words like "cruel" and "harsh," and all the hyperbole you could expect to be thrown around to score political points from their base. Let me be clear. Those labels belong not to those fighting for reform but to those who would refuse commonsense changes today and instead allow this critical safety net program to become fiscally unsustainable, leaving behind the very people that depend on it every single day.

If we want Medicaid to be there in its entirety for the next generation, for those that truly need us, who we need to be working for every day, we must act now. House Republicans are committed to doing just that.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, first of all, can the gentleman name for me one meeting that the Rules Committee had, when Democrats were in control,

where the hearing portion began at 1 o'clock in the morning?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I didn't serve then, so I am not sure.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thought he was intimating that that was the case. I don't know of a single meeting where we began taking testimony—we may have reported out Rules late at night, but not taking testimony.

Mr. Speaker, and, secondly, let me just say, with all due respect, I don't view it as theatrics to stand up for people's healthcare and food assistance. I feel that that is my job.

If Republicans think that somehow people are not going to be adversely impacted, read the CBO score on the current draft of the bill. Again, it is going to get worse.

On the current draft of the bill we are told because of the changes in this bill and because of the inaction by Republicans, CBO estimates right now 14 million Americans will lose their healthcare. That is not me. That is the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office. Republicans rely on that. Democrats rely on that. By saying somehow that people aren't going to be adversely impacted by the cuts in nutrition, I don't think you understand the nutrition title if that is what you believe.

Under this bill, if a mother of a 7-year-old loses her job, for whatever reason, she has 3 months to find a new job. Otherwise, she loses her food assistance.

You have lowered the age of when work requirements are mandatory, and it is a cruel thing to do because this is about children. I don't know, but if you are a single parent and you have got a 7-year-old—by the way, some schools end the day at 2 or 2:30. How do you pay for childcare? How do you try to make ends meet? What about the summer vacation when school is not in session?

My Republican friends are so in the pockets of billionaires and the well-off and the well-connected, I don't think they know what real life is like for so many people in this country, how difficult it is.

When we talk about programs like SNAP, I have a news flash for you. The majority of people on SNAP who are able to work, work. They earn so little they still qualify for the benefit.

By the way, the benefit is on average of about \$2 per person per meal. You can't buy a cup of coffee in the United States Capitol Complex for \$2.

Then what my friends don't talk about is how this is shifting some of the cost burdens on to States. All of a sudden States are going to be required to come up with hundreds of millions and, in some cases, billions of dollars in order to prevent people from losing their food assistance.

Who does that? Who does that, all while giving tax breaks to billionaires?



It just makes no sense to me. All we are asking for—and I think some Republicans may agree with me on this—is before you bring the bill to the floor—and I appreciate the gentleman saying that there will be a CBO score by the time it gets through the Senate—don't House Members deserve to know what the hell they are voting on before they vote on it?

We ought to insist that we all go into this with our eyes wide open, so that we know, in fact, what the impact is going to be on our constituents. I don't think that is a radical thing to demand or to ask for. Yet, my Republican friends seem to think that that is unrealistic.

This bill is going to need major changes for me to even take another look at it and show the priorities don't represent my values. We don't share the same values. It is clear when I look at this bill.

The bottom line is the process right now and what is relevant to this rule that we are debating right now. My friends on the other side put in same-day rule authority to expedite this so people won't even have adequate time to find out how it impacts their constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we had to go and do a little research, but in the 110th Congress on August 1, 2007, when considering House Resolution 3162, the Democrats did indeed convene a Rules Committee meeting at 1 a.m., and they gavled out at 3:07 a.m.

They have done exactly the same thing that we have all heard about, the ranting and raving and the waving of arms here today. What is good for the goose is good for the gander. However, rules for thee and not for me is typically the way this works.

We will do the work of the Rules Committee. We will continue to pass this legislation and deliver real relief for working families in this country. We have listened to a lot of rhetoric about millionaires and billionaires. It sounds like BERNIE SANDERS is in the Chamber, but really this is about the working people of this country.

If we do nothing and the tax cuts expire in this country, it will be a \$4.5 trillion tax increase on the American people. It will cut the child tax credit in half. It will cut the standard deduction in half that puts real money into the pockets of working families. In my district, it is about \$1,700 a month that the current Tax Cuts and Jobs Act delivers. We deliver even more in this reconciliation package.

That might not sound like a lot to some of the people on the other side of the aisle. For my constituents, that is a couple of mortgage payments. That means real relief for working families in western New York.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, let's set the record straight. I have to go back and look 20 years ago? Yet, I can say this: Democrats never ever did anything like Republicans are doing here today, never. I don't even remember, and maybe the gentleman could enlighten us what the bill was.

Yet, on a major budget reconciliation bill, the majority is jamming this through? It is going to add to the deficit. It is going to throw people off of food assistance. It is going to throw people off of healthcare assistance.

That is not me saying that. That is the Congressional Budget Office saying it. Nothing like this has ever been done. Nothing like this has ever been done, and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are doing it with a straight face as if it is no big deal. It is as if who cares if people lose their food assistance.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman talks about that if we don't do something, taxes will be increased. The reason why taxes are going to be increased is because when my friends passed this tax bill when Trump was last in office, the majority made all the tax cuts for middle-class families temporary. They all expired. Mr. Speaker, do you know what Republicans didn't make temporary? The tax breaks for corporations; those are permanent. Those are permanent, and that says it all there. That is the difference between the two parties, it is that I think we have different priorities. We have a different set of values.

Mr. Speaker, I am really deeply concerned about those who will go without food, and I am deeply concerned about those who will go without healthcare. Those are my priorities. I am sorry it makes the gentleman and the Republicans uncomfortable, but that is where I am coming from.

I don't give a damn about whether Elon Musk gets another tax break or not. Maybe my friends do because he poured so much money into the last campaign. Again, that is why we need campaign finance reform. We need to get this place to focus in on what regular people are concerned about and not what billionaires and corporations are concerned about.

Mr. Speaker, before Republicans try to cut Medicaid and SNAP benefits in the dead of night, I should also point out that the majority is giving gifts to big polluters in broad daylight.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a letter signed by nearly 100 public health and environmental organizations laying out the extreme risks of increased incidence of cancer and birth defects if S.J. Res. 31 is enacted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

MAY 20, 2025.

ALL MEMBERS,  
*United States House of Representatives,*  
*The Capitol, Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the undersigned organizations, we urge you to oppose S.J. Res. 31, a joint resolution providing for disapproval under the Congressional Review Act ("CRA") of a rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") titled "Review of Final Rule Reclassification of Major Sources as Area Sources Under Section 112 of the Clean Air Act." We base our opposition on two grounds: (i) the rule it would overturn is a crucial tool to protect the American public from some of the most toxic air pollutants; and (ii) using the CRA to legislate in this space would create profound regulatory uncertainty and would throw the Federal government's ability to protect the public from highly toxic airborne pollution dangerously into doubt.

I. THE ENACTMENT OF S.J. RES. 31 WOULD  
JEOPARDIZE PUBLIC HEALTH

The The Clean Air Act requires EPA to regulate emissions of some of the most toxic air pollution—including lead, mercury, arsenic, benzene, and metals, which are dangerous in fractions of ounces and are known to cause cancer, birth defects, and other serious maladies—as "hazardous air pollutants" ("HAPs"). Facilities that have the potential to emit 10 tons per year of any one HAP, or 25 tons per year of any combination of HAPs, are treated as "major sources" of toxic air pollution. "Major sources," such as chemical plants, are subject to maximum achievable control technology ("MACT") standards, which are based on the attainment of emissions levels already achieved by the best-controlled sources in the industry.

For decades, EPA policy (known colloquially as "once in, always in") required that "major sources" that had complied with MACT standards and lowered their HAP levels must continue doing so—even if, after compliance, their total HAP emissions were reduced to levels below the "major source" threshold. That sensible approach was displaced in 2020 by an ill-considered rule (the "2020 Rule") that would have upended this practice. Fortunately, that misguided effort was curtailed in part in 2024 by the rule presently in S.J. Res. 31's crosshairs (the "2024 Rule"), which ensured that facilities emitting seven of the 187 most dangerous pollutants ("super-toxics") covered by the Clean Air Act remain subject to strict pollution controls.

The 2020 Rule allowed nearly 50 percent of "major source" facilities (approximately 4,000 in total) across the nation to increase their emissions of some of the most dangerous air pollution regulated by the Clean Air Act overnight, and with no guaranteed monitoring or reporting. The 2024 Rule prevents some of the most harmful increases enabled by the 2020 Rule, even as it retains that rule. Should S.J. Res. 31 be enacted, and the 2024 Rule struck down—without a clear answer as to what the state of regulatory affairs would be in S.J. Res. 31's aftermath—the threats to public health could be devastating. In short, the door could open for the air we breathe to be contaminated at an unprecedented rate by some of the most toxic air pollution that Congress has identified. These super-toxics cause, among other things, cancer, developmental disorders, and neurological problems even at extremely low levels of exposure.

This should be reason enough to vote "no" on S.J. Res. 31, but there is further cause to oppose this misbegotten bill.

## II. THE CRA IS AN INAPPROPRIATE TOOL FOR REPEALING THE 2024 RULE.

We do not contend that the 2024 Rule is the perfect tool for the regulation of “major sources” of HAPs. We would advocate for a rule that provides even *stronger* protections for public health; we recognize that certain industry actors, more interested in ameliorating costs, would argue the opposite. Regardless of one’s stance, however, *there should be universal agreement that using the CRA to set the 2024 Rule aside is a mistake—and, potentially, a dangerous one.*

*First*, it is uncertain what the ultimate regulatory state of play will become if the 2024 Rule is set aside using the blunt-force instrument that is the CRA. If the answer is that the 2020 Rule would occupy the field, that rule still is the subject of unresolved litigation currently held in abeyance. Might we revert to the longstanding “once in, always in” policy if the 2020 Rule ultimately is struck down? If not, a regulatory vacuum would ensue that would, at a minimum, take time to fill—time that the public’s welfare cannot afford, as emissions of the most highly toxic air pollutants would be allowed to increase across the country. Either way, it is clear that this use of the CRA is a terrible gamble when it comes to protecting the air we breathe.

*Second*, use of the CRA to strike down the 2024 Rule may prevent further similar regulation, including regulatory efforts that may be undertaken by the present administration. The CRA provides that rules disapproved under its auspices cannot be replaced by “a new rule that is substantially the same” as the one struck down. The scope of this prohibition is essentially untested and could pave the way for a less—or more—protective future rulemaking when it comes to the reclassification of “major sources.” *The problem is, no one can be sure.* Moreover, such a bar on new regulation may not be contestable in court, given the CRA’s proscription on the judicial review of determinations made pursuant to the statute. Thus, we could be left with a regulatory landscape that leaves the public wholly unprotected—or perhaps even one that the present administration views as unpalatable—and find ourselves stuck in place. This is an unthinkable risk to assume when it comes to the regulation of the Clean Air Act’s most toxic air pollution and the health of the American people.

In short, whether you support the rule that it targets or not, you must oppose S.J. Res. 31. It is a perilous legislative half-measure in an area that requires serious deliberation and responsible lawmaking, and it cannot be permitted to proceed.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Air Alliance Houston; Alliance for Mission-Based Recycling; Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments; American Lung Association; American Public Health Association; American Thoracic Society; Asthma and Allergy Foundation of America; Bend the Curve; Between the Waters; Breathe Project; Center for Biological Diversity; Center for Coalfield Justice; Center for Environmental Health; Center for Oil & Gas Organizing; Cherokee Concerned Citizens.

Cherokee Concerned Citizens Pascagoula, MS; Children’s Environmental Health Network; Church Women United; Citizens for Arsenal Accountability; Clean 4 Change, Kentucky; Clean Air Action Network of Glen Falls; Clean Air Coalition of Greater Ravena-Coeymans; Clean Air Council; Clean Water Action; Climate Action Campaign; Climate Conservation Brazoria County; Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety; Defend Our

Health; Del Amp Action Committee; Earth Ethics.

Earthjustice Action; Eco Madres; ecoAmerica/Climate for Health Environmental Protection Network; Eco-Cycle; Ecology Center (Michigan); Environmental Advocates; Environmental Justice Health Alliance for Chemical Policy Reform; Environmental Law and Policy Center; Environmental Watch NJ; Environmental Watch NY; Eureka Recycling; FracTracker Alliance; FreshWater Accountability Project; Friends of the Earth; Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives (GAIA).

Good Neighbor Steering Committee of Benicia; Greenpeace USA; Health Care Without Harm; Hip Hop Caucus; International Society for Environmental Epidemiology North America Chapter; Iowa Environmental Council; Just Zero; League of Conservation Voters; Los Jardines Institute; Louisiana Just Recovery Network; Micah 6:8 Mission; Mid-Ohio Valley Climate Action; Milwaukee Riverkeeper; Moms Clean Air Force; Natural Resources Defense Council.

Neighbors for Clean Air; North American Climate, Conservation and Environment (NACCE); Oncology Advocates United for Climate and Health; Partnership for Policy Integrity; People Over Petro Coalition; Physicians for Social Responsibility; Physicians for Social Responsibility Pennsylvania; Plastic Free Future; Plastic Pollution Coalition; Recycle Hawaii; Resource Renewal Institute; Rio Grande International Study Center; RiSE for Environmental Justice; RISE St James; Safer States.

San Antonio Bay Estuarine Waterkeeper; Santa Cruz Climate Action Network; Seneca Lake Guardian; Sierra Club; SOBE Concerned Citizens Youngstown, Ohio; Social Eco Education (SEE); Society of Native Nations; Southern Environmental Law Center; Southwest Detroit Environmental Vision; Terra Advocati; The Last Plastic Straw; The Story of Stuff Project; Turtle Island Restoration Network; Union of Concerned Scientists; Unite North Metro Denver; Utah Physicians for a Healthy Environment; Vessel Project; WEAFT for Environmental Justice; West Berkeley Alliance for Clean Air and Safe Jobs; 350.org; 5 Gyres Institute.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the truth is that Republicans have betrayed the middle class of this country time after time after time. We are seeing that today with the CRA measures that uplift big banks and big polluters at the expense of our health, safety, and economic security.

Does anybody think that big banks need more help, that we want big banks to get even bigger, and we want big banks to swallow up community banks? I don’t know. On what planet is that a good idea? It is a good idea only in the Republican-controlled Congress here.

We will see during the rest of this week Republicans’ priorities all twisted as my Republican colleagues jam through Trump’s one big, awful tax scam.

The Speaker has ordered Republicans on the Committee on Rules to meet at 1 o’clock in the morning. That is the middle of the night. Again, here is what puzzles me: We were supposed to meet at noon yesterday, and we are instead meeting at 1 o’clock in the morning.

Mr. Speaker, we know there are going to be changes. Republicans could have taken testimony and hearings

from all the committees and waited to report out the rule until whenever final deals were made with their Members. Yet, Republicans are deliberately choosing to meet at 1 o’clock in the morning on something this consequential.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman thinks it is a good idea. The gentleman says that I will use my time and try to take every moment I can to make my points. I can say to the gentleman: You bet your life I will be. I am going to be fighting like hell for the people of this country. I am not going to sit back, and I can say this for the other Democratic Members and others who will come to this mike: We are not going to sit back and watch our constituents get screwed over. We are just not going to do that.

Republicans can do it at 1 o’clock in the morning or 2 o’clock in the morning. We are going to be there, and we are going to stay there. We are going to offer our amendments, and we are going to make our points. I would urge my colleagues to be prepared to be there for a very, very long time.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the gentleman can give us some assurance that, unlike in the Agriculture Committee where the chairman cut off debate and cut off amendments even though there were many amendments that were pending, we won’t see the same thing happen in the Committee on Rules.

Clearly, our debate on this bill is something Republicans don’t want the American people to see. I invite every single American—it doesn’t matter if they are Republican, Democrat, Independent, or someone who doesn’t follow politics—to tune in to the Committee on Rules. It will be up on our website. I will be live-streaming on YouTube. It will be on C-SPAN. Hell, maybe even cable will carry us live.

I urge Americans to watch it and judge for themselves what this bill means for them and their families and their communities. They will see how Republicans are gutting regular order to jam this thing through. They will probably see them walk in with a huge amendment at the last minute. It will be one that could dramatically change the bill, including accelerating the timeline for kicking millions of people off of their health insurance. As soon as next year, people could start losing coverage. That is what we are being told might be coming down the way.

If the rule that we are talking about right now passes, my Republican colleagues will be able to rush that newly changed bill to the floor just hours later, giving Members and the American public zero time to read it or to review it.

Make no mistake: A vote for today’s rule is a vote to give the Republican leadership a blank check to fast-track Trump’s one big, ugly bill through this House.

Mr. Speaker, here is what really gets me: Members of the House Freedom

Caucus have said over and over again that bringing a 1,000-page bill to the floor without time to read it is corrupt and immoral. They were the loudest voices demanding the 72-hour rule, so let's see if they mean it. Let's see if they actually mean what they say or if they fold under pressure.

Mr. Speaker, I urge every Member of this House to vote "no" on the PQ, "hell no" on this rule, "no" on the underlying legislation, and to send a strong message that we reject this Republican obsession with screwing over the middle class to give tax breaks to billionaires.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we are here once again to protect Americans from the heavy hand of Biden-era regulations. The slew of midnight rules forced on the American people by the last administration pose a direct harm to our Nation's economy, and it has threatened jobs.

The pieces of legislation before us today under this rule are not filler. They are quite the opposite. The resolutions passed by the Senate and here before the House are lawmaking exercises. Democrats' dismissal of these CRAs speak volumes as to their lack of care and compassion for the serious ramifications that the regulatory agenda has had on the economy, on consumer choice, and on the environment.

My Democratic colleagues certainly wouldn't want to focus our time today on these CRAs because they are part and parcel to dismantling the regulatory agenda that they wed themselves to for 4 long years under President Biden.

What was the result of their commitment in the Biden-era regulatory agenda: \$450 billion in new regulatory costs on the economy. That may just be numbers on paper for a D.C. bureaucrat, but the amounts of jobs lost, manufacturing shuttered, and communities decimated for folks outside the beltway is what it is really all about.

The CRAs before us will allow Congress and the Trump administration to continue its important work of reversing harmful regulations and unleashing the promise of the American economy. I strongly support the rule before us today.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 426 OFFERED BY  
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 2753) to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide for a point of order against reconciliation measures that cut benefits for Medicaid or the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous

question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 5. Clause 1 (c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 2753.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1330

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOST) at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 426;

Adoption of House Resolution 426, if ordered; and

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1223, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 13, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY RELATING TO THE REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS UNDER THE BANK MERGER ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 31, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO "REVIEW OF FINAL RULE RECLASSIFICATION OF MAJOR SOURCES AS AREA SOURCES UNDER SECTION 112 OF THE CLEAN AIR ACT"; AND WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(A) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 426) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 13) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency of the Department of the Treasury relating to the review of applications under the Bank Merger Act; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 31) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Review of Final Rule Reclassification of Major Sources as Area Sources Under Section 112 of the Clean Air Act"; and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 215, nays 207, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 134]

YEAS—215

Aderholt	Bice	Ciscomani
Alford	Biggs (AZ)	Cline
Allen	Biggs (SC)	Cloud
Amodei (NV)	Bilirakis	Clyde
Arrington	Boebert	Cole
Babin	Bost	Collins
Bacon	Brecheen	Comer
Baird	Bresnahan	Crane
Balderson	Buchanan	Crank
Barr	Burchett	Crawford
Barrett	Burlison	Crenshaw
Baumgartner	Calvert	Davidson
Bean (FL)	Cammack	De La Cruz
Begich	Carey	DesJarlais
Bentz	Carter (GA)	Diaz-Balart
Bergman	Carter (TX)	Donalds

Dunn (FL)	James Johnson (LA)	Oberholte Ogles	McGovern McIver	Pressley Quigley	Suozzi Swallow	Gooden Gosar	Lee (FL) Letlow	Rogers (KY) Rose
Edwards Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD) Joyce (OH)	Onder Owens	Meeks Menendez	Ramirez Randall	Swallow Takano	Graves Green (TN)	Loudermilk Lucas	Rouzer Rulli
Ellzey Emmer	Joyce (PA) Kean	Palmer Patronis	Meng Mfume	Raskin Riley (NY)	Thanedar Thompson (CA)	Green (TN) Greene (GA)	Luna Luttrell	Rutherford Scalise
Estes Evans (CO)	Kelly (MS) Kelly (PA)	Perry Pfluger	Min Moore (WI)	Rivas Ross	Thompson (MS) Titus	Griffith Grothman	Mace Mackenzie	Schmidt Schweikert
Ezell Fallon	Kennedy (UT) Kiggans (VA)	Reschenthaler Rogers (AL)	Morelle Morrison	Ruiz Ryan	Talbott Tokuda	Guest Guthrie	Mackenzie Malliotakis	Scott, Austin Self
Fedorchak Feenstra	Kiley (CA) Kim	Rogers (KY) Rose	Moskowitz Moulton	Salinas Sanchez	Tonko Torres (CA)	Hageman Hamadeh (AZ)	Mann Mast	Sessions Shreve
Fine Pinstad	Knott Kustoff	Rouzer Roy	Mrvan Mullin	Scanlon Schakowsky	Torres (NY) Trahan	Haridopolos Harris (MD)	McCaul McClain	Simpson Smith (MO)
Fischbach Fitzgerald	LaHood LaLota	Rulli Rutherford	Nadler Neal	Schneider Scholten	Torres (NY) Tran	Harris (NC) Harshbarger	McClintock McCormick	Smith (NE) Smith (NJ)
Fitzpatrick Fleischmann	LaMalfa Langworthy	Scalise Schmidt	Neguse Ocasio-Cortez	Schrier Scott (VA)	Underwood Vargas	Hern (OK) Higgins (LA)	McDowell McGuire	Smucker Spartz
Flood Fong	Latta Lawler	Schweikert Scott, Austin	Schmidt Olaszewski	Scott, David Sewell	Vasquez Veasey	Hill (AR) Hinson	Messmer Meuser	Staubert Steil
Fox Franklin, Scott	Lee (FL) Letlow	Self Sessions	Pallone Panetta	Sherman Simon	Velazquez Vindman	Harris (MD) Harris (NC)	Miller (IL) Miller (OH)	Steube Strong
Fry Fulcher	Loudermilk Lucas	Shreve Simpson	Pelosi Pappas	Smith (WA) Sorensen	Wasserman Schultz	Harshbarger Hunt	Miller (WV) Miller-Meeks	Stutzman Taylor
Garbarino Gill (TX)	Luna Luttrell	Smith (MO) Smith (NE)	Perez Peters	Soto Stansbury	Waters Watson Coleman	Huizenga Hurd (CO)	Miller-Meeks Mills	Tenney Thompson (PA)
Gimenez Goldman (TX)	Mace Mackenzie	Smith (NJ) Smucker	Pettersen Pingree	Stevens Strickland	Whitesides Williams (GA)	Issa Jack	Moolenaar Moore (AL)	Tiffany Timmons
Gonzales, Tony Gooden	Malliotakis Maloy	Spartz Stauber	Pocan Pou	Subramanyam Wilson (FL)	Williams (GA) Wilson (FL)	Jackson (TX) James	Moore (NC) Moore (UT)	Turner (OH) Valadao
Gosar Graves	Mann Massie	Steil Steube				Johnson (LA) Johnson (SD)	Moore (WV) Moran	Valadao Van Drew
Green (TN) Greene (GA)	Mast McCaul	Strong Stutzman	Cleaver Connolly	Norman Omar	Stanton Stefanik	Jordan Joyce (OH)	Moran Murphy	Van Dwyne Van Orden
Griffith Grothman	McClain McCormick	Taylor Thompson (PA)	Jordan Norcross	Salazar Sherrill	Tenney	Joyce (PA) Kelly (MS)	Nehls Newhouse	Wagner Walberg
Guest Guthrie	McClintock McDowell	Tiffany Timmons				Kelly (PA) Kennedy (UT)	Nunn (IA) Obornolte	Weber (TX) Webster (FL)
Hageman Hamadeh (AZ)	McGuire Messmer	Turner (OH) Valadao				Kennedy (VA) Kiley (CA)	Ogles Onder	Wied Westerman
Haridopolos Harrigan	Meuser Miller (IL)	Van Drew Van Dwyne				Knott Knott	Owens Palmer	Williams (TX) Wilson (SC)
Harris (MD) Harris (NC)	Miller (OH) Miller (IL)	Van Orden Wagner				Kustoff LaHood	Palmer Patronis	Wittman Wittman
Harshbarger Hern (OK)	Miller (WV) Miller-Meeks	Walberg Weber (TX)				LaMalfa Langworthy	Perry Pfluger	Womack Yakym
Hern (OK) Higgins (LA)	Mills Moolenaar	Webster (FL) Westerman				Langworthy Latta	Reschenthaler Rogers (AL)	Zinke Zinke
Hill (AR) Hinson	Moore (AL) Moore (NC)	Wied Williams (TX)						
Houchin Hudson	Moore (UT) Moore (WV)	Wilson (SC) Wittman						
Huizenga Hunt	Moran Murphy	Womack Yakym						
Issa Jack	Nehls Newhouse	Zinke						
Jackson (TX)	Nunn (IA)							

Randall	Simon	Tonko
Raskin	Smith (WA)	Torres (CA)
Riley (NY)	Sorensen	Torres (NY)
Rivas	Soto	Trahan
Ross	Stansbury	Tran
Ruiz	Stevens	Underwood
Ryan	Strickland	Vargas
Salinas	Subramanyam	Vasquez
Sánchez	Suozzi	Veasey
Scanlon	Swalwell	Velázquez
Schakowsky	Sykes	Vindman
Schneider	Takano	Wasserman
Scholten	Thanedar	Schultz
Schrier	Thompson (CA)	Waters
Scott (VA)	Thompson (MS)	Watson Coleman
Scott, David	Titus	Whitesides
Sewell	Tlaib	Williams (GA)
Sherman	Tokuda	Wilson (FL)

## NOT VOTING—15

Cleaver	LaLota	Roy
Connolly	Lawler	Salazar
Garbarino	Norcross	Sherrill
Kean	Norman	Stanton
Kim	Omar	Stefanik

□ 1403

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# ACCELERATING NETWORKING, CYBERINFRASTRUCTURE, AND HARDWARE FOR OCEANIC RESEARCH ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 1223) to require a plan to improve the cybersecurity and telecommunications of the U.S. Academic Research Fleet, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FONG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. FONG. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 11, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 136]

## YEAS—412

Adams	Bell	Carbajal
Aderholt	Bentz	Carey
Aguilar	Bera	Carson
Alford	Bergman	Carter (GA)
Allen	Beyer	Carter (LA)
Amo	Bice	Carter (TX)
Amodei (NV)	Biggs (SC)	Casas
Ansari	Bilirakis	Case
Arrington	Bishop	Casten
Auchincloss	Boebert	Castor (FL)
Babin	Bonamici	Castro (TX)
Bacon	Bost	Cherfilus-
Baird	Boyle (PA)	McCormick
Balderson	Brecheen	Chu
Balint	Bresnahan	Ciscomani
Barr	Brown	Cisneros
Barragán	Brownley	Clark (MA)
Barrett	Buchanan	Clarke (NY)
Baumgartner	Budzinski	Cline
Bean (FL)	Bynum	Cloud
Beatty	Calvert	Clyburn
Begich	Cammack	Cohen

Cole	Higgins (LA)	Mfume	Subramanyam	Torres (CA)	Wasserman
Collins	Hill (AR)	Miller (OH)	Suozzi	Torres (NY)	Schultz
Comer	Himes	Miller (WV)	Swalwell	Trahan	Waters
Conaway	Hinson	Miller-Meeks	Sykes	Tran	Watson Coleman
Correa	Horsford	Mills	Takano	Turner (OH)	Weber (TX)
Courtney	Houchin	Min	Taylor	Underwood	Webster (FL)
Craig	Houlahan	Mooleenaar	Tenney	Valadao	Westerman
Crank	Hoyer	Moore (AL)	Thanedar	Van Drew	Whitesides
Crawford	Hoyle (OR)	Moore (NC)	Thompson (CA)	Van Duyn	Wied
Crenshaw	Hudson	Moore (UT)	Thompson (MS)	Van Orden	Williams (GA)
Crockett	Huffman	Moore (WI)	Thompson (PA)	Vargas	Williams (TX)
Crow	Huizenga	Moore (WV)	Tiffany	Vasquez	Wilson (FL)
Cuellar	Hunt	Moran	Timmons	Veasey	Wilson (SC)
Daids (KS)	Hurd (CO)	Morelle	Titus	Velázquez	Wittman
Davidson	Issa	Morrison	Tlaib	Vindman	Womack
Davis (IL)	Ivey	Moskowitz	Tokuda	Wagner	Yakym
Davis (NC)	Jack	Moulton	Tonko	Walberg	Zinke
Dean (PA)	Jackson (IL)	Mrvan			
DeGette	Jackson (TX)	Mullin			
DeLauro	Jacobs	Murphy			
DeBene	James	Nadler			
Deluzio	Jayapal	Neal			
DeSaulnier	Jeffries	Neguse			
DesJarlais	Johnson (GA)	Nehls			
Dexter	Johnson (LA)	Newhouse			
Diaz-Balart	Johnson (SD)	Norman			
Dingell	Johnson (TX)	Nunn (IA)			
Doggett	Jordan	Obermole			
Donalds	Joyce (OH)	Ocasio-Cortez			
Downing	Joyce (PA)	Ogles			
Dunn (FL)	Kamlager-Dove	Olzewski			
Edwards	Kaptur	Onder			
Elfreth	Kean	Owens			
Elizy	Keating	Pallone			
Emmer	Kelly (IL)	Palmer			
Escobar	Kelly (MS)	Panetta			
Espailat	Kelly (PA)	Pappas			
Estes	Kennedy (NY)	Patronis			
Evans (CO)	Kennedy (UT)	Pelosi			
Evans (PA)	Khanna	Perez			
Ezell	Kiggans (VA)	Peters			
Fallon	Kiley (CA)	Petterson			
Fedorchak	Kim	Pfluger			
Feenstra	Knott	Pingree			
Fields	Krishnamoorthi	Pocan			
Figures	Kustoff	Pou			
Fine	LaHood	Pressley			
Finstad	LaLota	Quigley			
Fischbach	LaMalfa	Ramirez			
Fitzgerald	Landsman	Randall			
Fitzpatrick	Langworthy	Raskin			
Fleischmann	Larsen (WA)	Reschenthaler			
Fletcher	Larson (CT)	Riley (NY)			
Flood	Latimer	Rivas			
Fong	Latta	Rogers (AL)			
Foster	Lawler	Rogers (KY)			
Foushee	Lee (FL)	Rose			
Fox	Lee (NV)	Ross			
Frankel, Lois	Lee (PA)	Rouzer			
Franklin, Scott	Leger Fernandez	Ruiz			
Friedman	Letlow	Rulli			
Frost	Levin	Rutherford			
Fry	Liccardo	Ryan			
Fulcher	Lieu	Sallinas			
Garamendi	Lofgren	Sánchez			
Garbarino	Loudermillk	Scalise			
Garcia (CA)	Lucas	Scanlon			
Garcia (IL)	Luna	Schakowsky			
Garcia (TX)	Luttrell	Schmidt			
Gillen	Lynch	Schneider			
Gienez	Mace	Scholten			
Golden (ME)	Mackenzie	Schrier			
Goldman (NY)	Magaziner	Schweikert			
Goldman (TX)	Malliotakis	Scott (VA)			
Gomez	Maloy	Scott, Austin			
Gonzales, Tony	Mann	Scott, David			
Gonzalez, V.	Mannion	Self			
Gooden	Massie	Sessions			
Goodlander	Mast	Swell			
Gottheimer	Matsui	Sherman			
Graves	McBath	Shreve			
Gray	McBride	Simon			
Green (TN)	McCaul	Simpson			
Green, Al (TX)	McClain	Smith (MO)			
Greene (GA)	McClain Delaney	Smith (NE)			
Griffith	McClellan	Smith (NJ)			
Grothman	McClintock	Smith (WA)			
Guest	McCollum	Smucker			
Guthrie	McCormick	Sorensen			
Hageman	McDonald Rivet	Soto			
Hamadeh (AZ)	McDowell	Spartz			
Harder (CA)	McGarvey	Stansbury			
Haridopolos	McGovern	Staubert			
Harrigan	McIver	Steil			
Harris (MD)	Meeks	Steube			
Harris (NC)	Menendez	Stevens			
Harshbarger	Meng	Strickland			
Hayes	Messmer	Strong			
Hern (OK)	Meuser	Stutzman			

## NAYS—11

Biggs (AZ)	Crane	Miller (IL)
Burchett	Gill (TX)	Perry
Burlison	Gosar	Roy
Clyde	McGuire	

## NOT VOTING—10

Cleaver	Norcross	Stanton
Connolly	Omar	Stefanik
Costa	Salazar	
De La Cruz	Sherrill	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.)

□ 1410

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I was necessarily absent and missed three votes on the House Floor during the 1:30 p.m. series today. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 134, NAY on Roll Call No. 135, and YEA on Roll Call No. 136.

□ 1415

# PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY RELATING TO THE REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS UNDER THE BANK MERGER ACT

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 426, I call up the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 13) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency of the Department of the Treasury relating to the review of applications under the Bank Merger Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 426, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

## S.J. RES. 13

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Office of*

the Comptroller of the Currency of the Department of the Treasury relating to "Business Combinations Under the Bank Merger Act" (89 Fed. Reg. 78207 (September 25, 2024)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this joint resolution of disapproval that would nullify the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency's final rule that makes it more difficult for banks to merge and merge in a healthy way. That is why I introduced the House companion, H.J. Res. 92.

Today, we have the opportunity to prevent future administrations from issuing arbitrary rules on mergers and acquisitions that lack robust cost-benefit analysis and would make it significantly harder for financial institutions to grow and compete.

Banks in the great Commonwealth of Kentucky and throughout the country are facing challenges in managing the high costs of complex regulations. Furthermore, customers now demand advanced technological features, such as mobile and online banking, which require substantial capital investments.

Mergers often present the only viable path for these institutions to keep up with these regulatory and technological costs and continue serving their local communities.

They also play a vital role in ensuring the safety and soundness of the financial system. By enabling stronger, well-managed institutions to acquire weaker ones, especially those struggling due to local economic conditions, we can prevent bank failures and the panic that they cause.

Instead of making it harder for banks to merge, we should be eliminating outside obstacles to mergers, enhancing competition and innovation, and ensuring that Americans, especially those in rural and underserved communities, retain access to physical branches with employees who understand their local economies.

That is why I introduced H.R. 1900, the Bank Failure Prevention Act, which includes a shot clock to ensure

timely decisions on merger applications.

Mr. Speaker, I come from Kentucky. It is a basketball-crazed Commonwealth, and we care about the shot clock. Congress should care about the shot clock on merger applications, as well.

My bill would restore fairness and predictability, preventing delays and giving banks the stability they need to focus on serving their customers and growing their businesses.

The Bank Failure Prevention Act will help community banks and regional banks thrive in today's competitive environment, providing for a shot clock on the review of those merger applications and providing better outcomes for consumers.

I look forward to marking up this important legislation in the House Financial Services Committee this week.

The OCC's merger rule under the Biden administration would have taken us in the exact opposite direction. It would have upended decades of precedent by shifting the burden onto banks to prove their merger should be approved rather than requiring the OCC to demonstrate how the merger conflicts with statutory factors.

This would be fundamentally unfair, increasing confusion for banks seeking to merge and massively increasing the delay on the pendency and review of these applications without any kind of deadline on the review.

Additionally, the rule would have abandoned expedited review for mergers for small, well-capitalized banks. Before the Biden-era regulation, there was an opportunity for expedited review of healthy mergers when there were small and well-capitalized institutions involved. Unfortunately, because of the Biden regulation, this resulted in a much more protracted process.

Expedited reviews are essential to avoid prolonged, costly merger review processes that hinder banks from maintaining their employee base or investing in technology. Instead, long-drawn-out application processes create an environment of uncertainty due to regulatory delays, even when the proposed transaction is relatively simple.

At the end of the day, Mr. Speaker, consumers are the ones who are hurt most when their banks are caught in limbo and forced to devote resources to navigate the merger process instead of enhancing their own products and services.

The Democratic-led OCC rule was driven more by a progressive ideology against mergers in all sectors of all kinds in the economy rather than sound, rational policymaking. In fact, the Biden-Harris OCC did not even coordinate with the other banking regulators, such as the Federal Reserve Board, before issuing this final rule.

Creating different merger rules for banks with different charters would add significant ambiguity for both banks and their customers.

Thankfully, the current OCC under President Trump has recently indi-

cated they will abandon this flawed rule. However, without this Congressional Review Act resolution, there is nothing to prevent a future administration from reintroducing this damaging rule that would prevent healthy, beneficial mergers from occurring. Community and regional banks, as well as their customers, should not have to fear that the rules will change dramatically in a few years.

Mr. Speaker, I can already anticipate the argument from my good friend from California. I know what she is going to say here in just a few minutes. She is going to say: Look at the Republicans. They are supporting mergers of big, bad banks, and that hurts Americans.

To the contrary, Mr. Speaker. Allowing healthy mergers to prevent bank failures allows for healthy financial institutions to compete with the big Wall Street banks. If you want more competition for big Wall Street banks, you should support this resolution of disapproval because you are going to create stronger competitors to the big Wall Street banks.

Opposing this resolution, like the gentlewoman and ranking member of our committee is about ready to do, is defending the regulatory moat that protects big banks from real competition.

The Democrats' opposition here is defending big banks without competition, and that is why I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support healthy competition to prevent bank failures and to disapprove of this unwise regulation from the Biden administration.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution and prevent the regulatory whipsaw that has proven so detrimental for banking institutions and the American people who rely on them. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased that the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) referred to me because the big banks hate me. They love him. They support him. They don't support me. Let's see whose side he is on.

As a matter of fact, he is here talking about not being in support of big bank mergers because he is trying so hard to get more community banks. We need more community banks, but he is a long way from getting what he is talking about.

The fact is, we really do need them because of the big bank mergers. One of the things he could do to increase having community banks that relate to the neighborhoods and relate to the people in the communities is to stop allowing these big mergers to take place.

I rise to express my opposition to S.J. Res. 13, a Congressional Review Act resolution that would rescind a rule the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency has put forth to improve their bank merger application review procedures.

Consumer groups, experts, and I have long rung the alarm bell as the Federal Government rubberstamped bank mergers for decades to the detriment of competition. The result has been a growing number of banking deserts where communities lack even one bank branch.

Let's see what happens after a merger.

Mr. Speaker, I want the gentleman to listen to me. I want him to know what happens after the big bank mergers. They close branches. They close down branches all throughout the communities. They lay off the workers. They need less workers, and so they start laying them off. They raise interest rates and fees on their customers.

We lose relationship banking, community involvement, and a personal touch from your neighborhood bank. When these big bank mergers come in, you don't have tellers anymore. As a matter of fact, when they close down the branches, you try to get them on the telephone.

Have you tried to talk with a bank manager on the telephone with these menus that they have? They run you around from so-called extension to extension to extension. You lose all of these relationships.

In fact, while thousands of bank mergers were approved in the last few decades, the last bank merger application that regulators denied was denied in 2003, 22 years ago.

Meanwhile, community banks have disappeared as the number of banks declined from more than 18,000 in 1990 to fewer than 5,000 today. Meanwhile, the biggest banks have grown much bigger through mergers and, not surprisingly, are charging customers more for banking products and services.

For example, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau found that the largest banks charged between \$400 and \$500 every year in additional interest and other fees for their average credit cardholders, compared to smaller community banks and credit unions.

In fact, that negative consumer impact is one of the many reasons I and more than 90 percent of public commenters urged regulators to oppose a recent Capital One and Discover merger—I think the gentleman supported that—which created the largest credit card issuer.

The Trump administration approved it anyway, and I know the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) did what Trump wanted him to do.

We already have enough megabanks with too much corporate power. In the mid-1990s, the 20 largest banks held 15 percent of all bank assets. Today, they hold more than 65 percent of all bank assets. The four largest megabanks hold more assets than the next 75 largest banks combined.

These megabanks are too big to manage. Take Wells Fargo, for example. They grew larger through mergers and then repeatedly violated the law and harmed millions of consumers. It got

so bad that the Fed, under former Chair Janet Yellen's leadership, imposed an asset cap that remains in place to this day.

That is not easily done. Mr. Speaker, you don't hear Treasury doing that, placing asset caps, but they did that because of the way that Wells Fargo bank had just mismanaged and disregarded its customers.

To curb these rubberstamped mergers, former President Biden issued an executive order to encourage the Department of Justice and the banking agencies, including the OCC, to strengthen their merger reviews—get more information and find out what they intended to do and how they were going to provide more services.

That is what President Biden tried to get done with the OCC, to get more information. Don't just rubberstamp them. Let them merge, and do all the things that I have just alluded to.

□ 1430

After going through a public notice and comment process, the OCC, which oversees most large banks, including the four largest commercial banks in the country, published a final rule last year that made several commonsense improvements to its merger review procedures.

First, it eliminated a fast-track procedure where even the largest bank mergers could receive automatic approval of their mergers 15 days after their public notice comment period closed.

Second, the OCC required merger applicants to file the standard merger application to ensure they had enough information to weed out harmful mergers.

Third, the rule provided guidance, something industry often asks for. Specifically, the OCC provided guidance on how they would consider statutory factors when reviewing an application, making the process more transparent.

Rolling back these reforms is dangerous, especially at a time when DOGE is firing staff at the OCC and the other bank agencies, making it harder for them to carefully review these mergers.

I guess Elon Musk didn't stop with all of the other agencies that they were undermining and firing and laying off. They decided that they would fire staff at the OCC and the other bank agencies, making it harder for them to carefully review these mergers.

What Elon Musk was doing is consistent with what he has been doing and I guess what Trump wants him to do. They want less services. They want to make sure that they are supporting the biggest banks with these mergers, the biggest banks that are going to close down the community relationships that we have with community banks.

Moreover, I do not know why Republicans rushed this bad resolution to the floor, bypassing a committee markup. That would have been prudent. As I

would point out, this resolution is actually a giant waste of time, as it would rescind a rule that was already rescinded by the OCC.

You heard me right. President Trump's Acting Comptroller of the Currency rescinded this very rule last week when it issued an interim final rule that took effect on May 15.

I am not surprised that my Republican colleagues weren't paying attention to this development, or maybe they were. Maybe they think that it was something that Trump had said to Elon Musk: Go get it done, an executive order. Maybe they felt that this was one of those executive orders that would get ruled out by the courts when we absolutely oppose him.

This resolution is only moving because Republicans needed to waste time while they hammer out how best to give \$5 trillion in tax breaks to billionaires. They needed more time to figure out if tens of millions of Americans would lose Medicaid, whether millions of children would lose access to food stamps, and just how many consumer watchdogs they would fire at the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. It doesn't matter that the United States bond ratings were downgraded, that foreign investors are dumping U.S. investments, or that small businesses are struggling to keep their lights on.

No, Republicans are instead rescinding a rule that Trump already rescinded. I tried to give them credit for why he might be doing this, but what they have done is they have just disregarded that it has already been done. They came over to waste some time, just to make sure that that executive order perhaps won't work.

Much later tonight, when the rest of America is sleeping, Republicans are going to figure out just how many Americans they can squeeze to pay off their billionaire overlords.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad resolution being considered under the worst circumstances. I don't know why we are wasting time on this floor. I urge Members to reject this wasteful, harmful, anticompetition resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Before I yield some time to my good friend from Florida, I will take the opportunity to respond to a few of the points that my friend from California made that maybe she is misunderstanding what the law actually says.

When I refer to the law, I am referring to the Congressional Review Act, which is the statute that we are invoking here to invalidate this Biden-era regulation.

The gentlewoman from California says that: This is a waste of time. The Trump OCC has rescinded the rule. We don't need to do this. I would remind the gentlewoman from California the reason why we need to do this. The reason why we are invoking the provisions



of the Congressional Review Act is that passing a resolution of disapproval under this law ensures that a substantially similar bad rule can never be reintroduced in the future without scrutiny.

We obviously know that there are bad regulators from the prior administration that prevented healthy mergers that would have prevented bank failures. There is no guarantee that we are not going to have an equally bad regulator in the future. That is why we have to take out this insurance policy against bad regulators in the future.

That is what the CRA is. It sends a clear message about balanced regulations that foster competition and innovation without excessive bureaucracy, and it safeguards against unchecked regulatory actions, ensuring that future rules undergo careful oversight.

Now I will address this assertion that bank merger applications are just rubber-stamped by regulators. If there is any evidence that that is not true, it is proof from the prior administration. Not only was there not a rubberstamp, there was so much scrutiny that they never happened. They languished. There was no shot clock. There was no review. They just sat there and languished.

Do you know what happened as a result? Banks withered on the vine waiting for a decision because of regulatory paralysis from the previous administration. There was hardly a rubberstamp. There was never a decision.

Frankly, all we are asking for is a decision one way or another, Mr. Speaker, yes or no, green light, red light. Don't just sit there in purgatory forever and not make a doggone decision. That is the problem we are trying to fix.

With respect to the gentlewoman's concern about closed branches, we are concerned about the lack of branches. We are concerned about banking deserts. That is exactly why Republicans introduced a resolution to allow for more *de novo* charters. We want more banks, not less. We want more competition, not less. We want those new banks to form in those underserved communities, urban, rural, suburban, wherever they are. We need more.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the gentlewoman, the ranking member, is: Why did she vote against that? If she is so concerned about no branches, not enough branches, banking deserts, why is she voting against making it easier for new banks to form in those places where there are no financial services?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HARIDOPOLOS), who is a great leader on our committee and who will offer his wisdom on this subject.

Mr. HARIDOPOLOS. Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of Congressman BARR's good legislation.

Let me remind those listening about this idea that the tax issue is so impor-

tant. Let's be clear here. The current rate on the highest earners in the United States is 37 percent. If our resolution passes, it will stay at 37 percent. There is no big tax break for the rich, as they claim over and over. It is 37/37. Let's be very clear on that message.

Second, who is getting the big tax cuts in this resolution? It is seniors, Social Security, people who earn tips, and people who work overtime. Those are the hardworking Americans who have supported the President and want to push this resolution forward so that we all enjoy economic success.

Getting to this issue today, I think it is so important, and Congressman BARR has put it perfectly. This is consumer protection. This is fair competition because the prior administration's OCC rule burdened businesses with excessive red tape, particularly targeting small banks and limited beneficial mergers.

Reversing this rule allows for essential mergers that drive innovation, lower operational costs, and benefit consumers. Remember, this rule was issued without coordinating with any other Federal agency.

This is why the smart decision Republicans are making today will codify and make a strong decision because we finally have true competition against the big boys that people say they are fighting against.

This is a commonsense issue, and I am proud to support Congressman BARR on this as a Member of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as to our Democratic colleagues' concern that this legislation and allowing for healthy mergers to happen in the banking sector would somehow diminish financial services or that customer service would somehow be lost, it is actually the opposite.

When you have healthy mergers among, especially, community banks or a small regional bank acquiring a community bank, that allows them to add scale. That allows them to invest in the very technology that provides the customers with better services, with better, more innovative financial services and products.

Far from losing customer service, this is a way for smaller institutions, regional banks, to come together into combinations, invest in more technology, to lower costs, to help those customers to increase access to financial services in ways that they can better compete with the megabanks.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

When I talk about rubber-stamping, oftentimes people don't really know what we are talking about. What I am saying is that we need to have better review. The OCC needs to be able to do everything possible to ensure that they

know what these big banks are going to do and whether or not they are going to close down branches, whether or not they are going to lay off people, whether or not people are only going to be able to go to their telephone, to the internet, and somehow try to get someone to talk to.

Let me tell you what the definition of rubber-stamping is. In 2023, the OCC approved—you won't believe this—22 of 23 mergers within 60 days. That is 95 percent done in 2 months. Now, that is what you call rubber-stamping. That is what you call the big businesses, big banks being able to do whatever they want to do. All they have to do is get individuals like my friend on the opposite side of the aisle to stand up and support them with what they want to do.

Again, I will remind you that when these big mergers take place, they lay off people, and they close down branch banking. That is why we have what we call deserts that exist in communities; deserts because there is no branch banking. The big boys don't really care about branch banking. They are big, and they are doing exactly what I have indicated by making more money by laying off more people, having less services, and charging larger interest rates. I am not on the side of big banks. I am on the side of the people.

Let me continue. The Republicans may claim this resolution also prevents the OCC from updating its merger review procedures in the future. Why would they want to do that with just one banking agency? Perhaps they forgot that we have two other Federal banking agencies, the Federal Reserve and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Not only will this resolution freeze the OCC's review procedures in time and arguably prevent them from even providing guidance to applicants on how their review procedures work, but it allows other Federal bank regulators, the FDIC and the Federal Reserve, to update their procedures.

□ 1445

This would likely lead to regulatory arbitrage, where banks seek to merge with banks within a charter where the primary regulator has the weakest review standards.

In fact, we saw this kind of arbitrage in the lead-up to the 2008 global financial crisis when the weakest banks would seek to get a charter from the weakest regulator, the Office of Thrift Supervision, OTS, until their banks failed and Congress shut down the agency in 2008.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I will address a couple of the arguments that were just made.

I think I heard the ranking member say that what we are trying to do is let them do whatever they want to do. That is actually not at all the case. The merger review process is a very involved process. There is quite a bit of

scrutiny that goes into approving these mergers. In fact, what we want to do here with the resolution disapproving of this is to actually force the agencies to make a decision one way or the other.

The problem we have seen, especially in the previous administration, is not necessarily that they disapproved a merger. They just didn't make a decision. If it is in the interest of financial stability to reject a bank merger, then that very well could be a legitimate regulatory decision, but make the decision. That is what we are saying here: Make the decision.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman is concerned about layoffs and employees of banks losing their jobs, the surest way that you will have massive layoffs and workers losing their jobs is for a bank merger application to be presented to the agencies and have literally no decision because guess where the acquisition target employees are going to go. They are going to go away. They are not going to stay with the bank.

What we are saying is: Give the merger applicant a decision one way or the other. That is the best way you can have worker retention in the banking sector.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S.J. Res. 13 to overturn a Biden-era rule that threatens competition, undermines community banks, and diminishes consumer choice.

Under the Biden-Harris administration, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency introduced unnecessary impediments to prevent healthy bank mergers with limited justification. Community banks are the cornerstone of local communities, and often mergers present an opportunity to allow them to better keep up with costly compliance and technology costs.

Unlike the Member from California, I represent a rural area in North Carolina. I have seen firsthand what happens to banks that are not allowed to grow; frankly, because of a lot of the overregulation that they have had to deal with, particularly these last 4 years in the Biden administration.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen the opposite. I have seen the fact that North Carolina continues to grow, that thousands and thousands of people are leaving from States like California where they are overregulated and overtaxed. They are voting with their feet and coming to States that are much, much more business friendly and much more consumer friendly. That is the kind of policies that we need to be adopting in Washington.

This resolution is going to ensure that future administrations cannot create complicated review processes that lock out competition, provide unnecessary delay, and keep things in limbo for unknown periods of time.

In the true spirit of competition, this resolution cuts burdensome red tape and allows banks to get back to what they do best: serving customers and serving communities. This is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, comments were made earlier on the other side about the big, beautiful bill that we are going to be passing hopefully this week. This is another step to move this economy forward, to finally unshackle American energy, to finally move forward and reduce taxes, and to let that American spirit continue to grow.

These are the kinds of things that we need to be doing. These are the kinds of things that we are doing, and I appreciate the gentleman yielding me time.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his excellent comments. I think another important point that needs to be made in the context of this resolution of disapproval of the Biden-era OCC rule is what is actually happening in the marketplace.

I think the arguments made on the other side of the aisle assume an antiquated market where the only competition that exists are banks, competing with banks. That is not the case anymore. We are living in 2025. In 2025, the advent of all kinds of nonbank financial services has to be taken into account when you look at the merger landscape in banking.

We have fintechs. We have nonbanks. There are credit unions. There is farm credit. There are all kinds of payment systems, movement to stablecoins and the blockchain. Financial services look a whole lot different than it did even 25 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, when you are doing an analysis of the propriety of a bank merger, you can't just look at whether or not this leads to some level of consolidation in the banking sector. You have to look at it in terms of competition across the financial services landscape.

In order to achieve the scale, to provide the same level of services, to provide the same level of technological convenience, and to provide the same level of underwriting and access to capital that consumers are being accustomed to now in this very competitive landscape, healthy mergers are needed for banks to compete with all of the financial technology that is happening in the economic landscape.

That is not being taken into consideration by my friends on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we tend to come to the floor when we are producing legislation, and we talk about a lot of ways that bills have to go through different kinds of discussions, different kinds of meetings, et cetera. Oftentimes, the people don't really understand what we

are saying when we talk about things like mergers, and we talk about the OCC and we talk about review and all of that.

Let me just try and talk about it in ways that people understand.

First of all, I have said and I stand by the fact that with these big bank mergers, they close down branch banking. They close down the banks in the communities. Why do they do that? They do that because they want to save money. Yet, what happens when they close down the bank?

Mr. Speaker, in many communities and in my own community, when banks were closed down, all you had was the ATM. You didn't have anybody you could talk to. When people go to the bank and they only have the ATM, what do you do when you want to talk about an automobile loan? What do you do when you want to talk about a mortgage? Who do you talk to? Who answers questions about the credit cards and about things that show up on the credit card that you don't know about? Who do you talk to?

Mr. Speaker, I don't know who you talk to. You sure can't ask the ATM about that. The ATM cannot give you the kinds of services that branches give you. The reason branches were there in the first place are when you have these big bank mergers that close down the branch bankers.

Mr. Speaker, I will elaborate on an earlier point that I made. We have seen how the largest banks have grown too big to manage through these bank mergers and then repeatedly broke the law and harmed their customers.

For example, a few years ago, when I chaired the Committee on Financial Services, we investigated Wells Fargo after they were found to have engaged in a pattern and practice of violating the law.

The bank illegally repossessed servicemembers' cars. They failed to submit a credible living will. They overcharged small business retailers for credit card services. They flunked their Community Reinvestment Act exam. They discriminated against people of color who were seeking mortgage loans.

To top it off, they pressured their employees to cross-sell their products, which led to the creation of millions of fake accounts without customers' permission so that staff could reach unrealistic sales goals.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think my colleague on the opposite side of the aisle would want to challenge me on that because that is why we fined them when we discovered what they had done.

Can the Speaker imagine a huge bank like Wells Fargo, too big to manage, having all of this unlawful activity and leading to the creation of millions of fake accounts without customers' permission so that staff could reach these unrealistic sales goals? This is unbelievable, but this is what happened. My colleagues on the other

side of the aisle know that this happened, and they know what we had to do with Wells Fargo.

As a matter of fact, it was after all of this revelation about these unlawful activities that we were able to at least help get rid of some board members and the CEO. They all had to go.

Yet, this is what happens when you allow big, big banks to keep merging. They are too big to manage, and they give up on customer service that branch banking is all about. I bring that to the Speaker's attention so that I could make my colleagues on the other side of the aisle remember what happened with Wells Fargo.

Wells Fargo was originally founded in 1852, and it grew, in part, through several bank mergers, including a 1998 merger with Northwest and an acquisition of Wachovia during the 2008 financial crisis. Wells Fargo became one of the biggest banks and the tenth largest public company in the world based on sales, profits, assets, and market value.

Yet, in our investigation, we learned that a senior official at Northwest had an aggressive cross-selling and product sales strategy, and he brought that approach to Wells Fargo. This strategy was adopted and spread throughout the business, including to former Wachovia branches and retail bank operations that Wells Fargo acquired.

Wells Fargo's CEO, John Stumpf, was fully aware that Wells Fargo's focus on this cross-selling combined with aggressive sales goals and associated incentive compensation plans could encourage employees' gaming and create compliance problems.

The bank was fined again and again until, in 2018, I pushed the bank regulators to use their full toolkit to hold a repeat offender like Wells Fargo accountable. The Federal Reserve, under former Chair Janet Yellen's leadership that I mentioned earlier about putting a cap on assets, used one of the tools regulators rarely use—and I repeat: Rarely is this used—to impose an asset cap on the bank until the bank cleaned up its act.

What it said basically was: You can't keep doing this and making money. You can't keep doing this and profiting off of the backs of your customers. You can't keep doing this and getting richer and richer, and so she put an asset cap on the bank until the bank cleaned up its act. That cap remains in place 7 years later.

Mr. Speaker, I hope Members will think of our constituents, including the servicemembers, the seniors, the students, the veterans, and our neighbors that Wells Fargo harmed when deciding if we could make bank mergers easier. If my colleagues do, they will vote "no" on this harmful resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, listening to my colleague from California just reminds me to make the point that economies of

scale are not inherently bad. Economies of scale and big, large financial institutions serve our economy. Community banks serve our economy. Midsize banks serve our economy. Regional banks serve our economy. Super-regional banks serve our economy, and big banks serve our economy. They serve different parts of the economy.

At the larger end, the globally and systemically important financial institutions make markets. They are part of why we have the deepest, most liquid, and most competitive capital markets on planet Earth. This is not a bad thing. This is a good thing.

Those large institutions are capable of serving large, multinational corporations that make the United States a destination for capital flows in our country. They are a magnet for foreign direct investment. They help us with countering terrorism. They give us a global visibility that we wouldn't have if we didn't have large globally important financial institutions that were forward positioned in other continents that allowed us visibility into financial flows and helped our law enforcement and our intelligence agencies find bad actors.

□ 1500

That is a good thing. That is not a bad thing. It is important, though, that we preserve the dynamism and the diversity of our banking sector. That is why we also want large regional banks, regional banks, midsize banks, and, yes, community banks and microbanks. We want it all. It is the diversity and heterogeneity of the banking sector that makes our system the best in the world.

That is why we want healthy mergers. We want de novo charters to backfill, but we want healthy mergers so that we have a constantly dynamic and healthy banking system.

Now, the gentlewoman cites this one particular case of fraud in one large bank, and she is right. It was a bad case, and it was properly punished by the regulators. She cites to a case of cross-selling and overly aggressive marketing and a sales goals program and compliance problems. It is true. There were, but it is not because there are healthy mergers in this country that that happened. That is not why that happened. That could have happened in a regional bank. That could have happened even in a smaller bank. It happened to happen in a larger bank, but guess what?

There are a lot of other large banks in this country where they didn't have those problems. When there are problems, that is why we have regulators and bank examiners. They fix those problems to make sure that they never happen again. You know what can help prevent those problems from happening even more than regulators, even more than central planning from Washington? Mr. Speaker, it is competition and choice.

That particular institution that the gentlewoman is talking about, maybe they didn't have enough competition. Maybe they didn't have enough competition, Mr. Speaker, because we had regulators that prevented healthy mergers to enter into their market space and actually compete and take customers who are unsatisfied with that cross-selling.

The whole point here is that we want a dynamic marketplace so that we can create competition. That is the best form of consumer protection, not a regulator, not an examiner, not regulatory inaction, or regulatory indecision. That is not consumer protection, but healthy mergers that allow for greater competition of the big banks. That is the way to protect consumers.

I will make one other point before I reserve, as well. When we say that large banks are not inherently bad, what we mean by that is that when you allow for a merger, let's say, of two regional banks, and you allow that scale, that economies of scale to take place, and where there are investments in technology, not only do you give the customers of that larger institution, that successor merged institution with greater resources to provide lower cost services, more technological advancements, but, yes, you allow them to invest in what? They invest in consumer protection.

You allow them to make sure that people in their organization are not making mistakes with cross-selling, making sure that they are using the latest technology to ensure that everybody is getting the right deal and the best deal and the most financial inclusion possible given that particular customer's circumstances.

Far from promoting problems, this resolution will actually help solve the problems.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as we consider whether we should make the approval of bank mergers easier, I have another example of how mergers have led to major problems.

In 2020, the Federal Reserve and the OCC fined Citigroup \$400 million over serious ongoing deficiencies relating to its risk management systems.

Now, this is very, very important. Every bank must have risk management but when they get too huge not only do they not have the proper risk management, it doesn't work very well. It was a longstanding issue that Citi had after they went through a series of mergers in the 1990s.

When the 2020 fine of \$400 million was imposed, there was an article in *The Wall Street Journal* that explained how mergers harm the bank. They wrote: "Regulators have long fretted that the hodgepodge of systems, a legacy of a string of deals in the 1990s that turned Citigroup into a financial powerhouse, could make the bank vulnerable to

costly and potentially damaging missteps.”

They were too big to manage.

“A recent high-profile error—Citigroup’s accidental \$900 million payment to creditors of cosmetics company Revlon, Inc.—gave credence to their concerns.”

That is right. The bank lacked sufficient controls because of its past mergers—too big to manage—and accidentally paid \$900 million to Revlon, which quickly went into litigation.

The bank did not correct their problems. Regulators fined them again last year, but earlier this year, we learned that Citibank made another big payment error. The bank—I love this one—intended to pay a customer \$280 but someone accidentally added way too many zeros to the transaction. For 90 minutes before an employee caught the mistake, one lucky customer had \$81 trillion credited to their account. Unfortunately, for that customer, the bank corrected their error and far too often these kinds of mismanagement mistakes actually lead to harm for consumers.

In fact, since 2000, Citigroup has paid over—listen to this—\$27 billion in fines, settlements, and consumer remediation, including 42 actions related to consumer protection violations. This includes discriminating against Armenian-American credit card applicants, overcharging other credit card holders, and mortgage servicing violations that could have helped homeowners avoid failure.

Again, this is the logical conclusion if we have faster mergers. We will have fewer and fewer banks that are bigger and bigger and, indeed, too big to manage.

Let me just say: When I said how much they had been fined just a moment ago, Citigroup, one could think how could they be fined that much money? How can they afford it? Where do you think they got that money from? Where do you think that money came from? Why do you think that doesn’t matter to the big banks? It is just a matter of doing business.

Do you know where that money comes from? It comes from the customers. That is why we have to make sure that the customers are serviced properly, that when a big merger wants to have support from the government, that they will have been vetted in such a way that OCC understands very well: How are you going to service these customers? Are you going to close down these branch bankers? How are you going to help somebody that is looking for a mortgage? What are you going to do to the person that can’t talk to the ATM because they are trying to get a car loan?

These are legitimate questions. These are legitimate answers that need to be given.

I will say this: The money does not fall out of the sky that allows them to pay millions and millions of dollars in fines. It comes from charging the cus-

tomers, increasing interest rates, laying off employees so you have less employees to pay, and the services get worse and worse and worse.

The customers are the victims of these big mergers who do not want to be reviewed properly and who you support in not wanting to be reviewed properly.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me give you an example of where a merger that was recently approved certainly doesn’t hurt consumers but helps consumers and creates more competition.

The gentlewoman cites the approval of the Capital One-Discover merger. Do you know what that merger did? It created a third option, in addition to MasterCard and Visa, for consumers to access in terms of a payment network. That is not diminishing competition. That is creating more competition. It is more competition for Visa and more competition for MasterCard. Ask Visa and MasterCard. They will tell you.

This is a very formidable competitor to MasterCard and Visa now that there is an approved merger between Capital One, a substantial credit card business, a substantial payment business, and Discover with their substantial network. You create a third option for consumers. That is procompetition, not anticompetition.

I will make another point. This is not just about big banks. It is about small community banks. We are scrutinizing today the Biden OCC’s regulation.

What did that regulation do, Mr. Speaker? It eliminated expedited procedures for approval of what? It eliminated expedited procedures for approval of community bank mergers, small noncomplex mergers that would allow those community banks to serve those small communities better. That regulation eliminated that.

Here is what the trade association of the smallest banks in America says about that Biden regulation. Here is what the small banks say about that regulation.

“ICBA strongly opposes the elimination of the expedited review and streamlined applications. . . . not every transaction is complex. For example, in instances where two community banks within the same market attempt to merge, and the merger does not pose significant financial stability, consumer protection, competition or safety, and soundness concerns, the OCC should treat the transaction as noncomplex and permit for review under streamlined procedures.”

It makes sense to me that we would have streamlined, expedited procedures so that we can make sure community banks can continue to compete. This is not about big banks. It is about small banks and the survival of small banks under the avalanche of red tape that came at them after Dodd-Frank, after the avalanche of competition from

nonbanks and credit unions and fintechs and blockchain companies. We want these small banks to survive, to continue to serve their communities. This is the way they do it.

Finally, I will make a point that hasn’t really been discussed here today in this debate; that is, we should remember the lessons of Silicon Valley Bank. There was a very, very significant panic because of the failure of Silicon Valley Bank and there was a run on that bank.

We don’t want that to happen again. We don’t want a panic. We don’t want a run. We want to prevent bank failures, and the way to prevent bank failures is to allow strong banks to acquire weak banks. We want to make sure that a failing bank can be saved by a white knight. Delaying approvals of healthy mergers is very dangerous for financial stability.

We need this legislation so that we never have a bad regulation that would prevent regulators from allowing expedited approval of mergers that help save the system.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am just sitting here being absolutely shocked by some of my own words when I take a look at the fines that we have charged both Citi and Wells Fargo. I see that each of them have paid \$27 billion in fines, but they are still in business. Do you know why? It is because they make so much money. This is just the cost of doing business. We break the law. They are going to fine us, but we can afford it. We will go on doing what we do. This is what happened with the big, big banks that you allow to merge without understanding what they are all about and what is their commitment to the consumers.

As a matter of fact, they can afford to pay \$57 billion in fines, money that they have collected from their customers. They only see this as the cost of doing business, and they keep on doing business, keep on getting fined. What are we talking about?

Listen, I am not opposed to credible mergers. Democrats just want mergers that result in a bank that will follow the law and serve the community. We want to make sure that they have the systems in place and the management to follow the law. Why? Because the consumer is on the hook and the taxpayer is on the hook; that is why.

Mr. Speaker, I want my colleagues to know that I have not talked to anybody recently who was happy with their bank. They have problems getting services because the banks keep cutting back on employees and trying to push everybody to the ATM.

We can do better than this. We can understand when the mergers want to take place, who these entities are that want to merge, how huge this is going to make this bank, and what they are going to do about branch banking.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1515

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, former Federal Reserve Governor and now-Vice Chair for Supervision Michelle Bowman, who talked about the procompetition benefits of healthy mergers, said: "Reducing the efficiency of bank M&A can be a deterrent to healthy bank transactions. It can reduce the effectiveness of M&A activity that preserves the presence of community banks in underserved areas, prevent institutions from pursuing prudent growth strategies, and actually undermine competition by preventing firms from growing to a larger scale, effectively creating a 'protected class' of larger institutions."

Mr. Speaker, we had a hearing that was called when the ranking member was the chair. She called in all the CEOs of the biggest banks in the country. In this particular hearing, the gentlewoman from California also hauled in some of the CEOs of the regional banks, the big regional banks, in addition to the G-SIB Wall Street banks.

I noticed that the CEO of a successor institution that was formed by the merger of two regional banks was sitting right next to the CEO of one of the largest banks on planet Earth, so I said to the CEO of one of the largest banks on planet Earth: This gentleman who is now the CEO of a big regional bank is sitting next to you. Can you tell me what a more formidable competitor to your big Wall Street bank is? Is it the original small regional bank, the other small regional bank, or is it the combination of those two regional banks that made a bigger regional bank?

He said: Undoubtedly, it is the bigger regional bank that poses a bigger competitive threat to me, the big Wall Street bank.

Not all mergers are bad. There are a lot of mergers that help create more competition. That is what we want.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, it provides better financial services and products and access to the American Dream for the American people.

That is why we want to disapprove this bad regulation. That is why we want to make sure that mergers are allowed to allow for distressed banks to sell themselves instead of failing, thereby insulating the Deposit Insurance Fund from losses.

This is to help financial stability, Mr. Speaker. I urge all of my colleagues, for the reasons that we have outlined today, to help us invalidate this bad regulation and to make sure that no regulator in the future can pass another bad regulation like this that would prevent healthy mergers.

For goodness' sake, if you want dynamism and competition in a diverse banking system, support our agenda that not only allows for healthy mergers but also provides for regulatory tailoring so that we provide relief to

small community banks so that they can compete, relief to the regional banks so that they can compete, and, for goodness sake, clear the way for de novo charters, new banks, to come into the system.

I don't know, for the life of me, why my friends on the other side of the aisle who complain about big banks won't allow for healthy mergers to compete with them, won't allow for new banks to come into the system by overregulating the heck out of the sector, and won't allow there to be a dynamic, diverse banking system.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons and others, as I explained earlier, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FINE). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

#### NO WRONG DOOR FOR VETERANS ACT

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1969) to amend and reauthorize the Staff Sergeant Parker Gordon Fox Suicide Prevention Grant Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1969

*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 Wrong Door for Veterans Act".*

#### SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF STAFF SERGEANT PARKER GORDON FOX SUICIDE PREVENTION GRANT PROGRAM OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) DURATION.—Section 201 of the Commander John Scott Hannon Veterans Mental Health Care Improvement Act of 2019 (Public Law 116–171; 38 U.S.C. 1720F note) is amended, in subsection (j), by striking "the date that is three years after the date on which the first grant is awarded under this section" and inserting "September 30, 2026".

(b) EMERGENT SUICIDE CARE.—Such section is further amended—

(1) in subsection (m)—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4);

(B) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph (3):

"(3) EMERGENT SUICIDE CARE.—In the case of an eligible individual who receives suicide prevention services provided or coordinated by an eligible entity in receipt of a grant under this section, the eligible entity shall notify—

"(A) the eligible individual that the individual may be eligible for emergent suicide care under section 1720J of title 38, United States Code; and

"(B) the Secretary, if an eligible individual notified under subparagraph (A) elects to receive such emergent suicide care."; and

(C) in paragraph (4), as so redesignated, by striking "(1) or (2)" and inserting "(1), (2), or (3)"; and

(2) in subsection (n)—

(A) by inserting "(1) IN GENERAL.—" before "When" and adjusting the margins accordingly; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2) TIME FRAME.—If the Secretary does not provide services under paragraph (1) to an eligible individual during the 72-hour period following a referral under subsection (m), such eligible individual shall be treated as eligible for emergent suicide care under section 1720J of title 38, United States Code."

(c) REAUTHORIZATION.—Such section is further amended, in subsection (p)—

(1) by striking "section a total of \$174,000,000 for fiscal years 2021 through 2025." and inserting "section—"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(1) a total of \$174,000,000 for fiscal years 2021 through 2025; and

"(2) \$52,500,000 for fiscal year 2026."

(d) REQUIREMENTS FOR ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—Such section is further amended, in subsection (q)(3)—

(1) by inserting "an entity that has continuously provided mental health care or support services in the United States during the two-year period before the date on which the entity applies for a grant under this section and that is" after "means";

(2) in subparagraph (A), by striking "or foundation" and inserting "foundation, or health care provider"; and

(3) in subparagraph (E), by striking "A" and inserting "a".

(e) TECHNICAL CORRECTION TO DEFINITIONS.—Such section is further amended, in subsection (q)(5), by striking "Medical services" and inserting "The term 'emergency treatment' means medical services".

(f) REQUIRED USE OF CERTAIN SCREENING PROTOCOL.—Such section is further amended, in subsection (q)(11)(A)(ii), by inserting after "risk" the following: "which in the case of a grant made on or after the date of the enactment of the No Wrong Door for Veterans Act, shall be the Columbia Protocol (also known as the Columbia-Suicide Severity Rating Scale)".

**SEC. 3. INCLUSION OF ADAPTIVE PROSTHESES AND TERMINAL DEVICES FOR SPORTS AND OTHER RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES IN MEDICAL SERVICES FURNISHED TO ELIGIBLE VETERANS BY THE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**

Section 1701 of title 38, United States Code, is amended, in paragraph (6)(F)(i), by inserting "(including adaptive prostheses and terminal devices for sports and other recreational activities)" after "artificial limbs".

**SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF CERTAIN LIMITS ON PAYMENTS OF PENSION.**

Section 5503(d)(7) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking "November 30, 2031" and inserting "January 30, 2033".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) and the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1969, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1969, as amended. This bill was introduced by the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS), my friend and colleague.

The bill is a powerful reminder that mental health and physical health go hand in hand. This bill extends authorization for the Staff Sergeant Parker Gordon Fox Suicide Prevention Grant Program.

House Republicans created the Fox grant program to expand the reach of VA's mental health services through community-based organizations where veterans and their families live. The organizations that have qualified for the Fox grant program provide traditional and nontraditional mental health and therapy support services to veterans in need. This ensures VA services are reaching everyone who needs them. We should, without question, continue the Fox grant program.

This bill also recognizes that being in the military is a physical task. If our country wants to make veterans whole after their service, it only makes sense that VA should provide the means for physical activity.

Representative MILLER-MEEKS' bill would make adaptive prosthetics a necessary medical service. This would help our veterans to return to the activities they were accustomed to or even explore new opportunities.

We must not let our veterans' time in service be what holds them back from living the rest of their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I thank our Health Subcommittee chairwoman for her leadership on both issues. This bill is a fantastic idea that will save veterans' lives, and I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 1969, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in hesitant support of H.R. 1969, the No Wrong Door Act, as amended.

This bill would reauthorize the Staff Sergeant Parker Gordon Fox Suicide Prevention Grant Program, or Fox grants, for fiscal year 2026.

As the ranking member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, one of my top priorities has been and will continue to be veteran suicide prevention. The Fox grant program is an important tool in our arsenal for this work.

Community-based programs are a crucial part of a public health approach to suicide prevention. However, I do have significant concerns with this legislation's approach to reauthorizing this program.

We must ensure that we reauthorize this program in a way that ensures it is as effective and robust as possible. I would like to take this time to highlight some of those concerns.

First, based on congressionally mandated reports that the committee has received, VA has not established enough metrics to allow Congress to monitor the success of the program. Additionally, in our view, grantees are not collecting or reporting complete data for all participants, which further limits Congress' ability to determine whether the program is meeting its intended purposes. It is clear that this bill, as drafted and amended, will not do enough to improve data collection and make clear what data grantees are responsible for collecting.

This bill would also compound this issue by requiring grantees to use the Columbia-Suicide Severity Rating Scale to screen participants for their baseline mental health when entering the program. While this scale is a widely accepted, clinically validated behavioral health screening instrument, its primary use is to measure a patient's suicidal ideation and the severity of suicidal risk at a given point in time.

VA already requires Fox grantees to screen their participants using a number of other validated screening tools, both at baseline and after connecting veterans to additional support. Each of these tools measures other upstream factors of mental health that contribute to veterans' suicide risks, such as levels of emotion, optimism, work satisfaction, and social support.

Limiting grantees to the use of a single screening instrument that measures suicide risk at a point in time will further limit our ability to evaluate the overall effectiveness of the Fox grant program on improving veterans' mental health.

Perhaps more importantly, Congress is not and should not be in the business of mandating the use of a particular clinical tool. Not only does it micromanage providers or grantees in terms of determining the most clinically appropriate tool, but it also arbitrarily

limits providers and grantees from using a different tool in the future if it is determined to be more effective.

Finally, I remain concerned about language that would dramatically alter the entities that would be eligible to receive grants. Specifically, we oppose language that would add "healthcare providers" as eligible grantees. The Fox grant program was designed to allow community-based organizations to help address upstream suicide risk factors and provide services to support veterans' needs. It was never intended to directly provide clinical care, particularly mental health care.

Combined with my existing concerns about the bill's lack of requirements to strengthen data collection and demonstration of effective outcomes, I remain extremely concerned that opening eligibility up to new types of grantees without establishing additional definitions, guardrails, or oversight will weaken the quality of care provided to veterans.

In its current form, H.R. 1969, as amended, does not reauthorize this grant program in a way that will meet the needs of our veterans.

Just 2 weeks ago, we held a markup where my Republican colleagues rejected several amendments to improve this version of the bill, including an amendment I offered that would have at least partially addressed my concerns. Thus, the bill that we are considering today is not one that considers any of the areas of improvement that I had hoped could be incorporated into the legislation at the community level.

□ 1530

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Senator WARNER's bill to reauthorize this program, S. 793, is a better starting place that will help ensure that we reauthorize the strongest possible version of this grant program.

I hope we will have an opportunity to engage in robust renegotiation and discussion with my Republican colleagues and our Senate counterparts to ensure we advance the strongest possible bill to prevent veteran suicide.

That said, while I have serious concerns about how this bill would reauthorize the program, I want to make clear that I understand that this grant program is a critical piece of VA's efforts in ensuring veterans receive the outreach, support, and services they need and deserve when it comes to their mental health.

Therefore, I hope that, moving forward, we can work together, along with our Senate counterparts, to reauthorize the Fox Grant Program in a responsible way and ensure it is as effective and robust as our Nation's veterans deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, at the end of the fiscal year, the Fox Grant Program expires. This bill will keep the Fox Grant Program going. We have made important



improvements to the grant program, the bill that is before us today.

I look forward to continuing to work with stakeholders and veterans groups to find ways to make even more improvements to the Fox Grant Program, but I won't let perfect be the enemy of the good. We can't let this lifesaving program that veterans and their families rely on stop. That is what we are here to do.

When it comes to the screening tool, it is essential that all grantees use the same protocol to determine the effectiveness of services and programs.

The Columbia-Suicide Severity Rating Scale is currently a tool used by VA as one component of an eligibility screening and identifies individuals with suicidal thoughts and behavior.

If we simply allow grantees to use whatever protocol they choose, this could create differing approaches and confusion. The bill simply requires that grantee servers include this essential screening tool. The code says include, not exclude or only.

This bill, as amended, preserves VA's flexibility to ensure the best results for veterans who are seeking mental health services in their most desperate moments.

It is common sense to allow those who are already providing mental health services to receive grants for a suicide prevention program. Not only are these applicants subject to the same level of scrutiny as previous years' grantees but they also receive the same amount of funding.

The idea that this creates a loophole or expands community care is far from reality. Adding qualified providers to the list of grantees helps keep the door open for veterans seeking mental health services. The reality is this program is set to expire in September, and we cannot allow this to happen.

Delay jeopardizes this program. We have big problems to solve. Adding qualified mental health providers will only help.

I can appreciate the fact that the Senate has a different perspective. However, I find their approach to be business as usual for Congress and VA. Their bill would simply reauthorize the program for longer and with more money. It would also oblige VA to provide more vague reporting requirements and briefing, in other words, more money and more bureaucracy.

If this program had been perfect, maybe this would be a good idea. I think we can do better by ensuring the program continues longer, while giving Congress the opportunity to revisit these programs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS).

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman BOST for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1969, the No Wrong Door for Veterans Act. As an Army veteran of 24 years, a physician, and a Member of

Congress, I have seen the toll that service can take on our veterans, not just physically but mentally and emotionally. I have heard from too many who feel forgotten once they have taken off the uniform.

While I respect my colleague's comments from the other side of the aisle, to ask for data for metrics and for outcomes but not to provide a tool for these grantees seems to be the wrong path to take.

Mr. Speaker, 17 veterans die by suicide every single day. That number should shake this Chamber. It is a national tragedy and a moral call to action. This bill reauthorizes and strengthens the VA's Staff Sergeant Parker Gordon Fox Suicide Prevention Grant Program, one of the most effective tools we have to get local, trusted organizations the funding they need to help struggling veterans.

In Iowa, I have seen incredible work being done by people like Shane Sawyer, an Air Force special operations combat veteran who helps lead the Quad Cities Veterans Network. He brings veterans together, not just to socialize but to survive, to reconnect with the tribe they lost, to rediscover their identity, and to talk to people who understand what they have been through.

His work saves lives. It is that simple. This bill helps him and thousands like him do even more. It also includes my Veterans SPORT Act, which ensures veterans can access adaptive prosthetics for sports and physical activity.

Recovery isn't just about prescriptions. It is about purpose. Whether it is walking a golf course or playing a team sport, these activities can be the difference between isolation and hope.

Mr. Speaker, we made a promise to our veterans. This bill is about keeping it. It ensures no veteran falls through the cracks. No door should be the wrong door when a veteran is in crisis. No door should be the wrong door when it comes to making our veterans whole.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 1969. Let's do the right thing by those who put everything on the line for us.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to share my position on H.R. 1969, the No Wrong Door for Veterans Act, as amended. I will always be supportive of efforts to prevent veteran suicide, but I remain concerned that this bill does not do enough to ensure the Fox Grant Program is working as intended.

Veterans deserve our best legislative efforts, not legislation that creates more problems than it solves and that does not take steps to improve suicide prevention efforts.

That being said, I will not stand in the way of forward progress on veteran suicide prevention efforts, but I strongly urge my House and Senate colleagues to work with us to ensure that

final reauthorization of this program is as robust as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, once again, I encourage all Members to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1969, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1700

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. McGUIRE) at 5 p.m.

## PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY RELATING TO THE REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS UNDER THE BANK MERGER ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 13) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency of the Department of the Treasury relating to the review of applications under the Bank Merger Act, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 207, not voting 6, as follows:



[Roll No. 137]

## YEAS—220

Aderholt  
Alford  
Allen  
Amodei (NV)  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Baird  
Balderson  
Barr  
Barrett  
Baumgartner  
Bean (FL)  
Begich  
Bentz  
Bergman  
Bice  
Biggs (AZ)  
Biggs (SC)  
Bilirakis  
Boebert  
Bost  
Brecheen  
Bresnahan  
Buchanan  
Burchett  
Burlison  
Calvert  
Cammack  
Carey  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Ciscomani  
Cline  
Cloud  
Clyde  
Cole  
Collins  
Comer  
Crane  
Crank  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Davidson  
De La Cruz  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donalds  
Downing  
Dunn (FL)  
Edwards  
Ellzey  
Emmer  
Estes  
Evans (CO)  
Ezell  
Fallon  
Fedorchak  
Feenstra  
Fine  
Finstad  
Fischbach  
Fitzgerald  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flood  
Fong  
Foxy  
Franklin, Scott  
Fry  
Fulcher  
Garbarino  
Gill (TX)

Gimenez  
Goldman (TX)  
Gonzales, Tony  
Gooden  
Gosar  
Graves  
Green (TN)  
Greene (GA)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guest  
Guthrie  
Hageman  
Hamadeh (AZ)  
Haridopolos  
Harrigan  
Harris (MD)  
Harris (NC)  
Harshbarger  
Hern (OK)  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill (AR)  
Hinson  
Houchin  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Hunt  
Hurd (CO)  
Issa  
Jack  
Jackson (TX)  
James  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (SD)  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Joyce (PA)  
Kean  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kennedy (UT)  
Kiggans (VA)  
Kiley (CA)  
Kim  
Knott  
Kustoff  
LaHood  
LaLota  
LaMalfa  
Langworthy  
Latta  
Lawler  
Lee (FL)  
Letlow  
Loudermilk  
Lucas  
Luna  
Luttrell  
Mace  
Mackenzie  
Malliotakis  
Maloy  
Mann  
Massie  
Mast  
McCaul  
McClain  
McClintock  
McCormick  
McDowell  
McGuire  
Messmer  
Meuser  
Miller (IL)

Miller (OH)  
Miller (WV)  
Miller-Meeks  
Mills  
Moolenaar  
Moore (AL)  
Moore (NC)  
Moore (UT)  
Moore (WV)  
Moran  
Murphy  
Nehls  
Newhouse  
Norman  
Nunn (IA)  
Oberholte  
Ogles  
Onder  
Owens  
Patronis  
Perry  
Pfluger  
Reschenthaler  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rose  
Rouzer  
Roy  
Rulli  
Rutherford  
Salazar  
Scalise  
Schmidt  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Self  
Sessions  
Shreve  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smucker  
Spartz  
Stauber  
Stefanik  
Steil  
Steube  
Strong  
Stutzman  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Tiffany  
Timmons  
Turner (OH)  
Valadao  
Van Drew  
Van Dyne  
Van Orden  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Westerman  
Wied  
Williams (TX)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Yakym  
Zinke

## NAYS—207

Adams  
Aguilar  
Amo  
Ansari  
Auchincloss  
Balint  
Barragán  
Beatty  
Bell  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop  
Bonamici  
Boyle (PA)  
Brown  
Brownley  
Budzinski  
Bynum  
Carbajal  
Carson

Carter (LA)  
Casar  
Case  
Casten  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Cherfilus-  
McCormick  
Chu  
Cisneros  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Conaway  
Correa  
Costa  
Courtney  
Craig  
Crockett

Crow  
Davids (KS)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (NC)  
Dean (PA)  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Deluzio  
DeSaulnier  
Dexter  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Elfreth  
Escobar  
Españat  
Evans (PA)  
Fields  
Figures  
Fletcher

Foster  
Foushee  
Frankel, Lois  
Friedman  
Frost  
Garamendi  
Garcia (CA)  
Garcia (IL)  
Garcia (TX)  
Gillen  
Golden (ME)  
Goldman (NY)  
Gomez  
Gonzalez, V.  
Goodlander  
Gottheimer  
Gray  
Green, Al (TX)  
Harder (CA)  
Hayes  
Himes  
Horsford  
Houlahan  
Hoyer  
Hoyle (OR)  
Huffman  
Ivey  
Jackson (IL)  
Jacobs  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (TX)  
Kamlager-Dove  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy (NY)  
Khanna  
Krishnamoorthi  
Landsman  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latimer  
Lee (NV)  
Lee (PA)  
Leger Fernandez  
Levin  
Liccardo  
Lieu

Lofgren  
Lynch  
Magaziner  
Mannion  
Matsui  
McBath  
McBride  
McClain Delaney  
McClellan  
McCollum  
McDonald Rivet  
McGarvey  
McGovern  
McIver  
Meeks  
Menendez  
Meng  
Mfume  
Min  
Moore (WI)  
Morelle  
Morrison  
Moskowitz  
Moulton  
Mrvan  
Mullin  
Nadler  
Neal  
Neguse  
Ocasio-Cortez  
Olshewski  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pappas  
Pelosi  
Perez  
Peters  
Pettersen  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Pou  
Pressley  
Quigley  
Ramirez  
Randall  
Raskin  
Riley (NY)  
Rivas  
Ross  
Ruiz

Ryan  
Salinas  
Sánchez  
Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Schneider  
Scholten  
Schrier  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Sherrill  
Simon  
Smith (WA)  
Sorensen  
Soto  
Stansbury  
Stevens  
Strickland  
Subramanyam  
Suozzi  
Swalwell  
Sykes  
Takano  
Thanedar  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tlaib  
Tokuda  
Tonko  
Torres (CA)  
Torres (NY)  
Trahan  
Tran  
Underwood  
Vargas  
Vasquez  
Veasey  
Velázquez  
Vindman  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson Coleman  
Whitesides  
Williams (GA)  
Wilson (FL)

## NOT VOTING—6

Cleaver  
Connolly

Norcross  
Omar

Palmer  
Stanton

□ 1730

Ms. PINGREE and Mrs. McIVER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. WITTMAN changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Started for:

Mr. PALMER. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably delayed. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 137.

Mr. STANTON. Madam Speaker, I was necessarily absent and missed one vote on the House Floor during the 5 p.m. vote series today. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 137.

HONORING 692ND TANK  
DESTROYER BATTALION

(Mr. McGUIRE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 692nd Tank Destroyer Battalion for their service in World War II. Their accomplishments cannot be overstated.

The 692nd Tank Destroyer Battalion endured 195 consecutive days of combat

across Europe in the fall of 1944 through the spring of 1945. They helped free thousands of prisoners in the Dachau concentration camp. The day after that, they captured Munich.

There are many names to be honored in such a historic group, but two I would like to highlight today are Captain William McQuade and the last surviving veteran of the battalion, Jack Myers. Their stories serve as a great reminder of the dedication this great generation had to the principle of freedom.

I thank them for their service, and God bless America.

GOP TAX SCAM HURTS WOMEN  
AND FAMILIES

(Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I recently heard from a mom in Massachusetts. I will call her Rachel.

Rachel's son was born 3 months early and then spent 2 years in the hospital. He is finally home, but he needs a ventilator and a feeding tube. Still, his mom says he is the happiest little 3-year-old in town.

They have been through a lot, but they are able to get by—unless this Republican budget becomes law.

Medicaid pays for the daily care this little boy needs to survive. Rachel wrote: “We are terrified about what losing Medicaid support would mean for our family.”

Moms have enough to deal with. Let's leave their healthcare alone.

RECOGNIZING SHERIFF TIMOTHY  
WILZ

(Mr. WIED asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WIED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an exceptional man who recently celebrated 30 years of dedicated service to Waupaca County and the citizens of northeast Wisconsin.

Last week, Waupaca County Sheriff Timothy Wilz reached a milestone of three decades of service in law enforcement. From his time as a jailer and dispatcher to his current role as sheriff, Timothy Wilz's dedication to public service is an inspiration to us all.

It is especially fitting that his 30-year anniversary fell during National Police Week, a time when we honor the hard work of our law enforcement officers who put their lives on the line every day to keep our communities safe.

Throughout his impressive career, Sheriff Wilz has served in multiple roles that have been essential to maintaining the safety of Waupaca County residents.

Sheriff Wilz began his career in law enforcement with the Manawa Police Department in 1991 and became a corrections officer in 1995 with the

Waupaca County Sheriff's Office. Given his leadership, he was promoted to patrol sergeant in 2007, where he also served as a training coordinator.

In 2018, he was elected to serve as the sheriff of Waupaca County due to his wide-ranging skill set, ample knowledge, and unwavering service to the people of Waupaca County.

I had the privilege of getting to know Sheriff Wilz personally over the last year, and I know that he is a man of integrity who is committed to upholding the rule of law and protecting the people of Waupaca County.

On behalf of the people of Waupaca County and Wisconsin's Eighth Congressional District, I thank Sheriff Wilz for his decades of honorable service.

□ 1840

#### GOP TAX SCAM HURTS WOMEN AND FAMILIES

(Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. There are a lot of Representatives here today because the Democratic Women's Caucus and my Democratic colleagues are here to stand against Republicans' bad bill and their budget.

My Democrat colleagues are here to tell the stories of how the Republicans' slashing of Medicaid and SNAP will betray American families, women, and cause immense suffering.

Vanessa's 6-year-old son, Alex, has hemophilia. The littlest cut could cost him his life. Imagine worrying about your child bleeding to death just for playing in the schoolyard.

Alex can live an almost normal life with medicine, but it costs \$700,000 a year.

Vanessa works at the Taos schools, but in her words, without Medicaid, we would not be able to afford this medicine. Alex's mom is terrified to lose Medicaid because she is worried it means she will lose her son.

Republicans, we need four of you, just four of you, to stand up against the billionaires and to stand with Alex and working moms like Vanessa.

Who will join us to save Alex's life?

#### RECOGNIZING LUKE JENNINGS

(Mr. TAYLOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Luke Jennings.

Luke is from Felicity, Ohio, and was elected to serve as the national secretary of the Future Farmers of America.

Farming is in Luke's blood, as he has raised livestock, shown pigs and cattle, and his family owns and operates Windy Ridge Acres, a beef cow operation. As the Representative of an agri-

culture-focused district, I understand how important family farms are. It is my honor to advocate on their behalf in Congress.

The FFA plays a critical role in equipping our young people with the tools they need to successfully lead the next generation of American farming. Farmers across the United States and my district have benefited from the FFA's commitment to advancing agriculture education through their comprehensive learning model.

Luke earned his national secretary position after serving as the Felicity-Franklin chapter officer and Ohio State officer for 2 years.

In addition to his service in the FFA, Luke is currently pursuing a degree in agriscience education at the Ohio State University.

I would also like to recognize Luke's mom, Holly, who is a longtime FFA adviser.

Luke, the whole Jennings family, and the farmers across America represent the best of this country. I congratulate and thank Luke for all he does.

#### GOP TAX SCAM HURTS WOMEN AND FAMILIES

(Ms. McDONALD RIVET asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. McDONALD RIVET. Mr. Speaker, Medicaid and SNAP are lifelines for hundreds of thousands of people in mid-Michigan.

There are 148,000 people in my district who rely on SNAP to put food on the table.

Over 224,000 in my district get healthcare through Medicaid, including over 87,000 children and 19,000 seniors.

Every one of these individuals is now at risk of losing their lifeline because of these cuts.

Rhonda from Genesee County has a 28-year-old son with Angelman syndrome whose intensive care is heavily funded by Medicaid. Rhonda had to quit her job to care for him and receives money through a Medicaid-funded program for caregivers.

There are thousands of stories just like Rhonda's in my district and millions more across this country. This budget will be devastating for the very people we swore to serve.

That is why I am offering an amendment to address how these cuts will hurt maternal health outcomes in this country.

Slashing SNAP, eliminating access to prenatal care, and kicking expecting mothers off their insurance will only worsen the maternal health crisis in this country and lead to more suffering.

Working families, children, mothers, and seniors deserve a budget that works for them, not the ultrawealthy.

#### RECOGNIZING BLUFFDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

(Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OWENS. One of the Merit Caucus' core missions is to spotlight exceptional educators, and Utah is blessed with so many. My team recently visited Bluffdale Elementary, a dual language immersion school where students start learning Portuguese in the first grade and stick to it throughout high school.

Two inspiring classrooms were taught by Ms. Jessica Bell-Aver's first grade class and Edson Habelo's sixth grade class. Both teachers spoke exclusively in Portuguese, and the students rose to meet the challenge. First graders eagerly answered questions about the calendar and weather in Portuguese. Sixth graders tackled science concepts like ecosystems in fluent Portuguese.

This is what happens when we set a high bar. Bluffdale's students are thriving because dedicated teachers believe in their potential and push them to reach them. That is merit in action.

#### GOP TAX SCAM HURTS WOMEN AND FAMILIES

(Mrs. MCBATH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to attempts by Republicans to slash healthcare that millions rely on just to benefit Elon Musk and the friends of the President.

Almost 14 million Americans will lose healthcare coverage if this plan is successful. This is life or death.

In my home State of Georgia, these Republican cuts impact 2 million people, real people. A single mother in Atlanta working two jobs is now facing losing her Medicaid. A veteran in rural Georgia now has to face red tape just to get the benefits he earned serving our country. This isn't about accountability. It is about taking food and healthcare from people who need it most.

People have seen how these policies fail. In Georgia, red tape and paperwork errors have already kicked thousands off their healthcare coverage, even when they are eligible.

This isn't reform. This is cruelty. My colleagues need to protect healthcare for working families, not strip away their lifeline.

#### DELIVERING ON THE MANDATE

(Mr. CRANK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in anticipation to deliver on the mandate that the American people gave my conservative colleagues and I last year. The mandate was clear: We must deliver safety, prosperity, and stability.

This one, big, beautiful bill does this and more. It extends the Trump tax

cuts, bolsters our national defense, and helps secure our southern border.

Don't believe the demagoguery of those who, for political purposes, mislead the American people and scare them. Holding out for personal agendas holds back the President's America First policies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in making America strong, secure, and to deliver on the promises made to the citizens of our great Nation.

#### RECOGNIZING PAUL REDMAN

(Ms. HOULAHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Paul Redman, the visionary leader behind the world-renowned Longwood Gardens, which is a fixture of my community in the Philadelphia area.

Since 2006, Paul's masterful leadership has helped Longwood navigate modernization, a global pandemic, and even an escaped convict hiding on the grounds. Under his direction, Longwood has grown physically and programmatically, becoming a go-to destination for events, employing hundreds across southeastern Pennsylvania, and bringing 1.6 million people to our community last year.

I have been proud to honor hosts like the Japanese Ambassador to Longwood Gardens, and I am always grateful for Paul's graciousness and hospitality.

This week, for his steadfast dedication to our community and to Longwood, Paul is being inducted into the Chester County Economic Development Council Hall of Fame. He has made innumerable contributions to our region, and this honor is beyond well-deserved.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Paul. I am so proud to have an extraordinary leader such as him in our community and at the head of our Longwood Gardens.

□ 1750

#### REINING IN CALIFORNIA'S LOW CARBON FUEL STANDARD

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, once again, the California Air Resources Board is trying to jam through a gas price hike under the cover of its so-called low carbon fuel standard. After the rule was blocked earlier this year for being unclear and poorly written, CARB is now racing to make it effective by July 1, just months after quietly approving it right after the election and in time for summer travel for people on vacation, et cetera.

Even their own staff at CARB admitted it will raise gas prices. Californians

already pay the highest gas prices in the country. This will just make it worse.

This is set to add at least 65 cents per gallon by this move. Combined with a couple of closed refineries in California, by the time that kicks into place, a USC study indicates it could be \$8.40 per gallon. Let that settle.

That is exactly why I acted at the Federal level and led the charge to rein in California's Clean Air Act waiver authority, the same waiver CARB uses to push these costly, unchecked regulations onto the rest of the country. No agency should have this much power to raise costs without public input or accountability. This is bureaucratic overreach.

We voted here to contain CARB on forcing electric cars and trucks under these waivers. We should give them no more waivers and allow that or other radical policies that raise costs for families and everybody else.

#### GOP TAX SCAM HURTS WOMEN AND FAMILIES

(Ms. DEXTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DEXTER. Mr. Speaker, of all of the titles I hold, the most important is "mom." Like fierce, fighting mothers across this country, we want a better future and a safer future for our children, like Tiffany George. She is a courageous mother in Hood River who has two beautiful children, Wylie and June.

Wylie, her youngest, was diagnosed with a rare genetic disorder at 18 months. Very quickly, Tiffany and her husband were overwhelmed with medical bills, doctor visits, therapies, medical equipment, and hospital visits.

Mr. Speaker, 10 hospital visits almost put them into bankruptcy. Medicaid was a lifeline. Without Medicaid, Wylie's lifesaving medications would cost \$9,000 a month. That is \$9,000.

Democrats are united against this cruel Republican budget because we are willing to fight for families, for their future, and for their health.

Without food stamps and healthcare, children like Wylie will suffer. Families will be pushed to the brink. I am here fighting every day for Tiffany, for Wylie, and every other mother and American family who deserves that stability.

We must fight this awful Republican budget bill.

#### NEW TAX CUTS

(Mr. GROTHMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I feel I must address one of the key issues that we are going to be dealing with in the next 2 days, and that is: What type of new tax cuts are we going to put into the Internal Revenue Code?

Some people think that if I had my choice, I would bring back the personal exemption and put \$1,000, or \$2,000, or \$3,000 per child on that return because there is no time in life in which you need money more than when you are just starting out with children and have a big mortgage. We should look out for the average guy at a time when they are most desperate.

Some people would say my second pick would be to reduce the marginal tax rate on the most technical manufactured goods because we want those goods to be made here in America, and it would be great to have those manufactured in America.

Some people, however, think the most important thing is to encourage States to increase their taxes and have higher property taxes from the local units of government and higher income taxes for the State government. They want to increase the exemption for those to encourage State governments and local governments to spend more money.

No, we should be helping out the young people with children just starting out.

#### GOP TAX SCAM HURTS WOMEN AND FAMILIES

(Ms. MATSUI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to share the impacts of Republicans' big, bad bill.

I don't want us to forget that healthcare is a matter of life and death, and the proposed Medicaid cuts are a death sentence for people like Jessica, who lives in my district.

Jessica fled an abusive relationship when she was 25. Then she found out she was pregnant. Only through Medicaid, Jessica was able to access prenatal care.

Then, late in her pregnancy, her doctor discovered a knotted umbilical cord. She was rushed into surgery. Thankfully, Jessica gave birth to a healthy baby.

Without Medicaid, Jessica might not be a mom today. She and her daughter might not have survived. These massive cuts will force hospitals and birthing facilities to close. That means that no one has a safe place to give birth.

The result is a tragic domino effect for moms and kids.

#### GOP TAX SCAM HURTS WOMEN AND FAMILIES

(Ms. SCHOLTEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SCHOLTEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share a story from Charlene, a grandmother in Michigan, who wrote me with a real, honest fear about Medicaid cuts.

Her granddaughter is just 11 years old, and she lives with type 1 diabetes.

Her life depends on insulin and a constant stream of medical supplies to keep her alive.

Her mother is a single mom and a nurse. She takes care of others for a living. Even though she has her own insurance, it doesn't come close to covering all of her daughter's needs.

That is where Medicaid comes in. She is doing everything right and this family is still holding their breath. If Medicaid disappears, Charlene's granddaughter faces the possibility of going without the medicine that keeps her alive.

Who are we as a nation? Why are we talking about this right now, and all for what? It is so that Republicans can continue massive tax cuts for billionaires and corporations. We can afford the healthcare that we need and deserve in this country if we are willing to stand up to the ultrawealthy.

I will never stop fighting for Charlene's granddaughter and every family like hers in west Michigan and across the country.

#### GOP TAX SCAM HURTS WOMEN AND FAMILIES

(Ms. CHU asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the GOP tax scam, which would gut the programs that families rely on, like Medicaid and SNAP, just to give trillions in tax breaks to the wealthy.

In my district, more than 208,000 people rely on Medicaid, and 75,000 people rely on SNAP. They include women like Nancy from Pasadena, California.

Nancy has stage V kidney failure. She relies on Medicaid, SNAP, and Social Security to keep a roof over her head, food on her table, and continue her treatment. She is scared to death about losing these.

Nancy asked me to tell my Republican colleagues that one day, they or their loved one might need the resources that they are fighting so hard to slash.

Do not take food literally out of the mouths of babies just so Elon Musk can buy another yacht. Nancy deserves better. All of our constituents deserve better, and House Democrats are here to fight back against this cruelty.

□ 1800

#### GOP TAX SCAM HURTS WOMEN AND FAMILIES

(Ms. HOYLE of Oregon asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HOYLE of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, Medicaid is a critical and important safety net and a provider of affordable, accessible, appropriate healthcare, especially in the rural communities I represent.

Today, I will share a story of Florence from North Bend, Oregon. She is a mother, a caregiver, and a fighter. She lives with a rare neuromuscular disease, myasthenia gravis, a rare form of angioedema.

For her, Medicaid isn't just a safety net, it is a lifeline. It covers the critical treatment and specialist care that keep her out of the ER and out of the ICU. Beyond that, it allows her to be there for the people who count on her most. Because Medicaid helps her manage her health, Florence is able to raise her 10-year-old daughter and care for her elderly parents. Her mother who has heart failure and COPD, and her father, who has serious health challenges of his own, were able to age in their homes.

Without Medicaid, this entire support system would collapse. Taxpayers would pay more to support all of them, and their family would be broken. This is what is at stake.

Mr. Speaker, Medicaid isn't just about individual coverage. It is the backbone of family stability across the country; for Florence, for her daughter, for her parents, and for millions of families like theirs. We must protect and strengthen Medicaid. Lives and futures depend on it.

#### GOP TAX SCAM HURTS WOMEN AND FAMILIES

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join our Democratic leader and Democratic Women's Caucus colleagues in highlighting stories of women and children who would be harmed by the House Republican agenda.

Republicans are slashing \$300 billion—that is b, billion dollars—from SNAP, in addition to cutting \$700 billion from Medicaid. That is \$1 trillion in cruel cuts from our Nation's children in order to give tax cuts to billionaires.

SNAP is our Nation's most effective antihunger initiative. The devastating Republican cuts threaten children and families in California and across America who are scared and crying out for help.

One single mom, Melissa, from California who lives in a district represented by one of our Republican colleagues shared that if not for SNAP, her family of three children every month would be running out of money for food. She would have zero dollars for food. She attends school full time and says that without SNAP they would be forced to rely on food giveaways or starve.

Republicans shamelessly call this reform, but let's be clear: It is a sinful betrayal of the Gospel of Matthew: "When I was hungry, you fed me."

Mr. Speaker, Democrats will never stop fighting to ensure no child is left

behind. Hands off our Medicaid, and hands off our SNAP.

#### GOP TAX SCAM HURTS WOMEN AND FAMILIES

(Ms. MENG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander Heritage Month.

There are 25 million Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders in the U.S., representing the fastest growing racial group in the country. We have made invaluable contributions to our country and play a vital role in shaping America for the better.

However, at a time when we should be celebrating, our communities are anxious and afraid. This celebration of our heritage, culture, and stories is dampened by the Republican scheme to strip away benefits from those that need them most.

This big, bad billionaire bill would impact nearly 200,000 Asian-American constituents, many of them senior citizens in my district alone, not to mention the nearly 1 in 10 Asian Americans across our country that rely on food assistance through SNAP and the 1 in 6 NHPs living in poverty.

Meanwhile, the top 20 percent of income earners will get nearly 70 percent of the benefits of this bill.

There are hungry grandmas, sick children, and veterans who were promised care after serving our country. What a way to celebrate and uplift our diverse AANHPI communities.

Our communities deserve not just to survive but to thrive.

#### GOP TAX SCAM HURTS WOMEN AND FAMILIES

(Mrs. DINGELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to read the letter that the Governor of Michigan and I received from Marie Adkins.

"I'm a mom to a son with special needs. I'm also a nurse in primary care settings. My story is from the front lines. . . . If you cut Medicaid, Americans will die. People will get sick. They'll lose jobs. Some won't survive. It's not an exaggeration. It's reality.

"This bill doesn't cut waste. It cuts the heart out of programs that help Americans meet their basic needs: healthcare, nutrition, essential services. There's nothing excessive about needing insulin or a wheelchair or therapy. This isn't luxury. It's survival. My son is on the autism spectrum.

"And let's be real about who this hits the hardest: children, people with disabilities, and low-income seniors. These are Americans who rely on Medicaid to live with dignity, to have food

on the table, to get to doctor's appointments, to afford medication.

"Every day at our clinic, I hear it: 'I'm scared. I feel hopeless. I don't know how much longer I can hang on.'

"This is the health crisis we're living in and this bill would make it worse."

#### GOP TAX SCAM HURTS WOMEN AND FAMILIES

(Ms. RANDALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, for months, Members of Congress and the American people have been told by our Republican colleagues that we are being alarmist about this budget proposal.

We aren't being alarmist. House Republicans' cuts to Medicaid, SNAP, and other essential programs are alarming. These are real people who are depending on us to make sure they still have healthcare and are able to feed their families.

These are real people who come to my townhalls, who write to us, and who call my office. They are real people like Aneliese, a single mother, who called our office urging us through tears to protect SNAP, saying: I will have no way to feed my child. I am extremely stressed out, and if they cut food stamps, I don't know what I will do.

They are real people like Christy, whose daughter has autism and epilepsy. She said: Losing Medicaid would be absolutely devastating to my family. I won't be able to keep my daughter healthy or get her the medications she needs.

They are real people like Veronica, whose grandmother's last few days in long-term care were only possible because of Medicaid.

Taking healthcare and food away from people isn't bringing down prices for families. It is telling people that your health and your lives aren't worth as much as billionaires' bank accounts.

#### GOP TAX SCAM HURTS WOMEN AND FAMILIES

(Mr. LATIMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Speaker, in just a few hours, the Rules Committee will be making the final touches to America's worst budget ever. They are doing it in the middle of the night to hide the fact that this bill will make Americans sicker and poorer.

Take SNAP, the most effective anti-poverty tool we have. This bill is the deepest cut to food assistance in history, making it harder to put food on the table for seniors, families, and veterans, including 74,000 people in my district.

Vivian, in New Rochelle, said: I have been delivering food to seniors and peo-

ple in need since 2009. I do this every day because I know what it is like to be in need myself. I had to stop working when I was diagnosed with pancreatic cancer and now I rely on SNAP, and it is still not enough. If those benefits are cut, it would be devastating.

Republicans are taking food assistance and healthcare away from those who need it the most to give tax breaks to those who need them the least.

Try to spin it any way you want. Everyday Americans will suffer.

#### GOP TAX SCAM HURTS WOMEN AND FAMILIES

(Ms. BONAMICI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the big, bad billionaire bill, especially the cuts to Medicaid.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, this bill will result in more than 13 million people across the country losing health insurance coverage, and people with disabilities will be the hardest hit.

Medicaid is the primary program for comprehensive health and long-term care coverage to one in three people with disabilities.

My colleagues across the aisle are so focused on giving tax cuts to billionaires, I think they have lost sight of the everyday people who will be harmed by their reckless decisions.

One of my constituents, Rachael, is a caretaker for her adult son with Down syndrome. Payments from Medicaid allow Rachael's son to survive. Rachael told me that without these payments her son could die.

Republicans have claimed that vulnerable populations who need Medicaid will not be harmed by provisions in this legislation, but we saw this play out before.

In 2011, when States had to cut spending to comply with Federal requirements, many people with disabilities were hit hard and fast by the loss of services.

I implore every one of my colleagues: Do not be complicit in destabilizing the lives of millions of people, including Rachael's son who will have their healthcare ripped away.

□ 1810

#### GOP TAX SCAM HURTS WOMEN AND FAMILIES

(Mr. SORESENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SORESENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise with my colleagues today to call out the House GOP's big billionaire bailout at the expense of my neighbors back home in Illinois-17.

Their bill would take away food from hungry families and kick people off their health insurance, all so the richest people who walk the face of the Earth get a bigger tax break.

The other side claims to be fiscally responsible, but they are blowing a \$5 trillion hole in our national debt to do it.

What am I supposed to say to Mary Anne from Morrison, Illinois, who says she can't feed her kids without SNAP, or a veteran like Mike, who stopped in for his one meal a day at the veteran drop-in center in Rockford?

Republicans in committee voted unanimously against our amendment that would protect veterans from cuts.

They are saying this is about waste, fraud, and abuse? Give me a break. This bill is a disaster for anyone who is struggling to make ends meet, and it will be a disaster for our country, all so the filthy rich get richer. Vote "no."

#### GOP TAX SCAM HURTS WOMEN AND FAMILIES

(Mr. CARTER of Louisiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, last week, I had the privilege of welcoming the Corkern family to the Capitol. They traveled all the way from Louisiana to join me for the Energy and Commerce Committee's budget reconciliation markup because they, like so many Americans, are proof that Medicaid saves lives.

Connor Corkern was born 18 years ago with a congenital brain malfunction. At 6 weeks old, Connor's parents were told that his brain malfunction was so significant that he would need one-on-one care for all aspects of his life.

After nearly a decade of being on a waiting list for home- and community-based disability waivers, Connor was given an emergency New Opportunities Waiver, or NOW, in 2015. It changed their lives.

Medicaid funding and waivers like the New Opportunities Waiver, NOW, have been and continue to be the lifeline for the Corkerns. His Medicaid waiver is the reason he is able to live today.

When Republicans attack Medicaid, they attack families like the Corkerns. Cutting Medicaid means that a little boy born today with Connor's medical needs might not make it to his high school graduation. Connor and so many others need this service to live.

Mr. Speaker, if the Republicans like their big, beautiful bill so much, I beg this question: Why are they displaying it at 1 o'clock in the morning?

#### GOP TAX SCAM HURTS WOMEN AND FAMILIES

(Mrs. SYKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SYKES. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to uplift the story of a hero from Ohio's 13th Congressional District, Mariah Stacy Frederick.

Mariah is the voice and advocate for her daughter, who lives with spina bifida, a condition that occurs when the spine and spinal cord don't form properly.

For Mariah and her daughter, Medicaid is a crucial resource without which they would not be able to afford the proper care that her daughter requires for her condition.

In her message to my office, Mariah said: "I am asking for the budget to not touch Medicaid funding. My daughter is 2 years old and is just starting to walk on her own. This is all with the support she receives at physical therapy and the Help Me Grow [program]. I would be lost without all of these resources for her."

Mariah's story is one of heroism, but not different than many of my other constituents', a mother working hard to provide for her daughter who was born and lives with a condition that requires the care that Medicaid provides.

Mariah is fighting to make sure that her daughter is able to keep receiving that care alongside the 200,000 people in Ohio's 13th Congressional District.

What makes this even more infuriating is that this bill is robbing the working poor to pay for tax cuts to buy a yacht or a second home.

Mariah's story is inspiring, and she is not alone. Thousands of constituents from Ohio's 13th Congressional District have called and written to my offices in Akron, Canton, and here in D.C., imploring me to save Medicaid.

That is exactly what I am going to do. I am going to fight for Mariah and Ohio's 13th Congressional District.

#### GOP TAX SCAM HURTS WOMEN AND FAMILIES

(Ms. MCBRIDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCBRIDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to share the story of a mother from Delaware whose daughter lives with a condition that means she cannot eat food without getting sick. Her daughter relies on Medicaid to pay for the formula that keeps her alive.

Without it, she won't just struggle. As her mother wrote plainly to me: "If she loses Medicaid, she will die."

Mr. Speaker, we must not gut Medicaid to give tax breaks to billionaires while moms are begging for their children to survive. This mom's story is not an outlier. This is a daily reality for thousands of my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues: Protect Medicaid and protect this child. This is a lifeline.

#### GOP TAX SCAM HURTS WOMEN AND FAMILIES

(Mr. VINDMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VINDMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the extreme cuts

to Medicaid and SNAP being pushed by extreme Washington Republicans.

Last month, I spoke with Shannon, a mother whose son relies on Medicaid for lifesaving care. I also spoke with Eugene, a fifth-generation farmer in Culpeper who grows produce that goes straight to food banks, schools, and churches. Both Shannon and Eugene are facing uncertain futures because of these cuts.

More than 56,000 kids in Virginia's Seventh Congressional District rely on Medicaid or SNAP. These cuts would take food away from children as young as 8 years old. I guess we will just have to give our 8-year-old kids little, tiny boots with little, tiny bootstraps so they can pull themselves up.

These aren't just budget choices. They are moral ones. They are the wrong ones. We should support families and the farmers who feed them, not punish them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject these cruel cuts and stand with families and farmers like Shannon and Eugene.

#### GOP TAX SCAM HURTS WOMEN AND FAMILIES

(Mrs. TORRES of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, the Republican cuts to Medicaid jeopardize the lives of women and families across our country, women like Kristen from my district.

Kristen suffers from Williams syndrome, which causes cardiovascular issues and developmental delays. She receives care because of Medi-Cal. Every 4 months, she must drive 2 hours to San Diego to run lab tests and functions on her vital organs.

Despite these health concerns, Kristen works, volunteers in our community, and dreams of owning a bakery, thanks to Medicaid. All of that is endangered by this reconciliation bill.

I ask my Republican colleagues: Who are they to decide who gets the care that people like Kristen need and depend on to survive? All of these cuts are for what? So that billionaires and big corporations can get even more handouts?

Let's stand with people like Kristen. Protect Medicaid and the families who rely on Medicaid and got us to Congress.

#### GOP TAX SCAM HURTS WOMEN AND FAMILIES

(Ms. TOKUDA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Speaker, when I first met Atalina, she was on the front lines of the pandemic, keeping families housed and fed. When fires ravaged Maui, she was there for the victims.

Atalina is a pillar of her community and her church. She gives everything

she has to others, but even angels need help.

Atalina is the mother of five, soon to be six. Her husband, who is battling cancer and now severe back injuries, can't work consistently. Atalina still works full time and still serves her neighbors and community.

"If I put my entire family on my employer insurance," she told me, "it would cost more than half my paycheck."

Medicaid gave her family access to lifesaving care. SNAP made sure her kids didn't go to bed hungry. These programs aren't "handouts," she says. "They are lifelines."

Now, because her income barely crossed the threshold, she has lost SNAP. "It doesn't mean we can suddenly afford groceries," she says. "It just means we sacrifice even more."

If we cut Medicaid and SNAP, we are not trimming fat. We are cutting hope.

Let's be clear about the false choice we are being asked to make. Do we feed the greed of billionaires, or do we feed and care for families like Atalina's? We know who Republicans are choosing.

□ 1820

#### GOP TAX SCAM HURTS WOMEN AND FAMILIES

(Mr. CARSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Medicaid and nutrition assistance. I would like to tell you about Arica from Indianapolis' Eastside, a single mother of five, including one child with special needs. She says that if Medicaid is cut, she and her five children will not be able to survive.

There is Carol Ann from Indianapolis' Northside. Her Meals on Wheels have already been reduced. She told me simply: We need food to live.

Bethany from Center Township says that without Medicaid, she would be dead. If Trump cuts Medicaid, she will probably die.

These are the stakes. Every corner of my district, every corner of the great Hoosier State, and every corner of our country will be impacted by these very cruel budget cuts.

Under this budget, 14 million people will lose healthcare. Millions will lose SNAP benefits. Those aren't just numbers. These are people like Arica, Carol Ann, and Bethany.

I implore my colleagues to remember our shared humanity and vote "no" on this heartless bill.

#### GOP TAX SCAM HURTS WOMEN AND FAMILIES

(Ms. MCCLELLAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Speaker, I was in the Virginia State Senate when Virginia finally expanded Medicaid.

Today, as a result, over 600,000 Virginians now have health insurance who didn't before.

By giving them insurance, we were able to keep our rural hospitals open. We were able to keep costs from going up too much for everybody else because even the uninsured get sick. They don't seek care until they have to go to the emergency room.

Hundreds of thousands of Virginians now stand to lose their healthcare if this big, bad bill cuts Medicaid as it does now. Some Members of the Republican caucus want to go even further.

Gloria has struggled for a long time with her health. She was born with a heart murmur, blood pressure issues, and constant bronchitis. She was recently diagnosed with glaucoma and cataracts that are getting worse.

For years, Gloria had to rely on emergency care at the hospital because she was uninsured. Because she has Medicaid, she can have the surgery she needs and see again. Don't take Gloria's healthcare away.

#### GOP TAX SCAM HURTS WOMEN AND FAMILIES

(Ms. MORRISON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise on behalf of Minnesota families who will lose access to healthcare if the Republican budget passes. I want to tell you about Alicia and her daughter, one of them.

Alicia's oldest daughter is 11 years old. She is a happy, active, and confident fifth grader. She has also faced a lifetime of medical challenges including an immune disorder, a blood disorder, and a spinal condition.

Alicia and her family didn't ask for this. Nothing they did caused this. They work hard. They pay their taxes. They love their daughter fiercely. They simply cannot afford the care that she needs without Medicaid.

Medicaid is what allows Alicia's daughter to go to school, to regain her motor skills, and to run a 5K with her classmates, something unthinkable before her treatment. It is the reason she is not just surviving but she is thriving.

Republicans are going to gut the program that she and half of all American children get their healthcare coverage through. This isn't about politics. It is about our values. It is about protecting the health and future of our children. We must protect Medicaid. Our kids are watching, and they are counting on us.

#### GOP TAX SCAM HURTS WOMEN AND FAMILIES

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my constituent, Debra, has this to say

about Medicaid, and I agree. She says: It is absolutely essential.

She adopted two medically fragile children from foster care. Both have Medicaid as their primary and only health insurance. They both receive services through the Division of Specialized Care for Children in Illinois.

Her daughter has a Medically Fragile, Technology Dependent waiver. Together, they require 19 daily prescription medications. Her son requires a nightly injection that is \$4,000 a month. Her daughter requires multiple pieces of expensive medical equipment.

She would never have been able to adopt or afford to keep them without knowing they would receive Medicaid. She is so proud of them. Medicaid is a vital, lifesaving program for thousands of children like hers.

Mr. Speaker, I agree, and let's make it accessible to all who need it. I thank Debra, and I thank her children.

#### GOP TAX SCAM HURTS WOMEN AND FAMILIES

(Ms. RIVAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. RIVAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Leader JEFFRIES and Chair LEDGER FERNANDEZ for hosting this important discussion on the disastrous impact Republican cuts to Medicaid would have on women and children across the country.

In the middle of the night, Republicans on the Rules Committee will consider a bill that contains the largest cuts to Medicaid in our country's history. This outright assault on healthcare will result in 13.7 million Americans losing their health coverage, including many of the 370,000 Medicaid beneficiaries in my district.

This includes people like Yvette from Van Nuys who said that she wants to retire without spending a large portion of her pension on medical coverage.

I also heard from Joe from Panorama City who, without the help of Medicaid, would not be able to afford medical treatments for his children.

Cutting Medicaid will be a disaster for families across the country. I stand with my House Democratic Caucus colleagues in protecting it from Republicans' cruel and extreme budget.

#### GOP TAX SCAM HURTS WOMEN AND FAMILIES

(Ms. BROWN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand with Leader JEFFRIES and my Democratic Women's Caucus colleagues to oppose harmful cuts to food and health assistance.

Today, I rise to share the story of Cheryl from Cleveland Heights, a constituent whose life could be upended by cuts to SNAP and Medicaid.

Cheryl is a retired small business owner who ran an advertising company with her husband for 25 years. They were forced to close that business due to their health issues.

Cheryl lives with chronic respiratory issues and arthritis. Her husband is disabled. She also takes care of her 90-year-old father who is disabled, too. None of them can work, and they depend on SNAP and Medicaid to survive. If Congress guts these programs, it will gut a lifeline for Cheryl and her family.

Mr. Speaker, we must remember who we are here to serve. These are real people with real lives, and we must stand up for them.

□ 1830

#### SNAP AND MEDICAID

(Ms. GARCIA of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Scripture calls us to help one another.

In the Gospel of Matthew it says: I was hungry, and you gave me something to eat. . . . I was a stranger, and you invited me in.

However, Republicans never come here to talk about poverty or hunger or the sick. It is always about tax cuts, the rich, and the billionaires.

Tonight I rise for one of the Houston families they are attempting to hurt.

Luisa and Roberto are seniors in my district. They have worked their whole lives, and now they are afraid. They are afraid of what happens when Republicans slash the programs they paid into and now rely on to stay healthy.

It is not just them. We hear from moms with cancer, families with disabled children, or families with loved ones in nursing homes, and on and on. They are terrified of losing Medicaid and SNAP.

What Republicans are doing is un-American, un-Christian, and unacceptable.

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker. The American people know the difference between leadership and cruelty, and they won't forget who chose cruelty.

#### MEDICAID AND SNAP

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, please let me share the story of two of my constituents who will be hurt by the cruel bonanza for billionaires budget bill.

Bonnie is 82 years of age. She is the primary caregiver for her 63-year-old nephew, Michael. He is deaf, neurodivergent, and lives with multiple chronic health conditions.

For years, Bonnie has been his primary support so he can live independently, manage complex health needs, and navigate programs like Medicaid, Medicare, SNAP, and subsidized housing.



Bonnie handles most of Michael's communications with medical providers as he is unable to due to his ability to communicate by mouth or by ASL. Michael has relied on Medicaid for hearing aids, surgeries, dental work, housing, and more. If he loses his coverage, she believes Michael will become frustrated and either go to jail, self-harm, or die.

Michael's mother passed away when he was 19. With no other family to step in, Bonnie worries about what will happen to her nephew after she is gone. This is just one of many examples of who will be harmed by unreliable and onerous work requirements.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is absolutely morally wrong that millionaires and billionaires will be given \$4 billion plus \$4 trillion.

What is being done for families like this?

Cruelty is not an answer.

### MEDICAID

(Ms. TLAIB asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, this is not about America first. This is about billionaires first and corporations first.

I will take a moment to bring part of my district into this Chamber. I will read a letter from Angeline from Redford Township.

She said: "I am terrified about what the Trump administration is doing to those of us living in poverty with these cuts to SNAP and Medicaid."

"My family and I could not survive without these programs. It is bad enough we are struggling to purchase the basic essentials and have been heavily leaning on food pantries not only for extra food but also for toilet paper and soap."

That is with having the benefits that they have now.

"I am waiting for my Social Security case to go on appeal. I currently have no income. I am unable to work due to spinal injuries. With less people working at the Social Security office, it has taken longer than it should to review my case."

"I am barely surviving as it is, and I couldn't see any of my doctors without Medicaid. My grandchildren couldn't be able to see doctors. My single daughter and myself both rely on SNAP to eat and Medicaid to see our doctors."

"It is very clear those voting for these cuts have never experienced the traumatic effects of living in poverty and the threat of taking the only help we have away. Please don't let them do this."

### TRUMP'S ONE BIG, UGLY BILL

(Mr. RUIZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to Trump's one big,

ugly bill which would cut Medicaid by \$715 billion and devastate access to healthcare for millions of Americans, like Victoria. She is a young graduate student in the Imperial Valley, a rural and impoverished region.

She says: "Medi-Cal is the only way I can access essential healthcare. It protects me from financial hardship and ensures I can get the care I need to live and thrive."

Victoria isn't alone. She speaks for millions who rely on Medicaid for basic services like birth control and cancer screenings. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office warns that this bill would cause at least 13.7 million people to lose coverage.

Mr. Speaker, 42 percent of my constituents depend on Medicaid, and 60 percent of children in the district depend on Medicaid. Republicans are choosing to strip healthcare from those who need it most to provide tax cuts to billionaires.

Mr. Speaker, I choose to protect healthcare for working-class families, and I urge my colleagues to stand with Victoria and protect Medicaid.

### SNAP AND MEDICAID CUTS

(Ms. CROCKETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CROCKETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for a 28-year-old single mother of five in my district. She is doing everything right. She is working hard, raising her babies, and trying to keep them fed and healthy.

She was receiving \$1,000 a month in SNAP benefits. Then one day it was suddenly cut to \$500. She picked up more hours because that is what moms do.

In this bill they talk about people being lazy. I just want to say that the only thing that is lazy about this bill is their lies. That is because when we think about their lies and their lying, it relates to those who are going to be subjected to the work requirements.

There are lies about cutting almost 14 million people off their healthcare. Frankly, they lie about this being fiscally responsible. You don't have to believe me, Mr. Speaker. Just Google members of the Freedom Caucus and their objections. They hate the fact that after all of this, we are going to have death, malnutrition, and the shuttering of hospitals both in rural and urban America. Yet still, they are going to drive us into further debt.

When we talk about cutting SNAP, she was only going to get \$15 a day or \$2.50 per person.

Mr. Speaker, we need to make sure that we don't choose cruelty over competency, callousness over compassion, and cons over constituents.

Mr. Speaker, tell Republicans where they can cram this crap.

### SANDRA'S STORY: WHY MEDICAID MATTERS

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, tonight is about the millions of lives Republicans are destroying.

I rise for a single mother in my district caring full-time for her 16-year-old daughter, Naomi, who has chronic health conditions.

I want Americans to know the face of this family. Sandra Black is one of the millions whose family could lose their healthcare.

Sandra left her job as a veterinarian to care for her daughter. She would tell you tonight, Mr. Speaker: "Without Medicaid, literally, our lives would be at stake."

Republicans want to slash Medicaid and bankroll billionaires. Let me say that again. Republicans want to slash Medicaid and bankroll billionaires.

Mr. Speaker, today is about billions over hardworking Americans like Sandra Black's family.

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, you will hear story after story. Tonight you will hear Democrats standing up for the American people and staying here tonight for however long it takes. That is because we want America to know that we are standing up for Medicaid.

I will not be silent. I will fight for lives like Sandra's and Naomi's.

□ 1840

### GOP TAX SCAM HURTS WOMEN AND FAMILIES

(Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of my constituent Monica.

Monica has lupus, kidney disease, and congestive heart failure. Constant hospital stays make it tough for her to make ends meet.

Monica told me that her last hospital stay brought dialysis, blood transfusions, and one complication after another. It also brought a loss of her job.

Monica was hospitalized, fighting for her life, when she learned that her \$31 a week in SNAP benefits were being cut. Still, with the rising cost of food, she told me that just those \$31 in benefits made it possible for her to eat the foods that were healthy to keep her thriving and manage her health.

Monica wrote: "Any cuts to these programs would be devastating for people like me. This isn't just about politics. This is about survival."

I agree with Monica. This is about survival. This is about the millions of people who will lose access to food under the GOP tax scam.

Mr. Speaker, we demand better. It is time for House Republicans to stand up and join us in protecting the basic needs of the people instead of

prioritizing massive tax breaks for billionaires.

I stand with Monica.

#### GOP TAX SCAM HURTS WOMEN AND FAMILIES

(Mrs. McIVER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. McIVER. Mr. Speaker, "I probably wouldn't be alive because I wouldn't have been able to afford [my] medicine." That is what Dominique from East Orange, New Jersey, said about Medicaid.

Dominique is one of the 100,000 Americans who lives with the sickle cell disease, and she is one of the millions of Americans who would be devastated by Republicans gutting Medicaid.

We need to understand that the suffering they are going to create has a face, and it is Dominique's.

When she was just 6 years old, Dominique was diagnosed with sickle cell disease. That is also when her aunt enrolled her in Medicaid.

Medicaid didn't mean that life was easy—Dominique spent much of her time in hospitals and visiting doctors—but it made life possible.

With Medicaid, she is able to see a hematologist regularly, receive the appropriate equipment and medications to make living at home possible, seek mental health care due to the toll of living with this disease, and receive treatment for any potential emergencies.

Dominique gets to live knowing the care she deserves is within her reach, in her own words, thanks to Medicaid.

#### GOP TAX SCAM HURTS WOMEN AND FAMILIES

(Ms. PRESSLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, this Republican administration claims to care about babies and families, but I cannot hear the words they speak because I see the things that they do.

The birth of every baby should be a joyful transition defined by compassion and whatever healthcare is required for the baby and the mother.

America's broken for-profit healthcare system denies far too many this basic dignity, but Medicaid has been a lifeline.

Today, 42 percent of births in America are funded by Medicaid. Republicans who claim to be pro-family are coming for Medicaid with a sledgehammer.

What would this mean for families across America? It would mean even worse maternal health outcomes, States rescinding policies that improve access to reproductive care, and decimating access to prenatal care, contraception, and cancer screenings.

This big, shameful, unconscionable bill is unacceptable, but it is not inevitable.

I need just four Republicans, four people of conscience, to listen to their constituents, to look into the eyes of pregnant mothers praying for a safe delivery, and to show a shred of humanity and oppose this horrific bill.

If my colleagues aren't here to fight for the people who sent them, they should give up their damn seats.

#### GOP TAX SCAM HURTS WOMEN AND FAMILIES

(Mrs. TRAHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, proponents of Donald Trump's so-called big, beautiful bill are lying to the American people. They claim it won't cut Medicaid, but it slashes \$715 billion, gutting care for seniors and children with disabilities.

They insist moms and kids won't lose food assistance, but this bill will cut SNAP benefits for over 7 million Americans, stripping food from families' tables.

They say new red tape will improve efficiency. Come on, we know better. New GOP paperwork hurdles will cause millions of eligible Americans to lose Medicaid and SNAP, not because they don't qualify, but because they missed a form or got stuck in the system.

We have seen it before in Arkansas, Georgia, and New Hampshire. Republicans tried this approach, and people suffered.

Why are they doing it? They are doing it to fund tax breaks for billionaire donors—who won't have to fill out a single form, by the way.

Are these your priorities, tax cuts for the rich paid for by taking healthcare and food assistance away from everyone else? Prove us wrong. Reject this bill, and stand up for working families.

#### GOP TAX SCAM HURTS WOMEN AND FAMILIES

(Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, addiction is a public health crisis from which no community is immune. We saw the worst of it in 2021, when, in a 12-month span, more than 110,000 people died of overdose. That is 300 or more people a day, 365 days a year.

Here is a small light. In 2024, overdose deaths fell by 27 percent. We are finally seeing progress. That is a huge dent in this horrible tragedy.

What is the response of the Trump administration? Shuttering SAMHSA and shifting and shafting it into an illogical AHA—somebody tell me what that department is—organization and proposing a budget that kicks nearly 14 million people off Medicaid.

Nearly half of those struggling with opioid use disorder rely on Medicaid. In

Pennsylvania alone, that is 100,000 people who may now lose their only chance at life, at recovery, at treatment.

I know the desperate hope. I know the prayers for a loved one to find recovery. My son Harry is 12½ years in recovery from opioid addiction.

My family knows the struggle of way too many families, and we are among the lucky ones, though I don't like to call it lucky. Every family should be as lucky as I.

At this time, we must save more lives.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the President not cut Medicaid and SAMHSA.

#### GOP TAX SCAM HURTS WOMEN AND FAMILIES

(Mr. VARGAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, this week, Republicans are attempting to pass a budget that will gut Medicaid, all to pay for tax cuts for the rich.

These Medicaid cuts aren't just numbers on a page. They will hurt real people.

My constituent Rosemary wrote to me and shared her family's story. Rosemary has a child with disabilities. She says that if Congress were to cut Medicaid, their lives would be upended.

She wrote: "My child would no longer be able to receive therapies, and I would lose my ability to care for her and keep her safe. We have been stressed completely about our daughter's future without Medicaid. Please help our children by voting no on the cuts to Medicaid and other proposals that would take away these lifesaving services from people who need them, like my child."

I ask if my Republican colleagues, my friends, are listening and hear Rosemary and the millions of moms and dads across the country.

Giving a handout to the rich at the expense of families' access to care is shameful. It is just shameful.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Republican colleagues to stand up and fight for their constituents, not for their billionaire buddies.

#### TRUTH TELLING WITH MATH AND FACTS

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. SCHWEIKERT of Arizona was recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.)

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ELLZEY). Then, we are going to actually do some actual math and facts.

□ 1850

HONORING COMMANDER BRUCE "PUPPY" FECHT

Mr. ELLZEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my honorable friend from Arizona whose crusade against the debt is a

true public service. He has spent countless hours in here educating the American people on the dangers of the debt for our country, and we should all be grateful. I thank him for this time.

I also thank the folks here in the well who are working diligently to always take down the words that we say, take down our votes, and work day in and day out, allowing us to speak to the American people.

As we are about to enter Memorial Day, I wanted to bring attention to someone that led me in my career in the Navy, that I fought with and remember fondly. His memorial service is going to be this Friday, so I would like to read his obituary and tell a quick story about a man that we all know and loved and adored.

Bruce Fecht, born November 16, 1955, passed away March 16, 2025.

Captain Bruce William Fecht, U.S. Navy, retired, a true American hero, passed away on March 16, 2025, at the age of 69. He was born in Missoula, Montana, to Robert William Fecht and Marjorie June Fehr.

When he was a young boy, the family along with older sister Bobbi, moved to Spokane, Washington, where the family grew to include his two younger sisters, Rebecca and Brenda.

He went to Mead High School, where he was a standout basketball player. He continued his education and basketball prowess at Spokane Community College, eventually completing his electrical engineering degree at the University of Washington.

His first job at AT&T offered the comfort of a 9-to-5 routine, but it was the thrill of the flight that ultimately called him.

Bruce pursued his dream of becoming a naval aviator, applying to and being accepted into AOCs in Pensacola, Florida. He was commissioned in 1982, and 1 year later in 1983, he received his wings of gold in Beeville, Texas, marking the beginning of a distinguished career in the skies.

For the next decade, Bruce, call sign Puppy, served with distinction in various squadrons, including VF-124 Gunslingers, VF-111 Sundowners, VF-126 Bandits, VF-1 Wolfpack, flying the iconic F-14A and F-14D Tomcats along with the T-2C, A-4E, and F-16N.

He completed multiple deployments aboard aircraft carriers like the *Carl Vinson*, *Ranger*, and *Enterprise*.

He also graduated from Navy Fighter Weapons School Adversary Course and earned a master of science degree in systems management from the University of Southern California.

Most famously he was selected as an extra for the movie "Top Gun," which was filmed on site in Miramar, and can be seen in the Top Gun photo used in the movie.

His career was defined not only by his technical skills and unmatched piloting abilities but also by his leadership. After 14 years in the cockpit, he transitioned to staff roles, including serving as the Pol-Mil officer at U.S.

European Command in Stuttgart, Germany. There, he played a key role in operations in the Middle East, focusing on Israel, Lebanon, and Syria.

He returned to the cockpit in 1999, joining the VF-14 Tophatters as executive officer, where I knew him, and, later, commanding officer.

During his leadership, the squadron earned numerous awards, including the Clifton Trophy as the Navy's top fighter squadron, the Battle Efficiency award, and the Safety "S" Award. Under his command, the Tophatters were among the first to conduct air strikes on terrorist sites in Afghanistan following the tragic events of September 11, 2001.

His leadership during the onset of the global war on terror left an indelible mark on both his squadron and the larger Navy community. After leading the squadron through its transition to the Super Hornet, he was selected for an executive fellowship with the Hoover Institution at Stanford, where he shared his vast knowledge and insight with the next generation of leaders. He completed his career as commanding officer of VX-9, the Navy's premier test and evaluation squadron.

His career was a testament to his love of flying, his unwavering dedication to service, and his profound impact on all who worked with him.

His sense of adventure, intellectual curiosity, and deep care for his fellow servicemembers will forever be remembered by those whose lives he touched.

Bruce was a man of faith, and, interestingly, in the last 2 years of his life, he earned a master's degree in Catholic theology from Franciscan University of Steubenville. He planned to retire from General Atomics and serve as a chaplain. He attended St. Ann Catholic Church in Ridgecrest, California, and enjoyed serving meals and singing in the choir.

Bruce will be remembered for his great sense of humor and his generous heart. He was a faithful son, wonderful brother, and a fun uncle to his nephews and nieces.

His personal relationship with Jesus Christ took him through his last difficult journey with the strength and confidence that he could trust his Lord with the outcome of his life. We will miss him dearly but look forward to the day we will be reunited in Heaven.

Bruce will be remembered for his great sense of humor and his generous heart. He was a faithful son, wonderful brother, and a fun uncle to his nephews and nieces. His personal relationship with Jesus Christ took him through his last difficult journey with strength and confidence that he could trust his Lord with the outcome of his life.

Bruce is survived by his sisters, Bobbi, Rebecca and Brenda; numerous nieces and nephews; cousins; aunts; friends; and a lot of shipmates.

So now I am going to tell you about that little story I was telling you about, Puppy Fecht. Under his steady hand, Fighter Squadron 14 embarked

on what was meant to be a routine deployment aboard the USS *Enterprise* in April of 2001. As we all know, history had different plans. This deployment, while routine at the beginning, was set to be special before anybody stepped foot on the ship.

As it was, Fighter Squadron 14's final deployment with the F-25 Tomcat marked the end of an era. Once this mission was complete, the F-14 would be retired, and in its place the squadron would transition to the F-18 Super Hornet.

With both excitement and a bit of sadness at the loss of an aircraft that the squadron had known for so long, they were off. But just like every deployment under Puppy's leadership, his command was ready for any mission at any moment or any call to action.

On September 8, 2001, the USS *Enterprise* departed the Arabian Gulf, bound for home with a scheduled port call in South Africa for the first time in about 40 years. Just days later, while still south of the Arabian Peninsula, those aboard the USS *Enterprise* watched in horror as the tragedy of 9/11 unfolded.

In that moment, Commander Fecht's calm, visionary leadership shone through. He made sure his squadron was prepared not just for what came next but for whatever would follow. That readiness was tested when the call came.

On the eve of the first strikes of Operation Enduring Freedom in early October, Puppy assembled his team: Monty "Ash" Ashliman, Marcell "Opus" Padilla, and Art "Kato" Delacruz, their target a surface-to-air missile site northeast of Kabul, nearly 1,200 miles from the USS *Enterprise*. 1,200 miles; that is at least three refuelings.

It was a mission demanding precision, resilience, and courage. It was a nighttime operation deep into enemy territory, requiring multiple in-flight refuelings and flawless coordination with allied formations. At the time, we didn't have any other air bases that we could go to in Afghanistan.

Commander Fecht led his team with the same unshakeable calm that had become his signature, guiding them through enemy fire and back home for a sunrise recovery on the USS *Enterprise*. That is leadership. That is courage.

Puppy's strength wasn't just in his command of the skies. It was in the command of the hearts of those who served under him. Those who served alongside him speak of his infectious laughter, his unshakeable calm, and his belief that even in the most trying of times, there was room for joy and comradery. His unique ability to diffuse tension with humor and build trust through unyielding confidence made Fighter Squadron 14 not just a team, but a family.

He understood that a leader's spirit resonates throughout the entire crew, and because of that, his squadron was not only ready, they were resilient.

They were prepared for the worst and delivered the best. Commander Fecht led his squadron with dignity, courage, and an unyielding commitment to our Nation. He brought his entire team home, every single one of them.

That is the mark of a leader who not only commands respect but inspires it. He embodied the warrior spirit, the never-quit attitude, and the deep sense of duty that defines the very best of our Armed Forces in this country.

Today, I am proud to tell you just one of many stories of Bruce “Puppy” Fecht, and we honor him not just for what he did but for how he did it, with courage, with conviction, and with a spirit that lifted up everyone around him.

His legacy lives on in the hearts of those who served alongside him and the freedom that he so selflessly defended. Great American patriots like Commander Bruce “Puppy” Fecht will always ensure our Nation is secure, and they will also ensure the next generation of great leaders are trained and ready to carry that responsibility forward to wherever the next calling may be.

So fair winds and following seas, shipmate.

I would like to add, as we debate these bills on the floor here, that this weekend is Memorial Day where we remember those who have given their lives, that we may speak freely down here, that we may debate with our colleagues, hopefully in civil tone and purpose but understanding that this is the last great hope on Earth. With friends like my friend from Arizona, we will make it an even better place to live.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas. He always has some amazing stories.

Mr. Speaker, tonight is going to be a little tricky because I am going to try and weave three major subjects together. Some of it is going to be really technical. Some of it will be slightly sarcastic, but the math here is really important.

I am going to do it backwards from how I originally thought because I want to hit a couple of things that are remarkably important.

I have come behind this microphone, heaven knows how many times and shown the charts. We are borrowing \$72,000 a second. We could borrow as much as \$2.3 trillion this year. I am going to show some other things in here such as Moody's, and why they downgraded us, and show some of the things that are going on.

On occasion I get this: What are your solutions? Then we always try to come in and say: Here is the technology chute where you can disrupt the cost of healthcare. Here is the technology where you could change the price of delivering government services.

We started almost a year ago in my capacity on the Ways and Means Committee, chairing the Oversight Subcommittee.

I now chair the Joint Economic Committee, and I thank Mr. Speaker because he helped me actually have the capacity of hiring a Ph.D. in healthcare economics.

□ 1900

We have dropped last week—that is a term where we put in something called a “hopper.” That is actually where you file your piece of legislation—two pieces of legislation where the preliminary scores are almost \$2 trillion in savings over 10 years.

As we are having this discussion of debt and deficits, can you extend the tax policy? Can you do other things? It is not going to come from traditional austerity. The fact of the matter is that math doesn't work. You are going to do it through policy. You are going to fix policy, and people just stare at you like you are an idiot when you try to explain these things.

Let's walk through our big one. This is an occasion where I promise you that there is so much money involved. There is a reason other Members of Congress have been unwilling to do what we knew was a problem.

A few weeks ago, I came here with the MedPAC reports. I don't know if anyone ever bothers to read them, but you go through there, and it should light your hair on fire. For the last year, The Wall Street Journal has done a series of articles basically showing hundreds of billions of dollars of waste, fraud, misallocation, just misalignment incentives in something we call Medicare Advantage.

Walk with me through. In the early 2000s, there was this concept of managed care that if we could help our brothers and sisters with their earned benefit in Medicare, saying that we have fee-for-service, but you have to pay all of these copays. What would happen if you could align the incentives saying that we want insurers to manage a portfolio of access to healthcare, but within that, those insurers will actually make their money by helping you be healthier?

The model, which started in 2005—many of you know it as Medicare Advantage. You see the ads, and that is actually part of the problem—was supposed to come in at 95 percent of fee-for-service because this was a system where you were going to get better quality care, get taken care of, and the insurers would make their profit by helping their population become healthier.

Mr. Speaker, it turns out that if you actually read those MedPAC reports—these are the auditors who do the modeling, and we are talking something that is almost a trillion dollars in spending last year, so we are talking about something that is stunning amounts of money—last year, Medicare Advantage came in at 120 percent of fee-for-service.

Mr. Speaker, just that delta, 120 percent to the 95 percent that it was envisioned to be, that right there is \$100

billion a year. The fact of the matter is if you have been following the series of articles—I think ProPublica—The Wall Street Journal has spent tremendous resources doing it—it will curl your hair.

Then you have been seeing the most recent stories about the potential criminal acts. I think last Thursday, a story broke of actual criminal—not civil; criminal—coming.

Is it time for us as Members of Congress to talk about something which is often dangerous because when you are taking on a system that has trillions of dollars flowing through it, you have to understand that there will be ads in my district that are going to beat the ever-living crap out of me. It is the job. You have to tell the truth, know the math, and come with actual solutions.

Mr. Speaker, we went back and said: How do you design a system where you make sure the benefits, the promises, are there for seniors because it is an earned benefit? How do you make sure that you are doing nothing—nothing—to cut that access to healthcare, to cut that access to quality healthcare, but you align the incentives to go back to the original vision where it is about helping those seniors who are on Medicare Advantage become healthier, and the morality of that.

We had to do a number of things in design, so we introduced legislation. This was the preliminary score from the Joint Economic Committee economists: \$1.76 trillion of savings over the 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is it is only about 10 percent of the cost of the program over those 10 years, so you start to understand the scale of the cost of this. We believe—understand, this is only conversation between economists, and I was not on the call—that the preliminary score right now is \$1.84 trillion coming from the people that will score the legislation.

That would make it probably, from everything we can guess, the single biggest reduction in spending in a single bill in probably U.S. history. Does that give you a sense? When you have people talking about waste and fraud and misalignment and bad acts, this is the ginormous granddaddy of it all.

It is not that big of a bill. It is a little complex. It is really scary because, as you know around here, we are not ever supposed to talk about these things, particularly Medicare, but this is not Medicare as you think about it. This is the insurers who are paid to actually manage your care and help you be healthier. Yet, you have this series of stories saying how they have been taking advantage of the system.

There is a way to make this work. Even the MedPAC report says that we support Medicare Advantage and want it to stay, but we are going to have to fix these misalignments. The economists have been modeling the savings.

Mr. Speaker, what happens if you have a moment here where these sorts of dollars in savings—and this is going

to tie in, Mr. Speaker, to talking about what Moody's did last week, talking about how this and our talent-based immigration bill, those two bills together, probably score at \$2 trillion of savings, and they would be good for the economy. They would be good for healthcare. They would be good for people to be healthier. They would help grow the economy.

This is an example of getting policy right to actually take on a small sliver of the debt because, remember, our baseline debt for the next 10 years, we are going to borrow another \$22 trillion. Even though this number is massive, it is still just a fraction of what is coming at us.

Mr. Speaker, I am trying to make the point again. Our legislation, which we call Better Medicare, has been introduced. It is in the process of being scored. Yet, when you start to see these sorts of dollars—and, yes, it would change the current spending projection by about 10 percent to 10.7 percent according to the Joint Economic Committee economists. Yet, you already had the MedPAC saying it is already 25 percent more expensive than was the original model.

It gives you a sense of we are making reforms, but we are just trying to align the incentives. We have done some things to actually help the insurers be able to have sort of automatic enrollment, but you can choose to opt out for a longer period of time so that the investment for that senior who chooses that Medicare Advantage plan to be given the services to be healthier. Yet, also with that healthier, the provider benefits by having a healthier population.

We have been trying to just think like economists instead of so often what you hear behind these microphones because something I have teased about—I actually talked about this a couple of weeks ago—in *Nature Human Behaviour*, there was an academic article. This is one of those geeky ones that is peer reviewed, all of those things: “Computational analysis of U.S. congressional speeches reveals a shift from evidence to intuition.”

They basically took 240 years of House floor speeches, ran AI across them, and said: Guess what has happened? These speeches around here no longer talk about facts, about data, or about math. We now tell our feelings.

The problem is, if you have complex problems, your feelings aren't going to help us fix complex problems. It turns out that math does.

This is what we have been trying to do on this reform of Medicare Advantage. We want the system to work, but we can't allow \$1.76 trillion over 10 years of fraud and bad acts.

If you don't believe me, get in front of your computer right now and look up some of the articles of the potential indictments, the criminal activities that are coming. Also, look up *The Wall Street Journal* series that actually talks about people being scored as

sicker, and they don't have the diseases. They don't receive services. They are not on those medications. Yet, you and I as taxpayers are paying for it, and we are borrowing the money to do it.

□ 1910

Please, if you are a staffer watching this, if you are an American that actually cares about us getting our act together and doing things better, if you are a Member of Congress, I know doing big things around here is terrifying. We don't have a choice anymore.

If anyone actually read the Moody's report that was put out last Thursday, they make a couple points that should scare the crap out of us.

In 9 budget years, they believe about 9 percent of the entire economy in that year will be borrowed by the Federal Government. That \$3.8 trillion will be the borrowing amount in 2035, and that is just a baseline.

The reason we often don't tell the truth, the reason we avoid it is because almost all this growth of this borrowing is interest and Medicare. It turns out it is really not Republican or Democrat; it is demographics. We are so busy trying to get elected next time, we need something to blame them, and they want to blame us.

If you stand up here and try to actually fix problems, you will get the crap kicked out of you, but at least you are trying to do the right thing. This is what you are hired to do on this job. It is not pander to your voters, but tell them the truth and try to fix things.

I can't tell you how many speeches I hear behind these microphones where people will tell you the problem over and over. They will never spend a year writing a bill, putting about 100 hours in to it with academics, with Ph.D.'s, and healthcare. Experts from the industry put together a bill that says: This will work. This will make things better.

Mr. Speaker, here is a philosophical thought I want everyone to think about. The United States just got downgraded by the third major credit rating agency. Did you know there are 18 States that have a higher credit rating than the United States Government right now? Eighteen States have a higher credit rating, yet every dime a Member of Congress will vote on, every dime of discretionary, nondefense discretionary, as we call it, is borrowed money. Every dime of defense is borrowed money.

About \$400 billion, I believe, last year of what we call mandatory spending, the formulaic earned benefits, things of that nature, is borrowed money. Last year, for every dollar we took in in tax receipts, we spent \$1.39, and much of that money we are sending to States.

My State of Arizona, we do some things actually really well. Our Medicaid system called AHCCCS is actually remarkably well run, except for some of the fraud. I am going to touch on that. We haven't built the models to

catch it faster because we are not actually incentivized.

Now, we also play incredible games where we use a provider tax. We actually make money for the general fund more than is actually spent on healthcare. One of the great scams we are trying to fix right now is what happens when the washing machine is actually where you are padding State budgets instead of taking care of healthcare, but that will get protests.

Eighteen States have higher credit ratings than we do. It is just an interesting thought experiment. How about if I told you that, I think it is as of yesterday, either 12 or 13 countries can sell a 10-year bond cheaper than the United States. Greece today can sell a 10-year bond cheaper than the United States.

If any of you are paying attention, remember there is this concept of interest fragility. One of our greatest threats to this country is our ability to finance this debt. Today, both the 20-year and 30-year bond went over a touch 5 percent. We showed actually a couple months ago that a single point of interest on U.S. debt over 10 years came in at like \$3.3 trillion of additional interest.

Just a small movement of interest rate is bigger than everything we are debating here, but we are not going to tell you that. A, because it would require math; B, it would require facts; and C, it might actually mean someone has to do something.

There is an economist at Bloomberg, Anna Wong, who is truly freaky smart. I have had the opportunity and the honor. She came and spent part of a day with my Joint Economic Committee economists. She has been at the Federal Reserve. She has been at the White House. She is one of those people that is just intimidating on how she is able to calculate the world. She actually was looking at our reconciliation budget. She says that if we will do just a couple policy things, it is neutral in cost. It balances out. That is the point I am standing here for.

We cannot allow the taxes to go up on working people in this country. Well, right there that is \$3.1 trillion. How are we going to offset it?

It turns out if you take a look at—and this is just from Anna Wong's analysis. If you are a really geeky, you can get this on your Bloomberg terminal, all six people in Washington that have a Bloomberg terminal. They are really expensive, but I actually need it for what we do.

If the tariffs what they are producing, some of the DOGE offsets, it turns out if we will incorporate some of this policy, we can make this budget neutral. That is actually often part of my request for the leadership, for the committee chairs, for those of us in Ways and Means, we need to start actually pulling out our calculators and thinking this through. How do we do these things so we can stabilize the economy, maximize economic growth,

but not be adding to the debt? There is math that does it. Will anyone actually read the documents?

We actually start to walk through this. We are actually trying to build models right now on trying to see what is coming in in custom duties. That is the tariffs. What is that offsetting? You will see me over the coming weeks with a couple of charts and start saying: Okay, here is what we have to plug into our models. For everyone who has been whining around here, here is your math problem. I wish they would start the whining with telling the truth on math and facts before telling anecdotes and stories. Remember, I just pointed out to you the 140 years analysts of the speeches here in Congress, how they have become now about feelings instead of facts because we can manipulate you with telling anecdotal stories.

This simple chart here—see the nice coins? We stole this from someone else. Baseline is we are going to spend \$86 trillion over the next 10 years. All we are talking about trying to save is \$2 trillion out of that \$86 trillion. Are you telling me we can't get \$2 trillion out of \$86 trillion over 10 years?

This is what is causing the emotional meltdown here because this place only cares about one thing, and that is the money. Spend it, spend it, spend it, and basically screw over people's retirement and my kids. I have a 2½-year-old and 9-year-old. When my 2½-year-old—yes, I know. My wife and I adopted some kids. It is the greatest thing we ever did. When my 2½-year-old is basically 23, 24, every single tax in America has to be doubled to maintain baseline spending.

I have done presentation after presentation where I have come here with the actual charts using Democrat economists showing that every tax hike the Democrats have proposed on the wealthy—capital gains, income—the entire plethora produces about 1.5 percent of GDP. All the austerity, the cuts on our side, accounts for 1 percent of GDP. That is a big 2.5 percent.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to borrow about 7.3 percent of the economy this year. I showed you a chart a little while ago that Moody's has us in 9 budget years borrowing 9 percent of the economy.

Does anyone see a math problem? The rhetoric here, the moving of the mouth, doesn't match what is on the calculator. We make crap up. This is the baseline fact. Baseline, we are set to spend \$86 trillion over the next 10 years, and all we are trying to do is reduce \$2 trillion.

□ 1920

I think we should reduce dramatically more, but I think you can do it through policy, the adoption of technology, and the alignment of incentives, and we can make the delivery of government services work.

When only 31 percent of the phone calls at the IRS get answered, are we doing our job? You do realize there is

technology that would fix that, but that would anger the union of the government employees there. There are these barriers where you have armies of lobbyists walking up and down these hallways, and the inefficiency, that waste and fraud, is their profit model.

Mr. Speaker, 80 percent of the spending growth—we are not supposed to tell people this, but it is the math. You can't do policy unless you are willing to tell the truth about the math. Eighty percent of the spending growth over the next decade is Social Security, Medicare, and interest. The interest is now scaring the crap out of us because there is this concept called term premium.

As the Ray Dalios and these people who are the billionaire experts are saying: China is in the market. Germany is in the market. The United States is binging on debt. There is almost not enough savings in the world to finance the scale of borrowing, and much of that borrowing is driven because of demographics. The entire industrialized world got old. We have a shortage of young people. I think the math is, in 9 budget years, 23 percent of America is 65 and up.

Are we doing the things to maximize automation and growth so we can have productivity and continue to afford and provide the very services we promised? No, that would require math, thinking, and policy. It is not good storytelling, is it, Mr. Speaker?

Look, it is also one of the reasons I was so enraged about the intellectual laziness, I thought, of the Senate. Look, this is where I am being a bit sarcastic, if not mean. The House is not perfect. There are a number of things I am unhappy with. Leadership still doesn't have my vote on it until I get some agreements that we are able to move policy to start changing some of these numbers, but I have shown up with the policy. I am not just moving my mouth. We put it on paper, and we introduced them as bills. Now, look at the charts of the Senate's unwillingness to actually put policy into their budget reconciliation.

The reason we have to demonstrate a level of fiscal discipline—if you care about poor people, if you care about economic growth, if you care about my kids, if you care about your retirement, and if you care about what this government provides to society—we have to figure out how to pay for it.

CBO says that when we finish this fiscal year, U.S. debt will be at \$37.2 trillion. We have to take to market this year in just refinancing—and I am not counting the short roll on the short end of the curve if you want to geek out. I think we are going to bring \$9 trillion to market. We are probably going to bring another \$2 trillion, \$2.3 trillion of new issuances, and will start to see where the United States is interest rate-wise.

We start seeing Greece and other countries having substantially lower interest rates than us. That should set

off an alarm. Do you want the money to go to the world's bond markets? You do realize that convincing the world debt markets that we are creditworthy, that we are being disciplined, that we are doing things—just that differential is more money than everything that is being debated here.

When just 1 point of interest, 1 point differential here, is over \$3 trillion, that would solve a lot of this debate, wouldn't it? We can actually get those types of bond rates if we demonstrate to the world that we are creditworthy, disciplined, sensible, seeing long term, and actually understanding the honesty of our demographics.

Instead, a bunch of the brain trusts here in Washington spend their time attacking Moody's for downgrading us and telling the truth. The problem is, if you actually read their document, it is the truth.

For everyone out there who thinks balancing the budget and doing those things is simple, if you actually listen to folks from the last administration, this administration, the fantasy goal is to get to 3 percent of debt to GDP, not 7, not, heaven forbid, in 9 budget years being at 9 percent. If you have 3 percent, you are more sustainable.

You have to stop the fantasy of saying that we are going to cut it all with nondefense discretionary. Nondefense discretionary is 12 percent of our spending. Almost everything you think of as government—the Park Service, the FBI, the White House, our salaries here—that is in this 12 percent.

Interest on the debt is every bit as big as all the nondefense discretionary. Actually, real interest on the debt, if you add up everything, is about \$1.2 trillion this year. Remember, when we borrow money from the trust funds, we have to pay interest and pay it back.

For those who are willing to run around here and are interested in having discussions on Medicaid—remember, Medicaid is the program that was designed for indigent populations, for women, children, infants. Yet, you hear almost protests from the left. Here is a \$2.5 billion fraud in Medicaid in Arizona, where they exploited Tribal members, abused them, recruited them from our Tribal communities, put them in sober living homes, and bled the system for money. It took years because in a system that has the incentive where you are doing provider taxes and more of that money, raising the cost, it ends up in the general fund of your State. We should be ashamed that these types of scams were allowed to bleed money that should have been going to people who needed the help.

Look, if we don't get an alignment of policy, the cost, and how these things can actually work, Mr. Speaker, I think we are going to continue to live in this world where our debates mean nothing here. They are just based on feelings, exploitation of our voters, telling them things that are actually mathematically not true. It is great politics, and right now, this place



seems to care so much more about winning the next election than the survival of this Republic and its economy, people, and prosperity.

Is prosperity moral? There is a path where we can meet our obligations, help our brothers and sisters who need the help, and not scare the hell out of the very people who we turn to every single day because this government borrows \$9 billion a day, \$72,000 a second. Next year, it is going to be close to \$82,000 a second. In 9 years, it is approaching \$100,000 a second.

Often, the discussion behind these microphones are things that set off your anger and the mathematical fantasies. If I get one more person who says: I saw on cable news this, so why don't you fix it? I say that I would be happy to fix it, but realize that the Corporation for Public Broadcasting—I think that calculated to paying for 2 hours, 15 minutes of borrowing in an entire year.

□ 1930

Mr. Speaker, it is the lack of understanding of the scale of this math. There is hope. There is a way you can make this work but not until the calculators are pulled out. The morality and the prosperity are the goals, and it is the moral thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, I apologize to anyone if I hurt their feelings. Send me a note. I will write you an apology note. I seem to write a lot of apology notes. I continue to be mad at both parties and almost everyone around here because we are not willing to do the math. There is a way we can make this work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### GOP TAX SCAM HURTS EVERYONE

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Ms. SCHRIER of Washington was recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.)

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HURD of Colorado). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Speaker, I am here as one of the co-chairs of the Congressional Doctors Caucus in the House of Representatives. I am here to talk straight with you and with the American people and my constituents about this tax plan that is being worked on by my Republican colleagues.

It will explode the deficit. It will also hurt every single person in this country by making the biggest cuts to Medicaid and to food benefits ever.

I want to make clear, as I talk about this, how reckless it is and that even

people who do not rely on Medicaid themselves will be impacted by this. I am outraged. We are talking about a cut of \$715 billion to Medicaid. That is the largest cut ever. It will kick 13.7 million Americans off of their health insurance.

Let's just be really clear about why they are doing this. This isn't to balance the budget. It is not to deal with the deficit. In fact, this bill is exploding the deficit. This is to pay for a gigantic tax break for the wealthiest people in this country a la Elon Musk.

It is morally bankrupt to think about that, that transfer, about taking healthcare away from the people in my district and across this country and transferring it to the wealthiest Americans. It is also fiscally reckless.

Doing this will essentially collapse our healthcare system in the United States of America. That is why just last week, we spent 26½ hours in the Energy and Commerce Committee discussing this very thing, telling the stories of our constituents, painting a picture of what it would mean to cut 13.7 million Americans off of their insurance.

It is interesting that this whole discussion didn't start until 2 o'clock in the morning because my Republican colleagues didn't want to have this discussion during the day when people would actually hear it. They waited until the dead of night to bring up this topic of taking healthcare away from our constituents.

Mr. Speaker, in the State of Washington, one in three people rely on Medicaid. I am going to tell you that most people who do don't even know it because in Washington State it is called Apple Health. If people are asked if they are on Medicaid, they will say no. If they are asked if they are on Apple Health, they will say yes.

This represents the most vulnerable people. These are kids, pregnant women, people with disabilities, and the elderly in nursing homes. These are the people who need our help the most.

I think about my patients. I am a pediatrician. I think about the ones who have Apple Health. If they didn't have it, if they didn't have access to come see me, their primary care pediatrician, and get diagnosed early with a mild pneumonia or an ear infection or whatever the case may be, they would be forced to go to the emergency department for that care.

It is not like they are not going to get sick. They are going to get sicker, and they are going to go later when things are more expensive and more complicated.

Mr. Speaker, do you know what else? Even if you are not on Medicaid, as I think about my patients with private insurance, they are going to be waiting in that emergency department line, too. They will have broken an arm or have some other emergency. They are going to be waiting in a longer line. We all know that the lines are already long to be seen in the emergency department.

The care there is the most expensive a person can get. The lines are the longest lines. Somebody is going to pay for that care. Otherwise, hospitals go underwater, and they go out of business.

Who is that? That is the people who are not on Medicaid but who are paying private insurance premiums. Those premiums are going to go up. It will hurt individuals who buy their own insurance. It will hurt the businesses and the companies who employ those people. This hurts everybody.

I want to tell you the story about Ayla. This is Ayla. She is 4 years old. She was born in 2021 in a rural part of my district after an uneventful pregnancy. Right after she was delivered, something went very, very wrong. She was in dire straits. She was clearly sick. She needed emergency care.

Thank goodness, this rural hospital has a labor and delivery unit. They were well-equipped to resuscitate a baby, to stabilize her, and then to Life Flight her to a hospital that could provide the specialty care that she needed.

Let's think about it for a moment. If Medicaid gets cut and these rural hospitals see a disproportionate share of patients on Medicaid, either those hospitals are going to close or they are going to start cutting back services. Mr. Speaker, I will tell you the first service to go will be labor and delivery.

What if that had happened after these Medicaid cuts? What if Kittitas Valley Healthcare didn't have labor and delivery? What if Ayla had been born then? What if she had not had the specialists there and had not had the ability to be resuscitated there in the delivery room? She would not have made it.

That is what we are going to see when they start cutting away at Medicaid. It will mean the closure of rural hospitals and fewer labor and delivery units. More people will get sicker. They will get poorer. Children like Ayla will not make it.

That is what I mean when I say it collapses our whole healthcare system. Our healthcare system is like a three-legged stool. One of those legs is Medicaid. If we start taking that away, the whole system collapses.

That is what we are talking about: Hospital closures, taking away services, long waits in emergency departments, and a population that is sicker and that needs more care. That care becomes more expensive. It hurts us all.

That is why I am so outraged that this is the mechanism that my Republican colleagues want to use to pay for a tax plan that will give gigantic cuts to the wealthiest taxpayers in this country such as Elon Musk. That is unconscionable. I wanted to start with that.

I am really honored to yield to our Speaker Emerita NANCY PELOSI from the great State of California.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to receive time from the distinguished Congresswoman from Washington State (Ms. SCHRIER). She is a pediatrician. We have all learned a lot about how public policy has a direct impact on the health and well-being of the American people.

When I hear them talk about cutting over \$700 billion in Medicaid and that it is just waste, fraud, and abuse, this beautiful child is not waste, fraud, and abuse. I will talk about a little child in my remarks who is not waste, fraud, and abuse.

This Special Order comes together to shine a bright light on the Republican plan to fund tax breaks for billionaires by making huge cuts to Medicaid.

That is what it looks like. The fact is they will still with their tax bill add nearly \$4 trillion to the national debt to cover their tax break for the wealthiest people in our country.

□ 1940

This is fiscal engineering to reduce the role of government in the lives of the American people where it is most needed. This is Robin Hood in reverse, taking resources from where it is most needed, from people who need it most, and giving it to those who need it less, the billionaires in America.

This is shameful. It is a fraud, and it is a shame.

When President Johnson signed Medicare and Medicaid into law, he traveled to Independence, Missouri, to be in the presence of former President Truman who had worked on this when he was President, but it came to fruition under President Johnson. President Johnson went there, and he signed the bill in the presence of Harry Truman. He reminded the American people of a shared tradition:

"Never to be indifferent toward despair. . . . never to turn away from helplessness. . . . never to ignore or spurn those who suffer untended in a land that is bursting with abundance."

Indeed, Medicaid saves lives and is a pillar of health, security, and justice for tens of millions of Americans.

People often think of Medicaid as healthcare for poor children, and that would be justification enough, healthcare for poor children. However, it also is a middle-income benefit for nursing home residents and people needing it for long-term care services. They get that largely through Medicaid. It is also a benefit for people with disabilities.

The Republicans' devastating budget plan would push about 14 million Medicaid recipients off lifesaving healthcare and leave countless vulnerable families exposed to catastrophic medical bills. This is terrible. This is about health and financial health that is being devastated.

Working families and children from low-income households would face ruinous consequences as would rural hospitals—as the distinguished Congresswoman has mentioned—families seek-

ing opioid addiction treatment for their loved ones, and middle-class Americans with long-term care needs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert a statement from the California Medical Association into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CALIFORNIA MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,  
May 12, 2025.

CMA STATEMENT ON HOUSE REPUBLICANS'  
PROPOSED CUTS TO MEDICAID

California Medical Association President Shannon Udovic-Constant, M.D., issued the following statement regarding House Republicans' proposed cuts to Medicaid:

"The latest federal proposal to gut Medicaid is reckless. Physicians and hospitals will be pushed to the brink, forced to close their doors and unable to continue to care for their patients.

"These would be the largest Medicaid cuts in history and will leave veterans, seniors, the disabled, children and working families without health care coverage—making emergency rooms the only point of care for millions of people. Communities will be devastated, and lives will be lost.

"Congress must reject these cuts and instead focus on strengthening the safety net that protects us all. Otherwise, at least 13.7 million people will lose health care coverage."

Ms. PELOSI. This is what they have said about this.

California Medical Association issued the following statement regarding House Republicans' proposed cuts in Medicaid:

"The latest Federal proposal to gut Medicaid is reckless. Physicians and hospitals will be pushed to the brink, forced to close their doors and unable to continue care for their patients."

Mr. Speaker, that is because when this funding leaves those rural hospitals, then not only do the Medicaid patients lose, but all the patients in that rural area lose.

"These would be the largest Medicaid cuts in history and will leave veterans, seniors, the disabled, children and working families without healthcare coverage"—this is as the distinguished physician colleague has said—"making emergency rooms the only point of care for millions of people. Communities will be devastated; lives will be lost.

"Congress must reject these cuts and instead focus on strengthening the safety net that protects us all. Otherwise, at least 13.7 million people will lose healthcare coverage."

Republican attacks on healthcare impact real people, including little children. My guest at the President's State of the Union Address to Congress was Elena Hung, mother of Xiomara, a courageous Little Lobbyist, who is 11 years old.

Xiomara has complex medical needs, including chronic lung disease, chronic kidney disease, and global development delays. She has a tracheostomy, is ventilator and oxygen dependent, and uses a feeding tube.

Access to quality, affordable healthcare ensured that Xiomara received the care she needed during an extended hospitalization and can now live at home with her family.

Medicaid has helped Xiomara receive the therapies she needs to catch up with her developmental milestones, including physical therapy, occupational therapy, feeding therapy, and speech therapy.

However, these very lifelines, including Medicaid and more, are what Republicans are working to destroy to fund tax cuts for billionaires.

Democrats are standing strong against the administration's many attacks against families' healthcare. This is just one of them.

With this Special Order hour, we are calling out Republicans to either vote to protect their constituents' healthcare, or to vote to take it away. That is the choice.

In stark contrast to the President and Republicans in Congress, Democrats will always fight to lower healthcare costs. We are unified and ready to use every tool to stop this GOP scheme. We will always work to strengthen pillars of health and financial security in America. That includes the Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. We will always fight for Medicaid.

I just want to go back to that one thing. They are still adding nearly \$4 trillion to the national budget to give tax breaks to their wealthy billionaire friends. When the Republicans passed that bill and the President signed it into law, 83 percent of the benefits went to the top 1 percent, adding \$2 trillion to the national debt. They are doubling down on that, adding almost \$4 trillion to the national debt and saying: We have got to give all this money to billionaires and call children waste, fraud, and abuse in our Medicaid system.

It is really sinful, it is really sad, and it is something that I hope the Republicans will reject.

I hope their constituents will call them, because these Medicaid people are in Republican districts. One of our colleagues in California has, out of all of our constituents, he has nearly 500,000 people on Medicaid. Yes, he voted with Republicans on this.

Mr. Speaker, you can be sure he will be hearing from his constituents because people know.

I will close by saying that Lincoln said:

"Public sentiment is everything. With it, you can accomplish almost anything. Without it, practically nothing."

However, for public sentiment to prevail, people have to know, and we are making sure that our constituents know and they are being informed as to our knowledge of what Republicans are doing. It is Republican reverse Robin Hood.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity to share the story of this beautiful little girl.

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Emerita Speaker PELOSI for her moral clarity and her fiscal pragmatism in painting a clear picture of what is going on right now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Vermont (Ms. BALINT).

Ms. BALINT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative SCHRIER, and I am happy to be here.

Just this morning, President Trump said that the Republicans aren't cutting anything meaningful in their budget. What a thing to say. What a shocking thing to say when these cuts will hurt so many Americans. I am having a really hard time understanding how taking away healthcare from nearly 14 million Americans isn't meaningful.

It is not meaningful that rural hospitals across Vermont and across this country are going to be at risk of closing?

Just today I met with Vermonters from a little town called Coventry, and they are deeply concerned that they are going to lose access to labor and delivery healthcare at their local hospital.

Republicans are so out of touch with the reality of American families right now, and it is shocking to call these cuts not meaningful when their bill will hurt working families.

It takes away food and healthcare from millions and millions of people, their own voters, but yet they are not meaningful cuts.

These cuts are certainly meaningful for all the kids and veterans who will go hungry because of this cruel and what I think is a very cynical bill.

Why are my Republican colleagues making the cuts?

That is what we all want to know.

It is to give the very wealthy another big tax cut and deliver tax breaks to billionaires and corporations, people who absolutely don't need any more assistance.

It is taking that money from people who desperately need help and giving away to the people who don't.

□ 1950

People who are just struggling to get by are having precious resources taken away from them.

Right now, across this country, Americans are trying to figure out the math. Are they going to be able to afford groceries for their kids? They are trying to decide whether they can afford to go to the doctor.

While that is happening, in real time, my colleagues are spending time demanding more work requirements for Medicaid recipients when we know that almost half of adults on Medicaid are already working. They act like they are not working. They are working, and 27 percent of those working-age adults on Medicaid are disabled. They are doing the best they can here.

It couldn't be more obvious that they are just looking to remove more people from the Medicaid rolls in order to

have more money to give tax breaks to billionaires and corporations. It is sick.

These are real people who we are talking about tonight in every congressional district who cannot handle these cuts. It is as simple as that.

The reality is that Americans can't pay for their rent right now. They can't pay for their groceries. They are too high. Prescription drug prices are too high. Costs for consumers and small businesses are just going to go up because of the asinine tariff regime that we have been dealt.

Of course, Americans feel like it is rigged against them because it is. That is why we have to be here fighting for them. That is why we have to be here, raising the alarm about what is happening in this bill with Medicaid.

What Americans want is fairness. What they need is fairness. We owe them that. They want and need affordable healthcare, and we owe them that. They want and need a fair shot, a better life for their kids, and we owe them that.

This bill that cuts Medicaid is a statement of values. It shows exactly what and who the Republicans are caring about. It is not you and your family. It is not me and mine. It is about propping up billionaires and kicking the rest of us in the teeth while they do it.

What kind of leaders take away healthcare and food from working people so that the wealthy can get even more money? What kind of leaders? Not strong leaders, not leaders of conscience.

It is shameful.

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative BALINT for that clarity. I appreciate drawing that distinction that Speaker Emerita PELOSI referred to as reverse Robin Hood. That is exactly what is going on here.

Who are you standing up for? We saw with the Republican 2017 tax cut that the vast majority of that benefit went to the wealthiest, and it did not trickle down to people. People are already having trouble affording rent, home prices, food, and other goods.

Putting this kind of financial pressure not just on Medicaid recipients but on everybody else, because insurance rates and medical costs are going to go higher, only makes that squeeze worse.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. TOKUDA).

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a warning—no, a plea.

Rural America is already in crisis. People there die younger. Mothers face greater risks when giving birth. Hospitals teeter on the edge of collapse.

Medicaid is the thin lifeline holding together that fragile system. Cut it and people will die.

At Adventist Health Castle in Kailua, 75 percent of patients rely on Medicaid and Medicare. They have already weathered the storm of COVID. With new GOP-led cuts to provider fees, they may be forced to shut down essential

services—obstetrics, pediatrics, and emergency services, care that literally keeps babies and people alive.

This is not just about one hospital in Hawaii. This is a national crisis. Rural Americans face significantly worse health outcomes and health disparities. In too many rural counties, life expectancy is a decade shorter than that of their urban neighbors.

Maternal mortality in rural areas is nearly double that of urban areas, and more than 200 rural hospitals have closed their doors since 2005. Over 450 more are currently at risk of shutting their doors.

This isn't hypothetical. It is happening right now. Let's be clear: When these providers and hospitals close their doors, everyone in those communities, including, by the way, some Members of Congress and their families, will lose their healthcare. It won't bring me or anyone impacted any comfort or peace to say, "I told you so."

Suma Metla, a pediatric physical therapist and mom, treats kids with complex needs. Forty percent of her patients are on Medicaid. She told me plainly, as she sat in my office today with her 1-year-old, Kashi: If these cuts pass, we will not survive past this year.

Already, speech therapists and other specialists are shutting their doors in Hawaii and across the country. Her own practice is buried in a 2-week backlog. One of two hospitals that offer similar care, and we only have two throughout the State, has a 100-child waiting list right now.

Suma has traveled to Lanai to treat children no one else could reach. She tried to keep care going through telehealth, but when Congress let those tools expire, families were left stranded.

Let's talk about the preschool teacher in my district whose son was born weighing less than 2 pounds—5 months in the NICU, emergency surgery, feeding tubes, with a hospital bill 50 times more than she will make in a single year covered by Medicaid.

That little boy is now 3 years old, full of life, laughter, and love and obsessed with music and trucks. He is alive only because Medicaid was there.

We cannot forget what is at stake. These are not just numbers on a page. They are real lives, real children, real families, and real communities, people like you and me.

Slashing Medicaid won't balance a budget. It will close hospital doors. It will rip care from those who need it most. It will end lives.

We must not let this happen. Find the courage. Have a conscience. Vote "no."

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative TOKUDA for bringing up that particular issue of children in the neonatal intensive care unit, where I have worked.

I think about this frequently. When over 40 percent of births in this country are covered by Medicaid, I think about what it would mean for a family

to be bankrupt for the rest of their lives if they had a premature baby or a baby with special needs. I also think about what would happen if those babies didn't get the right care.

Sometimes this is not a matter of life and death but a matter of life, death, and lifelong disabilities. That is what good NICU care will mean, and it makes a difference for these babies who are relying on Medicaid.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER).

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of the first oath the gentlewoman took before she got here: First, do no harm.

I wish my Republican colleagues would take that oath because the harm that this proposal does to the least amongst us in this country is unfathomable, cruel, and madness from a financial perspective.

When everyone is cut off from Medicaid, where will they go? They will go to public hospitals that are already underfunded and trying to serve the least among us.

After all the stories you have heard, I want to put in some numbers. Think of multiplying these numbers to the stories you have heard, particularly for people who are the least among us as Americans.

There are 78.5 million people enrolled in Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program across America. This is 10 percent higher than in February 2020, pre-COVID.

One in three people with disabilities, 15 million, have Medicaid. Comparatively, 19 percent of adults without disabilities have Medicaid. These are the people who Republicans and Democrats in the past have tried to protect. Now, we are being cruel and dismissive of their needs.

One in five Medicaid enrollees has a disability. Two-thirds of Medicaid enrollees do not receive SSI benefits.

□ 2000

Mr. Speaker, 10.3 million people would lose Medicaid coverage in the next 10 years if the budget reconciliation bill of the Republicans passes because of its punitive work requirements. Most of these people are already working.

In 2022, Medicaid covered two-thirds of all home-care spending. 4.5 million people receive Medicaid-covered home-care services each year in America.

Medicaid cuts as proposed under the Republican budget threaten optional benefits the most, including long-term services and supports that help the disabled and the elderly in home- and community-based services that help protect these Americans who need our help. They live with disabilities in their own communities and get the support, love, and affection of those communities and their families.

In California alone, almost 15 million Californians are on Medicaid. 1,906,300 Californians on Medicaid have a disability. Of those, 992,000 people are

working, aged 19 to 65. A million people in California with disabilities who get Medicaid are working, and now they are going to be forced to go through a bureaucracy that supposedly the majority wants to make more efficient. That is not efficiency. That is cruelty to the least amongst us.

Mr. Speaker, 68 percent of California adults on Medicaid have a job. In just my district, which is the fifth wealthiest district in the House, 131,634 people are on Medicaid and are at risk of losing care under the Republican budget. 45,916 of those are children, 19,000 are seniors, 10,000 are people with disabilities, 48,300 adults are on Medicaid due to ACA expansion.

Mr. Speaker, this is madness. I thank my colleague for bringing this to the floor, and I thank her for her spirit and her personal testimony to what this will mean to millions of Americans who are the least amongst us.

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments and putting this in a very personal way.

I am wondering for people out there watching if they are thinking, gosh, I wonder is this really true? Are hospitals really going to close? Are we really going to lose labor and delivery and have to drive hours to get to the nearest hospital to deliver a baby?

In my district, the hospital that I talked about earlier is between two mountain passes. If it is snowing, there is really nowhere to go except by Life Flight, and that is not hyperbole. I have sat with the heads of school-based health clinics and community health centers, with heads of hospitals, with nursing homes—and, by the way, we have been referring to rural hospitals, but there are urban hospitals and suburban hospitals that are also highly dependent or have a very high percentage of Medicaid-dependent patients.

We are already seeing cuts in hundreds of employees in the Seattle area because of these impending cuts to Medicaid. I want to just be crystal clear; this is absolutely true. We are hearing this across the board that when Medicaid gets cut, we all lose.

We lose our local labor and delivery service. We lose our local emergency room. We lose the ability to be seen quickly in the event of an emergency because somebody who could have been taken care of by a primary care physician a couple of days earlier with an uncomplicated illness is now in the emergency room ahead of you in line, making you wait when you are having a heart attack. That is completely preventable by using the leanest, most efficient healthcare service and insurance that we have called Medicaid.

I want to tell another story. This is the story of Miguel. Now, we talked about Ayla before, a little 4-year-old girl. Miguel is at the other end of life. He is a senior. He is a constituent who is dependent on Medicaid. He is actually a 76-year-old widower who lives in Wenatchee, the apple capital of the world.

Now, after Miguel's wife passed away, he relied solely on his Social Security check to cover his living expenses. He is a retired orchard worker, and he worked hard to earn that Social Security. He spent decades doing physically demanding labor without access to a pension later, and private insurance was never affordable.

He still depends on Medicaid to stay in his modest home, receiving regular in-home nursing visits and help with daily tasks, like bathing, cooking, and managing his medications. Medicaid's coverage for home-based care is, by the way, far more affordable than nursing home-based care. He gets that home-based care, transportation, and care coordination through Medicaid. Without that, he would have no way to attend his checkups, manage his diabetes, and function through the limitations that he suffered because of a stroke.

Miguel fears losing access to the services that allow him to live at home with dignity, with independence, in familiar surroundings, and he deserves that. Frankly, that is the most cost-effective way to help Miguel.

For seniors like Miguel, Medicaid is not optional. It is their lifeline. It is how they keep dignity. It is how they stay at home. Unfortunately, Miguel's fears are not unfounded. The rural hospital that he depends on treats patients who are more likely to be on Medicaid or Medicare. In other words, they have a disproportionate share, and if these patients, these Medicare patients, lose their health insurance because of this bill, the cost of their care gets absorbed by the hospital.

For hospitals in rural areas that are already struggling, barely keeping their heads above water, this could be the death blow. This will force them to first cut services. I talked about labor and delivery. I could also talk about mental health services and opioid treatment. Those are often the first to go. This would leave Miguel without access to care.

I am not trying to fearmonger or deceive Americans, but this is scary. It is real. I am simply saying what our community health centers, and our hospitals, and our nursing homes, and our school-based health clinics are telling me, that the Republicans' budget will take healthcare away, and health insurance away from 13.7 million Americans all while, therefore, increasing costs for everyone, decreasing access to care, and leaving us all sicker and poorer.

Now, we haven't even talked really about the impact on nursing homes and on our seniors. Speaker Emerita PELOSI touched on this, but I also want to be very clear that three out of five middle-class, working-class Americans in nursing homes depend on Medicaid to pay those bills.

We already say in Washington we don't have enough nursing homes. In fact, people who should be in nursing homes are now filling hospital beds because there is nowhere else to go. Just

imagine if more nursing homes close what that will do to hospitals, what that will do to those patients.

Then think about this: I am in the sandwich generation. If I had a parent who relied on Medicaid to be in a nursing home and could not otherwise afford that, I would need to leave my job to take care of my parents. That is not what they would want for themselves or for me or for my family. This is what millions of families out there will go through if these Medicaid cuts happen.

Ms. PELOSI. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SCHRIER. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Just briefly, I want to make this further point. Ms. SCHRIER has been so eloquent, and all of us associate ourselves with her remarks and the professional knowledge that she brings, the intellectual resource she is on all of this.

I just want to add one thing. At the same time as the Republican reverse Robin Hood plan is going, taking it from those who need it most, giving it to those who have the most, they are also taking nearly \$300 billion from SNAP.

□ 2010

SNAP is for food. Food is medicine. You are going to make people even more sick if those children don't have food.

There was one time when Medicaid first began that one of the people who was starting community health centers around the country insisted—insisted—with the Federal Government that food be counted as medicine because it is about health. Children who do not have access to food are the ones who suffer the most.

I see that our colleagues have arrived.

Let me just add one thing. People ask me: What is your why? Why did you ever decide to leave home and come to Congress? I have five children. The idea that one in five children in America lives in poverty and goes to sleep hungry at night in the greatest country that ever existed in the history of the world, I just couldn't handle that. That is what took me from kitchen to Congress and housewife to House Speaker, to feed the children.

When Matthew says: "When I was hungry, you fed me," in the Gospel of Matthew, what do we do with that? Just tear it up. This is immoral. It is sinful for us to be taking food out of the mouths of babies to give tax cuts to rich people.

Yet, do you know what? It isn't about that. Republicans are giving those tax cuts anyway. The majority is fiscally engineering the shrinking of the compact that we have with the American people and that developed countries have with their constituents.

We are behind the rest of them in many of these regards when we have to take food out of the mouths of babies

to say that we are going to give a tax cut to the wealthiest, but we just really are taking food out of the mouths of babies because we don't want to feed them. That is what this is about, \$1 trillion: \$700 billion or more for Medicaid and \$300 billion for SNAP. It is reverse Robin Hood a la Republicans.

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Speaker, I so very much appreciate those comments and Speaker Emerita PELOSI's dedication to children in every way.

Just to put an even finer point on that, food is medicine, cutting SNAP benefits not only takes food away from hungry people, but it also undermines our economy because those dollars are spent at our local grocery store.

I also have to just mention that food banks, which are the next line of support, are also under threat because DOGE and Elon Musk and Donald Trump have cut the food going to those food banks, leaving shelves bearers and leaving food banks having to ration foods. They also canceled the program where local farmers can provide their food to the local food banks, which is the healthiest and local and fresh food.

All of this just adds up, once again, to hurting people in need in order to fund a tax cut for the billionaires in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my colleague from Minnesota (Ms. MORRISON) to give her perspective about Medicaid.

Ms. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative SCHRIER for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today alongside my colleagues in the Democratic Doctors Caucus and as the first and only pro-choice OB/GYN here in Congress to speak out against the Republicans' disastrous budget proposal and to fight for our women, children, and families.

For more than 20 years, I have had the honor and privilege of taking care of OB/GYN. One of the great joys of my job is caring for my patients during their pregnancies and helping them grow their families. I carry my patients and their stories with me, and they inform my work here in Congress.

I think about them and all of the challenges that new parents face during pregnancy and then after they head home with their new baby: recovering from the delivery, adjusting to life with a little one, accessing the care they and their family need, balancing caregiving and work, making ends meet, and the cost of raising children in the United States. It is a lot.

I think about all of the babies I have delivered whose moms got their healthcare through Medicaid and how critical that was to help them get off to the best possible start.

It is because of those patients and patients all across the country that I stand here today both incredulous and outraged that the Republican majority in Congress is shoving a budget through that will gut Medicaid, the very health insurance program that covers 40 percent of all births and insures almost half of all children in our

country. As an OB/GYN, as a mother, as a Member of Congress, and as an American, this is unconscionable to me. We already have a maternal health crisis in our country.

Let's look at the facts about that maternal healthcare crisis that we face now and remember that this is before we gut Medicaid. In more than half of our country, women do not have a place to go to get obstetric care. Among our peer nations, the United States has the highest rate of both maternal and infant deaths.

In 2022, there were more than double and sometimes triple the rate of maternal deaths in the United States compared to most other high-income countries, and unacceptable disparities exist. Black, American-Indian, and Alaska-Native women are three to four times more likely to die from a pregnancy-related cause compared to White women. Most of these deaths, more than 80 percent, are preventable.

What is the Republican majority doing to address this unacceptable crisis? Instead of working to find ways to improve women's health and to help moms and babies, they are shoving a budget through that will devastate our Nation's maternal healthcare and decimate many of our hospitals and clinics. It will unequivocally make our Nation's maternal health crisis worse.

Why in the world are they doing this? Why are they choosing to harm women and children? They are doing it to pay for tax cuts for the ultrawealthiest among us. That is literally why. To make the math work to cut taxes for billionaires, they are choosing to sell out the health of women, moms, new babies, and the future of our country to pay for tax cuts for billionaires, choosing to take healthcare away from moms and their babies.

Let's be clear. This won't just be devastating to the moms and new babies who get their healthcare coverage through Medicaid. It will be devastating for maternal healthcare across the country. All of this is coming from the party that calls itself pro-life and profamily. It is hard to imagine a more antifamily policy.

Instead of wasting time musing around ridiculous ways to persuade women to have more children, like giving medals for having six or more babies, I would remind my Republican colleagues that they could start with something real, meaningful, and impactful right now by not gutting the health insurance program that covers almost half of all births and half of all children in our country. The Republican majority needs to make their profamily rhetoric match their policy, put America's moms and babies first, and stop these proposed cuts to Medicaid.

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative Dr. MORRISON for her perspective, from the perspective of an OB/GYN who has taken care of pregnant women and new babies and really

paints a very clear picture about maternal mortality in this country and what cuts to Medicaid mean for that.

It is interesting. All of us in the Doctors Caucus have been talking for years—in fact, for the whole time I have been in Congress—trying and trying to improve Medicaid reimbursement, to make it so that Medicaid reimbursement can match Medicare reimbursement so that more children can have a medical home. It is about expanding Medicaid care for pregnant women until 1 year postpartum to make sure that they are healthy and plan their pregnancies and that we can cut down this outrageous incidence of maternal mortality in this country.

Now we are just fighting to keep Medicaid. That is the situation we are in now because Republicans want to gut Medicaid and take health insurance away from 13.7 million Americans to pay for a tax cut for the wealthiest Americans. That is just plain wrong.

I will talk for a moment about another constituent of mine who paints just a different angle on what it looks like to cut Medicaid. I will tell you that our phones are ringing off the hook. People understand what is going on. They are worried for their health, for the health of their families, and for the health of their parents. They get what will happen to their local rural hospital if these go into effect.

I will tell you about Kathleen, who graciously shared a story about her own mother. Kathleen's mother lived to be 92 years old. She was a widow for 42 of those years and helped care for five of her grandchildren.

□ 2020

Kathleen's mom lived through the deprivations of the Great Depression and World War II and was never one to complain. She lived simply.

In the last decades of her life, she had a number of serious, complex medical conditions that presented real challenges for her medical team and specialists and, of course, for her. Medicaid supplemented her traditional Medicare plan in the last years of her life and allowed her to get the medical care that she needed. She was treated with care and respect.

When Kathleen's mom injured herself in a fall, Medicaid covered the rehabilitation facility and, later, in-home physical therapy and occupational therapy so she could be in her own home.

Later, she had a life-threatening event and was hospitalized. Eventually, she was well enough to move to an outpatient rehabilitation facility, followed by in-home care. Again, Medicaid was there for her. The care was safe, reliable, and appropriate, and it gave tremendous relief to her and her family.

In the last months of her life, Medicaid provided hospice care. The nurses, home health aide, OT, PT, and case manager were her guardian angels. They treated her with compassion and dignity.

Isn't this the type of treatment and care, the care made possible by Medicaid, that all of us deserve, that all of us want, and that we want for our friends, family, and ourselves?

For so many seniors in this country, this type of care is made possible thanks to Medicaid. It is unfathomable that my Republican colleagues want to deny our seniors the type of comprehensive, compassionate, and thoughtful care that Kathleen's mother received.

That brings us full circle to how these cuts to Medicaid, Apple Health in Washington State—something a lot of people out there think is that they are not relying on Medicaid, so maybe it doesn't affect them.

The message I really want to deliver, Mr. Speaker—and I am actually going to look at the camera to speak directly to the American people—is that cuts to Medicaid, or to Apple Health, impact every single person in this country.

They impact you if you are the son, daughter, or spouse of a senior who needs to be in a nursing home because nursing homes will close, and you will have to leave your job to take care of your ailing parent or spouse.

They impact everybody who lives in a rural community or in an urban community where there are a lot of patients who rely on Medicaid insurance, because when Medicaid doesn't pay the bills for those people, the hospital gives away that care for free. Then, they either cut services or close—or, more likely, a combination of them—and your insurance premiums go up because somebody has to pay. Who is going to make up the difference? Private insurance. That means your insurance rates go up, and they are already high.

Everybody hurts from this, even if you are not paying for your own health insurance. I bet, at some point, you are going to the emergency room, and those patients who don't have Medicaid are now getting sicker, waiting longer, and getting their care late in an emergency department.

If you think the waits are bad now because hospital beds and ER beds are full of patients in mental health crises or with fentanyl overdoses or with nursing home patients who don't have a nursing home to go to, if you think the waits are bad now, just wait till 13.7 million Americans lose their health insurance.

We are all impacted. If you live in a rural area and have private insurance, you are doing fine, but if the labor and delivery department closes at that rural hospital and maybe you have a high-risk pregnancy and need obstetrics care and might have a complication with that delivery, you might have to go live in a more urban area for the month before that delivery just to make sure that you are safe and that your baby is safe.

This is something that none of us should have to worry about in the United States of America. This is a

prosperous country. We have excellent healthcare here, and to think that my Republican colleagues want to cut Medicaid, a lifeline for the patients who depend on it and for our entire healthcare system, that they want to cut what the people most in need depend on—again, we are talking about the elderly, people with disabilities, pregnant women, children. To think that they would cut care for them in order to pay for gigantic tax cuts for billionaires—it is a backward transfer of money. It is Robin Hood in reverse. It is just plain wrong. I have explained now that, in addition to being morally bankrupt, it is also fiscally reckless.

It is irresponsible, and I just don't understand how this is the plan that my colleagues came up with. Their constituents are going to hurt every bit as much as mine and, statistically, with more rural areas and already more vulnerable rural hospitals, chances are their constituents are going to hurt even more.

I sure hope that people out there are paying attention. Call the people who represent you. Tell them what your fears are. I know people are calling me, and I am standing up here to appeal to my Republican colleagues and let the American people know what is going on right now, why they should be concerned.

This is a democracy. Call the people who represent you. Tell them what you think. Tell them what it would mean for you, for your family, for your neighbor.

Again, when it is one out of three in Washington State, what would it mean if these largest-ever cuts to Medicaid transpired?

Here is what is going to happen tonight. At 1 o'clock in the morning, the Rules Committee is going to meet. They are going to craft the rules for Trump's so-called big, beautiful bill, which would be a travesty for the people I represent. They are going to do this at 1 o'clock in the morning when everybody else is asleep, not watching, not paying attention, not watching the nightly news. This is not prime time because, I think, they are embarrassed about what they are doing, but they are going to do it anyway. They are going to do it for the people who were in the front row at President Trump's inauguration. That is who they are going to do it for.

This is not helping their constituents. It is not helping my constituents. America, it is not helping you.

It is morally bankrupt. It is fiscally irresponsible. It is just plain cruel. That is why I, along with the rest of the Doctors Caucus, have spent this evening talking about what this means for our patients and for our healthcare system.

We understand it on a visceral level because we have lived in and worked in this healthcare system. We have worked in crowded emergency departments, seeing people who, if they had health insurance, wouldn't need to be



in the emergency department. We have taken care of patients who didn't have insurance like Medicaid, so they delayed care or they didn't pick up a medication because it was too expensive and they didn't have coverage.

We have seen these things. Dr. MORRISON and I have both seen complicated pregnancies and neonatal resuscitations. These are patients who rely on Medicaid. We are here as doctors who swore an oath to our patients to protect them, to stand up for them. This is us standing up for our patients, to plead with my Republican colleagues not to cut Medicaid.

Mr. Speaker, I will let them know and will let my constituents and the American people know that I will continue to fight every minute to make sure that these cuts don't happen and that we keep this oath to our patients.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

#### PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

ADJUSTMENT TO THE RECONCILIATION INSTRUCTION FOR THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS IN THE FISCAL YEAR 2025 BUDGET RESOLUTION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,  
Washington, DC, May 20, 2025.

MR. SPEAKER: I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record a certification and an adjustment to the reconciliation instruction for the Committee on Ways and Means under section 2001(b)(11) of H. Con. Res. 14, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2025.

Section 4001 of H. Con. Res. 14 requires the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget to adjust the reconciliation instruction for the Committee on Ways and Means under section 2001(b)(11) of that resolution if at least \$2 trillion in total deficit reduction over the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034 is not achieved in the reconciliation recommendations submitted by the 7 authorizing committees with instructions to reduce the deficit under section 2001 of H. Con. Res. 14.

Based on currently available information and estimates, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that the total net deficit reduction by the 7 authorizing committees is \$1.695 trillion. Therefore, I certify that the applicable reconciliation recommendations do not achieve net deficit reduction of at least \$2 trillion over the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034. As a result, the reconciliation instruction for the Committee on Ways and Means under section 2001(b)(11) of H. Con. Res. 14 is hereby adjusted by a commensurate amount and lowered to \$4,195,257,000,000. As a result, the reconciliation instruction for the Committee on Ways and Means under paragraph (11) of section 2001 (b) of H. Con. Res. 14, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2025, is deemed to be as follows:

The Committee on Ways and Means shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$4,195,257,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

This adjustment is made based on currently available information and estimates

from the Congressional Budget Office and pursuant to section 4001 of H. Con. Res. 14. If there are any questions regarding this adjustment, please contact Brad Watson of the Budget Committee staff.

Sincerely,

JODEY C. ARRINGTON,  
Chairman, Committee on the Budget.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 21, 2025, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. Arrington: Committee on the Budget. H.R. 1. A bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of H. Con. Res. 14 (Rept. 119-106). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. ANSARI (for herself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. CARSON):

H.R. 3504. A bill to amend section 235 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for an exception from expedited removal for certain countries concern; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEYER (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. THANEDAR, Mrs. TRAHAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. CARSON, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 3505. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish a grant program to facilitate the installation, on certain infrastructure, of evidence-based suicide deterrents, including suicide prevention nets and barriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. BROWN (for herself and Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3506. A bill to amend the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 to reauthorize the Healthy Food Financing Initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURCHETT (for himself and Mr. MOSKOWITZ):

H.R. 3507. A bill to require the chairs of committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate to submit certain information to the Clerk of the House of Representatives or the Secretary of the Senate with respect to reported bills and joint resolutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mrs. FOUSHEE):

H.R. 3508. 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 Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOLDEN of Maine (for himself and Mr. LUTTRELL):

H.R. 3509. A bill to remove the six-year statute of limitations on certain claims against the United States Government by survivors of members of the Armed Forces who died in the line of duty on or after September 11, 2001; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER:

H.R. 3510. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to establish a grant program to assist with the cost of suicide prevention software for use in elementary schools and secondary schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER (for himself and Ms. FRIEDMAN):

H.R. 3511. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to direct the Assistant Secretary for Mental Health and Substance Use to establish a grant program for certain undergraduate or graduate students who agree to work as school psychologists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HERN of Oklahoma (for himself and Mr. FEENSTRA):

H.R. 3512. 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 Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. CARSON, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. FROST, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LIEU, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MIN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROSS, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. STANTON, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. CRAIG, Ms. PRESSLEY, and Mr. NEGUSE):

H.R. 3513. 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 Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BERA, Ms. VAN DUYNE, Ms. CHU, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. BALDERSON, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. YAKYM, Ms. SEWELL, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CAREY, Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. BEYER, Ms. TENNEY, Ms. TOKUDA, Mrs. MILLER of

West Virginia, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. COSTA, Mr. SMUCKER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. BACON, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. MANN, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. CISCOMANI, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. FINSTAD, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. SHREVE, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia, Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MRVAN, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. CASE, Ms. MCBRIDE, Ms. ROSS, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SORESENSEN, Mr. MCGARVEY, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. BROWN, Mr. CROW, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. STANTON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KEATING, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. GOODLANDER, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BALINT, Mr. RYAN, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS):

H.R. 3514. 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 Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia (for herself and Mr. BISHOP):

H.R. 3515. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude military bonuses from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MACE (for herself and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 3516. A bill to prohibit certain practices relating to certain commodity promotion programs, to require greater transparency by those programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin:

H.R. 3517. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to make various reforms to Social Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. OWENS, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ONDER, Mr. GOSAR, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. MOORE of North Carolina, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY of Utah, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. BEGICH, Ms. VAN DUYN, and Mr. CRENSHAW):

H.R. 3518. 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 Education and Workforce.

By Mr. OWENS (for himself and Mr. DONALDS):

H.R. 3519. 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 Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself and Mr. PFLUGER):

H.R. 3520. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide for the scheduling of tianeptine as a schedule III substance, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself and Mr. PFLUGER):

H.R. 3521. A bill to modernize clinical trials and remove barriers for participation in clinical trials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Mr. GROTHMAN, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 3522. 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 Education and Workforce.

By Mr. SHREVE (for himself and Ms. VAN DUYN):

H.R. 3523. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to designate certain covered organizations as Foreign Financial Threat Organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SOTO (for himself, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Ms. SALAZAR):

H.R. 3524. A bill to render certain military spouses eligible for adjustment of status, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. VAN DUYN:

H.R. 3525. A bill to improve agency rule-making, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. VAN DUYN:

H.R. 3526. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the limitation on qualified first-time homebuyer distributions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H. Res. 430. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BERA (for himself, Mr. AMODEI of Nevada, and Mr. KEATING):

H. Res. 431. A resolution recognizing the importance of the Arctic Council and reaffirming the commitment of the United States to the Arctic Council; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GOLDEN of Maine:

H. Res. 432. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2550) to nullify the Executive Order relating to Exclusions from Federal Labor-Management Relations Programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. LEE of Florida (for herself, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. DONALDS, Mrs. HOUCIN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. EZELL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. BIGGS of Arizona, Mr. SELF, Mr. GOODEN, Mr. BARR, Mr. MCGUIRE, Mr. FALLON, Mr. MCDOWELL, Ms. HAGEMAN, Mrs. LUNA, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. NORMAN, Ms. BOEBERT, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CLYDE, Mr. HUNT, Mr.

PATRONIS, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H. Res. 433. A resolution condemning former FBI Director James Comey's incitement of violence against President Donald J. Trump; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. SYKES:

H. Res. 434. A resolution remembering John Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. ANSARI:

H.R. 3504.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 3505.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. BROWN:

H.R. 3506.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII

By Mr. BURCHETT:

H.R. 3507.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 3508.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. GOLDEN of Maine:

H.R. 3509.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER:

H.R. 3510.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER:

H.R. 3511.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. HERN of Oklahoma:

H.R. 3512.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 3513.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 1.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3514.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish requirements with respect to the use of prior authorization under Medicare Advantage plans.

[Page H3974]

By Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia:

H.R. 3515.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. 1, Sec. 8

By Ms. MACE:

H.R. 3516.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin:

H.R. 3517.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H.R. 3518.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 3519.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 3520.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 3521.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 3522.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. SHREVE:

H.R. 3523.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 3524.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. VAN DUYNE:

H.R. 3525.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. 1 Sec. 8

By Ms. VAN DUYNE:

H.R. 3526.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. 1 Sec. 8

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 38: Ms. FEDORCHAK.  
H.R. 307: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.  
H.R. 328: Mr. SUOZZI.  
H.R. 355: Mr. GOODEN.  
H.R. 392: Mr. VINDMAN.  
H.R. 404: Mr. GOODEN and Mr. MCCORMICK.  
H.R. 407: Mr. LIEU.  
H.R. 425: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.  
H.R. 439: Mr. CUELLAR.  
H.R. 465: Mr. MOORE of North Carolina.  
H.R. 491: Mr. SUBRAMANYAM and Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 516: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 539: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 562: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 569: Mr. BEGICH.

H.R. 643: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 764: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 833: Mrs. HOUCHIN and Mr. HILL of Arkansas.

H.R. 912: Mr. LIEU.

H.R. 946: Ms. SALINAS and Mr. DUNN of Florida.

H.R. 979: Mr. NUNN of Iowa and Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 1027: Mr. LIEU.

H.R. 1041: Mr. MCDOWELL.

H.R. 1046: Mr. GRAY.

H.R. 1091: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1105: Ms. CRAIG.

H.R. 1151: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 1171: Mr. KENNEDY of New York.

H.R. 1207: Mr. WIED.

H.R. 1229: Mr. MCDOWELL, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. RILEY of New York, and Mr. ROSE.

H.R. 1262: Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. NUNN of Iowa, Mr. FIGURES, Mr. SUBRAMANYAM, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 1267: Mr. CISNEROS.

H.R. 1317: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 1330: Mr. SOTO and Mrs. TORRES of California.

H.R. 1361: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 1379: Mr. HUNT.

H.R. 1410: Mr. CISNEROS and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1422: Mr. COSTA, Ms. STEVENS, and Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 1517: Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, and Mr. STANTON.

H.R. 1522: Ms. PRESSLEY.

H.R. 1530: Mr. MCDOWELL.

H.R. 1559: Mr. GOLDEN of Maine and Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 1560: Mr. GOLDEN of Maine and Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 1585: Mr. BAUMGARTNER.

H.R. 1703: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1732: Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BELL, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 1735: Mr. RILEY of New York.

H.R. 1777: Mr. NEGUSE and Mr. KUSTOFF.

H.R. 1842: Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 1897: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. LATTI.

H.R. 1954: Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1970: Ms. BYNUM and Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 2004: Mrs. KIM.

H.R. 2005: Mr. NUNN of Iowa and Mr. MRVAN.

H.R. 2010: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 2013: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2036: Mr. GRAVES, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. MOORE of West Virginia, and Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2048: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mrs. MCIVER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, and Mr. RILEY of New York.

H.R. 2062: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 2095: Mr. GOLDEN of Maine.

H.R. 2102: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. RANDALL.

H.R. 2175: Mrs. KIM and Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 2189: Mr. EDWARDS.

H.R. 2199: Mr. LANDSMAN.

H.R. 2225: Mrs. KIM.

H.R. 2314: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2395: Mr. GOODEN.

H.R. 2538: Mr. SMUCKER and Mr. BACON.

H.R. 2559: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2585: Ms. BARRAGAN and Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 2656: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 2701: Mr. LAWLER.

H.R. 2725: Ms. PINGREE and Mr. MACKENZIE.

H.R. 2799: Ms. DEXTER, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr.

STANTON, Ms. CRAIG, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. ANSARI.

H.R. 2808: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 2821: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 2853: Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 2854: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 2860: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 2880: Ms. SALINAS, Ms. TLAIB, and Ms. BUDZINSKI.

H.R. 2885: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 2896: Mr. MOORE of Utah.

H.R. 2904: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 2936: Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. AMODEI of Nevada, Ms. ROSS, and Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 2941: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 2954: Mr. BARRETT.

H.R. 2964: Mr. MCDOWELL.

H.R. 2984: Mr. RILEY of New York.

H.R. 3063: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. TOKUDA, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 3077: Mr. POCAN and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 3115: Mr. LANDSMAN, Ms. ELFRETH, and Mr. AMO.

H.R. 3127: Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 3151: Mr. KUSTOFF.

H.R. 3164: Ms. TENNEY, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. CRAIG, Mrs. TRAHAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. YAKYM, Mr. BOST, and Mr. MCCORMICK.

H.R. 3194: Mr. MANN, Mr. GRAVES, and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 3199: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 3226: Mr. RILEY of New York.

H.R. 3234: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 3258: Mrs. FISCHBACH.

H.R. 3285: Ms. HAGEMAN.

H.R. 3288: Ms. CRAIG.

H.R. 3296: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 3304: Mr. MOULTON and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 3310: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 3331: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 3332: Mr. BEGICH.

H.R. 3352: Ms. SALAZAR.

H.R. 3353: Mr. VINDMAN.

H.R. 3359: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 3362: Mr. GILL of Texas.

H.R. 3368: Mrs. TRAHAN and Mr. GOMEZ.

H.R. 3371: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 3392: Mr. MOORE of Alabama.

H.R. 3398: Mrs. FLETCHER.

H.R. 3411: Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.R. 3437: Mr. GILL of Texas.

H.R. 3440: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 3442: Mr. THANEDAR.

H.R. 3449: Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. CARSON, Mr. VASQUEZ, Ms. ELFRETH, and Ms. CRAIG.

H.R. 3451: Mr. MOORE of Utah, Ms. MALOY, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 3452: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 3453: Mr. TIMMONS.

H.R. 3469: Ms. LEE of Florida and Ms. PETTERSEN.

H.R. 3470: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 3477: Mr. CARSON.

H.R. 3481: Mr. VAN ORDEN.

H.R. 3484: Mr. HUDSON and Mr. BAUMGARTNER.

H.J. Res. 12: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois and Mr. JACK.

H. Con. Res. 12: Mr. MURPHY.

H. Res. 120: Mr. CLEAVER.

H. Res. 205: Mr. SUOZZI.

H. Res. 267: Mr. DELUZZIO.

H. Res. 386: Mr. CISNEROS.

H. Res. 412: Mr. ONDER and Mr. FITZGERALD.

H. Res. 413: Mr. NUNN of Iowa, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. PETTERSEN, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. ROSS, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. LAWLER.

H. Res. 415: Mr. THANEDAR.

H. Res. 417: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H. Res. 419: Mr. SMITH of Washington.



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119<sup>th</sup> 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.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S2983

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 bipar-

tisan 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 re-

cent 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 vet-

eran, 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 sup-

porting 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 natural-born 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 col-

league 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 Re-

public 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 chil-

dren 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 which ever 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, non-partisan 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 col-

leagues 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 reads 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).”;

(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 af-

ford 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 Dube, 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 Fallon, 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 Krajewski, 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 of 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 Odum, 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; Kyle Scott, US Ambassador, retired; Tod Sedgwick, Former US Ambassador to 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 Sneed, 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 by 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 ex-

panding 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 exer-

cise 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 George 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 Sec-

retary; 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 Manage-

ment 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 Non-attainment 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 estab-

lish 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 Dominique 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, Ms. 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. Edwin 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. RISC, 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 en-

forcement 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. GALLEGOS) 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, cere-

monies, 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)”;

(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)”;

(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. [ ] I. 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. [ ] I. 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, 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.



# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## RECOGNIZING NYX WALTON

### HON. BRITTANY PETTERSEN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 20, 2025*

Ms. PETTERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Nyx Walton for earning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.

Nyx has overcome many challenges along her journey to success, demonstrating perseverance at every step. Students who strive to make the most of their education, like Nyx, develop crucial skills and a work ethic that will guide them for the rest of their lives. This award is a testament to Nyx's hard work, determination, and perseverance at Pomona Jr./Sr. High School and is clearly just the beginning of a bright and promising future.

It is my honor to congratulate Nyx Walton on achieving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.

## RECOGNIZING LUKE BOWLSBY ON HIS APPOINTMENT TO THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

### HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 20, 2025*

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding student from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am pleased to announce that Luke Bowlsby from Amherst, Ohio, has been offered an appointment to the United States Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland.

Luke's offer of appointment permits him to attend the United States Naval Academy this fall with the incoming Class of 2029. Attending one of our Nation's military academies not only offers the opportunity to serve our country but also guarantees a world-class education while undertaking one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of their lives. Luke brings a tremendous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming Class of 2029. While attending Marion L. Steele High School, he was involved in cross country and track and field, earning his varsity letter in both. After high school, he attended the Naval Academy Preparatory School in Newport, Rhode Island. I am confident that he will carry the lessons of his student and athletic leadership to the Naval Academy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Luke Bowlsby on his offer of appointment to the United States Naval Academy. Our service academies offer the finest military training and education available, and I am positive that Luke will excel during his career at the Naval Academy. I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to him as he begins his service to our Nation.

## HONORING MR. JOSEPH DECOSIMO

### HON. CHARLES J. "CHUCK" FLEISCHMANN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 20, 2025*

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Joseph F. Decosimo of Chattanooga, Tennessee, on his 100th birthday, and to recognize his commitment to the Chattanooga community.

Joe was born to immigrant parents in 1925. After graduating from high school, he served in the United States Navy during World War II. After the war, Joe attended the University of Georgia on the GI Bill, earning his degree in accounting before earning his MBA from the Kellogg School of Business at Northwestern University.

Joe and his wife, Rachel, then returned to Chattanooga, where he began his first job as a certified public accountant. In 1971, he started his own firm, Joseph Decosimo & Company. He would go on to hire four of his nine children at the growing firm. JD&Co would grow into one of Tennessee's largest accounting firms, employing over 300 people. He would take the knowledge gained from this to found Decosimo Corporate Finance, where he continues serving as Principal Emeritus.

Joe's involvement in our community can be seen through the legacy of his name. In 2014, the University of Tennessee—Chattanooga honored his support and involvement with the Joseph F. Decosimo Student Success Center within the University's Rollins College of Business. Further, Joe has established two scholarships and a professorship in Accounting at UTC and has served as a teacher, advocate, and supporter of the University and the Rollins College of Business. Joe also served as a founding member of the stadium board for Finley Stadium and was instrumental in the construction of the stadium.

Joe has served in key board positions at several Fortune 500 companies and has been involved in several civic and professional organizations during his career. He served as president of the TN CPA Society and as chair of the Tennessee State Board of Accountancy. Joe also chaired the Chattanooga United Way Board of Directors and led its annual campaign drive, served as a founding board member of the Hamilton County/Chattanooga Convention Center, served on the board of the Chattanooga Bible Institute (now Richmond Graduate University), served as senior investment advisor to the Arthur S. DeMoss Foundation, and as President of the Chattanooga Rotary Club. He was honored by the Chattanooga Kiwanis Club as their Person of the Year and was King of the Chattanooga Cotton Ball, an annual event to raise money for charities to benefit women and children in need in the Chattanooga area. Joe has served as chairman for numerous charitable drives that have raised millions of dollars for the Chattanooga community.

Joe's legacy is also reflected in his family. Joe and Rachel were married on September 27, 1949, and celebrated their 75th anniversary this past year, and are parents to nine children and 72 grandchildren, and great-grandchildren. His children and grandchildren continue to serve the community as business and civic engagement leaders throughout Chattanooga. Joe is a parishioner of St. Augustine Catholic Church of Signal Mountain.

It is with great pride and profound gratitude that I recognize Joseph F. Decosimo for his extraordinary service to our community. His dedication, leadership, and contributions stand as a model of service. I have been fortunate to know Joe as a personal friend and stand to express my sincere appreciation for all he has done in support of our great Nation and community.

## RECOGNIZING JAYDEN CORDIC

### HON. BRITTANY PETTERSEN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 20, 2025*

Ms. PETTERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jayden Cordic for earning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.

Jayden has overcome many challenges along his journey to success, demonstrating perseverance at every step. Students who strive to make the most of their education, like Jayden, develop crucial skills and a work ethic that will guide them for the rest of their lives. This award is a testament to Jayden's hard work, determination, and perseverance at Oberon Middle School and is clearly just the beginning of a bright and promising future.

It is my honor to congratulate Jayden Cordic on achieving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.

## RECOGNIZING FAITH MCCREA, GOLD AWARD

### HON. MARK E. AMODEI

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 20, 2025*

Mr. AMODEI of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Faith McCrea. Faith is a member of Girl Scouts of the Sierra Nevada, Troop 1306, and has exemplified extraordinary leadership, innovative problem-solving, and a demonstrated commitment to making a lasting, positive impact, by earning the most prestigious award in Girl Scouting, the Gold Award.

Gold Award Girl Scouts are recognized as trailblazers who are willing to tackle the most pressing challenges facing their communities and the world with measurable, sustainable, and far-reaching results. To earn the Girl

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

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Scout Gold Award, high school-age Girl Scouts must identify and investigate an issue they care about, devise a plan, and then lead a team of experts and community members to implement a project that produces lasting change. Over the course of 1 to 2 years, Gold Award Girl Scouts demonstrate significant initiative, commitment, and leadership, distinguishing them from their peers. Through their resourcefulness and perseverance, they embody the Girl Scout Law to truly make the world a better place.

Faith McCrea created "Emotions through Art," designed to help students who experience anxiety and depression when dealing with the pressures of school. Faith began by researching art therapy and how it can help people who are dealing with negative emotions. Applying her research on art therapy techniques, Faith's project helped students express their negative emotions through art using colors and shapes. Faith presented the color wheel to students and taught them how they can use art to express and influence their emotions. She uploaded art videos to YouTube for people to watch when they are feeling upset, and she also passed out brochures that she designed with resources on how to seek professional help if they need it.

On behalf of the 2nd Congressional District of Nevada, congratulations to Faith McCrea for achieving the highest distinction in Girl Scouts, the Gold Award. We thank Faith for her leadership and for making such a positive, lasting change in our community.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. ANN WAGNER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 20, 2025*

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not present for Roll Call votes on May 19, 2025. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 132, and YEA on Roll Call No. 133.

#### RECOGNIZING INDIO PORTER

### HON. BRITTANY PETTERSEN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 20, 2025*

Ms. PETTERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Indio Porter for earning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.

Indio has overcome many challenges along his journey to success, demonstrating perseverance at every step. Students who strive to make the most of their education, like Indio, develop crucial skills and a work ethic that will guide them for the rest of their lives. This award is a testament to Indio's hard work, determination, and perseverance at Mandalay Middle School and is clearly just the beginning of a bright and promising future.

It is my honor to congratulate Indio Porter on achieving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. J. FRENCH HILL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 20, 2025*

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, while leading a delegation on behalf of the Speaker of the House to the Vatican, I was delayed by unavoidable mechanical issues with my aircraft and was not present for votes.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 132, and YEA on Roll Call No. 133.

#### TRIBUTE TO ALISON WALES— CALIFORNIA'S 24TH CONGRESSIONAL WOMAN OF THE YEAR

### HON. SALUD O. CARBAJAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 20, 2025*

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, each year, I have the privilege of honoring women on the Central Coast who have made a meaningful impact in our community through the Women of the Year Award. This year, it's my pleasure to recognize Alison Wales of Lompoc, California, for her outstanding contributions and commitment to improving the lives of countless individuals.

Alison's journey began in a small Iowa town, where the values of service and community were instilled in her by her family. Since arriving in Lompoc in 1987, she has demonstrated dedication to uplifting others and amplifying voices that might otherwise go unheard.

In 1996, Alison transitioned from volunteer to team member at the North County Rape Crisis and Child Protection Center, launching a 30-year career in crisis counseling, program development, and survivor advocacy. Through her work, Alison has shaped programs that have had a lasting difference in our community. Including an AMAC support group that has served individuals for over two decades, initiatives supporting at-risk boys and their mothers, teen parenting programs, and a five-year tenure as the Lompoc Police Department Advocate.

Alison also prioritized education, earning degrees from Chapman University to strengthen her ability to serve others. She played a pivotal role in civic engagement, serving with the League of Women Voters and the Santa Barbara County Commission for Women. During her tenure, she helped secure funding for the launch of 'She Raised Her Hand,' an initiative dedicated to addressing the unique challenges faced by female veterans, and providing them with the education, support, and connections they need to thrive.

It is with great pride that I honor Alison Wales as Women of the Year for her contributions to our community and for being a beacon of hope and positive change for so many. Her legacy of service and her commitment to others will continue to inspire future generations.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Alison Wales, a true champion of justice, compassion, and influence in California's 24th Congressional District.

#### RECOGNIZING IBRAHIM YOUSUF

### HON. BRITTANY PETTERSEN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 20, 2025*

Ms. PETTERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ibrahim Yousuf for earning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.

Ibrahim has overcome many challenges along her journey to success, demonstrating perseverance at every step. Students who strive to make the most of their education, like Ibrahim, develop crucial skills and a work ethic that will guide them for the rest of their lives. This award is a testament to Ibrahim's hard work, determination, and perseverance at Oberon Middle School and is clearly just the beginning of a bright and promising future.

It is my honor to congratulate Ibrahim Yousuf on achieving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.

#### HONORING COLEE M. ANTHONY

### HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 20, 2025*

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an exceptional young leader, Mr. Colee M. Anthony of Indianola, Mississippi, for his academic excellence, public service, and unwavering dedication to civic engagement across the state of Mississippi.

Mr. Anthony is currently pursuing a Bachelor of Arts in Public Policy Leadership and Political Science at the University of Mississippi, with an expected graduation in May 2025. A proud graduate of Gentry High School in Indianola, Mississippi, he ranked 22nd out of a graduating class of 150 students in May 2021.

Throughout his academic journey, Mr. Anthony has consistently demonstrated a deep commitment to leadership and public service. As a member of the University of Mississippi's Men of Excellence organization since 2021, he has served in various roles, including Vice President during the 2022–2023 academic year and President during 2023–2024. His leadership has helped cultivate a culture of integrity, mentorship, and excellence on campus.

Mr. Anthony is also an active member of the Black Student Union, where he was elected Judicial Chair in November 2024. In this position, he ensures the organization upholds its constitution and remains mission-driven in serving Black students at the university. Additionally, he is a dedicated member of the University of Mississippi chapter of the NAACP.

Outside of campus life, Mr. Anthony's service extends into the broader community. Since July 2024, he has served as the Mayor's Youth Advisor in Indianola, Mississippi, working to strengthen relationships between the city's youth and senior citizens and advising on crime-reduction strategies and community development initiatives.

Mr. Anthony's commitment to public service is also reflected in his internship experiences. In the summer of 2024, he served in my Greenwood office, assisting with scheduling

and constituent services. In 2023, he interned with Judge Carlos Palmer at Palmer Law Services in Greenwood, where he supported client appointments, attended court proceedings, and proofread legal documents. He also served as a student ambassador during the 2024 U.S. Senate campaign for Ty Pinkins, helping organize events and bringing the candidate to engage with students at the University of Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, Colee M. Anthony embodies the promise of Mississippi's future—intelligent, driven, and dedicated to service. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing his outstanding achievements and in celebrating the positive example he sets for youth in our communities and across the Nation.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 20, 2025*

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unable to make the following votes. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 132, and YEA on Roll Call No. 133.

#### RECOGNIZING GIANA PADILLA

### HON. BRITTANY PETTERSEN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 20, 2025*

Ms. PETTERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Giana Padilla for earning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.

Giana has overcome many challenges along her journey to success, demonstrating perseverance at every step. Students who strive to make the most of their education, like Giana, develop crucial skills and a work ethic that will guide them for the rest of their lives. This award is a testament to Giana's hard work, determination, and perseverance at Mandalay Middle School and is clearly just the beginning of a bright and promising future.

It is my honor to congratulate Giana Padilla on achieving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.

#### CELEBRATING 40 YEARS OF RADIO MARTÍ

### HON. CARLOS A. GIMENEZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 20, 2025*

Mr. GIMENEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate a monumental milestone, the 40th anniversary of Radio Martí.

For four decades, Radio Martí has been a beacon of truth for the Cuban people, piercing through the propaganda and tyranny of the Castro regime.

In a country where freedom of speech is silenced and independent media is outlawed, Radio Martí has delivered uncensored news, real stories, and a powerful message: liberty is not only possible, it is on the horizon.

As a proud Cuban American and a staunch defender of democracy, I know firsthand the value of what Radio Martí represents. It's more than just a station; it's a lifeline for a community that longs for freedom.

I thank the dedicated journalists and staff who have carried this mission forward since 1985. Their work is vital, their courage is undeniable, and their impact is immeasurable.

Here's to 40 years of truth, resilience, and the unbreakable spirit of the Cuban people. May this next chapter bring us even closer to a Cuba libre.

#### ACCELERATING NETWORKING, CYBERINFRASTRUCTURE, AND HARDWARE FOR OCEANIC RESEARCH ACT

SPEECH OF

### HON. HALEY M. STEVENS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, May 19, 2025*

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1223, the Accelerating Networking, Cyberinfrastructure, and Hardware for Oceanic Research Act, or ANCHOR Act. I would like to thank my colleague, Representative VINCE FONG (R-CA), for working with me to advance this bipartisan legislation. I would also like to thank Senators ALEX PADILLA (D-CA) and DAN SULLIVAN (R-AK) for taking up this important legislation in the Senate.

The Blue Heron, a research vessel operated by the University of Minnesota Duluth, is the only U.S. Academic Research Fleet vessel operating in the Great Lakes. It provides critical research that informs science-based decisions to protect Michigan's gift to the country, our Great Lakes. These vessels represent a global network of essential research platforms that advance our understanding of the world's marine and freshwater ecosystems. It is paramount for Michiganders that the Blue Heron and the entire fleet have the resources they need to operate safely, securely, and effectively for years to come.

However, just like every part of our modern economy, these vessels are increasingly vulnerable to cybersecurity threats. For the past several years, the National Science Foundation has taken steps to harden terrestrial research infrastructure, especially after major telescopes were disabled for weeks in 2023 due to a cyber incident. It is vital that NSF also hardens the cyberinfrastructure capabilities of the Blue Heron, and the entire Academic Research Fleet.

This common-sense, bipartisan, bicameral legislation is designed to support the efforts of the U.S. Academic Research Fleet to advance their cyberinfrastructure and networks to ensure they are protected and able to continue to do their important work. The ANCHOR Act directs the National Science Foundation to develop a plan to modernize the Academic Research Fleet's information technology, including its cybersecurity practices, to carry out the fleet's mission to deliver critical science that protects Michigan's Great Lakes.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill to secure and modernize the IT systems used by our academic research fleet.

#### RECOGNIZING MAKILA CORDOVA

### HON. BRITTANY PETTERSEN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 20, 2025*

Ms. PETTERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Makila Cordova for earning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.

Makila has overcome many challenges along her journey to success, demonstrating perseverance at every step. Students who strive to make the most of their education, like Makila, develop crucial skills and a work ethic that will guide them for the rest of their lives. This award is a testament to Makila's hard work, determination, and perseverance at Oberon Middle School and is clearly just the beginning of a bright and promising future.

It is my honor to congratulate Makila Cordova on achieving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.

#### CELEBRATING 90 YEARS OF RUTT INSURANCE

### HON. LLOYD SMUCKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 20, 2025*

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to congratulate and recognize Rutt Insurance for their 90th anniversary.

Founded in May 1935 by B. Titus Rutt, an orchard manager-turned-insurance salesman, Rutt Insurance is a family-run independent insurance company located on Main Street in Mount Joy, Pennsylvania. Since Jamie Rutt, Titus's grandson, joined the business in 1991, the company has nearly doubled in size and expanded its reach by acquiring other small agencies.

Rutt Insurance continues to serve the people of Lancaster County with integrity, helping individuals and businesses find the right coverage for their homes, vehicles, and livelihoods. As proud members of the Keystone Insurers Group and the Mount Joy Chamber of Commerce, their contributions extend beyond business—they are active participants in building a stronger, more resilient community.

As Rutt Insurance celebrates a milestone anniversary and prepares the next generation of Rutt family leadership, I commend Rutt Insurance for 90 years of hard work, service, and positive community impact. The American Dream is alive in Pennsylvania's 11th Congressional District, and Rutt Insurance demonstrates that. May their success continue for many more years to come.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. PRAMILA JAYAPAL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 20, 2025*

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I missed Roll Call Votes No. 123 and Roll Call No. 124 on May 13, 2025. Had I been present, my votes would have been Yea on Roll Call No. 123, and Yea on Roll Call No. 124.

## RECOGNIZING LILI PRYOR

**HON. BRITTANY PETTERSEN**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 20, 2025*

Ms. PETTERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lili Pryor for earning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.

Lili has overcome many challenges along her journey to success, demonstrating perseverance at every step. Students who strive to make the most of their education, like Lili, develop crucial skills and a work ethic that will guide them for the rest of their lives. This award is a testament to Lili's hard work, determination, and perseverance at Oberon Middle School and is clearly just the beginning of a bright and promising future.

It is my honor to congratulate Lili Pryor on achieving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. STEPHANIE I. BICE**

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 20, 2025*

Mrs. BICE. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend votes yesterday, as travel back from the Congressional Delegation to attend Pope Leo XIV's Mass for the beginning of his Pontificate was delayed due to a mechanical problem. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 132, and YEA on Roll Call No. 133.

## RECOGNIZING NATIONAL ROOFING CONTRACTORS ASSOCIATION AND NATIONAL ROOFING WEEK

**HON. RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 20, 2025*

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the National Roofing Contractors Association headquartered in Itasca, Illinois, on the occasion of National Roofing Week between June 1–7, 2025.

National Roofing Week honors the efforts of thousands of roofing-related workers and businesses across the country, as well as the industry's commitment to public service in general. National Roofing Week is a valuable reminder of the significance quality roofing has on every home and business in the U.S.

Established in 1886, NRCA is one of the Nation's oldest trade associations and the voice of professional roofing contractors worldwide. NRCA has nearly 4,000 roofing company members representing the entire roofing supply chain. Using its network of roofing contractors and industry-related members, NRCA is responsible for the installation of new construction and replacement roof systems on commercial and residential structures in America. Most of NRCA's members are small, privately held businesses that provide family-sustaining jobs for thousands of hardworking individuals who are the backbone of our economy.

Professional roofing contractors provide vital services to their communities, on and off the clock. NRCA members will recognize National Roofing Week June 1–7, by supporting numerous charitable projects, employee training programs and other activities across the Nation. I commend NRCA and the vital role the organization and its members play in every community, and I ask my colleagues to join me in acknowledging their contributions during National Roofing Week.

## RECOGNIZING LEYANA MILLER

**HON. BRITTANY PETTERSEN**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 20, 2025*

Ms. PETTERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Leyana Miller for earning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.

Leyana has overcome many challenges along her journey to success, demonstrating perseverance at every step. Students who strive to make the most of their education, like Leyana, develop crucial skills and a work ethic that will guide them for the rest of their lives. This award is a testament to Leyana's hard work, determination, and perseverance at Oberon Middle School and is clearly just the beginning of a bright and promising future.

It is my honor to congratulate Leyana Miller on achieving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.

## SUPPORTING THE DEMOCRATIC WOMEN'S CAUCUS ON DEFENDING SNAP AND MEDICAID CUTS

**HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 20, 2025*

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to defend Medicaid and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or food stamps, from an ongoing Republican assault.

In a few hours Republicans will meet to advance a bill that abandons Americans who are struggling with the cost-of-living crisis. It guts Medicaid, which covers health care for children, people with disabilities, seniors, and low-income workers, and it cuts nearly \$300 billion from agriculture and programs that combat hunger, including food stamps.

This Republican bill cuts Medicaid, forcing states to pay more or cover fewer people—it cuts benefits.

I think of the 64,000 people in Connecticut, including 27,000 children, who can eat thanks to food stamps.

If this program is pushed back to the states, who have fewer resources, the children will go hungry, and their families will not be able to afford healthy foods. In this cost of living crisis, the last thing we should be doing is making it harder for families to put food on the table. But that is exactly what Republicans are preparing to do. The results will be devastating—the largest cut to the most successful anti-hunger program in American history. All to pay for massive giveaways to billionaires.

## CONGRATULATING PRESIDENT-ELECT NICUSOR DAN

**HON. JOE WILSON**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 20, 2025*

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the American people extend their congratulations to President-Elect Nicușor Dan on decisively winning the runoff election, as an independent, to become the President of Romania held on May 18, 2025.

The President-elect's political career as the leader of the Save Romania Union (USR) party began in 2016, during his service in the Romanian Chamber of Deputies, then in 2020, went on to become the Mayor of Bucharest.

His strong priorities of strengthening cooperation with the United States and the European Union demonstrates his suitability to be the right leader for the people of Romania. I have a personal appreciation for Romania with visits since 1997 where Cluj-Napoca was adopted as sister city of Columbia, South Carolina. I have visited numerous parts of the country with troops from South Carolina stationed at NATO facilities enduring the warm friendship of Americans for Romanians.

There is a deep appreciation for President-Elect Dan and his commitment to promoting both academic and civil engagement in Romania, which dates back to his co-founding of the Școala Normală Superioară București, in 2001, modeled after the French École Normale Supérieure. Aiming to cultivate academic excellence in Romania, his commitment to furthering academic excellence in Romania, combined with his efforts to eliminate corruption and encourage fiscal reform nationwide, cements the strong policy foundation he will take with him as he enters office.

My appreciation for the people of Romania is personal as I have seen firsthand how they have flourished since being liberated from the tyranny of the failed Soviet empire. As war criminal Putin attempts to rebuild the former Soviet Empire, I am grateful that Romania has taken a stand against them, siding with the democratic Rule of Law, which will always triumph over the authoritarian Rule of Gun.

We cannot allow war criminal Putin to rebuild the failed former Soviet empire and nations like Romania will help us maintain Peace Through Strength across Europe and the rest of the world.

This election is a powerful testament to democratic resilience in the face of neighboring warfare and criminal electoral manipulation.

Romania continues to be a strong local supporter of the people of Ukraine in their struggle against the illegal invasion of woke war criminal Putin. I am eager for the United States to work with President-Elect Dan. In November of last year, Romania almost fell into the Russian sphere of influence, again, as the Kremlin instructed domestic actors to influence the first round of elections, which would have led to the rise of the Anti-American far-right.

Thankfully, the Constitutional Court of Romania upheld the Rule of Law and ordered the election to be held once more with more integrity safeguards to be put into place. I commend the Court for ensuring that malign foreign influence, particularly from Russia, does

not determine leadership in a reliable and important democratic ally to the United States.

The Kremlin's attempts to subvert Romania's democracy are part of a broader campaign to weaken transatlantic cohesion. The United States unequivocally condemns these actions and supports coordinated sanctions and countermeasures to counter these criminal maneuvers.

I look forward to President-Elect Dan being sworn-in during the coming weeks. The United States is proud to stand with the President-Elect as a vital NATO ally and a democratic anchor on NATO's eastern flank.

Romania's electoral course correction can serve as a blueprint for other democracies under pressure from Russian tyranny, from Georgia to Ukraine. President-elect Dan's victory reaffirms that the democratic spirit cannot be extinguished by external sabotage or internal division. We wish him the best as he enters office and forms a government and counters the moves by our common enemy.

Mr. Speaker, the United States wishes President-Elect Dan a warm congratulations and best of luck, or felicitări și mult noroc.

RECOGNIZING DR. ALISA WHITE,  
PRESIDENT OF SAM HOUSTON  
STATE UNIVERSITY

**HON. MORGAN LUTTRELL**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 20, 2025*

Mr. LUTTRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize President Alisa White of Sam Houston State University for her dedication, devotion and leadership in service to Sam Houston State University, its students and all Texans. Like Sam Houston himself, Dr. White saw Texas as a land of promise, offering opportunities for bold enterprise and she is delivering on that promise every day.

Assuming the role as President of SHSU in August of 2020, Dr. White brought her leadership to the University in a time of disruption, change and uncertainty in education. The COVID pandemic had rendered the college experience unrecognizable. Finding a way through the pandemic, protecting her students and maintaining excellence, President White showed true leadership.

Dr. White is truly committed to Sam Houston's first-generation college students and those coming to the school from low-income households. In every conversation with Dr. White, she speaks of her commitment to these students and to giving them the tools they need to be successful. This led to the establishment of the First-Generation Center to offer tailored resources and support to this cohort of students.

Sam Houston has recently launched the Polytechnic College, known as SamPoly. This initiative aims to provide students with practical, industry-aligned education to meet the evolving demands of the workforce. True to Dr. White's mission to provide opportunities for students across multiple interests, SamPoly is breaking barriers to education and leading to success for an ever-growing range of student interests.

In tune with the needs of the country and the interests of the students, President White has thrown her full support behind a new com-

mitment to Cyber Studies. Both degree and certificate level programs are growing at Sam Houston and the school is working with the CIA, FBI, DHS and other agencies to create a pathway to jobs in this fast-growing field.

Under her leadership, the SHSU College of Osteopathic Medicine is making a name for itself in the medical field. Training predominantly Primary Care Physicians, they will serve throughout Texas and the U.S. in underserved communities. Since Dr. White coming to the helm, the medical school secured an investment from the State of Texas for \$32 million and an additional \$23 million in pledges and gifts in 2023 alone.

It's not just in the classroom that Dr. White is making a difference. On the fields and courts, and even on the beaches, with the introduction of Beach Volleyball this year, Sam Houston students are reaching new heights. Dr. White has brought her brand of energy to Sam Houston State University and the feeling on campus is electric.

As a Sam Houston State University graduate, I could not be prouder to offer this commendation to my fellow Bearkat—Dr. Alisa White. Her leadership and service to the University and to Texas are unrivaled.

RECOGNIZING KARIZA CORTEZ

**HON. BRITTANY PETTERSEN**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 20, 2025*

Ms. PETTERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Kariza Cortez for earning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.

Kariza has overcome many challenges along her journey to success, demonstrating perseverance at every step. Students who strive to make the most of their education, like Kariza, develop crucial skills and a work ethic that will guide them for the rest of their lives. This award is a testament to Kariza's hard work, determination, and perseverance at Mandalay Middle School and is clearly just the beginning of a bright and promising future.

It is my honor to congratulate Kariza Cortez on achieving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.

HONORING SERGEANT WILLIE J.  
TRUEITT, JR.

**HON. CHARLES J. "CHUCK"  
FLEISCHMANN**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 20, 2025*

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Sergeant Willie J. Trueitt, Jr. of Chattanooga, Tennessee, in recognition of his impending retirement.

Sergeant Trueitt serves as the lead for Special Operations and Community Engagement with the University of Tennessee—Chattanooga Police Department. He has held positions in law enforcement for 31 years, including seven years with the Chattanooga Police Department, five years with the U.S. Veterans Affairs Police, and more than 19 years with the UTC Police Department.

Sergeant Trueitt also served our Nation in the United States Navy. In his eleven years of service, then-Petty Officer Trueitt served in duty stations including Scotland and Norfolk, Virginia.

I had the pleasure of meeting Sergeant Trueitt when he served in the security detail for my visits to the UTC campus, and he also oversaw the security planning for my Service Academy Day event this year. He has committed himself to serving the campus community, displaying a high level of professionalism while also bringing a bright smile and a positive attitude to his work.

It is with gratitude that I recognize Sergeant Willie J. Trueitt, Jr., for his 42 years of public service to our Nation and our community, and I wish him well on his retirement.

RECOGNIZING LINDSEY HATCHER  
ON HER OFFER OF APPOINTMENT  
TO ATTEND THE UNITED  
STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

**HON. ROBERT E. LATTA**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 20, 2025*

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding student from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am pleased to announce that Lindsey Hatcher of Van Wert, Ohio, has been offered an appointment to the United States Military Academy in West Point, New York.

Lindsey's offer of appointment permits her to attend the United States Military Academy this fall with the incoming Class of 2029. Attending one of our Nation's military academies not only offers the opportunity to serve our country but also guarantees a world-class education while undertaking one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of their lives. Lindsey brings a tremendous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming Class of 2029. While attending Lincolnview High School, she participated in science club, band, student government, and was on the honor roll. Throughout high school, Lindsey was involved in track and field and golf, earning her varsity letter in both. I am confident that she will carry the lessons of her student and athletic leadership to the Military Academy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Lindsey Hatcher on her offer of appointment to the United States Military Academy. Our service academies offer the finest military training and education available, and I am positive that Lindsey will excel during her career at the Military Academy. I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to her as she begins her service to our Nation.

RECOGNIZING JAYDEN ZALAZAR

**HON. BRITTANY PETTERSEN**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 20, 2025*

Ms. PETTERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jayden Zalazar for earning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.

Jayden has overcome many challenges along his journey to success, demonstrating perseverance at every step. Students who strive to make the most of their education, like Jayden, develop crucial skills and a work ethic that will guide them for the rest of their lives. This award is a testament to Jayden's hard work, determination, and perseverance at Mandalay Middle School and is clearly just the beginning of a bright and promising future. It is my honor to congratulate Jayden Zalazar on achieving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.



# Daily Digest

## Senate

### Chamber Action

*Routine Proceedings, pages S2983–S3016*

**Measures Introduced:** Sixteen bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1808–1823, and S. Res. 236–238. **Pages S3009–10**

#### Measures Reported:

S. 180, 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, to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide public safety officer benefits for exposure-related cancers.

S. 419, to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to reauthorize grants to support law enforcement officers and families.

S. 539, to reauthorize the PROTECT Our Children Act of 2008, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

S. 911, 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. 1316, 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, with an amendment.

S. 1563, 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, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

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

**Page S3009**

#### Measures Passed:

**No Tax on Tips Act:** Committee on Finance was discharged from further consideration of 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 the bill was then passed.

**Pages S2993–94**

**Save Our Seas 2.0 Amendments Act:** Senate passed 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.

**Pages S3001–02**

**Securing Semiconductor Supply Chains Act:** Senate passed S. 97, to require SelectUSA to coordinate with State-level economic development organizations to increase foreign direct investment in semiconductor-related manufacturing and production.

**Pages S3002–03**

**Honoring the Members of the 1st Armored Brigade Combat Team, 3rd Infantry Division in Lithuania:** Senate agreed to S. Res. 237, honoring the service and memory of Army Staff Sgt. Jose Duenez Jr., Army Staff Sgt. Edwin 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.

**Page S3003**

**26th Annual National Charter Schools Week:** Senate agreed to S. Res. 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.

**Page S3003**

#### Measures Considered:

**Genius Act—Agreement:** Senate continued consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of

S. 1582, to provide for the regulation of payment stablecoins. **Pages S2983–88**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill at approximately 10 a.m., on Wednesday, May 21, 2025, post-cloture, and that all time on the motion to proceed expire at 11:30 a.m. **Page S3016**

**Messages from the House:** **Pages S3007–08**

**Measures Referred:** **Page S3008**

**Executive Communications:** **Pages S3008–09**

**Executive Reports of Committees:** **Page S3009**

**Additional Cosponsors:** **Pages S3010–11**

**Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:** **Pages S3011–13**

**Additional Statements:** **Pages S3006–07**

**Amendments Submitted:** **Pages S3013–16**

**Authorities for Committees to Meet:** **Page S3016**

**Adjournment:** Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:07 p.m., until 10:00 a.m. on Wednesday, May 21, 2025. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S3016.)

## Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

### APPROPRIATIONS: HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2026 for the Department of Health and Human Services, after receiving testimony from Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., Secretary of Health and Human Services.

### APPROPRIATIONS: STATE DEPARTMENT

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2026 for the Department of State, after receiving testimony from Marco Rubio, Secretary of State.

### DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

*Committee on Armed Services:* Committee concluded open and closed hearings to examine the posture of the Department of the Air Force in review of the Defense Authorization Request for Fiscal Year 2026

and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from Troy E. Meink, Secretary, and General David W. Allvin, Jr., USAF, Chief of Staff, both of the Air Force, and General B. Chance Saltzman, USSF, Chief of Space Operations, all of the Department of Defense.

### BUSINESS MEETING

*Committee on Armed Services:* Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Richard Anderson, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, and Adam Telle, of Mississippi, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army, both of the Department of Defense, Matthew Napoli, of Virginia, to be Deputy Administrator for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, National Nuclear Security Administration, Department of Energy, and 2,233 nominations in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Space Force.

### DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

*Committee on Armed Services:* Subcommittee on Strategic Forces concluded a hearing to examine the Department of Energy's atomic energy defense activities and Department of Defense nuclear weapons program in review of the Defense Authorization Request for Fiscal Year 2026 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from James J. McConnell, Acting Principal Deputy Administrator, Admiral William J. Houston, USN, Director, Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program, and David A. Hoagland, Acting Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs, each of the National Nuclear Security Administration, and Roger A. Jarrell II, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, all of the Department of Energy; and Brandi C. Vann, performing the duties of the Assistant Secretary for Nuclear, Chemical, and Biological Defense Programs, Office of the Secretary, General Thomas A. Bussiere, USAF, Commander, Air Force Global Strike Command, and Vice Admiral Johnny R. Wolfe, Jr., USN, Director for Strategic Systems Programs, Department of the Navy, all of the Department of Defense.

### NOMINATION

*Committee on Finance:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of William Long, of Missouri, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Department of the Treasury, after the nominee testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

### DEPARTMENT OF STATE BUDGET

*Committee on Foreign Relations:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2026 for the Department of

State, after receiving testimony from Marco Rubio, Secretary of State.

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY BUDGET

*Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2026 for the Department of Homeland Security, after receiving testimony from Kristi Noem, Secretary of Homeland Security.

## UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine defending against drones, focus-

ing on setting safeguards for counter unmanned aircraft systems, after receiving testimony from Troy Wilson, Texas Department of Public Safety; Robert Dooley, Florida Highway Patrol; Ricky Dixon, Florida Department of Corrections, on behalf of the American Correctional Association; Jennifer Daskal, Venable LLP; and Laura K. Donohue, Georgetown University.

## INTELLIGENCE

*Select Committee on Intelligence:* Committee received a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

# House of Representatives

## Chamber Action

**Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced:** 23 public bills, H.R. 3504–3526; and 5 resolutions, H. Res. 430–434, were introduced. **Pages H2197–98**

**Additional Cosponsors:** **Page H2199**

**Report Filed:** A report was filed today as follows: H.R. 1, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of H. Con. Res. 14 (H. Rept. 119–106). **Page H2197**

**Speaker:** Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Miller-Meeks to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H2149**

**Recess:** The House recessed at 11:22 a.m. and reconvened at 12 p.m. **Page H2157**

**Committee Elections:** The House agreed to H. Res. 430, electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives. **Page H2158**

**Recess:** The House recessed at 1:09 p.m. and reconvened at 1:30 p.m. **Page H2166**

**Suspension—Proceedings Resumed:** The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure. Consideration began Monday, May 19th.

***Accelerating Networking, Cyberinfrastructure, and Hardware for Oceanic Research Act:*** H.R. 1223, to require a plan to improve the cybersecurity and telecommunications of the U.S. Academic Research Fleet, by a  $\frac{2}{3}$  yea-and-nay vote of 412 yeas to 11 nays, Roll No. 136. **Page H2168**

**Recess:** The House recessed at 3:39 p.m. and reconvened at 5 p.m. **Page H2177**

**Suspension—Proceedings Postponed:** The House debated the following measure under suspension of the rules. Further proceedings were postponed.

***No Wrong Door for Veterans Act:*** H.R. 1969, amended, to amend and reauthorize the Staff Sergeant Parker Gordon Fox Suicide Prevention Grant Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs. **Pages H2175–77**

**Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency of the Department of the Treasury relating to the review of applications under the Bank Merger Act:** The House passed S.J. Res. 13, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency of the Department of the Treasury relating to the review of applications under the Bank Merger Act, by a yea-and-nay vote of 220 yeas to 207 nays, Roll No. 137. **Pages H2159–66, H2168–75, H2177–78**

H. Res. 426, the rule providing for consideration of the joint resolutions (S.J. Res. 13) and (S.J. Res. 31) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 210 ayes to 208 noes, Roll No. 135, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 215 yeas to 207 nays, Roll No. 134. **Pages H2159–66, H2166–68**

**Quorum Calls—Votes:** Three yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2166–67, H2167–68, H2168 and H2177–78.

**Adjournment:** The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:29 p.m.

## Committee Meetings

### NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVES FORCES

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Defense held an oversight hearing on the National Guard and Reserves Forces. Testimony was heard from General Steven S. Nordhaus, Chief of the National Guard Bureau, Department of Defense; Lieutenant General Robert D. Harter, Chief of Army Reserve and Commanding General, U.S. Army Reserve Command; Vice Admiral Nancy S. Lacore, Chief of Navy Reserve, Department of the Navy; Lieutenant General Leonard F. Anderson IV, Commander, U.S. Marine Corps Reserve, Department of the Navy; and Lieutenant General John P. Healy, Chief of Air Force Reserve, Department of the Air Force.

### U.S. SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government held an oversight hearing on the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. Testimony was heard from Paul Atkins, Chairman, U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission.

### APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Department of the Interior. Testimony was heard from Doug Burgum, Secretary, Department of the Interior.

### MEMBER DAY

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “Member Day”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Rulli and Goodlander.

### TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Homeland Security held an oversight hearing on the Transportation Security Administration. Testimony was heard from Ha Nguyen McNeill, Acting Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security.

### MEMBER DAY

*Committee on Armed Services:* Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Member Day”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Kaptur, Vicente Gonzalez of Texas, Escobar, Schrier, Stansbury, Budzinski, Randall, Perez, Yakym, Stauber, and Feenstra.

### EMPOWERING THE MODERN WORKER

*Committee on Education and Workforce:* Subcommittee on Workforce Protections held a hearing entitled “Empowering the Modern Worker”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

### THE FISCAL YEAR 2026 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY BUDGET

*Committee on Energy and Commerce:* Subcommittee on Environment held a hearing entitled “The Fiscal Year 2026 Environmental Protection Agency Budget”. Testimony was heard from Lee Zeldin, Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency.

### MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

*Committee on Financial Services:* Full Committee began a markup on H.R. 1013, the “Retirement Fairness for Charities and Educational Institutions Act of 2025”; H.R. 1190, the “Expanding Access to Capital for Rural Job Creators Act”; H.R. 1469, the “Senior Security Act of 2025”; H.R. 2225, the “Access to Small Business Investor Capital Act”; H.R. 2441, the “Improving Disclosure for Investors Act of 2025”; H.R. 3301, a bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to specify certain registration statement contents for emerging growth companies, to permit issuers to file draft registration statements with the Securities and Exchange Commission for confidential review; H.R. 3323, the “Helping Startups Continue To Grow Act”; H.R. 3339, the “Equal Opportunity for All Investors Act of 2025”; H.R. 3343, the “Greenlighting Growth Act”; H.R. 3348, the “Accredited Investor Definition Review Act”; H.R. 3351, the “Improving Access to Small Business Information Act”; H.R. 3352, the “Helping Angels Lead Our Startups Act of 2025”; H.R. 3357, the “Enhancing Multi-Class Share Disclosures Act”; H.R. 3381, the “Encouraging Public Offerings Act of 2025”; H.R. 3382, the “Small Entity Update Act”; H.R. 3383, the “Increasing Investor Opportunities Act”; H.R. 3394, the “Fair Investment Opportunities for Professional Experts Act”; H.R. 3395, the “Middle Market IPO Underwriting Cost Act”; H.R. 3422, the “Promoting Opportunities for Non-Traditional Capital Formation Act”; H.R. 940, the “Fair Audits and Inspections for Regulators’ Exams Act”; H.R. 1900, the “Financial Institution Regulatory Tailoring Enhancement Act”; H.R. 3379, the “Halting Uncertain Methods and Practices in Supervision Act of 2025”; H.R. 3380, the “Taking Account of Institutions with Low Operation Risk Act of 2025”; and H.R. 2702, the “Financial Integrity and Regulation Management Act”.

## EXAMINING THREATS TO IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT OPERATIONS

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Subcommittee on Oversight held a hearing entitled “Examining Threats to ICE Operations”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

## LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

*Committee on Natural Resources:* Subcommittee on Federal Lands held a hearing on legislation on the FORESTS Act. Testimony was heard from Representative Hurd; John Crockett, Deputy Chief, State, Private and Tribal Forestry, U.S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; and public witnesses.

## LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

*Committee on Natural Resources:* Subcommittee on Water, Wildlife and Fisheries held a hearing on H.R. 1885, the “Town of North Topsail Beach Coastal Barrier Resources System Map Amendment Act of 2025”; H.R. 2294, to reauthorize the Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009; H.R. 2860, the “Northwest Straits Marine Conservation Initiative Reauthorization Act of 2025”; and H.R. 3179, to rename the Anahuac National Wildlife Refuge located in the State of Texas as the “Jocelyn Nungaray National Wildlife Refuge”. Testimony was heard from Chairman Babin, and Representatives Murphy and Larsen of Washington; David Miko, Acting Deputy Director of Operations, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; Tom Leonard, Alderman, North Topsail Beach, North Carolina; and public witnesses.

## LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

*Committee on Natural Resources:* Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing on H.R. 513, the “Offshore Lands Authorities Act of 2025”; H.R. 931, to allow certain Federal minerals to be mined consistent with the Bull Mountains Mining Plan Modification, and for other purposes; H.R. 2250, the “National Landslide Preparedness Act Reauthorization Act of 2025”; H.R. 2556, the “CORE Act of 2025”; H.R. 3168, the “National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program Reauthorization Act of 2025”; H.R. 3176, to amend the John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act to reauthorize the National Volcano Early Warning and Monitoring System. Testimony was heard from Representatives Hunt, Begich, DelBene, Valadao, Higgins of Louisiana, and Downing; Walter Cruickshank, Acting Director, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management; and public witnesses.

## MANDATES, MEDDLING, AND MISMANAGEMENT: THE INFLATION REDUCTION ACT’S THREAT TO ENERGY AND MEDICINE

*Committee on Oversight and Government Reform:* Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Energy Policy, and Regulatory Affairs; and Subcommittee on Health Care and Financial Services held a joint hearing entitled “Mandates, Meddling, and Mismanagement: The IRA’s Threat to Energy and Medicine”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

## THE JFK FILES: ASSESSING OVER 60 YEARS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT’S OBSTRUCTION, OBFUSCATION, AND DECEPTION

*Committee on Oversight and Government Reform:* Task Force on the Declassification of Federal Secrets held a hearing entitled “The JFK Files: Assessing Over 60 Years of the Federal Government’s Obstruction, Obfuscation, and Deception”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

## BREACH OF TRUST: SURVEILLANCE IN PRIVATE SPACES

*Committee on Oversight and Government Reform:* Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Information Technology, and Government Innovation held a hearing entitled “Breach of Trust: Surveillance in Private Spaces”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

## INNOVATIONS IN AGRICHEMICALS: ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE’S HIDDEN FORMULA DRIVING EFFICIENCY

*Committee on Science, Space, and Technology:* Subcommittee on Environment held a hearing entitled “Innovations in Agrichemicals: AI’s Hidden Formula Driving Efficiency”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

## FEDERAL COURTHOUSE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION: EXAMINING THE COSTS TO THE TAXPAYER

*Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure:* Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management held a hearing entitled “Federal Courthouse Design and Construction: Examining the Costs to the Taxpayer”. Testimony was heard from David Marroni, Director, Physical Infrastructure, Government Accountability Office; Glenn T. Suddaby, District Judge, U.S. District Court for the Northern District of New York, and Chair, Judicial Conference Committee on Space and Facilities; and Michael Peters, Commissioner, Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration.

## Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

### NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, p. D396)

H.J. Res. 20, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Energy relating to “Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Consumer Gas-fired Instantaneous Water Heaters”. Signed on May 9, 2025. (Public Law 119–6)

H.J. Res. 24, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Energy relating to “Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Walk-In Coolers and Walk-In Freezers”. Signed on May 9, 2025. (Public Law 119–7)

H.J. Res. 42, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Energy relating to “Energy Conservation Program for Appliance Standards: Certification Requirements, Labeling Requirements, and Enforcement Provisions for Certain Consumer Products and Commercial Equipment”. Signed on May 9, 2025. (Public Law 119–8)

H.J. Res. 75, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy relating to “Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Commercial Refrigerators, Freezers, and Refrigerator-Freezers”. Signed on May 9, 2025. (Public Law 119–9)

S.J. Res. 18, disapproving the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to “Overdraft Lending: Very Large Financial Institutions”. Signed on May 9, 2025. (Public Law 119–10)

S.J. Res. 28, disapproving the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to “Defining Larger Participants of a Market for General-Use Digital Consumer Payment Applications”. Signed on May 9, 2025. (Public Law 119–11)

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 21, 2025

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

### Senate

*Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry:* business meeting to consider the nominations of Luke Lindberg, of South Dakota, to be Under Secretary for Trade and Foreign Agricultural Affairs, and Devon Westhill, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary, both of the Department of Agriculture, Time to be announced, S–216, Capitol.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Dudley Hoskins, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs, and Scott Hutchins, of Indiana, to be Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics, both of the Department of Agriculture, 10:30 a.m., SD–106.

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Department of Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2026 for the Department of the Interior, 10:30 a.m., SD–124.

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2026 for the Department of Energy, 2:30 p.m., SD–124.

Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2026 for the Small Business Administration, 2:30 p.m., SD–138.

*Committee on Armed Services:* to receive a closed briefing on an update on Yemen, 9:30 a.m., SVC–217.

Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, to hold hearings to examine defense of the Department of Defense Information Network; to be immediately followed by a closed session in SVC–217 at 3:30 p.m., 2:30 p.m., SR–222.

*Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:* business meeting to consider S. 190, to enhance the operations of the North Pacific Research Board, S. 318, to require a plan to improve the cybersecurity and telecommunications of the U.S. Academic Research Fleet, S. 337, to amend title 49, United States Code, to clarify the authority of the Administrator of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration relating to the shipping of household goods, S. 503, to direct the Federal Communications Commission to evaluate and consider the impact of the telecommunications network equipment supply chain on the deployment of universal service, S. 1092, to require certain products to be labeled with ‘Do Not Flush’ labeling, S. 1442, to amend title 49, United States Code, to allow for eligibility for projects for the installation of human trafficking awareness signs at rest stops, S. 1523, to modify operations of the National Water Center of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, S. 1626, to reauthorize the National Landslide Preparedness Act, and the nominations of David Fink, of New Hampshire, to be Administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration, David Fogel, of Connecticut, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Director General of



the United States and Foreign Commercial Service, Robert Gleason, of Pennsylvania, to be Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors for a term of five years, and Pierre Gentin, of New York, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce, and promotions in the Coast Guard, 10 a.m., SR-253.

*Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:* business meeting to consider the nominations of Jonathan Brightbill, of Virginia, to be General Counsel, Tina Pierce, of Idaho, to be Chief Financial Officer, and Conner Prochaska, of Texas, to be Director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy, all of the Department of Energy, and Ned Mamula, of Pennsylvania, to be Director of the United States Geological Survey, Department of the Interior, 9:30 a.m., SD-366.

*Committee on Environment and Public Works:* to hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2026 for the Environmental Protection Agency, 10 a.m., SD-562.

*Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:* to hold hearings to examine the state of higher education, 10 a.m., SD-430.

*Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:* Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, to hold hearings to examine science and Federal health agencies, focusing on Myocarditis and other events associated with the COVID-19 vaccines, 2 p.m., SH-216.

*Committee on the Judiciary:* to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Stanley Woodward, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Associate Attorney General, Thomas Gaiser, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Joseph Edlow, of Maryland, to be Director of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, and John Squires, of Florida, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, 10:15 a.m., SD-226.

Subcommittee on Privacy, Technology, and the Law, to hold hearings to examine AI-generated deepfakes, 2:30 p.m., SD-226.

*Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship:* to hold hearings to examine fueling America's manufacturing comeback, 10 a.m., SR-428A.

*Committee on Veterans' Affairs:* to hold hearings to examine S. 214, to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rate of the special pension payable to Medal of Honor recipients, S. 219, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to improve the ability of veterans to access medical care in medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs and in the community by providing veterans the ability to choose health care providers, S. 506, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to coordinate, navigate, and manage care and benefits for veterans enrolled in both the Medicare program and the system of annual patient enrollment of the Department of Veterans Affairs, S. 585, to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a pre-transition health care registration process to facilitate enrollment in the patient enrollment system of the Department of Veterans Affairs by members of the Armed Forces who are separating from the Armed

Forces, S. 599, to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the mileage rate offered by the Department of Veterans Affairs through their Beneficiary Travel program for health related travel, S. 605, to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum age for children eligible for medical care under the CHAMPVA program, S. 635, to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to recognize nurse registries for purposes of the Veterans Community Care Program, S. 649, to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for Post-9/11 Educational Assistance to members of the National Guard who perform certain full-time duty, S. 778, to amend title 38, United States Code, to require a lactation space in each medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs, S. 784, to expand and modify the grant program of the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide innovative transportation options to veterans in highly rural areas, S. 800, to modify the Precision Medicine for Veterans Initiative of the Department of Veterans Affairs, S. 827, to extend and modify the transportation grant program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, S. 879, to expand medical, employment, and other benefits for individuals serving as family caregivers for certain veterans, S. 1318, to direct the American Battle Monuments Commission to establish a program to identify American-Jewish servicemembers buried in United States military cemeteries overseas under markers that incorrectly represent their religion and heritage, S. 1320, to direct the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to take certain steps regarding research related to menopause, perimenopause, or mid-life women's health, S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, S. 1441, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to award grants to nonprofit entities to assist such entities in carrying out programs to provide service dogs to eligible veterans, S. 1533, to amend title 38, United States Code, to make permanent and codify the pilot program for use of contract physicians for disability examinations, S. 1543, to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs the Veterans Economic Opportunity and Transition Administration, and S. 1591, to amend title 38, United States Code, to reorganize the acquisition structure of the Department of Veterans Affairs and to establish the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation in the Department, 4 p.m., SR-418.

*Select Committee on Intelligence:* to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH-219.

## House

*Committee on Appropriations,* Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies, budget hearing on the Army Corps of Engineers (Civil Works) and the Bureau of Reclamation, 10 a.m., 2362-B Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, oversight hearing on the Federal Communications Commission, 10 a.m., 2358-A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, budget hearing on the Department of Education, 10 a.m., 2358-C Rayburn.

Subcommittee on National Security, Department of State, and Related Programs, budget hearing on the Department of State and Related Programs, 2 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

*Committee on Education and Workforce*, Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Development, hearing entitled “Restoring Excellence: The Case Against DEI”, 10:15 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

*Committee on Energy and Commerce*, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigation, hearing entitled “Examining Ways to Enhance Our Domestic Critical Mineral Supply Chains”, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

*Committee on Energy and Commerce*, Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade, hearing entitled “AI Regulation and the Future of U.S. Leadership”, 10:15 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

*Committee on Financial Services*, Full Committee, continue markup on H.R. 1013, the “Retirement Fairness for Charities and Educational Institutions Act of 2025”; H.R. 1190, the “Expanding Access to Capital for Rural Job Creators Act”; H.R. 1469, the “Senior Security Act of 2025”; H.R. 2225, the “Access to Small Business Investor Capital Act”; H.R. 2441, the “Improving Disclosure for Investors Act of 2025”; H.R. 3301, a bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to specify certain registration statement contents for emerging growth companies, to permit issuers to file draft registration statements with the Securities and Exchange Commission for confidential review; H.R. 3323, the “Helping Startups Continue To Grow Act”; H.R. 3339, the “Equal Opportunity for All Investors Act of 2025”; H.R. 3343, the “Greenlighting Growth Act”; H.R. 3348, the “Accredited Investor Definition Review Act”; H.R. 3351, the “Improving Access to Small Business Information Act”; H.R. 3352, the “Helping Angels Lead Our Startups Act of 2025”; H.R. 3357, the “Enhancing Multi-Class Share Disclosures Act”; H.R. 3381, the “Encouraging Public Offerings Act of 2025”; H.R. 3382, the “Small Entity Update Act”; H.R. 3383, the “Increasing Investor Opportunities Act”; H.R. 3394, the “Fair Investment Opportunities for Professional Experts Act”; H.R. 3395, the “Middle Market IPO Underwriting Cost Act”; H.R. 3422, the “Promoting Opportunities for Non-Traditional Capital Formation Act”; H.R. 940, the “Fair Audits and Inspections for Regulators’ Exams Act”; H.R. 1900, the “Financial Institution Regulatory Tailoring Enhancement Act”; H.R. 3379, the “Halting Uncertain Methods and Practices in Supervision Act of 2025”; H.R. 3380, the “Taking Account of Institutions with Low Operation Risk Act of 2025”; and H.R. 2702, the “Financial Integrity and Regulation Management Act”, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

*Committee on Foreign Affairs*, Full Committee, hearing entitled “FY26 State Department Posture: Protecting American Interests”, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

*Committee on Homeland Security*, Subcommittee on Emergency Management and Technology, hearing entitled “Mass Gathering Events: Assessing Security Coordination and Preparedness”, 2 p.m., 310 Cannon.

*Committee on the Judiciary*, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 3492, the “Protect Children’s Innocence Act of 2025”; H.R. 3486, the “Stop Illegal Entry Act”; H.R. 589, the “FACE Act Repeal Act of 2025”; H.R. 1163, the “Prove it Act of 2025”; and H.R. 1605, the “Separation of Powers Restoration Act of 2025”, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

*Committee on Natural Resources*, Subcommittee on Indian and Insular Affairs, hearing on H.R. 2130, the “Tribal Trust Land Homeownership Act of 2025”; H.R. 2388, the “Lower Elwha Klallam Tribe Project Lands Restoration Act”; H.R. 2815, the “Cape Fox Land Entitlement Finalization Act of 2025”; and H.R. 3073, the “Shivwits Band of Paiutes Jurisdictional Clarity Act”, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled “Unleashing a Golden Age: Examining the Use of Federal Lands to Power American Technological Innovation”, 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

*Committee on Oversight and Government Reform*, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 580, the “Unfunded Mandates Accountability and Transparency Act”; H.R. 3279, the “Renewing Efficiency in Government by Budgeting Act”; H.R. 2409, the “Guidance Clarity Act”; H.R. 2953, the “All Economic Regulations are Transparent Act”; H.R. 67, the “Modernizing Retrospective Regulatory Review Act”; H.R. 689, the “Full Responsibility and Expedited Enforcement Act”; H.R. 884, to prohibit individuals who are not citizens of the United States from voting in elections in the District of Columbia and to repeal the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022; H.R. 2096, the “Protecting Our Nation’s Capital Emergency Act”; H.R. 3095, to direct the United States Postal Service to designate single, unique ZIP Codes for certain communities, and for other purposes; H.R. 672, to establish new ZIP Codes for certain communities, and for other purposes; legislation on the Esophageal Cancer Awareness Act; H.R. 1008, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 298 Route 292 in Holmes, New York, as the “Sheriff Adrian ‘Butch’ Anderson Post Office Building”; and H.R. 1009, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 86 Main Street in Haverstraw, New York, as the “Paul Piperato Post Office Building”, 10 a.m., HVC-210.

*Committee on Rules*, Full Committee, hearing on legislation on the One Big Beautiful Bill Act, 1 a.m., H-313 Capitol.

*Committee on Veterans’ Affairs*, Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, hearing entitled “Pushing VA Forward: Review of VA’s Adaptive Programs for Disabled Veterans”, 10:30 a.m., 360 Cannon.

*Next Meeting of the SENATE*

10 a.m., Wednesday, May 21

## Senate Chamber

**Program for Wednesday:** Senate will continue consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1582, GENIUS Act, post-cloture, with a vote on the motion to proceed thereon at 11:30 a.m.

*Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES*

10 a.m., Wednesday, May 21

## House Chamber

**Program for Wednesday:** Consideration of S.J. Res. 31—Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to “Review of Final Rule Reclassification of Major Sources as Area Sources Under Section 112 of the Clean Air Act”.

## Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

## HOUSE

Amodei, Mark E., Nev., E453  
 Bice, Stephanie I., Okla., E456  
 Carbajal, Salud O., Calif., E454  
 DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E456  
 Fleischmann, Charles J. “Chuck”, Tenn., E453, E457

Gimenez, Carlos A., Fla., E455  
 Hill, J. French, Ark., E454  
 Huffman, Jared, Calif., E455  
 Jayapal, Pramila, Wash., E455  
 Krishnamoorthi, Raja, Ill., E456  
 Latta, Robert E., Ohio, E453, E457  
 Luttrell, Morgan, Tex., E457

Pettersen, Brittany, Colo., E453, E453, E454, E454,  
 E455, E455, E456, E456, E457, E457  
 Smucker, Lloyd, Pa., E455  
 Stevens, Haley M., Mich., E455  
 Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E454  
 Wagner, Ann, Mo., E454  
 Wilson, Joe, S.C., E456



# Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at [www.govinfo.gov](http://www.govinfo.gov), free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, [contactcenter@gpo.gov](mailto:contactcenter@gpo.gov). ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: [bookstore.gpo.gov](http://bookstore.gpo.gov). Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

**POSTMASTER:** Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.