

private property rights are all protected. But it puts a recognition in this area that it is a Federal designation, just a recognition, no property is taken over, but to say: We as a nation remember.

It is important to the people of North Tulsa because the families and communities and the businesses in North Tulsa are literally turning tragedy into triumph. They are looking back on that time and saying that is what happened on that day, but don't look at just that day, look at who we are; look at who we have been; look at who we are now and where we are going.

This is an important piece that literally every single Republican cleared. No struggle with this bill at all. And then my Democrat colleagues came today, of all weeks and this day, to be able to say they were going to block it.

So my challenge is to my Democratic colleagues, I don't know what the fight and struggle is on this, and I don't know why this is difficult to be able to do. We should all have agreement on this. So whatever struggle is happening among their conference, I would encourage them to be able to work it out so we can pass this because in the past, in this body, this has been a unanimous issue. This should not be controversial to say: We, as a nation, recognize what happened on that day, and we honor the people of North Tulsa for what they are working to still create there in the Greenwood District.

So my encouragement is, let's work out our differences today on this. Let's get this passed and get this done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the pending item.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the clerk will read the title of the joint resolution for the third time.

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

VOTE ON H.J. RES. 87

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Ms.

ALSOBROOKS) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 279 Leg.]

YEAS—51

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

NAYS—45

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

NOT VOTING—4

Alsobrooks	Budd
Blackburn	Heinrich

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 87) was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table.

PROVIDING 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 AND NONROAD ENGINE POLLUTION CONTROL STANDARDS; THE 'OMNIBUS' LOW NO_x REGULATION; WAIVER OF PREEMPTION; NOTICE OF DECISION"—Motion to Proceed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand the Senate received H.J. Res. 89 from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. I move to proceed to H.J. Res. 89.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to H.J. Res. 89, a joint resolution providing 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 and Nonroad Engine Pollution Control

Standards; The 'Omnibus' Low NO_x Regulation; Waiver of Preemption; Notice of Decision".

VOTE ON MOTION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) is necessarily absent.

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 280 Leg.]

YEAS—51

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

NAYS—46

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

NOT VOTING—3

Blackburn	Budd	Heinrich
-----------	------	----------

The motion was agreed to.

PROVIDING 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 AND NONROAD ENGINE POLLUTION CONTROL STANDARDS; THE 'OMNIBUS' LOW NO_x REGULATION; WAIVER OF PREEMPTION; NOTICE OF DECISION"

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

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 89) providing 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 and Nonroad Engine Pollution Control Standards; The 'Omnibus' Low NO_x Regulation; Waiver of Preemption; Notice of Decision".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

CALIFORNIA CLEAN AIR ACT AUTHORITIES

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I know we are working our way through a series of votes. Many people are at lunch or wrapping up lunch. We have a little bit of business still ahead of us, but I want to take a minute just to remind this body what has transpired here over the last 24 hours: evidence again, actions again demonstrating that Donald Trump and Republicans in Congress are stopping at nothing to attack California for the audacity of working to protect the health of Californians and for having the audacity to lead the clean energy economy.

But as I have said repeatedly over the last couple of days, it is not just what Donald Trump's EPA and Senate Republicans are doing that is problematic; it is how they made this possible—by fundamentally changing how the Senate operates through rules changes last night.

Now, it was not a magic trick. Before dinner yesterday, these bills to gut California's Clean Air Act authority were recognized as regular bills, subject to the filibuster rule requiring 60 votes to move forward, open to full debate and amendments, but somehow, after dinnertime yesterday, once Senate Republicans were done with overruling the Parliamentarian, these bills were now not subject to the filibuster.

For the record and for the public's recognition, this is the first time in Senate history that the majority has used a nuclear option to take joint resolutions that were subject to the filibuster one minute and eliminate the filibuster for them the next. You may hear them try to deny it, but it is all on the record.

So let me recap. The Senate Parliamentarian, through the Chair, confirmed that all points of order are waived during a Congressional Review Act resolution. That is in the law. But the majority voted to ignore that provision of the law and raise one anyway.

Then the Senate Parliamentarian, through the Chair, confirmed that these resolutions do not qualify—repeat, do not qualify—for expedited consideration, but the majority voted to override the Parliamentarian again and plow ahead anyway.

But no one should be fooled. What happened on the floor, as witnessed by the public, was nothing short of a power play that fundamentally changed how the Senate works.

Why? What was the driving impetus here? Was it President Trump? Is it the

fossil fuel industry and what they want? Or did you happen to just think changing these rules and the way the Senate operates was simply a good idea? I would love to hear you make that case. But I know that one of the results of last night's actions and today's votes is that Californians will be forced to breathe dirtier air than they should have to.

California is being targeted for its leadership—it is that blatant; it is that obvious—because, yes, for over half a century, we have been the innovators and trailblazers in the fight against pollution.

A little bit of a history refresher here. Back in 1966, California established the first tailpipe emission standard for passenger vehicles in the Nation, responding to California's unique air quality needs with policy based on science and data. A year later, California established the California Air Resources Board to more comprehensively address the severe air pollution and its consequences.

Then, some of you may remember a catastrophic oilspill off the coast of Santa Barbara. Californians rose up and demanded stronger environmental protections, and this became the birth of the modern-day environmental movement and eventually the first Earth Day in 1970, which has grown in its recognition and celebration.

That same year, Congress passed the Clean Air Act on an overwhelming bipartisan basis. That original Clean Air Act authorized the waiver provision that allows California to set our own separate and more ambitious vehicle emissions standards.

Fast-forward to the year 2006, when California passed the Global Warming Solutions Act, stating the bold goal of reducing emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020. It was the first in the world set of goals to establish both the regulatory and market programs to achieve real-world reductions in the greenhouse gas emissions that were causing climate change.

I remember it vividly because that same year, I ran for State senate because I wanted to be part of crafting policies to actually achieve those goals and implementing those policies and programs. I went on to serve for 6 years as chair of the California State Senate Committee on Energy, Utilities and Communications.

Since then, California has continued to lead the Nation with increasingly ambitious goals for cutting emissions.

It is a remarkable history when you stop and think about it and especially when you recognize that it hasn't just been Democrats that have been driving this.

As President, former California Senator Richard Nixon signed into law landmark legislation, including the National Environmental Policy Act, the Clean Air Act of 1970, the Endangered Species Act, and the creation of the EPA.

Yes, folks watching at home, Republicans did that.

As Governor, Ronald Reagan established the California Air Resources Board, committing California to a comprehensive, statewide approach to aggressively address air pollution in California.

A Republican did that.

It was Republican Governor Pete Wilson who established the California EPA.

A Republican did that.

It was Republican Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger who signed the 2006 Global Warming Solutions Act into law.

A Republican did that.

As a result of bipartisan efforts, in 2025, California achieved a diverse portfolio of clean energy resources—think not just conceptual but actually operational solar energy, wind energy, geothermal energy—all while fostering the fourth largest economy in the world. And we have a plan to decarbonize nearly every sector of our economy, from transportation to electricity, to manufacturing, to agriculture, construction, and buildings.

It is that long-term vision that has diversified our energy sources so that after seasons of extreme weather, we can still take advantage—more importantly, take advantage—of hydropower opportunity after rainstorms or reap the benefits of expanded wind and solar energy because we have grown our battery storage, technology, performance, and capabilities and capacity.

Now, here is where the rubber meets the road, colleagues. Most of you were not here last night in the wee hours of the morning when I explained that California, at the State and local level, has already done almost all they can to push the most ambitious regulatory agenda in the country to reduce emissions. They have done what they can from what is within their jurisdiction. We are investing in R&D into cleaner locomotives. We are investing in port electrification. We are making breakthroughs in hydrogen marine technologies like the first hydrogen fuel cell ferry in the United States.

But despite all this progress, despite all this innovation, despite all this investment, we are still shy in too many regions of attaining Federal clean air standards. Why? That is a logical question. If California is doing so much, why?

Well, California has done everything it can, but the Federal Government has not. We need the Federal Government to do its part.

Unless or until we have a Federal Government that says we need more ambitious goals and standards for the Nation, then California needs and deserves the ability to lead for itself, to protect Californians. That is why these waivers have been so important, because absent the Federal Government doing its part—and I am not holding my breath for the next 3½ years waiting for the Trump EPA to do so—California needs the Federal waivers to get the job done.

But I know that even after all this progress, the detractors will fall back on the same tired playbook of excuses. We know that the big oil industry sees California's clean cars and clean truck sales as existential threats. California has made tremendous advancements not just in technology but in markets, but that is why the fossil fuel industry has launched an all-out assault on California's rules.

I will give you just one example. If you happened to be reading the Wall Street Journal this past January, you might have picked up the paper to find an op-ed with the headline "Biden's EPA Tries to Put One Over With EV Mandate." That kind of sounds a little ominous, but if you read who the authors were—the authors went on to complain about how slow and laborious the process is for the EPA to revoke a California waiver administratively. They literally tripped themselves up searching for every possible way to weaponize the Congressional Review Act to take down California's waivers.

Now, who were those authors? The authors were partners at the law firm of Boyden Gray, who represent oil and gas clients and who were in court actively trying to repeal California's waivers. So it makes a whole lot of sense when you realize that they wanted to publish this op-ed by January 8, just 12 days before January 20, when Donald Trump was sworn into his second term.

It is certainly no surprise that a month later, the EPA attempted to submit waivers as rules for congressional review, claiming that the Biden EPA had withheld them. Now, that is a little rich, to accuse the Biden administration of withholding EPA waivers when the first Trump administration did the exact same thing, and so did every other EPA before it, both Republican and Democratic, in its entire 50-plus-year history of the California waiver provision.

In fact, when Donald Trump's EPA did what the Boyden Gray lawyers told them to—submitting these waivers as rules to Congress—they actually still included language admitting that these were waivers and not rules. And when they were called on it, when it was pointed out, they had to go through the motions, do backups, and resubmit the waivers to Congress—ridiculous, blatant.

Now, regardless of how ludicrous this effort has been, we continue to hear all kinds of misinformation from detractors about why California's ambitious goals just won't work. I have a series of them, but I will just focus on the main talking point that I have heard from my Republican colleagues and from industry: that California is somehow coercing other States into adopting California's standards; or to let California do this is the equivalent of setting a national standard; or that these emissions standards become de facto national ones.

That is ridiculous. We have made it clear: Let California take care of Cali-

fornians. If California had the power, the authority to set those national standards, trust me, we would be doing this and a lot more. But we don't.

But I think the good work that California has done that has benefitted Californians—both our health and our economy, along with our environment—has inspired more than a dozen other States to follow California's lead voluntarily. Nobody is forcing other States—blue States or red States—to follow California's lead, but these other States see the benefits of what California is doing, and they choose to do so to protect their residents and to protect their environment.

Lastly, let me just conclude by stating something that has conveniently been stifled in this whole debate—limited debate—and conversation. So who benefits from all of this? It is not unleashing job creation and innovation in States—the other 49 States—but California. It is holding our Nation back in terms of improving air quality and our transition to a clean energy economy.

The winner here is actually China because, like it or not, the clean energy boom globally is happening. We have a big say in who leads it and who benefits from it.

Is it the United States? Not by the leadership and the policies I have seen of this administration in the near future. It can be California, but it seems like you are more interested in taking our tools away. And so now we risk China jumping ahead, both economically and technologically, in this space.

So I will remind you, folks, despite—not despite but because of California's leaning in on addressing the emissions, pollution, and climate challenges, California has become the fourth largest economy in the world.

We have proven that is what is good for clean air and is good for business and the economy. And that is something that you all ought to replicate and scale up, not fear and stifle. We have to be able to do both—protect our planet, strengthen our economy.

California has shown us the way. We can have reliable cars. Our kids can breathe clean air. We can invest in our economy and in our future.

California has been proud to fill the role of national leader in this space. We will continue to try to do anything and everything we can to do so, both for our interests and for the Nation's, but what has happened in the last 24 hours makes the job that much harder.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. LUMIS). The Senator from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam President, Members, welcome to the roaring twenties, not the ones you may have read about in F. SCOTT FITZGERALD novels, not the ones with jazz and liberation and industrial boom. I mean these roaring twenties—the ones where instead of flappers, you get fossil fuel and dirty air; where instead of innova-

tion, you get obstruction, tariffs, isolationism, blinding nostalgia for a world that no longer exists. Instead of leaders who want to tackle the climate crisis head-on, you get votes to tear down the tools that we need to fight it.

The reason I stand here today and was here last night until 1:30, 2 in the morning is that Senate Republicans have pushed through resolutions to revoke California's authority to set its own vehicle emissions standards, to set its own rules about what kind of air we breathe in California.

This is an authority that my State has had by statute for more than 50 years. We have had the right to deal with our unique problems of congestion, our topography, our smog. We have had the right to demand of ourselves cleaner air, for ourselves and for our children.

That is under attack right now, and not just California's ability to set its standards to protect its people, but because other States have also followed California's lead. This will affect the quality of air all around the country.

And that is the gravamen of the problem for my colleagues in the GOP. And that is that it is not just California. It is the fact that so many other States have followed our lead. So many other States have decided they would rather have fewer cancers than more cars with combustion engines.

That was their choice. That was their right. They weren't coerced into joining California. They made the decision about what was best for their constituents, and it is not for us in this body to arrogate to ourselves, to decide we know better for Californians or we know better for people in other States than what their own leaders have decided about the quality of their air.

This is a direct attack not only on my State but on our ability to innovate, to lead, and, indeed, to breathe clean air. This is bad policy—clearly, certainly yes—but it is also a dangerous abuse of the process in this House that will lead to other harmful consequences.

To get this done, to repeal California's statutory waiver to set its own air pollution rules, Republican leadership has decided to blow a procedural hole in the filibuster. And let's call it what it is: This is a dangerous new kind of nuclear option that dispenses with the filibuster. But they would have us believe: only here, only when it is necessary to cater to the oil industry. It is the oil exception to the filibuster rule.

Now, the nuclear option has been used over nominees in the past. And there has been debate about doing away with the filibuster entirely. But, today, what we are talking about is only carving out the oil industry from the filibuster—so not carving out protection for voting rights; not carving out protection for reproductive freedom; not carving out fundamental rights for the American people, for which there would be a strong case to

have a carve-out from the filibuster. But no, today, we are talking about an oil-industry-only carve-out. And they are using it to overturn some of the most successful clean air policies in American history.

Since the 1960s, California has had the obligation and the ability and the authority to lead, and they have used it. We have used it to reduce pollution, to increase fuel efficiency, and to drive innovation across the country. And much of the country has California to thank for the development of electric vehicles, for the improvement in fuel efficiency standards, because as we have led, others have followed and industry has adapted.

Despite the naysayers and those always saying it is too hard, it can't be done, America got cleaner cars thanks to California, and consumers got more choices thanks to California. Now, some in this Chamber want to go back in time, not because the policy failed but because it succeeded.

Imagine if, just after Henry Ford unveiled the Model T, Congress passed a resolution demanding we double down on bigger, stronger horses, because that is what this is—a deliberate attempt to deny the future because it threatens the status of Big Oil.

The President says that he is for energy independence. That is their mantra: Make America energy independent. But that is not what they are doing. They are killing clean energy all over the country.

You know what just came out of the House in the dead of night, last night, in their reconciliation bill—their “Big Ugly Bill?” A provision to essentially kill every clean energy project in the country that is not almost all finished. If it isn't going to be operational in a very short period of time, they want to pull the plug.

Now, why would they do that? Why would they do that when, in fact, most of those projects are in red States, not blue ones, not States like California but States like Indiana and Kentucky.

Why would they do that? Because the obligation here is not to their State or constituency. The obligation here is to the oil industry. They would sacrifice the jobs and the clean energy industry all over the country. To their own constituents, they would put those people out of work. And why? Because of fealty to the oil industry.

This is not about energy independence. It is about oil dependence.

Today, we are in a full transition to a clean transportation future—or we could be—and Senate Republicans are trying to bring back the smog. They are trying to make America smoggy again.

We are seeing the climate crisis, and they are trying to cut the brake lines on progress. We are literally standing at the gates of the future—a future that we will lead or China will lead, a renewable energy future—and some would rather turn it all around and ride off in a horse and buggy, because

that is what this vote means. That is what these votes mean—not just being stuck in a past technology beholden to an old way of doing things, but also stuck in a dirtier and more toxic world.

Millions will be stuck breathing in hazardous emissions unnecessarily.

What is the pay-for here? What is the pay-for for this gift to the oil industry? Cancer—cancer is the pay-for. We will pay for this repeal of clean air rules with cancer—maybe your cancer, maybe your father's cancer, maybe your sister's cancer, maybe your child's cancer.

That will be the pay-for because this is about power, and it is about profit, and it is about punishing States that dare to lead. It is about undermining the Senate's own rules to score a short-term win that will do long-term damage but will placate the oil industry, because once you start twisting the CRA into a weapon to attack anything you don't like—rules, waivers, facts—you don't just hurt California; you hurt the country, because don't think for a second it ends here.

If this gambit works, it will not be the last time this tactic is used. Today, we blow a hole in the filibuster for the oil industry. Tomorrow, we blow another hole in the filibuster for what other polluting industry? Or, more broadly, should we expect this majority to use it to strip away protections for workers or privacy rights or reproductive freedom?

This is the real fight here, not just over emissions or waivers or vehicles, but whether we are a nation led by and empowered to shape the future or held hostage by the past.

The roaring twenties were a time of reckless optimism. The stock markets soared, inequality deepened, and political leaders told Americans not to worry, everything was under control—until it wasn't, because the same decade that gave us jazz and swing also gave us the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, a disastrous attempt to protect American industry by walling off our economy to the rest of the world.

It sparked global retaliation. It strangled trade. It helped turn a market crash into a full-blown depression.

What are we seeing now? New tariffs, retaliation threats, political attacks on States that lead, and now an attempt to tear down environmental progress and green innovation just as the global economy is demanding more of it—much more of it.

The roaring twenties gave us invention, yes, but also an illusion, a false belief that we could grow forever without rules and without consequences.

We are in danger of making the same mistake again. We should be building the EV infrastructure for the future, not dismantling climate progress. We should be investing in clean energy, not clinging to combustion engines. We should be protecting the rules of this Chamber, not torching them when they become inconvenient to the oil industry.

The gutting of these norms doesn't end in prosperity; the sacrifice of clean air doesn't end in making us healthy again. It ends in cancer; it ends in an enfeebled economy; it ends in a country going backward and shrinking in on itself. It ends in crisis. Let's not go there.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

RECOGNIZING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF JEWISH AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH AND CALLING ON ELECTED OFFICIALS AND CIVIL SOCIETY LEADERS TO COUNTER ANTISEMITISM

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, I stand today to condemn the anti-Semitic and hate-fueled murders of Yaron Lischinsky and Sarah Milgrim that occurred last night at the hands of a Hamas sympathizer. This was a sickening, violent, and anti-Semitic attack in our Nation's Capital.

These two young professionals were targeted and murdered because they represented Israel and the Jewish people, with their murderer chanting “Free Palestine” after killing them in cold blood.

These were innocents, out for a night together at the Capital Jewish Museum here in DC, just like members of our own staff do each and every week. This anti-Semitism and hate for Israel and the Jewish people is disgusting, unacceptable, and must be condemned on every level. It is despicable, and it is dangerous.

We have seen a rise in anti-Semitism and anti-Israel hate since the October 7, 2023 attacks. We have seen Hamas sympathizers take over college campuses and instill fear in Jewish students. We have seen violent protests on our streets and now in our Nation's Capital. Jewish Americans are afraid to walk outside or live their daily lives. For nearly 600 days now, Israel has defended itself against Iran-backed Hamas terrorists who want to destroy Israel and destroy the Jewish people.

These terrorists murder babies and women in cold blood, take and murder innocent people, and brag about their acts with no remorse. They took innocent people, including Americans, hostage and tortured them. They still hold the bodies of American hostages to deprive their families of closure.

Israel is the United States' greatest democratic ally in the Middle East. We cannot abandon our ally. Thankfully, we have a President who is an ally of Israel and who is working to fight anti-Semitism in the United States.

President Trump is pushing back on colleges and universities that allow hateful anti-Semitic actions on campus that threaten the safety of Jewish students. He has appointed the most pro-Israel Cabinet ever assembled. And he is committed to defending Israel, combating terrorism, and protecting Jewish Americans.