



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 171

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JUNE 27, 2025

No. 111

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

Dr. Gary G. Dull, Faith Baptist Church, Altoona, Pennsylvania, offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father and God, we thank You for receiving us through the work of Your son, the Lord Jesus Christ, on the cross. We also thank You for the many blessings You have showered upon this great Nation.

Today, I thank You for those You have brought into this great Chamber to represent the citizens of our country and to advance the American ethic laid firm by the faith of our Founders.

May You guide, direct, enable, and strengthen Speaker Johnson and each Member of this body in the path of unity that will bring lasting peace and prosperity to this Nation we all love.

I pray that, by Your grace, You will enlighten each Representative with Your wisdom that will maintain America as a bastion for peace and freedom around the world for generations to come.

These things, I pray in the name of Your son and our Savior, Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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. Will the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania 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.

WELCOMING DR. GARY G. DULL

The SPEAKER. Without objection, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the pastor of the Faith Baptist Church of Altoona, Pennsylvania, and the president of the Way of Truth Ministries, Pastor Gary Dull.

Pastor Dull has been preaching the Gospel since he was 12 years old. By the time he was a senior at Washington Bible College, Pastor Dull was already preaching at Morningside Baptist Church in Suitland, Maryland, right outside of Washington, D.C.

Since then, Pastor Dull has had an incredible life. He has served at four churches in Pennsylvania and Florida and is currently in his 29th year as the pastor of the Faith Baptist Church of Altoona.

Pastor Dull also founded the Way of Truth Ministries, which has missionaries on three continents. Pastor Dull has evangelized by preaching the Gospel and serving those in need in 25 different countries.

Pastor Dull has devoted his life to spreading the Word of the Lord and serving those less fortunate. Whether in his community or throughout the world, he has embodied the selfless service of Jesus Christ, his Savior.

It is a privilege to welcome Pastor Gary Dull and his wife of 50 years, Nancy, to Washington to open the floor of the United States House of Representatives in prayer.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOORE of North Carolina). The Chair

will entertain up to five further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL HOMEOWNERSHIP 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 Homeownership Month, a time to celebrate the cornerstone of the American Dream.

For generations, owning a home has symbolized stability, independence, and opportunity. It strengthens families, builds communities, and lays the foundation for long-term financial security.

Yet, today, that dream feels out of reach for too many, especially first-time buyers, young families, and those in rural and working-class communities. Rising interest rates, limited housing supplies, and increasing costs are making it harder for Americans to put down roots.

That is why we must work together across the aisle to support policies to expand access to affordable housing, invest in infrastructure, and reduce regulatory barriers that drive up costs.

Homeownership shouldn't be a luxury. It should be an achievable goal for every hardworking American.

TRUMP LEADS WITH SMOKE AND MIRRORS

(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, the United States airstrikes in Iran, which we hope to be briefed on today, is the latest in the signature chaos and erratic decisionmaking from the Trump White House.

□ 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.

H3015

I thank God that our extraordinary military appears to have exquisitely executed its mission. We can be grateful to our military's carrying out of a decision while we ask questions about that decision.

While the news is inundated with reports of Trump's airstrikes, there are many concerns that we are not hearing about here at home: hostages; Ukraine; Federal institutions, like USAID and NIH, gutted; the big, ugly bill that would slash Medicaid for 14 million Americans, including 110,000 of my constituents; and the cruel cuts at SAMHSA that will jeopardize the lives of those struggling with addiction and mental health.

The Trump White House leads with smoke and mirrors, but they are doing incredible harm to my constituents and Americans across this country. I call upon my colleagues to not let them be successful in their attempts to obscure and distract.

Thomas Jefferson said: When injustice becomes law, resistance becomes duty.

Resist.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL BOYD MASON

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

Mr. EZELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an extraordinary American and proud son of south Mississippi, Lieutenant Colonel Boyd Mason, for his nearly three decades of distinguished service to our country.

Lieutenant Colonel Mason served with courage and honor, including 2½ years doing Active Duty in the Vietnam war. His dedication to our Nation didn't end with his military service. He continues to be a guiding light in Jackson County and all across south Mississippi's Fourth Congressional District.

Today, Mr. Mason faces a new battle. The battle this time is a personal one, a fight against cancer.

Yet, his strength and spirit remain unshaken. He is a devoted father of 5, grandfather to 12, and a great-grandfather to 5 more.

Lieutenant Colonel Mason's legacy of service, faith, and perseverance reaches far beyond the battlefield. It lives on in the lives he has touched and the freedoms he helped to defend.

While our military members risk their lives every day for the sake of our great country, it is more important than ever to honor those who answered the call. Lieutenant Colonel Mason is a hero, plain and simple, and I ask all Americans to join me in keeping him and his family in our thoughts and prayers.

Mr. Speaker, we honor Lieutenant Colonel Mason today.

RECOGNIZING WILLIAM "BUS DAD" HORNE

(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, I rise to recognize William Horne, affectionately known as "Bus Dad."

After an impressive 51 years behind the wheel of a schoolbus dedicated to transporting exceptional children within Wilson County Public Schools, Mr. Horne has recently entered a well-deserved retirement.

Mr. Horne was more than just a schoolbus driver. He was devoted to his students and their families. He warmly welcomed each child onto his bus every morning, making sure they were ready for school. His bus was more than just a mode of transportation. It was a safe haven.

Mr. Horne's dedication exemplifies a great American story highlighting the essence of public service: impactful, consistent, and full of love and compassion.

I thank Mr. Horne for his extraordinary commitment to his students over the decades. His legacy will remain with those he has touched, and I wish him a wonderful retirement.

WAKE-UP CALL FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Mr. CORREA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to once again stress the need for immigration reform in this country.

Just last week, back home, one of my taxpaying constituents, Narciso Barranco, was picked up by who I believe were ICE agents—they were masked—and is now sitting in an ICE holding facility in Los Angeles. Videos show him being punched by masked Federal agents, unprovoked.

Narciso Barranco has lived in my district for 25 years or more and doesn't have a traffic ticket to his name. More importantly, he has three sons—three sons—all serving in the U.S. Marine Corps.

Mr. Speaker, we make movies about families like this. He has three sons who are ready to make the ultimate sacrifice for this great Nation, and, instead, he is being held in custody in an ICE facility in Los Angeles.

Our Federal agents should be taking criminals off of our streets, not gentlemen like this.

I pray that Mr. Barranco's case is a wake-up call for all of us for immigration reform.

CALLING ON TRUMP ADMINISTRATION TO RESTORE LIFESAVING FOOD AID

(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 26th time to call on the Trump administration to honor its word and restore funding for lifesaving food aid around the world.

Mr. Speaker, the words from the Trump administration have been pretty good on this. Elon Musk said that funding for emergency food aid will be restored. Marco Rubio has repeatedly said he was going to do it. They even got FOX News to write a glowing online article about their plans to restore funding.

Yet, it has been 6 months since they cut this funding off. It has been 6 months, and every day that they wait is another day that children die of starvation unnecessarily.

Every day, there are children whose organs are shutting down, who are unable to eat conventional food, and who can only have their lives saved by ready-to-use therapeutic food manufactured in the United States.

Every day, the clock is ticking. The administration needs to do what it said it is going to do: restore funding for this aid. I will continue to stand on this floor every day until they do.

CONDEMNING THE VIOLENT JUNE 2025 RIOTS IN LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 530, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 516) condemning the violent June 2025 riots in Los Angeles, California, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 530, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 516

Whereas, on June 6, 2025, protests began in response to lawful Federal immigration enforcement actions by the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel in Los Angeles, California;

Whereas these protests quickly escalated into violent riots across Los Angeles, where acts of arson, widespread looting, property destruction, and vandalism were committed, blocking streets and highways, lighting streets on fire, throwing rocks at law enforcement vehicles, and assaulting Federal and local peace officers;

Whereas rioters have shot commercial grade fireworks and thrown Molotov cocktails at Los Angeles Police Department officers and assaulted Federal agents;

Whereas rioters burned American flags, an act that disrespects the nation that protects their freedom;

Whereas California Governor Gavin Newsom asserted that "local law enforcement didn't need any help," despite the Los Angeles Police Department declaring that the violence had worsened and spiraled out of control;

Whereas more than 561 rioters have been arrested, and 12 brave officers with the Los Angeles Police Department have been injured in efforts to contain the chaos;

Whereas local and State leadership failed to contain the rapidly escalating disorder, failing to support overwhelmed law enforcement personnel;

Whereas the actions of law enforcement have been crucial in preventing further violence and protecting law-abiding citizens from harm;

Whereas the U.S. Small Business Administration called on California Governor Gavin Newsom to request an SBA Economic Injury Disaster Loan Declaration to authorize SBA to deliver urgent assistance to Los Angeles-based small businesses that have been looted by rioters;

Whereas the Los Angeles Ambulatory Care Center, which provides health services for veterans, was closed for several days due to civil unrest, resulting in the cancellation of over 700 in-person appointments for United States veterans;

Whereas the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Los Angeles field office was temporarily closed due to the violence caused by anti-ICE riots and protests;

Whereas some mainstream media outlets and Members of Congress have falsely labeled the protests as "peaceful" and with "no violence" happening in Los Angeles;

Whereas United States Immigration and Enforcement officers have faced a 413% increase in assaults against them, and their family members have been doxed and targeted;

Whereas United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement officers have arrested at least 330 illegal aliens with prior criminal convictions such as murder, drug trafficking, assault, cruelty to children, domestic violence, robbery, and human smuggling;

Whereas illegal aliens have perpetrated violence against law enforcement officers; and

Whereas California's leadership has prioritized protecting illegal immigrants and violent individuals over United States citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the right to assemble and protest peacefully;

(2) condemns unequivocally the violence perpetrated against Federal, State, and local law enforcement; and

(3) calls on local and State elected leadership to work with the Federal Government to end the violent riots and restore peace; and

(4) expresses gratitude to law enforcement officers, including the Los Angeles Police Department, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, California Highway Patrol, Orange County Sheriff's Department, and other local, State, and Federal law enforcement agencies, including the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement for keeping our communities safe in the face of danger.

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

The gentleman from California (Mr. KILEY) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

□ 0915

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KILEY of California. 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 H. Res. 516.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, a couple weeks ago, the entire world witnessed horrifying scenes out of Los Angeles: Molotov cocktails and bricks being thrown at officers, Waymo cars being lit on fire, American flags being burned, and roadways being blocked.

Today, we will stand as a House to condemn these acts of violence and to condemn the irresponsible politicians who refused to adequately address them.

I think it is important to understand from the beginning the events leading to these horrific scenes.

We should first recognize that ICE was undertaking operations in Los Angeles that have been very standard across administrations, Democrat or Republican.

President Obama, after all, carried out millions of deportations, and the priority has always been to focus on those who have a criminal record and who pose a risk to the public. That is precisely what ICE was doing in Los Angeles. Among those targeted were murderers, pedophiles, and drug traffickers.

It should also be recognized that one of the reasons that some of these people had to be sought out in the community is that the city of Los Angeles and the State of California have chosen to enact sanctuary policies that explicitly forbid ICE from taking custody of these dangerous individuals in the safest and least disruptive setting, in a custodial setting, that is, in jails. That is the explicit purpose of our sanctuary laws.

Despite these facts, as these operations were being carried out in a standard and targeted way in Los Angeles, you had certain politicians who engaged in inflammatory rhetoric, who then had individuals gather to disrupt the activities of ICE and our Federal officers, and then you saw these extreme and horrifying acts of violence.

I will be very clear: I will defend in any way that I can the right to assemble and protest regardless of the content of what the protesters are advocating. This is foundational. It is fundamental to the American system of government, but violence is another matter entirely.

This is not just a matter of protests crossing a line. Violence is the antithesis of protests. It seeks to shut down the process of deliberation, argument, and debate. It seeks to exalt force over reason. It is an abandonment of the American experiment of self-government.

By the way, this is especially true when the very purpose of the violence

is to impede the policies of a duly elected President from being carried out. It is to say that a violent agitator should be able to overthrow through force the will of a democratic majority that has been established through a democratic, free, and fair election.

That is what we bore witness to in Los Angeles. Yet, instead of doing everything possible to restore order, to protect the citizens of Los Angeles, to protect our law enforcement officers, and our Federal officers, you saw certain irresponsible vainglorious politicians in California decide that this was their star-making moment, where they would egg on the violent agitators, where they would try to pick a fight in every way they could with the President, even going so far as to file a frivolous lawsuit that was thrown out unanimously by the Ninth Circuit.

Worst of all, these politicians decided to place the blame for the violence on our incredible National Guard members, somehow saying it was their presence there that caused it. This is deeply offensive, and our National Guard members are owed an apology.

Today, I hope we can stand together, Republicans and Democrats, in making it very clear that protests and assembly are fundamental rights in this country and that acts of violence are a grave threat to those rights.

Specifically, this resolution recognizes the right to assemble and protest peacefully, condemns unequivocally the violence perpetrated against Federal, State, and local law enforcement, calls on local and State-elected leadership to work with the Federal Government to end the violent riots and restore peace, and expresses gratitude to law enforcement officers, including the Los Angeles Police Department, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, California Highway Patrol, Orange County Sheriff's Department, and other local, State, and Federal law enforcement agencies, including the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement for keeping our communities safe in the face of danger.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the chair of the California Democratic Delegation who leads the 45 Democrats in the California delegation.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the Kim resolution.

Now, had it just condemned violence and thanked the National Guard and the Marines, who did not ask for this assignment, I think we would all be on board.

Instead, the resolution really is engaging in partisan games with misleading and inflammatory provisions.

Trump said he was going to go arrest and deport violent criminals. People are okay with that. Instead, armed, masked ICE agents, some refusing to identify themselves, aggressively, and

in some cases even violently, took down day workers at Home Depot, busboys, gardeners, and a union leader, and regular people in Los Angeles objected to that. Then, as the First Amendment provides, they peacefully protested against it.

Unfortunately, there were some hooligans and rowdies who infiltrated that group, and they committed violent acts and vandalism. For that, they should be prosecuted. They should be brought to justice and condemned, which we do.

However, the resolution really creates a misleading picture of what happened. On the first page, it says: "Whereas these protests quickly escalated into violent riots across Los Angeles, where acts of arson, widespread looting, property destruction . . . lighting streets on fire. . . ." The fact is that these demonstrations were largely confined to about a 10-block area in downtown Los Angeles.

The police, LAPD, had the situation under control. There is an elaborate system of mutual aid in California, and had they needed additional forces, it was readily available under mutual aid.

I will point out to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, in case they need a reminder, L.A. County is 4,060 square miles, not the 10 blocks. When President Trump deployed the Marines and National Guard in L.A., it was not at the request of local officials, the chief of police, or the Governor. It was unprecedented, unnecessary, and a clear attempt to take over the State's law enforcement authority. In fact, I think it did aggravate tensions in the area.

Now, the National Guard remains in Los Angeles to this day. They have nothing to do. We heard a report from a former commander that less than 20 percent are doing anything and they have been taken away from jobs where they were needed; for example, helping in efforts of forest fire prevention and the like.

As the elected chair of the California Democrat delegation, I was proud to join my colleague (Ms. BARRAGÁN) in introducing a resolution that, unlike this one, is based in fact.

Our resolution condemns the President's authoritarian response to First Amendment expressions of dissent, unlike the Kim resolution. It expresses support for law enforcement and for the National Guard and for the Marines, and it condemns violence by those who committed it.

Now, why is this important? In the resolution, it is so partisan. It says: "Whereas California's leadership has prioritized protecting illegal immigrants and violent individuals over United States citizens."

That is absurd. That is insulting to our elected officials, but it is right in keeping with what the President has said. He has indicated publicly that he intends to target cities and States that are democratically elected, that have Democrats elected in government.

What a strange thing to say.

The executive order that nationalized the California National Guard applies to anywhere in the United States. It is not just L.A. It is not just California.

I think this resolution really, as false as it is, is serving as a predicate, as a foundation for the military to be used in places all over the United States on any pretext, so that the military can go in and assume civilian authority away from those who are democratically elected.

That is why it is important that we do not approve this resolution with its false whereases, and that we do not participate in a scheme to replace the democratically elected officials in cities and counties and States across the United States.

I will just end with this: Who should we be more concerned about? What should we be more afraid of: the gardeners that are being arrested by ICE, the busboys, the farmworkers, or the concept that the administration may be taking the steps to replace, with the military, civil authority that has been duly elected around the United States?

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let's make sure that we are dealing with the facts as they actually occurred. The assertion the LAPD had the situation under control; we all saw otherwise on our television sets. The LAPD chief himself said that every person in Los Angeles should be disgusted by what occurred.

The Governor has, himself, in the past, recognized the virtue of using the National Guard when you had situations that required reinforcement.

This notion that somehow the President was taking over the State's law enforcement authority, the Ninth Circuit said otherwise unanimously. Even a Biden-appointed judge said: The President was exercising his authority to prevent the disruption of the enforcement of Federal law.

As to this notion that the violence was largely confined to downtown L.A., I can't agree with the assertion that it is somehow less objectionable to have violence occur within a concentrated area than on a more diffused basis.

Finally, this disparagement of our ICE officers for wearing masks. I think that this is outrageous. We have seen threats against our ICE officers absolutely skyrocket. It is very ironic for folks that had no problem forcing 2 year olds to wear masks all day, in defiance of even the World Health Organization's guidelines, that are now somehow objecting to Federal officers who feel the need to do this in order to protect themselves and their family.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. KIM).

Mrs. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative KILEY for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 516 to condemn the violent riots in Los Angeles this month, and I thank our brave law enforcement officers for keeping us safe.

I appreciate the heated debate and the conversation. I thank my colleague (Mr. KILEY) for leading on the groundwork and for explaining what led to the events that occurred last month in Los Angeles, which explains that Federal agents were conducting immigration enforcement, according to the law.

Mr. Speaker, protecting public safety should not be controversial. This resolution is very simple. It recognizes a right to assemble and protest peacefully, and it condemns unequivocally the violence perpetrated against Federal, State, and local law enforcement. It calls on local and State-elected leadership to work with the Federal Government and restore peace. It also expresses gratitude to our local, State, and Federal law enforcement officers for bravely keeping our communities safe in the face of danger.

□ 0930

That is what this is about. Do you stand with our law enforcement officers working to keep our communities safe and have the common sense to call out rioters who commit vandalism, violence, property damage, and other crimes in our streets?

Mr. Speaker, like others in the Chamber and many across this country, I am an immigrant who came here legally in pursuit of the opportunities that this country provides. I am proud to be an American, and I am paying it forward to keep the American Dream alive for my children and grandchildren.

Peaceful protests are a constitutional right we all cherish, and our communities should not be living in fear. But peaceful protests and freedom of assembly gave way to chaos in Los Angeles, as we witnessed a few weeks ago.

We saw acts of arson, looting, property destruction, vandalism, blocking streets and highways, lighting cars on fire, shooting fireworks, throwing rocks at law enforcement vehicles, and even assaulting Federal and local police officers. As a result, we saw more than 500 rioters were arrested, and at least a dozen LAPD officers were injured.

Local and State leadership clearly could not contain the chaos. The riots have cost at least \$30 million to pay overtime and repair property damages to city buildings. This doesn't include the small businesses and other private entities whose businesses fell victim to the destruction.

We also know that the riots were enabled by California's soft-on-crime policies that have allowed for lawlessness and endangered public safety.

Again, this resolution recognizes the right to assemble and protest peacefully, condemns the violence against law enforcement, and calls on local and State officials to work with the Federal Government to restore peace. We thank our law enforcement. This is not controversial.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA).

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I ask, what happened? My hometown, Santa Ana, California, is predominantly Hispanic Latino. Factory workers live there. Remember, we are the biggest manufacturing State in the Union. Nearshoring, guess where it is happening?

California is the largest ag State in the Union. There are a lot of farmworkers in my district. What happened? One day, we are going about our business in Santa Ana, Orange County, masked Federal agents start going into our neighborhoods, picking up hard-working neighbors. Oh, yeah, you bet, people were concerned, scared, and nervous.

A lot of people expressed their First Amendment rights. We got the National Guard. Orange County Sheriff Don Barnes did not call for the National Guard. Local police chiefs did not call for the National Guard. We get the National Guard.

President Trump promised to deport criminals, those with deportation orders, those here less than 2 years, but now it is hard workers, people who pay taxes that are being picked up. Mr. Speaker, 60 percent of those being picked up are now people without criminal records.

Orange County didn't have any violence. We had masked officers coming into our neighborhoods.

I bet President Trump would want to know what is going on on Main Street. One of the constituents that just got picked up I talked about a minute ago, Narciso Barranco. He has been in the U.S. for 25 years. He is a gardener and a father of three marines. We make movies of people like this. This gentleman is a hero. His family are heroes. Instead, he is in an ICE holding facility in Los Angeles.

I am hearing more stories coming, more Barranco-type families being broken up, military families being separated from their loved ones by ICE. I do not believe President Trump would want his legacy to be that he deported military family members like Mr. Barranco.

Let's use common sense here. This resolution is not prime time for a vote. There are a lot of inaccuracies. I am going to ask my colleagues to vote "no" on this measure.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am moved by the comments of the distinguished gentleman from California, and I wonder what our colleagues think the value is other than of a purely political nature to a resolution that purports to be honoring law enforcement when it is set up on a completely partisan basis. I wonder what the value of that is.

I especially wonder what the value of that is when the majority doesn't even stand by actual law when it comes to honoring law enforcement because this body on March 15, 2022, passed a resolution to put up a plaque, a simple plaque to honor the noble and brave police of-

ficers who battled for 4 or 5 hours to stop a violent riot and insurrection unleashed against this Chamber and against the Senate in an attempt to overthrow a Presidential election.

We voted to erect a plaque in their honor. That was on March 15, 2022. It was supposed to have been put up on March 15, 2023. We are now more than 2 years overdue in honoring those police officers, 140 of whom were wounded, injured, disfigured, and many of them permanently disabled. Several lost their lives in the days to follow that atrocity, attack on this body.

There is a law which says put up the plaque, and Speaker JOHNSON and the majority will not put the plaque up which is why you walk in the House Office Buildings now, everywhere there are poster replicas of that plaque being put up.

Now they want to pass a resolution deploring violence that took place thousands of miles away from here, and it is just a resolution, a hortatory resolution. They can't even get bipartisan support because of course they have to set it up on a polemical, partisan basis instead.

What is the utility of that resolution when they won't even follow an actual law to honor police officers who put themselves between us and a blood-thirsty mob?

That is not a partisan point because the Republicans denounced it at that time as terrorism, as an attack on this institution, as intolerable, as unacceptable.

I am happy to share with my colleague, who I know wasn't in Congress at the time, all of the statements made by Republican leaders at that time begging Donald Trump to send in the National Guard, which he controlled because it is the District of Columbia National Guard, and he didn't do it. He sat and watched it, eating hamburgers or whatever, in the White House on TV, ignoring all of the appeals to send the National Guard to come and defend Republican and Democratic Members of Congress.

Now we have got a law which says put the plaque up in honor of these officers, and they can't do it, but they want to bring a totally partisan resolution to the floor deploring violence thousands of miles away, and you have got Members of Congress from California saying that they are not capturing what actually happened there.

However, no, it has got to be another opportunity for partisan division. Why? Why can't we honor law enforcement together and follow through on our word?

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

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As to the comments of my colleague from California, he set forth his view as to what the priority and the limitations ought to be when it comes to deportation policy. He is, of course, act-

ing appropriately in doing so. That is his right, and that is his prerogative as a Member of Congress, as it is for any citizen.

This resolution does not have anything to do with the merits of his view. This resolution simply states that one should not use violence in order to advance that view. I would hope that this should be a principle we should be able to agree on on a bipartisan basis.

As to my colleague from Maryland's claim that this resolution is somehow set up in a partisan way, nothing could be further from the truth. The resolution simply condemns acts of violence. We are opposed to sanctuary policies. We are opposed to putting a target on the back of our Federal officers, and, frankly, to defunding the police.

It is not our fault that those who have allowed this violence, who have promoted sanctuary policies, who have put a target on the back of our officers, and who have called for defunding the police all happen to belong to one party.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, many Democrats in this House have called the L.A. riots peaceful, even while Americans watched with their own eyes as marauding mobs under foreign flags set cars on fire, threw concrete blocks at police, terrorized motorists, and vandalized and looted local shops.

The Democratic vice mayor of Cudahy has called on criminal street gangs to attack Federal law enforcement.

The Democratic mayor of Los Angeles said that for the riots to stop, the Federal Government had to stop enforcing Federal immigration law. You just heard the same sentiment expressed on this floor a few minutes ago.

The Democratic Newsom administration has paid millions of taxpayer dollars to one of the principal organizers of these riots.

I have news for the Democrats: The doctrine of nullification died with the Confederacy. States are not permitted to obstruct the enforcement of Federal law. In a humiliating slap-down of Mr. Newsom, even the notoriously liberal Ninth Circuit Court ruled that the President has the clear authority to federalize the National Guard to restore order whenever State or local officials are derelict in their duty to protect the public and enforce the law.

Remember how all this started: ICE agents attempted to execute court-ordered warrants on criminal illegal aliens. When a mob intervened, ICE called for local law enforcement. The mayor reportedly stopped them from responding, and the Governor did nothing. Now, we saw during the George Floyd riots what happens when leftist officials refuse to counter violent mobs: American cities aflame, billions of dollars of damage, and 19 people killed.

This resolution condemns the violence, but there is something far more sinister afoot that strikes at the very foundation of a constitutional Republic: the rule of law. As Abraham Lincoln told the Democrats long ago: "There is no grievance that is a fit object of redress by mob law," and this generation of Americans is taking note.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to hear my colleague invoke Abraham Lincoln in the rejection of disunion secession and violent attack on the Federal Government.

Neither of my colleagues who is on the floor has said a word explaining why they won't put the plaque up to honor hundreds and hundreds of police officers on the Capitol Police force, the Metropolitan Police Department, and the Montgomery County Police throughout the region who came to defend us. Why won't they put the plaque up if they are really such big supporters of the police? That is a law.

They just want to pass a resolution. Their resolution, of course, is completely political. One of their whereas clauses is: "Whereas, California's leadership has prioritized protecting illegal immigrants and violent individuals over U.S. citizens."

That is just defamation of the law enforcement officials in California. It is defamation against the Governor of California, the mayor of Los Angeles, the sheriff in Los Angeles County, the chief of police in L.A., all of whom fought to put that violence down when riots broke out, something Donald Trump never did when the riots broke out that he incited against us.

Remember, he was impeached by this body for inciting a violent insurrection against us. Not only did he not do anything to defend us, but he was the one who caused the whole chain of events that led to the deaths that took place that day and the violence that took place that day. My colleague won't utter a word about it. He won't say a word about it.

All of the attempt to focus everybody over there is a distraction from the fact that they still, to this day, are defending what Donald Trump did with January 6. Why? It is because they also defend his lie that he won the 2020 Presidential election, which he lost by more than 7 million votes, 306 to 232 in the electoral college.

□ 0945

I don't know what the meaning of their totally partisan resolution is when they won't even stand by the law—it was signed into law by the President—to put up a plaque, a simple plaque honoring police officers who fought tooth and nail for hours against the most bloody, vicious, violent insurrectionist mob ever to attack the Capitol of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this extremely partisan resolution that seeks to legitimize President Trump's baseless attacks on Los Angeles and our elected leaders, including Governor Newsom and Mayor Bass.

This administration's mass ICE raids by masked agents who will not identify themselves have trampled on our rights and left our community shaken but not defeated.

The President manufactured a crisis in Los Angeles and then blamed our constituents for it. He induced ICE to terrorize our community, detaining hundreds of hardworking residents at places like Home Depot and car washes, including U.S. citizens like Job Garcia, a doctoral student in my district at Claremont Graduate University. He was manhandled, thrown to the ground, and handcuffed.

For this, the President called in the National Guard and Marines?

This resolution only gives credence to Trump's dangerous rhetoric. Instead, we should be considering the resolution introduced by California's Democratic delegation, which condemns anyone engaged in violation of the law, violence, or vandalism. Most importantly, it stands up for our constitutional rights to due process and free expression and shows our appreciation to local law enforcement for upholding public safety.

Rather than feed into the President's cruelty, we are standing up for the communities we were elected to represent.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her excellent point. The California delegation has advanced, with Ms. LOFGREN, a truly bipartisan resolution that deplores all violence because the political violence is getting out of control in America.

We just had colleagues in Minnesota who were the subject of assassination attempts, and, of course, the former speaker of the Minnesota House was killed, along with her husband, and a State senator was wounded, along with his wife.

We deplore all the political violence across the board, and we defend the right to speak. We look for policies from the Federal Government that will not exacerbate conflict but will reduce conflict.

This resolution is far from being non-partisan, as my distinguished colleague argues. In fact, it attacks the Governor of California, Members of Congress, California leadership, and the mainstream media. I mean, come on.

We know the difference between what is a partisan, gotcha resolution and a resolution that actually attempts to unify people around common values.

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

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this notion that the President manufactured a crisis is simply asking us not to believe our eyes. You actually had Members of Congress from California who said that there was no violence, even though we all saw on television cars being lit on fire, Molotov cocktails, and bricks being thrown at officers. Among many other acts of violence, we had several officers who were injured during the process.

What did the President do? He asked our dedicated National Guard members to come in to protect Federal property and Federal officers.

To say that this somehow was what caused the crisis is not only completely at odds with the facts as we all witnessed them but is incredibly offensive to our dedicated National Guard members who went there and have successfully managed to keep the peace.

As to my colleague from Maryland who has now accused us of defamation with this cause, whereas California's leadership has prioritized protecting illegal immigrants and violent individuals over United States citizens, that is simply the very purpose of a sanctuary law, be it California's sanctuary State law or Los Angeles' sanctuary city law.

The entire purpose of these laws, their explicit effect, is to provide special protection for those who have not only come into the country illegally but have committed crimes.

I will give you an example of how sanctuary policies work in practice. We had a case not far from Sacramento where there was an individual who was in police custody for assaulting a peace officer. He had been arrested and was in custody. This is during the Biden administration, by the way.

ICE saw that he was in custody and asked to take custody of him from the sheriff's office so that he could be deported. The sheriff's office had to say, no, sorry, we are not allowed to do that under the sanctuary State law.

The next week, that man murdered his own three daughters as well as their chaperone, a horrific crime that never would have happened if not for California's sanctuary policies.

In a similar vein, many of the operations which ICE conducted in a targeted and standard way in L.A. would have been unnecessary if it were not for a sanctuary policy that forbade them from taking custody of these individuals within a custodial setting.

I would simply ask my colleague from Maryland: Are we to take it from his remarks that he would support reversing the sanctuary policies that have caused so much harm in California and Los Angeles?

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

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

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from California talks about defunding the police. He might want to update his talking points because look who is defunding the police. President Trump and the

Republicans are defunding the police, and we know that because we debated it for hours on this floor.

His DOGE agents, back when Elon Musk was still in town before he got run out of town by somebody, DOGE said a guy in the Department of Justice cut out an estimated \$500 million in community project funding to police departments across America, victim rights organizations, and others receiving those grants. They have not been able to explain it. They didn't even know it was happening.

Of course, they unleashed DOGE on the Department of Justice and hundreds of millions of dollars in State and local law enforcement, victim assistance, rape survivor organization grants, all of that was cut by them. Of course, they are also cutting more than a billion dollars in law enforcement funding in the DOJ appropriation this year.

We don't need any lectures about defunding the police from people who are actively defunding the police and people who are refusing to follow the law in honoring the police. My friend from California refuses to utter a word about that.

Could somebody please explain why they are not following the law and putting a plaque up to honor the officers who came to save our lives on January 6?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE), who is a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in fierce opposition to this performative and misleading resolution that reads like a cheap script treatment looking for a second-rate director.

H. Res. 516 is not about public safety. It is about fear, scapegoating immigrants, and gaslighting the American people into believing that Los Angeles is some so-called hellscape. If it is such a hellscape, I want to know why Republican Members of Congress have been flying into Los Angeles over the past few weeks attending fundraisers. Nobody is showing up in a hazmat suit or combat gear.

If it is such a hellscape, pull back the cameras and release the drone footage so we can see what is happening across the entire city.

This resolution ignores the fact that the violence didn't start in a vacuum. It was sparked by the Trump administration's provocative, aggressive immigration raids across the State.

ICE agents were in neighborhoods, grocery stores, and churches. I have never seen a segment on TV about an MS-13 cartel boss in the third grade. That is what we are seeing.

Of course, we came out and protested. That is what democracy looks like. Of course, our communities are terrified across Los Angeles, across the State, and across the country.

Instead of listening to us, the people from L.A., the President escalated this

drama, deploying the National Guard and the Marines to Los Angeles without a request from local law enforcement, the Governor, or the mayor.

Why? To launch a pathetic, made-for-TV reality TV show to justify authoritarian crackdowns and to divert from the real violence, the violence of cutting \$880 billion from Medicaid, the violence of kicking people off of healthcare, and the violence of tanking our economy into the gold toilet.

That is what we should be talking about. That is what this President doesn't want us to talk about, so he turned the cameras and the manufactured, fabricated violence onto Los Angeles.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, this audacity in blaming local leaders is about optics, power, control, and stoking the ego of Republicans and king daddy.

We are tanking the California economy, the fourth-largest economy in the world and the largest donor State. I refuse to support this resolution.

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is an odd notion that we have heard repeatedly, that the violence was only concentrated in part of L.A. and that we need to zoom out and look at the city as a whole.

For the folks who had to deal with this chaos in downtown L.A., it is little comfort to them that things might have been more serene in Beverly Hills.

My colleague from California uses the term "hellscape" for L.A. I am not sure I would use that term.

I can say that L.A. has had a lot of problems, so much so that the sheriff's department even had to come out and tell folks not to wear their jewelry when they go outside, to just put it on after they get to their destination.

As to the assertion that somehow this is a made-for-TV spectacle created by the President, I ask what made for more sensational TV images, the Waymos being set on fire and the Molotov cocktails being thrown at officers, which is to say that the things that happened before the National Guard got there, or our dedicated National Guard members standing outside Federal buildings, making sure that no further damage to property and life occurred?

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California has engaged in a spirited defense of the immigration policies of the administration. I wonder if he would clarify for us what the policy is this week, or at least today, with respect to agriculture in California or any other State.

President Trump heard from the Secretary of Agriculture and large agrarian interests saying that his immigration policies were destroying agriculture in America by getting rid of tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands of people who work there and that they are disrupting the entire agricultural economy.

Then, Donald Trump announced that there were some very fine, good workers within the agriculture sector, and they would not be enforcing the law there. That lasted for several days, and then there was a reversal. They went back to saying, yes, we will be doing ICE immigration crackdowns again.

Then, Donald Trump heard again from the Agriculture Secretary, as I understand it, and other interests, and he said no, they would be leaving some of these people alone.

I wonder if the gentleman could clarify that for us, and I wonder whether it causes him to second-guess in any way his absolute support for these policies. Maybe it suggests that there is something wrong with what they are doing and that the administration could go back to the drawing board.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN).

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this partisan and misleading resolution under consideration.

We have heard our colleague distort the facts already through this debate. I want to remind the American people and everybody that it was local law enforcement that got the situation under control before the National Guard and the Marines showed up. I know because I was on the phone with the sheriffs and local law enforcement who said, no, they don't need anybody, that the situation was under control.

This resolution distorts the facts of what happened in Los Angeles. It falsely paints a picture of widespread chaos across Los Angeles to justify and legitimize Donald Trump's dangerous decision to deploy the National Guard and U.S. Marines on American soil, all without the consent of California's Governor or a request from local leaders and law enforcement.

That is why I worked with Representative ZOE LÖFGREN to introduce a resolution that condemns violence, supports peaceful protests, and sets the facts straight.

Angelenos have exercised their First Amendment right to peacefully protest Federal ICE raids that have terrorized our communities. Unfortunately, there have been a small handful of troublemakers who have taken to the streets to cause destruction and physical confrontation.

□ 1000

Mr. Speaker, they should be arrested and prosecuted, something that the Governor, the mayor, and L.A.'s congressional delegation have called for from the start.

Let's remember, though, how we got here. What we have seen on our streets

is chilling. There are masked men in unmarked cars. They have no identification or badge. They are drawing weapons. They are swarming businesses and parks to indiscriminately stop, arrest, or detain immigrants and U.S. citizens.

People are being stopped and detained because of the color of their skin. These are not violent criminals. The majority of the people have no criminal record.

They are taking the parents, and they are leaving the kids stranded. They have set off flash-bang grenades in crowds. ICE even arrested U.S. citizens based on how they looked.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. BARRAGAN. Mr. Speaker, it is this conduct that is causing people to go out in the streets and peacefully protest.

President Trump's deployment of troops only escalated tensions and caused further unrest. Democrats have been clear. Anyone who commits violence must be held accountable. We must recognize that peaceful protests are patriotic. Deploying troops to silence dissent is not.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution ignores those facts to score political points, and I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the assertion has been made repeatedly that the President's deployment of the Guard escalated tensions. We have seen zero evidence for that. We all saw the images of the horrifying violence that occurred before the Guard came in.

For my colleagues who continue to assert that there was something untoward about the President deploying the Guard, I would also remind them that the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals has ruled otherwise.

In a unanimous decision, the court analyzed the relevant statute which provides that the President has the authority to make use of the Guard in order to stop the execution of Federal law from being disrupted.

The judges looked at the facts on the ground and said when Molotov cocktails are thrown at officers, when a commercial dumpster is used as a battering ram in order to break into a Federal office building's parking lot, when roadways are shut down, this looks a lot like there is a disruption of the ability to carry out Federal law.

Again, it is not me saying this. This is a unanimous panel of Trump-appointed and Biden-appointed judges who came to that determination.

I will happily answer the question of my friend from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) about what is the question when it comes to agriculture. Here is what the law says. The law says that coming into this country without authorization is categorically illegal.

Then it is within the discretion of the executive branch how to prioritize deportations. Across party lines, there has always been a strong focus on prioritizing those with criminal records. Beyond that, different Presidents have chosen to exercise that discretion in different ways.

For example, President Obama chose to deport millions of people during his time in office. It is ultimately a matter of how the President chooses to carry out that policy.

Here is the important point for purposes of today's debate. Whatever a person's views are on that matter, whether they favor deporting everyone in the country illegally or whether they favor deporting no one in the country illegally, we should not, cannot, and absolutely must not use violence in order to advance that point of view.

That is the principle at stake in today's debate. To vote against this resolution is to countenance what happened with the horrifying events we saw in my State.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am glad we are getting somewhere in this debate. The gentleman concedes that it is within the discretion of the administration to decide where to target resources.

I was just trying to find out where the administration is this week because we are getting conflicting accounts of whether or not they are still targeting farmworkers. We are getting reports from California, Texas, and New Mexico that entire farms are shut down because there have been ICE raids. The other workers are afraid to come to work.

They are begging the President to do something. The President then said we would stop doing that. Then they reversed it when Stephen Miller got involved. I think now the agriculture interests are getting involved. They should get the policy together.

It speaks to an underlying problem here, which is that the overwhelming number of arrests now are not of people who are criminal suspects for anything. Mr. Speaker, 65 percent of the people who have been taken by ICE since this administration began had no criminal convictions at all.

That is why we read articles in *The Wall Street Journal* about small, rural towns that voted for Donald Trump. They are up in arms and are in an uproar because people who have done nothing wrong and are pillars of the community are being taken away from their workplaces, their farms, their restaurants, their businesses, and their homes.

I ask the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. KILEY), who I know to be a serious student of the law because he was a student of mine of the law when we were at Yale Law School together: What authorizes the govern-

ment to send people out who are not identified with any law enforcement insignia, who are masked and who are in unmarked cars, to arrest people? Doesn't that set the people up for danger in America?

That is what the assassins in Minnesota were doing. They showed up, dressed like some kind of vague police person without any law enforcement insignia, and in an unmarked car. That sets us up for danger.

Doesn't my colleague think the law enforcement norm is for people to know who police officers are so that they know they have to submit to their authority? I would inquire if my colleague would like to answer the question.

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

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, if it is true that law enforcement is somehow never allowed to be in something other than their uniform, I think there are a lot of people who have gotten tickets for running a stop sign, when there was an unmarked car there, who would be happy to hear that. They now have a new basis to challenge that.

I think we are all aware that there are circumstances, like when someone is undercover or when they are doing a stakeout, in which it doesn't make sense for the official to identify himself as an officer.

Of course, that is neither here nor there because in these very targeted operations, we have seen that these folks are very clearly identified. To the extent that some have chosen to not have their faces revealed, it is because we have seen the threats against ICE absolutely skyrocket over the last several months.

It is, again, quite ironic when there were folks on that side of the aisle who were all about masks in the most absurd of settings during the COVID years. We had people playing singles tennis or out on the ocean paddleboarding required to wear a mask. There were 2-year-olds wearing a mask all day when no other country did this.

Yet when Federal officers, undertaking dangerous activity, trying to do their jobs, yet facing threats, being doxed and feeling like they and their family are at risk, choose to take this protective measure, now my colleague has a problem with it?

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for closing.

Mr. Speaker, there are masked agents in unmarked cars sent out, violating people's due process rights, as the courts have found. This includes all the way up to the Supreme Court. They are arresting Members of Congress. They are prosecuting Members of Congress for doing their jobs. They federalize the State National Guard when the police in Los Angeles and the elected officials are doing their jobs.

This is an authoritarian attack on constitutional democracy. We must get back to the rule of law.

If nothing else, the Republicans should put up the plaque they committed to put up, honoring the police officers who defended American democracy, the Vice President of the United States, the House of Representatives, the Senate, and everybody in this room during the January 6 violent insurrection which Donald Trump was impeached for having incited.

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

□ 1010

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, what happened in L.A. put on stark display years of reckless and failed policies, starting with the millions of people who came across the border illegally during the Biden years and then the sanctuary policies that California has enacted, not to mention the countless people who have been released from prison early thanks to reckless crime policies.

Today's resolution is not about any of that. Today's resolution is about something much simpler, a notion that I would hope would be unobjectionable: that in this country we settle our differences through reasoned arguments and debate and not through force and violence, that we make political decisions through elections and not through riots.

I hope that this resolution will receive strong bipartisan support on the floor today, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 530, the previous question is ordered on the resolution and the preamble.

The question is on adoption of the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 215, nays 195, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 185]

YEAS—215

Aderholt	Boebert	Crank
Alford	Bost	Crawford
Allen	Bresnahan	Crenshaw
Amodeli (NV)	Burchett	Cuellar
Arrington	Burlison	Davidson
Babin	Calvert	Davis (NC)
Bacon	Cammack	De La Cruz
Baird	Carey	Donalds
Balderson	Carter (GA)	Downing
Barr	Carter (TX)	Dunn (FL)
Barrett	Ciscomani	Edwards
Baumgartner	Cline	Ellzey
Bean (FL)	Cloud	Emmer
Begich	Clyde	Estes
Bentz	Cole	Evans (CO)
Bergman	Collins	Ezell
Bice	Comer	Fallon
Biggs (AZ)	Costa	Feenstra
Biggs (SC)	Crane	Fine

Finstad	Kiggans (VA)
Fischbach	Kiley (CA)
Fitzgerald	Kim
Fitzpatrick	Knott
Fleischmann	Kustoff
Flood	LaHood
Fong	LaLota
Fox	LaMalfa
Franklin, Scott	Langworthy
Fry	Latta
Fulcher	Lawler
Garbarino	Lee (FL)
Gill (TX)	Letlow
Gillen	Loudermilk
Golden (ME)	Lucas
Goldman (TX)	Luttrell
Gonzales, Tony	Mace
Gooden	Mackenzie
Gosar	Malliotakis
Gray	Maloy
Green (TN)	Mann
Greene (GA)	Massie
Griffith	Mast
Grothman	McCaul
Guest	McClain
Guthrie	McClintock
Hageman	McCormick
Hamadeh (AZ)	McDowell
Haridopolos	McGuire
Harrigan	Messmer
Harris (MD)	Meuser
Harris (NC)	Miller (IL)
Harshbarger	Miller (OH)
Hern (OK)	Miller-Meeks
Higgins (LA)	Mills
Hill (AR)	Moolenaar
Hinson	Moore (AL)
Houchin	Moore (NC)
Hudson	Moore (UT)
Huizenga	Moore (WV)
Hunt	Moran
Hurd (CO)	Murphy
Issa	Nehls
Jack	Newhouse
James	Norman
Johnson (LA)	Nunn (IA)
Johnson (SD)	Oberholte
Jordan	Ogles
Joyce (OH)	Onder
Joyce (PA)	Owens
Kean	Palmer
Kelly (MS)	Patronis
Kelly (PA)	Perry

NAYS—195

Adams	DeLauro	Kelly (IL)
Aguilar	DeBene	Kennedy (NY)
Amo	Deluzio	Khanna
Ansari	DeSaulnier	Krishnamoorthi
Auchincloss	Dexter	Landsman
Balint	Dingell	Larsen (WA)
Barragan	Doggett	Larson (CT)
Bell	Elfreth	Latimer
Bera	Escobar	Lee (NV)
Beyer	Espallat	Lee (PA)
Bishop	Evans (PA)	Leger Fernandez
Bonamici	Fields	Levin
Boyle (PA)	Figures	Liccardo
Brown	Fletcher	Lieu
Brownley	Foster	Lofgren
Budzinski	Foushee	Lynch
Bynum	Frankel, Lois	Magaziner
Carbajal	Friedman	Mannion
Carson	Frost	Matsui
Carter (LA)	Garcia (CA)	McBath
Casar	Garcia (IL)	McBride
Case	Garcia (TX)	McClain Delaney
Casten	Gomez	McClellan
Castor (FL)	Gonzalez, V.	McCollum
Castro (TX)	Goodlander	McDonald Rivet
Cherfilus-	Gottheimer	McGarvey
McCormick	Green, Al (TX)	McGovern
Chu	Harder (CA)	McIver
Cisneros	Hayes	Meeks
Clark (MA)	Himes	Menendez
Clarke (NY)	Horsford	Meng
Cleaver	Houlahan	Mfume
Clyburn	Hoyer	Min
Cohen	Hoyle (OR)	Moore (WI)
Conaway	Huffman	Morelle
Correa	Ivey	Morrison
Courtney	Jacobs	Moulton
Craig	Jayapal	Mrvan
Crockett	Jeffries	Mullin
Crow	Johnson (GA)	Nadler
Davids (KS)	Johnson (TX)	Neguse
Davis (IL)	Kamlager-Dove	Norcross
Dean (PA)	Kaptur	Ocasio-Cortez
DeGette	Keating	Olszewski

Omar	Scanlon	Titus
Pallone	Schneider	Tlaib
Panetta	Scholten	Tokuda
Pappas	Schrier	Tonko
Pelosi	Scott (VA)	Torres (CA)
Peters	Scott, David	Torres (NY)
Pettersen	Sewell	Trahan
Pingree	Sherman	Tran
Pocan	Simon	Underwood
Pou	Sorensen	Vargas
Pressley	Soto	Vasquez
Quigley	Stansbury	Veasey
Ramirez	Stanton	Velázquez
Randall	Stevens	Vindman
Raskin	Strickland	Wasserman
Riley (NY)	Subramanyam	Schultz
Rivas	Swallow	Waters
Ross	Sykes	Watson Coleman
Ruiz	Takano	Whitesides
Ryan	Thanedar	Williams (GA)
Salinas	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (FL)
Sánchez	Thompson (MS)	

NOT VOTING—22

Beatty	Gimenez	Moskowitz
Bilirakis	Goldman (NY)	Neal
Brecheen	Graves	Perez
Buchanan	Jackson (IL)	Schakowsky
DesJarlais	Jackson (TX)	Sherrill
Diaz-Balart	Kennedy (UT)	Smith (WA)
Fedorchak	Luna	
Garamendi	Miller (WV)	

□ 1038

Messrs. LOUDERMILK and COSTA changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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.

Stated for:

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I missed a vote today. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 185.

Mr. BRECHEEN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained due to illness and was not able to cast my vote on Roll Call No. 185. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 185.

Ms. PEREZ. Mr. Speaker, I unfortunately missed the vote today. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 185.

Stated against:

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for the vote in the House chamber today. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 185.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I inadvertently missed today's vote. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 185.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE SPEAKER

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 27, 2025.

I hereby designate the period from Friday, June 27, 2025, through Sunday, July 6, 2025, as a “district work period” under clause 13 of Rule I.

MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

RECOGNIZING HILLSBORO HIGH SCHOOL LADY INDIANS

(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 the Hillsboro High School Lady Indians softball team.

The Lady Indians had a historic season this year that saw them achieve over 20 wins and secure the Division 4 regional championship for the first time in 23 years, finishing the year as State runner-up.

Teamwork propelled them to great achievements as the Lady Indians consistently had great performances on the mound and in the batter's box.

Along the way, the Lady Indians were supported by a dedicated fan base of parents and alumni that fueled their desire for victory. Without the fan support and the support of their coaches, none of this would have been possible.

I will always be grateful for the parents and coaches that pour so much of themselves into our student athletes. The great achievements of the Lady Indians belong to them as much as they belong to the players.

Mr. Speaker, all of southern Ohio is proud of our Lady Indians' accomplishments, and I look forward to another great season next year.

SUPPORTING THE LGBTQ+ COMMUNITY

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

Ms. SALINAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the LGBTQ community to celebrate Pride Month, and to call out President Trump's reckless decision to shut down the 988 specialized LGBTQ youth hotline. This is a devastating decision that will affect people in every corner of our country.

I will put this into perspective: In 2024, 12 percent of LGBTQ youth attempted suicide, while nearly 40 percent seriously considered it. In comparison, the national average for students contemplating suicide is 20 percent, which is still far too large.

Additionally, many of these young people are left without critical support from caring adults, leaving them nowhere to turn when a crisis happens. We cannot deny the fact that this hotline is a vital service.

Mental health is not a partisan issue, and our children should not be used as pawns in the President's purely political game. As the co-chair of the bipartisan Mental Health Caucus, I am committed to expanding access to specialty mental health care by training qualified professionals to provide culturally relevant care and ensuring that high-quality, affordable services are available to all who need them.

Mr. Speaker, I will not remain silent in the face of President Trump's targeted attacks, and I will continue to fight for the LGBTQ communities.

RECOGNIZING THE NATIONAL MUSEUM OF THE MIGHTY EIGHTH AIR FORCE

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of our Nation's greatest World War II museums, the National Museum of the Mighty Eighth Air Force.

The museum, located just outside of Savannah in Pooler, Georgia, received a preserved B-24 Liberator from the National Museum of the U.S. Air Force at Barksdale Air Force Base.

The aircraft is one of the three remaining B-24 relics from World War II, originally named Rupert the Roo II.

Rupert will undergo a brief restoration process and will join a B-17 Flying Fortress to become the newest centerpiece of the museum.

These two machines represent the complete collection of the aircraft flown by the Mighty Eighth throughout the Second World War in both the European and Pacific theaters.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Barksdale Air Force Base for reallocation and preservation of these historic planes. Efforts like these allow the National Museum of the Mighty Eighth Air Force to fully educate the public on the Nation's most storied Air Force division ever known.

RECOGNIZING LOCAL CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE

(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, we often speak about how Congress can help small businesses grow, but the true hard work is being done on Main Streets across this Nation.

In the Sound Shore region of Westchester, businessowners are advancing their own businesses and finding time to lead local Chambers of Commerce, implementing programs and events that promote their business districts. From Mistletoe Magic in Rye to the downtown farmers market in Scarsdale, sidewalk sales in Larchmont and Mamaroneck, these entrepreneurs are driving revenue and profits with creativity and energy.

Let me recognize the work of these local leaders: Catherine White, New Rochelle; Michael Murphy, Mamaroneck; Brian Jackson, Rye; Ralph Karkout in Harrison; Cammie Morrissey and Fritz Falanka, Port Chester, Rye Brook, Rye Town; Gina Proia and Nancy White, Larchmont; Marcy Berman-Goldstein and Ken Giddon, Scarsdale Business Alliance; Anne Gold and Marc Jerome, New Rochelle Business Improvement District.

Mr. Speaker, in future speeches, I will recognize leaders in the Bronx and along the Hudson River communities of Westchester. We salute them all.

RECOGNIZING JOHN NAGLE

(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, there are good days and bad days in this building. Today, we have a little bit of a happy day and sad day in the Grothman office.

John Nagle, part of my policy shop, is leaving today. He is a great guy. He is the pride of Poway, California. While it is our loss, it is going to be the gain of the Pacific Legal Foundation.

I will say one more time, I thank John for all the help he has given me. He is welcome to come back to our office again and again when he is on the Hill.

CAPITAL GAZETTE SHOOTING

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

Ms. ELFRETH. Mr. Speaker, 7 years ago, on June 28, 2018, a gunman who should never have been able to purchase a firearm, walked into the Capital Gazette and killed five members of our hometown newspaper: Gerald Fischman, Rob Hiaasen, John McNamara, Rebecca Smith, and Wendi Winters.

Amid the shock and horror, just hours after the shooting, the Capital issued a simple statement: We are putting out a damn paper tomorrow, and that they did.

These journalists made clear that the fourth estate cannot be silenced, and they made Maryland damn proud.

On this tragic anniversary, I will make it clear on this House floor that as elected officials, we were not sent here to look away, to give up, or to offer our thoughts and prayers alone. That is why I rise today to remember the journalists we lost, to continue the fight for full freedom of the press, and for commonsense gun safety legislation that protects all of our communities.

PROMISES MADE, PROMISES KEPT

(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, House Republicans have passed legislation that delivers on the promises made, promises kept of President Donald Trump by stopping wasteful spending with the big, beautiful bill, eliminating taxes on tips and overtime.

This bill secures the border, unleashes American energy, delivers the largest tax cut for working- and middle-class families ever, creates jobs, and brings common sense to government. Medicare and Social Security will be protected, while Medicaid will be guarded against waste, fraud, and

abuse as pioneered by Senator Billy Garrett of South Carolina, ensuring it is available to our most vulnerable Americans, with laws enforced by Solicitor David Stumbo.

This is important to everyone. A family with two children in South Carolina will receive higher take-home pay, between \$7,000 to \$10,000, with the new, beautiful bill.

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 war criminal Putin's lies, insulting Trump and mocking Trump, with Putin allied with the murderous regime in Iran who proclaim death to America.

□ 1050

NEW DEMS ON THE ROAD TOUR

(Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, as chair of the New Dems' Rural Broadband Task Force, I rise today to highlight the incredible progress we are making, and yet the critical work that remains to close the digital divide in our country.

This is a personal passion of mine, as I spent years as a nonprofit advocate, and then had a tenure at NTIA to roll out the broadband BEAD program.

This past Monday, I had the honor of hosting my colleague Representative BUDZINSKI in Frederick, Maryland, for the fourth stop on the New Dems on the Road Tour. We visited a fiber installation and sat down with local leaders, government officials, and industry experts to talk about what is working and what remains in the way of delivering high-speed affordable internet.

We also discussed the challenges facing broadband deployment, including new rulemaking efforts, potential disruptions and BEAD implementation, Federal funding freezes, and the incredible risks posed by the AI moratorium linked to the BEAD funding in the budget package.

I have just seen how transformative broadband access can be, from telehealth to learning, to also our U.S. competitiveness and emergency public communications. Just as rural electrification lit up America in the 20th century, broadband is the key to unlocking opportunity in the 21st. Let's finish the job.

HONORING LIFE AND LEGACY OF SISTER ROSEMARY CONNELLY

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life and legacy of Sister Rosemary Connelly of Chicago, Illinois, who passed away on June 19 at the age of 94.

During her extraordinary life, Sister Rosemary served with unmatched devotion as the longtime executive director of Misericordia, a home for children and adults with developmental disabilities on Chicago's north side. She started her work in 1969, when Misericordia was a small and underresourced institution caring for about 50 children with profound challenges.

Sister Rosemary brought a bold vision rooted in compassion and dignity, and over the next five decades she transformed Misericordia into one of the Nation's most respected care facilities, serving hundreds of residents and employing over 1,200 staff and volunteers. She spearheaded fundraising, created jobs through social enterprises like the Hearts & Flour Bakery, and expanded the campus to include community-integrated homes.

Revered across northern Illinois and beyond, Sister Rosemary was widely recognized for her impact on families and her unshakable belief that every life has purpose.

I extend my condolences to all of Sister Rosemary's family, friends, and colleagues on this immense loss.

WHAT AMERICANS WANT

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

Ms. BALINT. Mr. Speaker, we all know that the Republicans' so-called big, beautiful bill is wildly unpopular. Every poll, including FOX News, shows that Americans think it is rotten, and it is.

That is why Trump is trying desperately to rehabilitate the bill in the eyes of the public, but Americans aren't stupid. They don't want their healthcare taken away. They don't want us taking food away from hungry people. They don't want our rural hospitals to close. They don't want to add trillions of dollars to the debt, and they sure as hell do not want the wealthy to continue to get rich off the backs of the rest of us.

This is not rocket science. They want a tax code that doesn't screw us over. They want affordable rent and mortgages. They want lower healthcare costs. They want to see us fighting for a better future for their families.

All this bill does is take and take and take away from working people and provide it, once again, to the billionaires who do not need it. They see right through it, and so do we.

CELEBRATING OFFICER JOHN SALB

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, today I celebrate the storied career of Officer John Salb, who will be retiring today after proudly serving the Capitol Police for over 30 years.

Officer Salb first joined the Capitol Police in 1993 when he was hired as a security aide, before being hired as a full-time officer the following year. Working in Capitol Divisions 2 and 3, Officer Salb has protected this Capitol and its millions of visitors and workers with honor. After 30 years, he likely has enough stories to fill this House Chamber. A number of those include his brother, William, as the two served together from 1994 until 2008.

In 2011, John made his way down to the House Intelligence Committee, where he spent every day for the last 14 years securing our Members and staff. For over a decade, John has been a valuable asset to our intelligence team, not only providing security but also serving as the committee expert on all things Capitals and Commanders.

While everyone at Intel will miss our friend, we wish him the best as he embarks on his next great journey. May John enjoy his retirement.

HONORING STEVEN "CHAOS" CAMOU

(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 today to honor Steven "Chaos" Camou, a vibrant soul from Blythe, California, whose life reminds us of the urgent need for compassion in mental health care.

Steven was a talented hairdresser with a bright personality and deep love for his mother, Angela Colangeli. He faced incredible challenges: addiction, stigma around his queer identity, and schizophrenia, yet he fought to find peace, often without the professional help he needed.

On October 27, 2021, Steven tragically took his own life, but even in his darkest moments, he dreamed of helping others not to feel alone in their struggles.

In his memory, his mother and his father, George, founded Peace from Chaos, a nonprofit supporting those living with mental illness, addiction, and social rejection.

As Men's Mental Health Awareness Month comes to an end, let's honor Steven by fighting for a world where no one suffers in silence, and everyone has access to care, support, and dignity.

FACING DOWN PERPETRATORS OF DESTRUCTION

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

Mr. MACKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, the world once again witnessed a shocking act of terrorism committed against innocent civilians in Syria.

Those who attended Sunday mass at the Mar Elias Church were not combatants. They were members of the community who sought to live in peace and

rebuild from war. They were members of our community who had endured unimaginable suffering and faced an uncertain future with faith and hope.

In the shadow of relentless terror and violence, it takes enormous courage to do many of the things that we take for granted. We can take inspiration from those who face down the cowardly perpetrators of destruction with faith and hope as they work to rebuild their nation.

I join the Greater Lehigh Valley Syrian community in praying for the victims of this attack and for peace to return to Syria. May God bless all of those who stand up in the face of terror and violence.

HONORING FAIRLAWN POLICE DEPARTMENT OFFICERS

(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 recognize three outstanding police officers from the Fairlawn Police Department as this week's Ohio's 13th Congressional District Champions of the Week.

Last month, Officers Francisco Corona, Brian Buskirk, and Hannah Plant exemplified the best of public service when they jumped into action to save the life of a woman in distress.

On May 23, 2025, Officer Buskirk noticed a car stopped on the sidewalk, where he found a woman unconscious and unresponsive. With the assistance of Officers Corona and Plant, the officers broke the car window and extracted the woman, then quickly initiated CPR while preparing the automated external defibrillator. Their teamwork and rapid response made the difference in a critical life-or-death situation.

I extend my sincere gratitude to Officers Corona, Buskirk, and Plant, and the Fairlawn Police Department and Fire Department for continuing to keep our communities safe. Their actions and bravery do not go unnoticed.

On behalf of Ohio's 13th Congressional District and the United States House of Representatives, I thank them for their service to our community.

□ 1100

RECOGNIZING MIDVALE BOYS & GIRLS CLUB

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, it was a pleasure to visit the Midvale Boys & Girls Club recently to speak with the youth about success, grit, and the power of their dreams.

This summer, over 200 young people, supported by 17 dedicated staff members, will be granted an environment

where they can have fun. In the process, they will build character, learn leadership skills, and develop healthy relationships.

Many of the youth will take part in activities like the run club, where the benefits of competition can be experienced. They are also learning the importance of goal setting, the pain of preparation, and the tenacity to push through the pain.

They are in the process of learning one of life's more important lessons, which is that we cannot control the scoreboard, but we can control the hustle. These tenets are the heart of meritocracy and what I observed during my visit to the Midvale Girls & Boys Club.

I thank the staff for their commitment. I hope the young people enjoy the experience, remember what they are learning, apply what they have learned, and, more importantly, pass it on.

HONORING DIANA "DEE" HEYWOOD TALMAGE

(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, I rise to honor the life and legacy of a remarkable daughter of northwest Ohio, Diana "Dee" Heywood Talmage.

While her passing leaves a deep chasm in our community, Dee was a formidable force for good. She was a Republican, and I am a Democrat. Her patriotism, philanthropy, good sense, and elegance bestowed a living legacy that serves as an example of an exemplary life well lived.

Dee embodied the very highest aspirations for northwest Ohio. A product of Toledo's DeVilbiss High School, a proud Ohio State Buckeye, and a Toledo Rocket, she used her education to give back to the community that raised her.

Dee served on the Ottawa Hills School Board, the boards of Owens Community College and Woodlawn Cemetery, and helped guide the University of Toledo Alumni Association.

Dee always led with vision, clarity, courage, and compassion, and her inspired leadership drew from all walks of life to make a difference. She mentored generations of new leaders, many of whom sit on boards, serve in office, or volunteer today because of her example.

To observe Dee barreling down the street in her convertible, broadly smiling and waving, was to feel the heart of Toledo itself. Her love for our people, progress, and potential was boundless, and her life was not just one of service but of joyful commitment to her family—I will put their names in the record at a later time—including her beloved husband of 63 years, Brigadier General Dr. Lance Talmage, a dedicated community and military leader alongside her.

May Dee's legacy of character and commitment continue to inspire generations to come. She surely will be missed. She was one of a kind.

SUPPORTING SUPREME COURT RULING ON NATIONWIDE INJUNCTIONS

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

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of this morning's ruling from the Supreme Court that will greatly reform the ability of rogue district court judges to issue nationwide injunctions.

According to a Politico article this morning, with this ruling, the Supreme Court said that in most cases, judges can only grant relief to the parties who brought a particular lawsuit and may not extend those decisions to protect other individuals without going through the process of converting a suit into a class action.

I have been fighting for this day for years, including introducing legislation in multiple sessions of Congress that would curtail the ability of rogue district court judges to issue nationwide injunctions, often at the behest of special interest groups that shop around for a friendly district court judge.

This is a good day for democracy. Please join me in congratulating the Supreme Court for this outstanding ruling.

REMEMBERING D'WAYNE WIGGANS

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

Ms. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, as Black Music Month comes to a close, I rise in the House today for 1 minute to honor my dear friend, D'Wayne Wiggans.

D'Wayne Wiggans passed away on March 7, 2025, and my community of Oakland, California, and the world continues to grieve. We are mourning not only his significant contributions to the Black music community, but we knew D'Wayne as a legendary musician who gave as much of his voice as he gave to community.

D'Wayne made and produced music that uplifted so many. Moreover, we know him as a monumental soul of good. He mentored countless artists and young people, including Destiny's Child and Beyonce, helped to start the career of Alicia Keys, and was on the Grammy stage every year for decades.

D'Wayne opened up many spaces for young people in my community in California's District 12 to thrive. He was incredibly generous.

Moreover, we know that there is no dying when it comes to D'Wayne's voice. You cannot kill culture. Our community loves him and his family, and I am so thankful for what he has

given our community. His voice will never cease.

CENSURING ANTI-IMMIGRANT SENTIMENT

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

Mr. THANEDAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor immigrants.

Throughout American history, immigrants of all kinds have made our country great. Sergey Brin invented Google, and Madeleine Albright blazed trails as the first female Secretary of State.

Instead of celebrating this diversity, many Republicans want to shame immigrants. On Tuesday, Zohran Mamdani, an immigrant from Uganda, won the New York mayoral primary. Representative ANDY OGLES promptly went on an unhinged, anti-immigrant, racist rant throughout yesterday and today, calling this freely elected man and U.S. citizen “Little Muhammad” and called for revoking his citizenship and for him to be deported with no just cause.

We must always condemn hate. I have introduced a censure resolution, H. Res. 553, against ANDY OGLES for his horrific anti-immigrant sentiment. Immigrants make our country great.

HONORING SALLYE RUTH MOORE

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the amazing life of Sallye Ruth Moore, a trailblazer in education, a fierce advocate for equity, a beloved daughter of Grand Prairie, and a pillar of the community in Dalworth on San Antonio Street.

Ms. Moore passed away this year at 91. She leaves behind a major legacy of education in the north Texas community.

For over four decades, she devoted her life to uplifting students and breaking barriers, becoming the associate superintendent in the Grand Prairie ISD. Her journey began as a teacher, counselor, and principal, where she received numerous accolades for her excellence in the classroom and for shaping and forming students for generations.

Ms. Moore's leadership wasn't just about academics. It was about dignity, discipline, and love. She was just an amazing person. A school was named after her, Sallye Moore Elementary, in the Dalworth community in Grand Prairie in 2001. Her legacy will live on for a very long time. She leaves behind a son, Greg.

If she looks familiar, it is because she was the last remaining sibling out of the four Johnson kids. Eddie Bernice Johnson, our former colleague, was her sister.

We remember Ms. Moore today as a servant leader, a giant in Texas edu-

cation, and a beacon of hope. May her memory be a blessing, and may we all strive to follow her excellent example.

CELEBRATING LGBTQIA+ COMMUNITY

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. GREEN of Texas was recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.)

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise.

I say “and still I rise” because I have been censured, but I would like to assure people that I have not been silenced; censured but not silenced.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, proud to say that I am an ally of the LGBTQIA+ community, an ally. I rise as an ally, Mr. Speaker, to acknowledge that H. Res. 550, the original LGBTQIA+ Pride Month resolution of 2025, is a part of the history of the records of the House of Representatives.

□ 1110

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a resolution that I am honored to present annually, and it speaks to the accomplishments of the community. It also addresses many of the things that are shortcomings in our society as they impact the community.

I am proud today to rise and say that as an ally of the community, this resolution has 125 cosponsors. For many, that might not seem like a lot. I can recall a time when we had many, many persons who wanted to sign on. For reasons that were associated with elections and politics, they would not sign on.

I think people are overcoming those concerns and those fears, and they are recognizing the fact that we should not discriminate against people because of who they are.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it would be beneficial for people to talk to people who are from the community before drawing conclusions. I especially say this as it relates to the trans community. There are many issues to be discussed about the trans community.

Today, having talked to people from the trans community, having had an opportunity to have dialogue and ask questions and get answers from the people themselves, I acknowledge that I have come to the conclusion that this community exists because people literally want to be themselves.

I spoke to a trans person who informed me that this person—without giving any hint as to who it is because the person had spoken to me in confidence—this person indicated that since the person could recognize the image in a mirror, the person realized that there was a need to have a different image. The person wanted to be of a different sex than the person was assigned at birth.

I have talked to more than one person who has given me similar evidence. I think we ought to believe people when they say this. I just don't think

that people would go out of their way to try to convince us that this is appropriate and would do some of the things necessary to identify themselves properly just to get attention.

Nobody wants to get attention by having surgery that costs thousands of dollars. Nobody wants to get attention by facing a society that rejects, too often, people because they don't understand who they are and what they are all about.

We are talking about people who just want to live their lives and be left alone. They are not trying to impose themselves upon other people. These are decent human beings who just want to be left alone and be allowed to be themselves.

I cannot for the life of me understand how someone could see this as harmful to society in the main. I myself have been discriminated against. Having been born a son of the segregated South, having been born an African American, I have been discriminated against.

I can remember when I had to go to the back door to get food simply because of how I looked. It had nothing to do with any behavior that I exhibited. It was just because of the color of my skin I had to go to back doors.

I had to drink from a filthy colored water fountain with a pristine White water fountain next to it simply because of the color of my skin and how I looked. I had to sit in the balcony of the movie and the back of the bus simply because of how I looked.

I am so grateful to God for giving me those experiences because it gives me some sense of appreciation for what others go through simply because of who they say they are.

We cannot have the great country that we claim we are if we continue to discriminate against people because of who they say they are. This is the United States of America with liberty and justice for all. That has to include the trans community.

It really does have to include it to the extent that they can walk the streets and not be in fear. There are still people who will harm members of the trans community if they can catch them at a certain place and at a certain time when nobody is looking just because of who they are.

We talk about other people living in fear, and I think we should because there are others living in fear, as well. Little attention is given to this community and the fear that it has to live and coexist with simply because of who they say they are.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to present this resolution today. I plan to continue to introduce the LGBTQIA+ Pride Month resolution. I have been doing so for some time now.

I had the honor of serving with the Honorable Barney Frank when I was in Congress. The Honorable Barney Frank, a Member of Congress from 1981 to 2013, is recognized in this resolution as an honorary cosponsor of the resolution.

This resolution tracks the history of persons having the opportunity to first embrace themselves with the protestations that started and to move on to the point where now persons can actually embrace marriage and live with the person and love with the person that they choose.

As an ally of this community, I find none of this offensive. I find all of this to be natural for human beings who want to just simply be themselves.

I am also honored to say that in Houston, Texas, not only will this resolution be celebrated but also there is a Pride parade that would rival any parade in this country. People show up in the thousands, the tens of thousands, possibly hundreds of thousands. They line the streets, and they celebrate. To a certain extent, some commemorate lives who have been lost simply because they are a part of this community.

This is something that I would hope we could see around the country to a greater extent than we see it. Houston, Texas, has embraced it. Many other places have.

Until it is embraced in the small towns, in the boroughs, in places where people are now at some point in some places afraid to announce who they are, until this attitude of pride is embraced by the workplace—workplaces where people cannot indicate who they are because if they do, they are likely to lose their jobs—until that same level of pride, that same spirit of embracing people for who they are, judging them by the content of their character, not what they believe them to be within, I think we ought to believe people when they tell us who they are.

Today, my prayer is that this LGBTQIA+ Pride Month resolution will inspire people to do more than simply say hello, but they will become an ally. I am recruiting. The Pride community needs allies.

It needs people who are willing to stand up publicly and say: I am an ally of the community.

Mr. Speaker, I assure my colleagues that when we do this, we are doing what is expected of people of good will who want to see people simply live their lives, enjoy who they are, and just simply be themselves, we will promote and will help to cause a good many people that we may never meet and greet to benefit from another person becoming an ally of the LGBTQIA+ community.

□ 1120

Mr. Speaker, I close with this: The LGBTQIA+ community does not exist in a vacuum. It exists in a country that prides itself in pledging liberty and justice for all. This is an opportunity for every person who has never had the opportunity to talk to a person from this community to just do so.

I guarantee you, Mr. Speaker, if you do so, you will leave with a different attitude. I absolutely believe this. I also say to you, Mr. Speaker, don't

worry about the pride community trying to impose anything on you. If you don't know a person from the community, you are not likely to be invited to a wedding, so you don't have to worry about some imposition. Just worry about making America all that it claims it is.

I plan to do it, and I invite others to do so, as well.

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

TAX CUTS AND SPENDING

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. ROY of Texas was recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.)

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend from Texas, and I wish him safe travels back home to our great State.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if I may, I want to let people know this not just for the Honorable CHIP ROY, but I have relationships with people across all lines in this Congress. When he comes to the floor and says that he wishes me safe travels, I want to let people know that I will extend that to him, but also that notwithstanding what others may think, I have great respect for the gentleman. I don't have to agree with him to have great respect for him, and the gentleman doesn't have to agree with me, but at some point, we have to do what we are doing now and let people know that we have respect for each other notwithstanding these differences.

I really appreciate the way the gentleman has called for regular order. That means something to me. So while I have not been on the floor with the gentleman when he has done it, I want him to know that I have noticed that he has done it. I appreciate the gentleman, and I consider him a friend.

Mr. ROY. I appreciate those kind remarks from the gentleman. I consider the gentleman from Texas a friend, and I am sincere in wishing him safe travels and well wishes heading back home. We throw a lot of barbs around this Chamber, for good reason, we are here. Everybody always says how crazy it is and how divided we are, and I always remind people that when was the last time you had a Secretary of the Treasury and Vice President dueling in the street?

That has happened in our past, not now, that was 200-and-change years ago. We have differences of opinion, and that is the reason this body exists. We represent our constituents, and we are supposed to express on their behalf our views consistent with the Constitution in our republican form of government.

I am here today to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to talk about what has been known now as the One

Big Beautiful Bill Act which is, in simple speak, a reconciliation package which is supposed to be designed to reconcile current policies, tax and spending, to achieve a reduction in deficits, or make sure that we are not adding to the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, here we are.

The House of Representatives worked together and passed a bill. We passed a budget, we then passed a new budget, and then we passed a bill. We sent it to the Senate.

The House bill was not perfect by any stretch of the imagination from my perspective. The House bill didn't do enough on many things that I think are important. However, the House bill had core components of tax-cut extensions for hardworking Americans. The House bill had core components to give resources to the President, the administration, Tom Homan, Stephen Miller, and Secretary Noem to secure the border, and, importantly, to remove people through ICE and enforcement.

The House bill had core components to make sure our defense can modernize. The House bill had core components—and this is where it gets important—to terminate the green new scam subsidies, but not all of them. That is why I said the bill wasn't perfect.

I think we should repeal them all and save over \$1 trillion. We should stop subsidizing China. We should stop subsidizing big corporations. We should stop subsidizing unreliable energy, and stop interfering with the market. We only terminated about 60 percent of the green new scam. I think we should have done better.

The House had core components in it to reform Medicaid. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle were saying we are going to be taking Medicaid away from people. Medicaid goes up between 20 and 30 percent under our budget over the next 10 years.

Medicaid under our bill would be focused primarily on the vulnerable population more than the able-bodied. I think the bill should have gone farther. I think we should reform more of the money laundering scam that the FMAP seven times multiple giving more money to the able-bodied than the vulnerable. I think we should stop the scam of blue States taking more money from red States and nonexpansion States and giving it to hospitals and insurance companies. I think we should have ended that and done more.

We took a giant step forward to have work requirements to ensure that Medicaid could actually be solvent. It has gone up another \$1 trillion just under the Biden administration in terms of overall baseline costs.

That is all in the weeds. People watching this at home don't know what is going on. They are going about their lives. All they know is that there is a big bill, there is some tax stuff in it, there is some spending stuff in it, and there is some border stuff in it. That is about all they know.

Mr. Speaker, so why am I here?

It is because the House passed that bill—imperfect but I will call it passable by definition. We sent it to the Senate. The Senate is making the bill worse as we speak. The Senate is making decisions, both policy decisions and what is called going through a process over there to see if it is language that is supposed to be in a budget-related reconciliation package. We call it the Byrd process. They are pulling pieces out of it. The bill is getting worse.

Let me see if I can put it in basic terms.

This chart is not going to mean much to most people back home. Mr. Speaker, you don't even need to look at all the bars. It gets kind of complex. I just want to be real simple. This orange line on this chart—people in the gallery can't see it, but imagine an orange line on an X-Y graph.

That orange line says that under the House bill on a dynamic basis—what does that mean?

It means, that accounting for economic growth, accounting for the tax policies, and accounting for what we believe will happen, we would have about an additional \$72 billion of deficit spending over 10 years. Sadly, \$72 billion is kind of a rounding error when we are talking about 10 years.

In other words, it is close to breakeven. We would cut taxes, we would reduce spending, and we would get economic growth. We believe we would add nothing more to the deficit.

Here is the problem. Adding nothing more to the deficit means we still have deficits. We still have \$1.8 trillion to \$2 trillion a year in deficits.

I voted for a bill that will perpetuate \$1.8 trillion deficits, and I hated doing it. I did it because in this process, in this political environment, to get the reforms that we were getting to Medicaid, to get the reforms that we were getting to terminate 60 percent of the green new scam subsidies undermining our grid, and to get the tax cut extensions for hardworking Americans, to me it was worth doing that when I thought credibly and believably we would not be adding to the deficit and get those important reforms.

Here we are. The Senate, in its infinite wisdom over in the house of lords, they are embarking on focusing on what we would have anticipated they would focus on, which is just the tax-cut side, for the most part. They are backing away from the spending cuts, the spending restraints. They are backing away from the reforms that we think makes the math work, and there-in lies the problem.

Mr. Speaker, do you want to know why we are \$37 trillion in debt as a nation?

It is because too often my Republican colleagues have never met a tax cut they didn't want to advance while then campaigning on balancing the budget and cutting spending that they never want to vote for.

We can't do that.

□ 1130

We have to actually lead. In a Republican form of government there are 435 of us representing 300 and, what, 30-something million Americans. I represent about three-quarters of a million people. In a Republican form of government I am supposed to take the hard votes. I am supposed to go back to my constituents and say: Well, we are doing this and this and this. We think it is good. I know you wanted this, but we can't have that because we are \$37 trillion in debt.

I go back to this chart. There is a big yellow bar over here with flames on top. It shows almost a trillion dollars of additional deficit that the Senate bill would add if the policies they are currently debating in the Senate are adhered to. That means they got rid of a lot of our savings, and they made certain tax cuts more permanent. They extended them. I support making those tax cuts permanent and extending them but not without the spending reductions necessary to get us back to deficit neutrality or deficit savings.

Why does this matter? It matters because Republicans will go around all the time and say: Don't worry. All tax cuts pay for themselves.

Let me be very clear. Not all tax cuts pay for themselves. They just don't.

I grew up a child of the eighties. I grew up on studying supply-side economics. I believe in leaving money in the hands of the American people to produce wealth. I believe that does create more revenue the Treasury can bring in with lower rates on a bigger pie. I think that is important.

You still have to do basic math. If you reduce the rate, which I want to do to be perfectly clear, for the worker, for the family, for the business, you are going to get a revenue reduction to the Treasury. Your hope is the economic growth will offset part of that.

When we do the math and we talk to every outside group and we listen to the CBO—the Congressional Budget Office gets a lot wrong—but every outside group who looks at this tells us that our assumptions that we baked in of \$2.5 trillion of economic growth is a kind of reasonable sweet spot, meaning we are assuming the growth. We are already baking in that you are going to get more revenue, but when you keep extending these tax cuts and you don't do enough spending cuts and you weaken the spending cuts that we put in place, you end up with this chart. You end up with a trillion dollars of additional deficit on top of the roughly \$18 trillion we are not even touching.

My question for my colleagues is: Was even the House bill good enough? Not really; it really wasn't. I held my nose and voted for it. I want to help the President. I want to move the agenda forward. I want tax cuts. I want the green new scam subsidies terminated. I want Medicaid reform. However, we were leaving in place adding another \$18 trillion to \$20 trillion of deficit spending, if we are lucky for it to be that low, over the next 10 years.

If the Senate is going to send the bill back to us that is going to add a trillion dollars more and not reform Medicaid properly and not terminate the green new scam that the President campaigned on terminating, then there is no way I can vote for that bill when it comes back. That needs to be said, and it needs to be clear.

The fact of the matter is our country is hanging on by a very thin fiscal thread. The bond markets are recognizing this. There was a headline in the Financial Times today that foreign markets are starting to pull out of Federal treasuries. Interest rates are doing what they are doing. You can change the Fed chairman all you want, but if you don't fix the fiscal mess we are in, the outer part of that curve, which is what sets our mortgage rates, our long-term borrowing rates, that is still going to be a mess, and the American people aren't going to be able to afford homes.

The average age of the American homeowner today is as high as it has ever been. It is up about 10 years. Now you are in your upper thirties before you are buying a home instead of your upper twenties, which it was not long ago.

We are ripping the American Dream out of the hands of our kids and grandkids because of people in this Chamber and people in the other Chamber who refuse to do the hard work of governing responsibly. I should say representing; we don't govern, but do our job.

I am blessed to be alive. I am a cancer survivor. I have talked about that before. I was blessed to have treatment at MD Anderson, and that was 14 years ago. I think it was 14 years ago this next month.

Why do I bring that up? I bring that up because I get cancer groups that come into my office all the time. Mr. Speaker, you get cancer groups, you get ALS groups, you get people who have a heart to solve a problem, and they want money. They want funding. I have to say no. If they don't come in and say: Well, we know that we are \$37 trillion in debt, so we are proposing this plan, and we are proposing cuts over here in order to achieve what we want, which is \$100 million for some research—they usually don't do that. They just come in and say: We need \$100 million for research or \$500 million for research or \$1 billion for some program, and I have to say no. I always say no.

I tell my farmers who come in and are just dying for relief because we have messed up their livelihoods so much, Congress has, with a failed system. Crop insurance is important. All the things we do are important, but we include a bloated food stamp program, which is exploding off the charts in the farm bill every 5 years, and they expect me to vote to continue a food stamp program, which is often going to the able-bodied, often corrupted, often feeding our children and people in this

country sugary, terrible foods that are making our healthcare system more expensive, and they want me to keep paying for that. I have to tell my farmers: Sorry, guys, I am not voting for the farm bill.

I have got to say there are only a handful of us in this Chamber who are willing to say no. "No" is the most powerful and important word in the English language when it is used the right way, which I would say in this body should be used most of the time.

Ronald Reagan famously said, I think it was on Johnny Carson's "The Tonight Show" interview, and they were talking and Reagan said—and Reagan hated taxes—Reagan said: That every new program that a Member of Congress brings to the floor should have a tax increase attached to it. He is correct. He was correct.

Why? He was correct because if you bring a billion-dollar program to the floor, we vote for it because the headline will say: CHIP ROY opposes puppies or CHIP ROY opposes cancer research or CHIP ROY opposes something for veterans or for the elderly. Who can vote against that?

If the bill was billion-dollar program and needed a tax increase on every American to pay for it, well, now that vote is a little different. We don't do that. We never do that.

Now what is going to happen? Well, there is going to be a lot of posturing over the next week.

Here is something that everybody should get a bit of a chuckle out of. We had to pass the budget right before Easter. We had to pass the bill right before Memorial Day. Now, we are supposed to pass the final bill, get it through the Senate by July 4.

□ 1140

We had to pass the government funding bill right before Christmas. The speaker knows. Mr. Speaker, why do you think that is? Do you think that is just because everybody says, well, wouldn't it be nice to do that right at those great holidays? No. It is something called jet fumes.

Every Member of Congress has a trip, personal, business, government, whatever. They all are going to take a trip, so they always want to have these bills right before that so that everybody comes in and says: "Yes, I will vote for it. Let's get out of here." Boom, they get out of town.

Mr. Speaker, here we are. Over the next week, there is going to be an enormous amount of pressure brought to bear from the White House and our leadership on both sides to get in line and say: "We have to pass it. If we don't pass it, the taxes are going to go up. If we don't pass it, we are not going to get the border funding. If we don't pass it, we won't have a debt ceiling increase, and the bond markets are going to freak out."

We are not going to default on our debt.

We are not going to let taxes go up in the end before this year is over. They

don't go up until December. We are going to do what we need to do on the border.

I would like to do it in this bill, but I am not going to do it in this bill if this bill is adding to the debt, not doing what it needs to do on the green new scam, not doing what it needs to do on Medicaid, and not doing what it needs to do on countless other issues.

I am not going to do it if it is going to be a big giveaway to blue State tax jurisdictions in State and local taxes. My friends in this Conference who represent big tax States like New York and California want a bigger deduction for their State taxes. Why the hell should I subsidize their stupid decisions in their States for their expensive taxes? Why should my constituents have to do that?

Why should we continue to allow food stamps to go to the able-bodied? Why should we continue to have Medicaid go to the able-bodied and not have work requirements or not deal with the money laundering scam?

Why shouldn't we, by the way, have health savings accounts? The Senate bill took our health savings accounts out of the House bill.

Why should we continue to have taxpayer-funded sex-change operations? The Senate bill puts that back in.

Why should we not tax these big university endowments and these universities that are engaging in political activism and taking massive Federal money and Federal student loan support? Why shouldn't we tax them on it? The Senate reduces our tax on university endowments to raise revenue by 20 percent.

Why shouldn't we stop China from getting taxpayer dollars through the green new scam subsidies? Our bill prevented China from getting rich off of our tax dollars. The Senate bill takes it out. Why?

Why shouldn't we tax the remittances of illegal aliens who are sending money back to their home countries? Our bill did that. The Senate bill takes it out.

We are at a critical juncture in our history as a country, and the question here is: Will Republicans step up and put forward transformational reforms when we have the majority in the House, the majority in the Senate, and the White House?

Will we deliver on the President's agenda responsibly? Will we actually take this moment to change the trajectory of debt that is killing our country for our kids and grandkids, or will we continue the same game of tax cuts for everyone but spending and more spending for everyone?

We can't keep doing the same thing. We can't.

I know the American people are frustrated. I know they expect us to deliver, and we must deliver. Failure is not an option, but we shouldn't deliver for the sake of it. We shouldn't pass a bill just to check a box.

We shouldn't pass a bill that increases the deficit; doesn't terminate

the green new scam; doesn't reform Medicaid; doesn't prevent tax subsidies for high State tax jurisdictions; doesn't prevent China from continuing to get subsidies for solar panels with taxpayer dollars; doesn't curb the waste, fraud, and abuse in food stamps; doesn't tax remittances for illegals who are sending money back home; doesn't include health savings account expansions for the American people; and, frankly, even in the House bill, doesn't do enough to reduce deficits.

The Senate bill was supposed to make the bill better, not worse. I voted for the House bill to move it along in the process for incremental gains and expected the Senate to step up to the plate. Right now, they are striking out.

If the Senate sends a bill over that makes this bill worse, adds to the deficit, and adds all the things I just talked about, I will vote "no."

No, Mr. President, it is not grandstanding. It is not grandstanding to say that I think we ought to be fiscally responsible. It is not grandstanding to say that we should honor the campaign commitment to terminate the green new scam in full. It is not grandstanding to say that we should reform Medicaid so that the able-bodied are not being subsidized by the vulnerable. It is not grandstanding. It is not grandstanding.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to make one final comment, and then I will save everybody from listening to my destroyed voice.

Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago today, Rhonda Massie, wife of my colleague and good friend THOMAS MASSIE, passed away suddenly.

THOMAS is a dear friend. THOMAS happens to be taking some heat politically because THOMAS believes, as I do, that we are not doing enough on spending and on the legislation we are talking about, but that is politics. THOMAS is thick-skinned. He will take the arrows. He will keep representing his constituents.

I believe he will get reelected, and I will support him in that endeavor because he is a good man and a good friend.

I just want everyone to know that my friend is hurting today because he lost his wife 1 year ago suddenly. My prayers are with THOMAS. My prayers are with his family. I know Rhonda is in Heaven looking down on THOMAS, probably laughing at him a little.

I know my colleagues all wish THOMAS well. He is a dear friend, and we will be thinking and praying about him today even as we go about doing our jobs.

I am proud to call THOMAS a friend. I am proud to stand alongside THOMAS, and I will stand alongside THOMAS as a man of principle who is trying to do the right thing. I don't always agree, but I agree most of the time.

God bless him, and God bless the memory of Rhonda and THOMAS' entire family.

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

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Kevin F. McCumber, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 42. An act to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to exclude certain payments to aged, blind, or disabled Alaska Natives or descendants of Alaska Natives from being used to determine eligibility for certain programs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 43. An act to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to provide that Village Corporations shall not be required to convey land in trust to the State of Alaska for the establishment of Municipal Corporations, and for other purposes.

H.R. 618. An act to amend the Apex Project, Nevada Land Transfer and Authorization Act of 1989 to include the City of North Las Vegas and the Apex Industrial Park Owners Association, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2215. An act to redesignate the Salem Maritime National Historic Site as the "Salem Maritime National Historical Park", and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina). Pursuant to clause 13 of rule I, the House stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, June 30, 2025.

Thereupon (at 11 o'clock and 48 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 30, 2025, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-1277. A letter from the Special Counsel, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's interim final rule—Business Combinations Under the Bank Merger Act; Rescission [Docket ID: OCC-2025-0001] (RIN: 1557-AF29) received June 26, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-1278. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Division of Trading and Markets, U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's extension of commission statement—Regulation SBSR (Reporting and Dissemination of Security-Based Swap Data Repository Rules; Extension [Release No.: 34-102886; File Nos.: S7-34-10; S7-35-10] (RIN: 3235-AK79; 3235-AK80) received June 26, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-1279. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Air Plan Approval; ID; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [EPA-R10-OAR-2025-0009; FRL-12550-01-R10] received June 26, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1280. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Office of the General Counsel, Depart-

ment of Transportation, transmitting a notification of designation of acting officer, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC-1281. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting a notification of a nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC-1282. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Method of Correcting Errors Involving Retired Lifecycle Funds received June 25, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC-1283. A letter from the Acting Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalty Amounts for 2025 [Docket No.: FR-6513-F-01] received June 25, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1284. A letter from the Vice President, Government Affairs and Corporate Communications, National Railroad Passenger Corporation (AMTRAK), transmitting the Grant and Legislative Request for FY 2026, and other materials, pursuant to Section 24315(a)(2) of Title 49 U.S.C.; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-1285. A letter from the Section Chief, Publications and Regulations Section, Associate Chief Counsel, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule—Extension and Modification of Transitional Relief Under Sections 3403, 3406, 6721, 6722, 6651, and 6656 with Respect to the Reporting of Information and Backup Withholding on Digital Assets by Brokers under Section 6045 (Notice 2025-33) received June 25, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC-1286. A letter from the Acting Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the report titled, "Part D Plans Generally Include Drugs Commonly Used by Dual-Eligible Enrollees: 2025 (OEI-05-25-00120)", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395w-101 note; Public Law 111-148, Sec. 3313(a)(2); (124 Stat. 477); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

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 Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. LATTA, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. GRIFFITH):

H.R. 4214. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to publish, concurrently with any final rule establishing or revising a national ambient air quality standard, regulations and guidance for implementing the standard, including information relating to submission and consideration of a preconstruction permit application under the new or revised standard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BAUMGARTNER (for himself, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. MCCORMICK, Mr. MOYLAN, and Mrs. BIGGS of South Carolina):

H.R. 4215. A bill to require the Secretary of State to promulgate expedited and fixed timelines for the decision-making process to license the export of certain defense articles and defense services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. BIGGS of South Carolina (for herself, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. BAUMGARTNER, Mr. MCCORMICK, and Mr. MOYLAN):

H.R. 4216. A bill to direct the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, to carry out a review of the list of defense articles and services required to be transferred under the foreign military sales program as opposed to direct commercial sale (FMS-Only List); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOST:

H.R. 4217. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to use on-site regulated medical waste treatment systems at certain Department of Veterans Affairs facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia (for himself, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. LATTA, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 4218. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to facilitate State implementation of national ambient air quality standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CASE (for himself and Mr. MOYLAN):

H.R. 4219. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish the National Wildlife Refuge System Invasive Species Strike Team Program; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4220. A bill to require the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network to issue an advisory about how homegrown violent extremists and other perpetrators of domestic terrorism procure firearms and firearm accessories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4221. A bill to modernize the Undetectable Firearms Act of 1988; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4222. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to restrict the ability to transfer business inventory firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4223. A bill to repeal certain impediments to the administration of the firearms laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4224. A bill to establish a grant program through the Department of Justice to incentivize States to establish point-of-contact systems for firearm sales subject to a background check, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4225. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to require adequate supervision before a juvenile can possess a firearm, to require the safe storage of firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. FINE (for himself and Mr. GILL of Texas):

H.R. 4226. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide a criminal penalty for interfering with immigration enforcement operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARCIA of California (for himself, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. FROST, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. BALINT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. MAGAZINER, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. CASTEN, and Mr. DELUZIO):

H.R. 4227. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prevent bulk sales of ammunition, promote recordkeeping and reporting about ammunition, end ammunition straw purchasing, and require a background check before the transfer of ammunition by certain Federal firearms licensees to non-licensees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. BELL, Mrs. MCIVER, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. SIMON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SOTO, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. SYKES, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. FROST):

H.R. 4228. A bill to provide justice for living survivors of the 1921 Tulsa/Greenwood Race Massacre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS of Maryland (for himself, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. CLYDE, Ms. BOEBERT, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GILL of Texas, and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana):

H.R. 4229. A bill to amend the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to require prior approval from Congress before the Comptroller General may pursue a civil action under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, 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 Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BISHOP, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. MENG, Mr. POCAN, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. CASE, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. MRVAN, and Mr. IVEY):

H.R. 4230. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require certain executive branch employees to complete annual training on appropriations law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAREY, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. COHEN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. TLAIB, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H.R. 4231. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coordination of programs to prevent and treat obesity, 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. KILEY of California:

H.R. 4232. A bill to provide penalties for certain misconduct by officers and members of the board of directors of nonprofit entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. KIM (for herself, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ZINKE):

H.R. 4233. A bill to modify provisions relating to defense trade and cooperation among Australia, the United Kingdom, and the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANGWORTHY (for himself, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. GUEST, Mr. OGLES, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. RULLI, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Ms. STEFANIK, Mrs. BIGGS of South Carolina, and Mr. MOORE of Alabama):

H.R. 4234. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Homeland Security from granting parole to certain dangerous aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LEE of Florida (for herself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. GOODLANDER, and Mr. FITZGERALD):

H.R. 4235. A bill to clarify the Holocaust Expropriated Art Recovery Act of 2016, to appropriately limit the application of defenses based on the passage of time and other non-merits defenses to claims under that Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS (for himself, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. BACON, and Mr. STEUBE):

H.R. 4236. A bill to clarify the authority of the Department of Energy to dispose of certain foreign-origin fissile or radiological materials at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MIN (for himself, Mr. LIEU, Mr. CARSON, Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY, Mr. BERRA, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. SUBRAMANYAM, Mr. BEYER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY):

H.R. 4237. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to clarify the application of certain requirements in the processes for denying or terminating eligibility for access to classified information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MOORE of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. EDWARDS, Ms. KING-HINDS, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. FRY, Mr. CISCOMANI, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 4238. A bill to improve accountability in the disaster loan program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, 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. MORAN (for himself and Mr. SORENSON):

H.R. 4239. A bill to require a study of rural weather monitoring systems; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. MOSKOWITZ (for himself and Mrs. RADEWAGEN):

H.R. 4240. A bill to establish certain reporting and other requirements relating to tele-

communications equipment and services produced or provided by certain entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. OMAR (for herself and Mrs. LUNA):

H.R. 4241. A bill to repeal sanctions with respect to the Syrian Arab Republic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Financial Services, 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. SCHWEIKERT (for himself, Mr. STANTON, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. CAREY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Ms. PEREZ, and Ms. MALLIOTAKIS):

H.R. 4242. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize the National Firearms Act to account for advancements in technology and less-than-lethal weapons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska (for himself and Mr. PANETTA):

H.R. 4243. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow qualified distributions from health savings accounts for certain home care expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THANEDAR (for himself, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. FROST, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LIEU, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SIMON, Mr. SOTO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. BALINT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin):

H.R. 4244. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to prohibit payments under the Medicaid program for conversion therapy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GARCIA of California, Ms. CROCKETT, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. SIMON, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. BALINT, Mr. COSTA, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. CHU, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. OMAR, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. PETERS, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. LIEU, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. HAYES, and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 4245. A bill to protect human rights and enhance opportunities for LGBTQI people around the world, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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 Ms. TOKUDA (for herself, Mr. BEGICH, Ms. SCHOLTEN, and Ms. KING-HINDS):

H.R. 4246. A bill to amend section 41733 of title 49, United States Code, to require that applications to provide compensated basic

essential air service include a contingency plan to continue air service in the event of a disruption, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. TORRES of California:

H.R. 4247. A bill to require disclosure of asbestos hazards in the sale and lease of residential dwellings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, 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 Mr. WEBER of Texas (for himself, Mrs. LUNA, and Mr. EVANS of Colorado):

H.R. 4248. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an exclusion from gross income for compensation of certain school resource officers and the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to make school resource officers eligible for public safety officer death benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. THANEDAR:

H. Res. 553. A resolution censuring Representative ANDREW OGLES; to the Committee on Ethics.

By Mr. BAUMGARTNER (for himself, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. NUNN of Iowa, Mr. LAWLER, and Ms. SALAZAR):

H. Res. 554. A resolution supporting President Trump's decisive actions to dismantle Iran's nuclear weapons program and affirming unwavering support for the State of Israel's right to self-defense; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. DINGELL (for herself, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H. Res. 555. A resolution expressing support for the designation of June 28, 2025, as "Community is Stronger than Cancer Day"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FINE:

H. Res. 556. A resolution impeaching Charles R. Breyer, Senior Judge of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, for high crimes and misdemeanors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUSTOFF (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. OGLES, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. ROSE, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. BURCHETT, and Mrs. HARSHBARGER):

H. Res. 557. A resolution honoring the life, achievements, and legacy of Frederick W. Smith; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SORESENSEN, Ms. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois):

H. Res. 558. A resolution remembering the lives lost and honoring the survivors 3 years after the Independence Day Parade shooting that occurred on July 4, 2022, in Highland Park, Illinois; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. MCCORMICK, and Ms. SALAZAR):

H. Res. 559. A resolution recognizing the urgent need for peace, stability, and reconciliation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) and supporting diplomatic, economic, and humanitarian efforts to achieve lasting peace in the region; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. STRONG (for himself, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. FIGURES, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. PALMER, and Ms. SEWELL):

H. Res. 560. A resolution commemorating the 65th anniversary of the Marshall Space Flight Center and recognizing its continued leadership in the development of the Space Launch System and human space exploration; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. VARGAS:

H. Res. 561. A resolution honoring the life and legacy of Father Stan, a prominent human rights activist who died while in custody of the Indian state on July 5, 2021, and encouraging India to pursue an independent investigation into his arrest, incarceration, and death; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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 Mr. ALLEN:

H.R. 4214.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. BAUMGARTNER:

H.R. 4215.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. BIGGS of South Carolina:

H.R. 4216.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. BOST:

H.R. 4217.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 4218.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. CASE:

H.R. 4219.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

By Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4220.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4221.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4222.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4223.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4224.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4225.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. FINE:

H.R. 4226.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, the foreign commerce clause, along with Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, the necessary and proper clause.

By Mr. GARCIA of California

H.R. 4227.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 4228.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18)

By Mr. HARRIS of Maryland:

H.R. 4229.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 4230.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4231.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. KILEY of California:

H.R. 4232.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII, Clause XVIII

By Mrs. KIM:

H.R. 4233.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. LANGWORTHY:

H.R. 4234.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article of the Constitution

By Ms. LEE of Florida:

H.R. 4235.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 4236.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. MIN:
H.R. 4237.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.
By Mr. MOORE of North Carolina:
H.R. 4238.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. MORAN:
H.R. 4239.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8.
By Mr. MOSKOWITZ:
H.R. 4240.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Pursuant to clause 3(d) (1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee find the authority for this legislation in article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Ms. OMAR:
H.R. 4241.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Art I Sec 8

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:
H.R. 4242.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:
H.R. 4243.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. THANEDAR:
H.R. 4244.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Congress shall have . . . power to make all laws. Article 1 Section 8.

By Ms. TITUS:
H.R. 4245.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. TOKUDA:
H.R. 4246.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution grants Congress the power to enact this legislation.

By Mrs. TORRES of California:
H.R. 4247.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United

States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. WEBER of Texas:
H.R. 4248.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 12: Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 205: Mr. STEUBE.
H.R. 485: Mr. BELL.
H.R. 539: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 556: Mr. STEUBE.
H.R. 631: Mr. STEUBE.
H.R. 718: Mrs. KIM.
H.R. 740: Mr. BIGGS of Arizona and Mr. FINSTAD.
H.R. 801: Mrs. HAYES and Ms. MCBRIDE.
H.R. 929: Mr. GOLDEN of Maine, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mrs. TRAHAN.
H.R. 1028: Ms. GREENE of Georgia.
H.R. 1065: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 1262: Mr. BRESNAHAN.
H.R. 1273: Mr. BERA.
H.R. 1329: Mr. BERA and Mr. MESSMER.
H.R. 1330: Mr. HERNÁNDEZ.
H.R. 1340: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 1415: Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 1421: Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 1498: Mr. PATRONIS.
H.R. 1585: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 1702: Mr. GRAY.
H.R. 1822: Mr. LANDSMAN.
H.R. 1958: Mr. MOORE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1993: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.
H.R. 2055: Mr. SWALWELL.
H.R. 2086: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE.
H.R. 2102: Ms. LEE of Florida.
H.R. 2126: Mr. CRANK.
H.R. 2141: Mr. SUBRAMANYAM.
H.R. 2175: Mr. LICCARDO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. SIMON, Ms. RIVAS, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. MIN.
H.R. 2203: Mrs. FISCHBACH.
H.R. 2290: Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 2347: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 2381: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Ms. ROSS, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 2475: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 2486: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 2531: Ms. ANSARI.
H.R. 2547: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
H.R. 2617: Mr. FINSTAD.
H.R. 2707: Ms. HOULAHAN and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2708: Mr. MOORE of Alabama.
H.R. 2821: Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 2853: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. WESTERMAN.
H.R. 2973: Mr. HAMADEH of Arizona.
H.R. 3057: Mrs. HAYES and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 3087: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 3112: Ms. POU.

H.R. 3124: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 3184: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
H.R. 3277: Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 3305: Mr. GOODEN.
H.R. 3335: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3418: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 3469: Mr. GILL of Texas.
H.R. 3498: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 3514: Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 3566: Ms. SCHRIER.
H.R. 3569: Ms. BROWNLEY and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 3616: Mr. MOORE of North Carolina.
H.R. 3694: Mr. FINSTAD.
H.R. 3701: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 3876: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 3912: Mr. ESTES.
H.R. 3917: Mr. MOORE of North Carolina.
H.R. 3930: Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 3941: Mr. HAMADEH of Arizona.
H.R. 3943: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.
H.R. 3974: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 3977: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 3978: Mr. OBERNOLTE.
H.R. 3997: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4007: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. CARSON, and Mr. THANEDAR.
H.R. 4018: Mr. CLOUD.
H.R. 4048: Mr. FROST.
H.R. 4070: Mr. MOORE of North Carolina.
H.R. 4083: Mr. GARCÍA OF ILLINOIS, MR. CUELLAR, and Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4085: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 4092: Mr. CLOUD.
H.R. 4099: Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 4103: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 4150: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 4152: Mr. LANDSMAN.
H.R. 4172: Mr. BURLISON.
H.R. 4173: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. CASE.
H.R. 4187: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 4200: Mr. HARRIS of Maryland.
H.R. 4201: Mr. HARRIS of Maryland.
H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. LATTA.
H. Con. Res. 40: Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. LICCARDO.
H. Res. 417: Mrs. HAYES.
H. Res. 473: Mr. DELUZIO.
H. Res. 500: Mr. BEGICH.
H. Res. 515: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.
H. Res. 521: Mrs. BICE and Mr. ROUZER.
H. Res. 543: Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY and Ms. ELFRETH.
H. Res. 549: Ms. RANDALL.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS— ADDITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 4 by Mr. MEEKS on House Resolution 391: Mr. Mannion, Mr. Menendez, Ms. Castor of Florida, Mr. Raskin, Mr. Deluzio, Mr. Boyle of Pennsylvania, Mr. Larson of Connecticut, Ms. Clark of Massachusetts, and Mr. Aguilar.

Petition 5 by Mr. MEEKS on House Resolution 393: Mr. Mannion, Mr. Menendez, Ms. Castor of Florida, Mr. Raskin, Mr. Larson of Connecticut, Ms. Clark of Massachusetts, and Mr. Aguilar.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 171

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JUNE 27, 2025

No. 111

Senate

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 24, 2025)

The Senate met at 3 p.m., on the expiration of the recess, 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.

Gracious, loving God, let Your light, Your wisdom, Your righteousness, and Your love fill our minds and hearts today.

Lord, You have promised Your wisdom for all who need it. Today, more than ever, Your lawmakers need Your wisdom. Illuminate their minds with more than human insight. Close the doors they should not walk through as you lead them through the path you have chosen.

Lord, remind them that as human beings, we sometimes make mistakes. Give our Senators, this day, the grace to listen to those with whom they disagree. Bring from the crucible of conflicting views truth and justice that will bless our Nation and world.

We pray in Your merciful 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. BANKS). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be

in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

PROJECT LABOR AGREEMENTS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the Senate to bring up the issue of how the Congress—on a piece of legislation that I am part of—and how President Trump can help the economy through helping small business.

President Biden issued an Executive order in February of 2022. That Executive order required what is called the project labor agreements, or PLAs, on Federal projects over \$35 million. Just to be clear, I meant that Executive order requires project labor agreements.

I opposed this Executive order at that time, and I joined a letter with my colleagues, telling President Biden what a bad idea that was. I believe the Trump administration should deregulate this Biden Executive order.

Project labor agreements are a sort of backdoor way to give unionized contractors a leg up on Federal contracts in competition with nonunion contractors. Plus, there is too much redtape for a business to comply.

Public project labor agreements effectively make it impossible for a contractor to compete for Federal contracts if its workforce isn't unionized. So it is kind of like a union shop outlawed by the Taft-Hartley Act in right-to-work States. About 27 States have right-to-work laws.

Well, most of the workforce in Iowa isn't unionized. This Executive order seems to assume that every workforce should be unionized, and Iowa happens to be a right-to-work State.

It happens that I support the right of workers to organize. I joined a union

from 1962 to 1971. I was a member of the International Association of Machinists. I am proud of my membership in that union and the years I spent on the assembly line at Waterloo Register in Cedar Falls, IA. It happens that my job was putting screw holes in furnace registers. However, I also support the right of workers not to join a union.

Iowa has many companies, small and large, including many family-run enterprises, where they care deeply about their employees. So it is natural that these companies' employees don't feel a need to unionize.

The Federal Government should not tip the scales against these great but small companies and their workers. Federal contracts should be awarded through a fair and competitive bidding process that allows all qualified contractors to compete on a level playing field based on merit, based on experience, quality, and the safety of their workforce.

Project labor agreement mandates prevent many small businesses from competing for Federal projects and may even lead to increased costs for taxpayers.

I told you I was going to talk about legislation that would do the same thing I asked President Biden to do. I am the cosponsor of a bill called the Fair and Open Competition Act prohibiting Federal Agencies from mandating project labor agreements or using PLA preferences on Federal construction contracts.

I am also joining Senator BRITT and a number of my colleagues in urging President Trump to revoke the ill-conceived Biden Executive order mandating project labor agreements on Federal projects. The Biden Executive order should be at the top of the list of a "deregulation" administration, which this Trump administration is and it proudly speaks so.

I yield the floor.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S3579

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

ONE BIG BEAUTIFUL BILL

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, last November, the American people elected President Trump and a Republican Congress with a clear mandate, and since taking control in Washington this year, we have been working to deliver on our promise of a safer, stronger, and more prosperous America.

Now we have the opportunity to pass a bill that advances all of these priorities and sets our country up for better days ahead. We have worked hard on this, and now it is time to deliver.

The centerpiece of our bill is permanent tax relief for the American people. The 2017 Republican-led tax cuts lowered rates for every income bracket. We doubled the child tax credit and nearly doubled the standard deduction. But those policies will expire at the end of the year without action from Congress, which means a typical family would be hit with a \$1,700 tax hike next year. In my State of South Dakota, South Dakotans would see their taxes go up on average \$2,500. We are determined not to let that happen—not next year, not ever. Our bill makes the 2017 lower tax rates permanent. It raises the child tax credit to \$2,200 per child and links it to inflation permanently, and it maintains the higher standard deduction that 90 percent of taxpayers use.

And we are not stopping there. Seniors will have an even higher standard deduction. Millions of tipped workers will benefit from no tax on tips, and millions of hourly workers will be able to keep more of their overtime pay with no tax on overtime.

Passing this bill means smaller tax bills and bigger paychecks for the American people—permanently.

It will also help get our economy firing on all cylinders again. In 2017, we boosted our economy by lifting the tax burden on American businesses. We lowered tax rates for the owners of small and medium-sized businesses, farms, and ranches. We made it easier for them to recover the cost of investing in their businesses, which, in turn, freed up cash for them to invest in their operations and their workers.

These and other major reforms helped kick-start our economy, and now we have the opportunity to make all of the pro-growth reforms from 2017 permanent and go even further.

Our bill makes the small business deduction permanent. Full expensing for new equipment and domestic R&D will be permanent. Full expensing for new factories and factory improvements will generate growth and job creation and encourage more goods to be made in America.

A higher death tax threshold that is linked to inflation will spare countless family farms, ranches, and small businesses from a potentially devastating tax and the cost of burdensome planning, and the next generation will be able to access new investment accounts when they reach adulthood to use for education, to start a business, to buy their first home—essentially, to get a running start on the American dream. All of this means more money in Americans' pockets, more opportunity, and greater prosperity.

A bill to make America stronger and more prosperous would be incomplete if it didn't make America's farmers and ranchers stronger. Agriculture producers will, of course, benefit from permanent tax relief, but this bill also directly addresses the challenges producers have faced these past few years. It increases reference prices for every covered commodity; it enhances crop insurance coverage and affordability, including for farmers just starting out; and it supports risk management, disaster assistance, and conservation programs that producers depend on.

The last few years have been some of the toughest in recent memory for American agriculture, and I am proud that this bill addresses these issues head-on. I can assure America's farmers and ranchers that their priorities will continue to be a priority here in Washington.

This bill is also about a stronger America, and it makes a generational investment in our national security—all of our national security. That starts with securing our borders. The Trump administration has already done incredible work in stemming the flow of illegal immigrants and deporting criminals who had taken up residence in our country, but there is more work to be done, and law enforcement needs more resources to do it. Our bill provides those resources: the technology and manpower to stop illegal immigrants and illegal drugs at the border; an increased capacity to deport dangerous individuals from our country; and, yes, finally finishing the wall. As I said, the administration has made great progress already, and I am eager to get these resources into the hands of the men and women on the frontlines to solidify those gains.

We are also making a major investment in strengthening our military. Recent events have only reinforced the imperative of military readiness. But in a number of instances, we have let our military strength slip, and adversaries like China have begun to outpace us in key capabilities. Our bill will help reverse that trend. It invests in shipbuilding, supports a new Golden

Dome for missile defense, revitalizes the defense manufacturing capacity in America, and invests in the warfighting technologies of tomorrow. With this bill, we can help ensure that our men and women in uniform have what they need to deter and defeat any threat.

We are safeguarding our national security from every angle, which means addressing energy security. Energy security might not get the same attention as border security or national defense, but it is a big part of keeping America strong and secure. Relying on energy from hostile nations or unstable parts of the world can be a dangerous proposition, and maintaining energy independence is key to keeping a country secure.

We are fortunate to have an abundance of natural resources in this country, and our bill makes sure that the American people benefit from those resources by freeing them up for responsible domestic production for a secure, stable, and affordable supply of energy.

There is a lot more I could say about this bill, but before I close, I just want to talk about how this bill delivers on Republicans' promise to rein in the size of government. It delivers savings to the American people by reining in waste, fraud, and abuse in Federal programs. It includes the largest spending cut in American history as well as commonsense, good-government reforms that haven't been attempted in Washington, DC, in decades. With more revenue—revenue we get by growing the economy, not by raising taxes—this bill will actually help reduce the deficit by as much as \$6 trillion.

This bill delivers on the mandate the American people gave Republicans last year: a stronger America, a safer America, and a more prosperous America. It is right around the corner.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The 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.

TRIBUTE TO MOLLY ROWLEY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the late Jack Valenti, the once Special Assistant to LBJ turned longtime President of the Motion Picture Association, once said:

Every good speech contains six words: Let me tell you a story.

I have taken Jack Valenti's advice to heart. I have often told stories that might otherwise have been ignored—stories of the most vulnerable members of our community, those who might not be able to obtain the services of communications agencies, white-shoe law firms, and high-profile lobbyists. For decades, I have been honored to

have one of the best storytellers on Capitol Hill helping me.

For more than 20 years, Molly Rowley, my director of speechwriting, has helped shaped some of my spoken words. Monday, June 30, will mark her final day on my staff.

Molly is not from Illinois. Her family hails from Missouri, and she is always happy to remind us and our colleagues that her Kansas City Chiefs are regular playoff contenders and repeat Super Bowl champions.

She began her career as a newspaper reporter, but she eventually found her way into public service, writing speeches from New Jersey Gov. Jim Florio, the late-Senator Harris Wofford of Pennsylvania, and Senator Tom Daschle of South Dakota.

In 2005—20 years ago—Molly came to my office after working for Senator Daschle when he was the Democratic leader of the Senate. Before leaving Senator Daschle's office, Molly had written a compelling floor speech that caught my attention. I went over to Senator Daschle and asked if he had a staffer who helped him write that speech, and he mentioned Molly.

Fast-forward to 2005, when I was the brandnew whip of the Democratic caucus looking for staffers with leadership office experience. Molly was the perfect person to bring on board.

Speechwriting is part art and part science but really not either one. It is translating complex policy issues into a compelling narrative. That is not always an easy thing to do.

For Molly, her process starts with a simple question: How would this affect the average family in Illinois? She has a knack for turning arcane legislative text into poetry, and she often did so with little time and even less background.

If you were to strike up a conversation with Molly, it would not take long for you to notice her passion for language, creativity, and a deep pride in her Irish roots, like so many in my home State of Illinois.

She was able to add some special Irish charm to many of my speech materials over the years, from immigration events to Chicago's notable St. Patrick's Day celebrations.

Molly's source material knew no bounds. She would artfully weave into my remarks quotes from our Nation's Founding Fathers; landmark speeches of Presidents like Illinois' very own Abraham Lincoln; civil rights icons like Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and the late-Congressman John Lewis; prose of the Irish literary giants James Joyce and William Butler Yeats; and even hit Broadway musicals like Lin-Manuel Miranda's "Hamilton."

She excelled at uncovering obscure facts about a small town or community and using it as a centerpiece to tie a speech together. Whether ribbon cuttings for local health clinics, naturalization ceremonies, commencement addresses, or Senate floor speeches, Molly did so much more than prepare

remarks; she found the heart of the story.

Molly's interest and commitment to social justice and civil rights has been evident not only in her work but in the way she participated in life on Capitol Hill.

A lot of history has been made in these hallways, and Molly has made herself a part of it, whether chronicling the lying in honor of Rosa Parks, State of the Union speeches by President Obama, or being seated in the middle of the room for the Judiciary hearings for the nomination of Ketanji Brown Jackson to be a Justice of the Supreme Court.

I am grateful to have had Molly as a member of my team for all of these years and to help me tell these stories. I am confident she will use her gift of words to raise awareness of current events, not just in her community and country but globally.

But, first, she will take a well-deserved break and explore Europe with her mom before returning to spend time with her beloved four-legged roommate Liam.

I will miss Molly's wisdom, skill, and rhetorical flourishes.

I would like to close my remarks with her own words about leaving Capitol Hill. Molly wrote recently:

My favorite part of the Capitol has long been the soft dips in the stairs where the hard marble has worn down by more than a century and a half of footsteps.

Those indentations always remind me that we are part of a great continuum.

We do our best while we are here to protect our beloved democracy and then we move on, hoping and trusting that those who come after us will also safeguard this priceless gift.

Molly, on your watch, you kept this gift safe. I am glad to be part of your career on Capitol Hill and a recipient of so much good work. I wish you the best.

HONORING OFFICER KRYSTAL RIVERA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, we know that our men and women in uniform are vital public servants. They shoulder an immense responsibility when protecting and safeguarding our communities. Each morning, when our officers put on that uniform and badge, they head into the line of duty not knowing what the day may bring. They may be called on to run toward danger. Or they may be put in harm's way. But despite the knowledge of this looming risk, our officers selflessly show up in service to others day in and day out, driven by a sense of mission larger than themselves.

So I am confident I speak for all of us in this Chamber when I say a how incredibly grateful we are to our police officers for their service. This is also why it is especially painful and tragic when one of our officers is lost in the line of duty. And it is with a heavy heart and profound sadness that I speak about the passing of one of Chi-

cago's own, Chicago Police Department Officer Krystal Rivera.

Officer Rivera was killed in the line of duty on Thursday, June 5 of this year. She was just 36 years old—her whole life still ahead of her—and leaves behind her 10-year-old daughter Bella. Officer Rivera was a 4-year veteran of the Chicago Police Department, but called the city "home" for much longer. The youngest of three sisters, she was raised in Humboldt Park by her loving and proud Puerto Rican parents Yolanda Rivera and Eduardo Miguel Rivera.

Those who were fortunate to know Officer Rivera described her as a passionately protective spirit who loved boldly—a trait she no doubt inherited from her beloved mother, with whom she credited as her greatest motivation and inspiration in life. Her father, too, shaped her immensely. A preacher, he imparted to Officer Rivera not just a deep love of God, but a profound sense of duty and devotion to family.

At 18, Officer Rivera initially planned to join the Army, but soon felt a strong calling to serve her community as a police officer—and serve she did. While she served and juggled the demands of motherhood, she also pursued a separate goal. Her dream was to become a forensic investigator, a dream she actively pursued. Because of the values she lived for, it should come as no surprise that, within the precinct, Officer Rivera earned the nickname "Mama 2"—one of two mother figures on the team. And for Officer Rivera, family was family—blood or not. She had a loving heart and touched countless lives.

Officer Rivera's funeral was held earlier this week, and hundreds of her fellow officers, friends, and family came out to pay their respects—because that is the kind of person she was. That was the impact she left.

And while she held many titles in life—daughter, officer, and "Mama 2"—none were more important to Officer Rivera than the one she cherished most: "Bella's mom." Her daughter Bella was her biggest priority in her life, and she poured all of herself into being her mom. In doing so, she gave Bella those same values her parents gifted her—values I am confident Bella will carry with her as she continues through life. And so I want to close with a story about Bella.

This story was originally shared at the service for Officer Rivera earlier this week where she was laid to rest; it is worth recounting.

On the night of her mother's tragic passing, Bella looked Chicago Police Superintendent Larry Snelling in the eye and asked him one simple question: "Was my mom a good police officer?" Officer Snelling responded, "Your mom was an exemplary police officer . . . She was magnificent because, what I've often said about being an exemplary police officer, you first have to be an exemplary human being."

To Bella, I would like to say: Your mother wasn't just a good police officer. She was a great one. And she wasn't just a good mother. She was an exceptional one. To lose your mother at that age must be an incredible pain. But, Bella, while painful, I hope you find comfort in her memory. Find comfort in remembering her kind smile and warm embrace. And find comfort knowing that, while she may be gone, she lives on through you—her sweet Bella—as you continue your own journey through this great ride called life.

My wife Loretta and I send our deepest condolences to Officer Rivera's family, including her mother Yolanda; her sisters Jacqueline and Yasmin; and her stepfather Roderick—along with Bella.

May God watch over you and wipe your tears during this difficult time, and may he continue to guide you today, tomorrow, and forevermore.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

IRAN

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, yesterday, the U.S. Senate got an update from the administration about Saturday's strike on Iran. We heard from Secretary of State Marco Rubio, Secretary of Defense Pete Hegseth, Central Intelligence Agency Director John Ratcliffe, and Gen. Dan Caine, who is Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They told us, beyond a doubt, the Iran strikes were successful.

Two things are clear: one, President Trump protected our country; and, two, America drew a redline on Iran—no nuclear weapons—and President Trump enforced it.

Every recent President has said a nuclear Iran is unacceptable. Bill Clinton said it. George W. Bush said it. Barack Obama said it. Joe Biden said it. Even Senate Minority Leader CHUCK SCHUMER said back in 2015:

If there is only a 10 percent chance Iran uses a nuclear weapon, it is vital we prevent it.

That is exactly what President Trump did, and he did it effectively. For over 40 years, Iran has targeted, threatened, and terrorized the United States and our allies. We know from our own intelligence and from independent experts that Iran was dangerously close to getting nuclear weapons.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have called for diplomacy. Well, President Trump tried diplomacy for months. President Trump laid down guidelines and deadlines, and then he drew a redline. Iran used diplomatic talks to stall. It did so as it continued to race toward a nuclear weapon.

As Commander in Chief, President Trump has the full authority to act. He did so consistent with article II, section 2 of the Constitution, and he did so decisively. It was a limited, powerful, and precise strike. It was aimed

specifically at Iran's nuclear facilities—not at Iran's leadership, not at the Iranian people. And here is more good news: No American lives were lost—absolutely none.

This was a powerful message to Iran, but not just to Iran—also to Russia, to China, to North Korea, and to anyone else who is an adversary of the United States. The message is this: America means what it says, and America will keep our people safe.

Now, Democrats, of course, rushed to turn this successful strike into a political fight. Even today, they are forcing the Senate to vote this very afternoon on a resolution that says the President lacked the authority to do what he did. They have gone so far as to imply that the successful protection of the American people is an impeachable offense. Democrats are calling for the President's impeachment because of his successful attack on the Iranian nuclear program.

National security should be something that unites us. But let's not forget that Democrats have said Presidents can act without a vote of Congress. They have said it many times in the past. Recall, when President Obama struck Libya in 2011, Speaker NANCY PELOSI said Congress wasn't needed because the strike was "limited."

Now that there is a Republican in the White House, what we are seeing is that Democrats are suddenly trying to rewrite the rules. National security moves fast. That is why our Constitution gives the Commander in Chief real authority. President Trump seized the moment. He did it responsibly; he did it decisively; and he did it constitutionally. America and our allies are safer today because of it.

And the resolution from Senator Kaine that we are voting on today I believe is not needed, and I most certainly will oppose it. If passed, it would prevent the President from protecting us in the future. I urge all of my colleagues to reject it.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, on a related matter, the Iranian air strike is about more than nuclear weapons. It is about, also, the threat of terrorism. Iranian terrorists have targeted Americans for decades. Iran actively pursued an assassination plot against President Trump. Other top officials in the United States have also been targets of Iranian terrorists.

Recently, Iran threatened to activate its so-called sleeper cells right here inside the United States. Let that sink in. This is an urgent reminder that national security starts with border security.

Under Joe Biden and the Democrats, more than 1,500 illegal immigrants from Iran crossed our southern border, and 729 of them were released into our country by Joe Biden. And that might just be the tip of the iceberg because,

remember, under Joe Biden and the Democrats, there were millions of "got-aways," people who weren't stopped sneaking across the border; they were detected—either through satellite images or different mechanisms of looking for people: heat detection of people moving across the desert—but not able to be captured.

How many of them were Iranian agents as well? How many of them are, today, in sleeper cells? Well, the truth is, no one knows. What we do know is this: President Trump took office, and since that time, illegal border crossings are down by 95 percent.

Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents are working fast. In the last 7 days alone, ICE arrested 130 illegal immigrants from Iran. Right now, 670 Iranian nationals are being detained. President Trump's detentions are working.

Now the administration needs more resources to finish the job. That is why Republicans are fighting for our comprehensive safety agenda. Our bill increases funding for border security and enforcement by \$160 billion. It finishes the wall. It hires thousands of new Border Patrol and ICE agents. It gives them a bonus for keeping our communities safe.

In November, Americans wanted, needed, and voted for safe communities and secure borders. Our Republican safety agenda delivers what the Americans want, need, and have voted for.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. MOODY). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam 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 PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

ONE BIG BEAUTIFUL BILL

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, it has been a pretty rough week for Donald Trump's so-called Beautiful Bill. As everyone watching can tell, things haven't gone according to plan. The bill has been bucking under its own weight, the delays have piled up, and it is obvious large chunks of the Republican conference don't like their own bill.

But, of course, we are hearing that Republicans may still try to bring this legislation to the floor as soon as tomorrow. That is not real legislating. This is a total rush job. This is Donald Trump bullying Senate Republicans to get a bill passed no matter what is actually in it, and this is Republican leadership perhaps daring their own members who are deeply worried about this bill to oppose it on the floor.

So if Republicans do, in fact, proceed very soon, let me remind them about the consequences of passing this bill. It will be a disaster for families, for the economy, and even for Republicans themselves. It rips healthcare from 16 million people. It is the biggest cuts ever to food funding. It raises energy prices and surrenders American energy leadership to China. And it rewards the ultrarich.

Republicans should abandon these destructive policies. But, of course, they aren't doing that. Instead of fixing their bill, Republicans want to rush it because they don't want the American people to find what is in it. And their fears are certainly justified because the more and more that Americans look at this bill, the more and more they despise it. It steals their Medicaid. It jacks up their premiums. It takes away their jobs. And it gives trillions away to billionaires and special interests. This is a nonsense and destructive piece of legislation, and it makes no sense for Republicans to scramble to pass it.

There is nothing inherently critical about July 4. Even Donald Trump, 2 hours ago, admitted the July 4 deadline is a fake. And yet, here they are, rushing, scrambling, and twisting themselves into knots to try and salvage a bill they know will hurt both their constituents and their own political futures. Republicans aren't just lying to their constituents, frankly; they are lying to themselves because this bill is wholly toxic.

Here is what Republicans should do. They should not let Donald Trump bully them. They should hold firm and tell Donald Trump his Big Beautiful Bill is a disaster, a betrayal of the American people. Republicans should keep their own promises not to cut Medicaid. They should listen to the critiques of some of their own colleagues like Senator TILLIS, who reportedly said behind closed doors, "This will be devastating to my State," or Senator JUSTICE, who said, "our rural hospitals are going to have a tough time . . . you may have to hold your nose and vote for disagreeable policies."

Senate Republicans should listen to their own words. They should ignore fake deadlines and stop the rush job.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

OPERATION UPTOWN FUNK

Mr. BUDD. Madam President, I rise to recognize and commend the outstanding efforts of our law enforcement community in western North Carolina for their role in the success of Operation Uptown Funk. Now, that is a pretty creative name, but it is a very serious issue. It was a yearlong investigation into drug trafficking in Appalachia.

This coordinated operation has involved law enforcement agencies from Buncombe, Henderson, Haywood, and

Transylvania Counties in North Carolina as well as Greenville and Spartanburg Counties in South Carolina, and it has been supported by the Drug Enforcement Administration. This is nothing short of a strong testament to the commitment of our law enforcement officers to put the welfare of our communities first.

Over the course of this investigation, authorities confiscated more than \$175,000 in illicit funds, 20 firearms, and 30 pounds of illegal drugs, including substantial quantities of cocaine, methamphetamine, and fentanyl. More than 30 individuals from Henderson County have been arrested and are being held accountable for their role in this dangerous drug network.

These results are not just statistics. They represent lives saved, overdoses prevented, and neighborhoods that can breathe easier knowing that they are a lot safer.

In a region still working to recover from the devastation caused by Hurricane Helene, dismantling this trafficking ring has brought a renewed sense of hope and security for Western North Carolinians.

On behalf of the people of North Carolina, I extend my deepest gratitude and congratulations to Sheriff Lowell Griffin of Henderson County, Sheriff Quentin Miller of Buncombe County, Sheriff Bill Wilke of Haywood County, and Sheriff Chuck Owenby of Transylvania County. I also want to thank the dedicated men and women within their departments—especially the Henderson County Drug Interdiction and Criminal Enforcement Unit, or DICE—for their service. Their courage has protected countless families and made it clear to drug traffickers they will find no refuge in the mountains of our beautiful Western North Carolina.

It is my honor to represent a State whose law enforcement professionals lead with tremendous integrity and commitment to our citizens. I will continue working in the U.S. Senate to ensure that they have the tools, resources, and support they need to keep our communities safe.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE—S.J. RES.

59

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, pursuant to section 601(b) of the International Security Assistance and Arms Control Expert Act, I move to discharge the Committee on Foreign Relations from further consideration of S.J. Res. 59, to direct the removal of U.S. Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion to discharge.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to discharge from the Committee on Foreign Relations, S.J. Res. 59, to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress.

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, we will begin a couple of hours of debate on this resolution prior to a vote that I understand is scheduled around 6 or maybe a little bit thereafter.

I rise to talk about the resolution for the second time in the last week, and I need to repeat all the points I made when I spoke about it last week. I will just begin with this: I came to the Senate in January of 2013, and I tell people that I came with 100 interests and 10 passions and 1 obsession. The obsession that I brought with me to this body was an obsession that I will do everything possible I can to stop the United States from getting into an unnecessary war.

Why did I bring that obsession with me in 2013? I brought it with me because of the experience in Virginia during two wars over the course of 20 years, from 2001 to 2021. I was Governor of Virginia from 2006 to 2010. I was Lieutenant Governor of Virginia before that. Like every State in this country, Virginia was deeply, deeply affected by the global War on Terror.

When I was Governor of Virginia, I had the honor and responsibility—but it was also a burden—of being the commander in chief of the Virginia National Guard. That meant that I was with our Guard men and women when they deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan and when they came home. I went to funerals. I went to wakes. These were very, very moving experiences.

I visited, as Governor, our troops, our Guard men and women, in both Iraq and Afghanistan during that period where the war was at a huge upsurge. Thousands of Virginia Guard men and women were deployed during those 4 years. Of course, because of who Virginia is, it wasn't just our Guard men and women; it was also our Active-Duty, our DOD civilians, civilians from other parts of the Federal family, reservists, military contractors, DOD civilians and their families. The cost of that 20 years of war on Virginia was very heavy.

I came with the obsession not only because of what I had seen in terms of the effect of these wars on my Commonwealth and my country—the deaths, the injuries, the longstanding mental health needs, the tremendous expenditure of public treasure, the lack of clear and positive results from that 20 years—but I also came with an obsession on this topic because of watching the way the war started, particularly the war in Iraq.

The United States was basically—the public and this body were basically lied to about the extent of the Iraqi program of weapons of mass destruction, and then an administration forced a vote on the floor of this body right before a midterm election. The debate and vote occurred in October of 2002.

I remember—at the time, I was Lieutenant Governor, and I was paying attention to this, and I thought, what is the urgency about this debate in October of 2022 right before a midterm election?

You might remember that the United States didn't even invade Iraq until March of 2023. There was no urgency. There was none. But it was determined to be politically expedient to force a debate before a midterm election to try to give one party an edge in those midterms. Yes, there was a vote, but it was timed and structured for political rather than military reasons, and thousands of Americans, both soldiers and contractors, lost their lives as a result.

So I came to this body fully believing that, yes, I am only 1 of 100, but I am going to do everything I can to make sure that the United States doesn't get into an unnecessary war and that if the issue ever arises, Congress needs to fully debate any military mission before we send our sons and daughters into war.

Now, I say this as a Senator from—I am going to argue this, and the President will challenge me on this, but I am going to say Virginia is the most pro-military State in the United States. Our military bases, our veteran population, our reservists, our Guard, our military families, our DOD civilians—our map is a map of American military history: Yorktown, Appomattox, the Wilderness, Fredericksburg, the 9/11 attack on the Pentagon. Everything about Virginia is connected to our Nation's military mission.

I know the President would make the same claim about Florida's connection to our military. This would be a virtuous competition as we would all talk about how pro-military our States are. But I believe this deeply about Virginia.

My dad was an Army officer. One of my kids is a Marine officer. I mean, this is family. And I am connected deeply as a member of the Armed Services Committee to all of our military community.

I am not a pacifist. Every year, I work on the Armed Services Committee to help write a defense bill and try to get it passed. I whip votes on the floor for military aid packages to allies. There are bad folks in the world. The United States needs to defend itself, and it needs to work with allies to help them defend themselves. But our troops, our sons and daughters, deserve to have wise civilian leadership that only makes the decision to send them into war on the basis of careful consideration and a debate before the entire public.

The other night when I spoke on the floor, I pointed out the history of the way the Framers of our Constitution grappled with this question in 1787. To just make it simple, they decided—contrary to the history of the world and the way virtually every other country did it, they decided that war was too big a decision for one person. I mean,

they were making this decision at the time that George Washington was President. He was very respected and admired. He was a wartime general. Deeply respected. But as much as they respected leaders like George Washington, they said that war is too big a decision for one person.

So they wrote a Constitution and said that the United States should not be at war without a vote of Congress. Defense against an attack or an imminent attack? Yes, the President, as Commander in Chief, has the power to do that. But to go on offense against another nation or an entity, like a terrorist group—and there were terrorist groups back in the days, like the Barbary Coast pirates. From the very beginning, we have confronted threats not just by nation states but by others.

But the decision was that it was too big a decision for any one person; we should only go to war after a debate—not only in Congress, where we put our thumbprint on “This is a national mission we are risking our sons and daughters' lives for,” we have a debate in front of the entire public so they can understand the stakes.

War is too big for any one person.

I think the events of this week have demonstrated that war is too big to be consigned to the decisions of any one person.

Our current Commander in Chief, on his social media account a day or two after the attack in Iran, put up a music video with lyrics that were matched to a Beach Boys song, “Barbara Ann,” but the music video contained these lyrics: “Bomb bomb Iran; bomb bomb bomb bomb bomb Iran . . . ; went to a mosque, gonna throw some rocks . . . ; time to turn Iran into a parking lot.”

We shouldn't premise a decision to send our sons and daughters into war on the judgment of a single person.

The President patted himself on the back, and he compared the attack to Hiroshima and Nagasaki. That was a most unusual—most unusual—comparison.

I haven't put all the lyrics of the song up on my chart, but one of the other lyrics was about sending the Ayatollah home in a box. I mean, is this some kind of a joke? Is this the way we treat war now? We run a victory lap, overstate it, and we turn it into a funny music video, or we use a Hiroshima and Nagasaki comparison as if that is like a good thing?

War is too big to leave the decision to send our sons and daughters and risk their lives on the say-so of one person.

We had some turmoil this week in the Senate. We were going to have a briefing on Tuesday from the national security officials in the administration. They had to postpone it until Thursday because they were fighting with themselves and they were fighting with reporters about intelligence that had come out that the President wasn't happy about.

In the immediate aftermath of the attack, he said that the Iranian nu-

clear program had been completely obliterated. All sources—Iranian sources, Israeli sources, the IAEA, the United States—have said “severe damage,” but because the President sort of went overboard with the Hiroshima and Nagasaki claims, reporters started to dig into it. Then the President got mad, and then his Secretary of Defense started to name-call reporters who were asking basic questions.

War is too big an issue to leave to the moods and the whims and the daily vibes of any one person. That is why the Founders said that unless it is imminent defense—and in this case, it wasn't. The Israeli Foreign Minister had said before the U.S. attack that their attacks had already set the Iranian program back at least 2 or 3 years. That is a direct quote from the Israelis who follow this very closely. If the program had been set back at least 2 or 3 years, what was the urgency that suggested we needed to take this action without a debate in Congress?

It was not only done without congressional authorization, it was also done without congressional consultation, and it was done without congressional notification of Democratic leaders. Republican leaders were given a briefing, but for the first time during my time here, no Democrat in a leadership position on the key committees was given an advance notice of this. Is war now to be a partisan thing where the White House just notifies those of the same party?

I have tried to be consistent about this. When I came to the Senate in 2013 with this passion that I am going to do anything I can to stop an unnecessary war, within a few months of arriving here, President Obama, who is a personal friend, was contemplating military action in Syria. I looked my friend in the eye, and I said: You do not have congressional authority to do that. You need to bring this to Congress.

Hey, I thought you were my supporter. I thought you were my friend and you would support this.

I do support you, and I think you have good judgment, and I think you are likely to make a careful decision, but war is too big an issue to leave in the hands of even a completely careful and deliberative of individual.

The Framers didn't want to leave war in the hands of George Washington, for God's sake. They thought Congress should be involved in it.

I said to President Obama: You need to bring this to Congress.

And guess what. A lot of Members of this body said the same thing.

Seven Members of the Senate right now were in the House in 2013. I have a letter that many of them wrote. Six Members who are currently Republican Members of the Senate signed this.

August 28, 2013:

Dear Mr. President, we strongly urge you to consult and receive authorization from Congress before ordering the use of U.S. military force in Syria. Your responsibility to do

so is prescribed in the Constitution and the War Powers Resolution of 1973.

We were in a recess then—it was August—but they said:

If you deem that military action . . . is necessary, Congress can reconvene at your request. We stand ready to come back into session, consider the facts before us, and share the burden of decisions regarding U.S. involvement in the quickly escalating Syrian conflict.

Six Republican Members of this body signed that letter in 2013, but based on their public statements, they seem to have a different standard for President Trump than they did for President Obama, a different standard for war against Iran than they did for war against Syria.

There is one Member who signed this letter who is consistent: Congressman PETER WELCH, who is now in the Senate. He signed this letter to the President of his own party, saying you can't do this without a vote of Congress, come to Congress. And he is taking the same position on the floor today, consistent with what he did then.

I am going to conclude and just say this: I know everybody in this body is praying that the cease-fire that is in place now, for a couple of days, works and that it holds.

I know everybody is praying that when the administration now says they are interested in a diplomatic resolution to this program, that they will have learned that they shouldn't tear up diplomatic deals that they did in 2018 but instead should prefer diplomacy and step back from war against Iran.

I pray that that holds and that we won't need to be back here doing this again, but I do note that the President, even today, said he would certainly bomb Iran again.

I am hoping—I am realistic—but I am hoping that Members of this body will stand up for the Constitution, will stand up for the proposition that war is too big to be decided by one person, will stand up for the principles that they articulated pretty clearly when it came to President Obama thinking about taking war into Syria.

At that moment, when we urged President Obama to do that, he didn't use military force. He did bring it to Congress. We had a debate in the Foreign Relations Committee. We passed an authorization, and in that debate, Syria stepped forward and said they would give up their chemical weapons program. Diplomacy achieved a result, just as diplomacy achieved a more effective control of the Iranian nuclear program—even than the bombs that we dropped last Saturday—until it was torn up.

I pray the cease-fire continues, but I fear we are going to be back here on this floor. And I hope when we are on this floor again, Members of this body will stand for the proposition that has been part of our history that war is too big an issue to allow one person to make the decision that sends our sons and daughters into harm's way.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I rise today in support of Senator KAINE's War Powers Resolution to make crystal clear that, as required by the Constitution of the United States, the President may not take offensive military action against Iran or any other country without congressional approval.

Last Saturday, the world learned through a social media post by Donald Trump that he had ordered an attack on three of Iran's nuclear enrichment sites, the first-ever direct U.S. military assault on Iranian territory.

We all agree that Iran must not obtain a nuclear weapon, but bombing is not the best, most sustainable way of achieving that goal, and nothing—nothing—I heard yesterday at the intelligence briefing changes that assessment.

The bombing attack was also a clear violation of the U.S. Constitution, which reserves to the Congress the power to declare war. And make no mistake, initiating a bombing attack against another country is not only a matter of foreign policy, it is an act of war.

For anyone who claims otherwise, I ask them to consider this: What would we have said if Iran or any other country had flown bombers over our country and struck our facilities? We would rightly call it what it was, an act of war.

While the President has the authority to defend the United States when attacked, article I of the Constitution vests the responsibility to go to war explicitly and exclusively in the Congress, not in one person in the Oval Office.

James Madison put it best in 1793 when he wrote:

[I]n no part of the Constitution is more wisdom to be found than in the clause which confides the question of war or peace to the legislature, and not to the executive. . . . The trust and temptation would be too great for any one man.

That is why the Framers of the Constitution designed a system of checks and balances to stop the government from ignoring the will of the American people, and the American people absolutely do not want the United States to be dragged into war, unnecessary wars.

So beyond the debate over the particular politics or policy of President Trump's decision to attack Iran, this debate is about the rule of law. And no President—past, present, or future—is above the law. Those strikes violated American law, and prominent legal experts have said they also violated international law.

The fact that there is now a cease-fire in place does not obviate the need to pass this resolution. President Trump has already shown that he is willing to initiate hostilities on his own, and, indeed, as Senator KAINE just mentioned, President Trump just said

a few hours ago that he would “absolutely” consider bombing Iran again.

And just last month, when asked whether he needs to uphold the Constitution of the United States, President Trump answered: “I don't know.”

We, the U.S. Senate and the House, should make clear that compliance with our Constitution is not optional.

Now, President Trump did not just attack another country in violation of the Constitution, he did so in spite of the facts presented by our own U.S. intelligence Agencies. Just 3 months ago, the U.S. intelligence community noted that they “continue to assess that Iran is not building a nuclear weapon and Supreme Leader Khamenei has not authorized the nuclear weapons program he suspended in 2003.”

That assessment has been reaffirmed year after year since at least 2007 that Iran was not producing a nuclear weapon and had not made a decision to do so. You would think that the facts and intelligence assessments would matter when a President chooses to attack another country. Apparently, not in this case.

Indeed, when President Trump was confronted with the U.S. intelligence community's assessment just days before he launched the attack, he dismissed it. It was an inconvenient fact. It was inconvenient because it showed there was more time for diplomacy to work, time to get a negotiated solution.

Secretary Rubio was asked about this intelligence assessment after the United States bombed Iran. His answer, very revealing, he said: “Forget about the intelligence” and then went on to try to justify the timing of the attack.

Now, as I said earlier, most, if not all of us, agree that Iran must not have a nuclear weapon, which would pose an existential threat to Israel, threaten America's interests in the region by further emboldening Iran's malign actions, and increase the risk of nuclear proliferation throughout the Middle East.

So the question is, How do we best accomplish that goal in a durable way that doesn't unleash unintended consequences and put Americans and others at greater risk?

President Obama answered that question. That is exactly what he accomplished through the agreement his administration negotiated with Iran 10 years ago this July.

President Obama made a deal with Iran to prevent it from building a nuclear weapon, and the agreement was working. Iran was subject to round-the-clock, 24-hour inspections from the International Atomic Energy Agency. That agreement made the whole world a safer place.

But in his very first term, Donald Trump ripped up that deal. Not surprisingly, Iran began to enrich uranium at higher levels, though still not at the 90 percent level needed for bomb-grade material.

Now, by the time Donald Trump returned to the White House this year,

even he and his administration had come to understand that the best way to ensure that Iran does not decide to develop a nuclear weapon is through negotiation. That is why, earlier this year, he dispatched his special envoy, Steve Witkoff, to open negotiations with Iran, and those negotiations were ongoing. Indeed, the sixth round of discussions were scheduled to take place on Sunday, June 15, just 2 days before the Netanyahu government launched its attacks on Iran. Not surprisingly, that Israeli attack derailed the ongoing United States-Iran negotiations.

It is important to remember that a decade earlier, Prime Minister Netanyahu worked very hard to derail President Obama's ongoing negotiations with Iran. Indeed, Prime Minister Netanyahu even addressed a joint session of Congress, urging the Congress not to proceed with those negotiations.

Prime Minister Netanyahu did not succeed in derailing President Obama's JCPOA. That agreement went into effect, and it did make the world and our country and Israel a safer place.

But unlike then, Prime Minister Netanyahu succeeded this time. He outmaneuvered Donald Trump. That story is well-documented in a June 17 New York Times piece entitled "How Trump Shifted on Iran Under Pressure from Israel" and a June 23 Washington Post story entitled "Netanyahu decided on Iran war last year, then sought to recruit Trump."

Simply put, Prime Minister Netanyahu accomplished that goal. President Trump joined his war of choice against Iran. And in doing so, President Trump put our men and women in uniform in the region in grave danger and unnecessary risk.

Following the attack, Iran fired 14 missiles at a major U.S. air base in Qatar. Fortunately, Iran gave the United States and Qatar advance warning, and there were no casualties. But the full extent of Iranian retaliation could play out throughout the region and other places around the world over a long period of time.

And what was accomplished? What was accomplished? To hear President Trump tell it, the Iranian nuclear program was "obliterated." That is flatout untrue—untrue.

We know from public reporting that a Defense Intelligence Agency assessment found that the strikes only set back Iran's nuclear program by "a few months."

Whether it is a few months or somewhat longer, the point is this: The strikes did not obliterate Iran's nuclear program. Before the attacks, U.S. intelligence assessed that Iran was not building a nuclear weapon, and in the aftermath of the attacks, Iran may well change its mind and move forward.

So President Trump disregarded a politically inconvenient U.S. intelligence assessment when he launched the attacks, and he is now making up his own politically convenient narrative about the results.

What has been particularly cowardly is the Trump administration's efforts to escape their own failures by hiding behind the amazing men and women of the U.S. military. To hear President Trump and Secretary of Defense Hegseth tell it, any criticism of their decision to attack Iran is somehow a criticism of the American military. This is garbage, and they know it. Our service men and women performed their mission flawlessly, and they did it with courage and with resolve.

It is especially rich to see Donald Trump, who has so often insulted and belittled our military heroes, now try to hide his own failings behind them.

So let's be clear, while we owe our servicemembers a debt of gratitude, we do not owe that debt of gratitude to President Trump or members of his Cabinet for their decisions or for their current efforts to manipulate the narrative about the results of the attack.

I have to say, as my colleague Senator Kaine mentioned, that the spectacle of President Trump and Secretary Hegseth berating the press for questioning their claims that the Iranian nuclear program had been "obliterated" only revealed their manic desperation to hide the truth.

Remember when President George Bush declared, with respect to Iraq, "Mission accomplished"?

What President Trump and Secretary Hegseth are communicating is that it is somehow treasonous to ask about intelligence reporting that casts doubts on their claims. This is not only an effort to intimidate and silence the press. It also sends a terrible message to all the intelligence analysts in the U.S. Government. It says that anybody who presents facts that don't fit President Trump's political narrative is trying to, as Secretary Hegseth said, "make the President look bad" or "undermining the success of our pilots" or "trying to manipulate the public mind."

That is ridiculous. We have already seen the dangers of manipulating intelligence to fit the President's narrative, rather than fidelity to the facts. The United States went to war in Iraq under false pretenses. Remember when the Bush administration told America that Iraq was developing weapons of mass destruction? Remember when Vice President Cheney warned, in March 2003, that "if there's a mushroom cloud in New York, you will know that Saddam Hussein is behind it." And, of course, there were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.

So false intelligence and false narratives that fan the flames of unnecessary wars cost us dearly. The Iraq war cost the lives of over 4,000 American soldiers and hundreds of billions of dollars of American taxpayer money. The war upended the region, killed hundreds of thousands of Iraqi civilians, strengthened Iran, and unleashed ISIS on the world. It was the worst U.S. foreign policy blunder in a generation.

The Trump administration has now created a culture of fear and retribu-

tion throughout the Federal Government. We have already seen patriotic Federal employees be fired for telling the truth. A whistleblower just filed a complaint the other day. He had been at the Justice Department. He said: I didn't sign up to lie.

So the real challenge is this: The President has not obliterated the Iran nuclear program, but he is doing everything he can to obliterate the credibility of the U.S. intelligence community so he can invent his own reality without contradiction. That is why it is more important than ever that Congress stand up for the Constitution and insist that the President cannot initiate hostilities without approval from Congress.

That is what this resolution asks. It asks: Do you support the Constitution and the role it gives to Congress to declare war? Do you believe that the people's representatives should have a voice in whether American lives and, specifically, the lives of our Nation's Armed Forces, are put at grave risk?

We owe it to our troops, and we owe it to the American people to ensure that no President—not this President or any other—can unilaterally commit our Nation to go to war.

The Constitution does entrust that responsibility to us. Let's not abdicate it.

Colleagues, I urge you to vote yes on the Kaine War Powers Resolution.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

MR. SCHIFF. Madam President, I rise today in support of Senator Kaine's resolution for the simple and compelling reason that it upholds our constitutional duty. Regardless of what people may think of the military's execution of its mission last weekend—and our servicemembers performed with courage, with professionalism, with extraordinary precision—or their views of its effectiveness—and I hope and pray the mission was effective—Iran is a malevolent regime, it is the paramount sponsor of terrorism in the world, and it must never be allowed to obtain the bomb.

Regardless of whether you support the President's decision to engage in preemptive strikes in the first place, regardless of whether or not you support the President generally or you do not, the Constitution charges the Congress, not the President, with the power to declare war.

Now, there may be a fog of war and a murky uncertainty concerning the battle damage assessment, but there is no ambiguity here when it comes to the Constitution. Article I, section 8 provides that "Congress shall have [the] Power . . . To declare War"—not the President, or the President if it is not convenient to the Congress, but the Congress. And this body, for far too long, has been allergic to the responsibility it has to govern the use of military force.

Not since the very early part of this century has Congress approved any authorization for the use of military

force. Nevertheless, a great deal of military force has been, in fact, used by the United States, since then, in far-flung places in the world.

In fact, post-World War II, the war powers have been utilized by an increasingly strong Executive and an increasingly deferential and fearful legislature.

Now, during the last several weeks, it has been apparent to anyone watching that the conflict in the Middle East had the potential to draw in the United States of America—when missiles began striking Tehran and Tel Aviv; when the President of the United States, with signature bombast, began to telegraph the possibility that we would enter the fray; when countless American families were forced to consider whether their children would be the next to bear the burden and carry the sacrifices of another potentially endless war in the Middle East.

And so with those families and our servicemembers in mind, Senator Kaine introduced this resolution to ensure that the President did not risk committing the United States to yet another open-ended conflict in the region without a debate in Congress and a decision by Congress as to whether the country should go down that dangerous road.

Now, at that time, many Senators, myself included, pushed for an intelligence briefing from the administration. We had significant questions we needed answered: Had Iran made the decision to build a bomb? Had Iran begun the process of building the mechanism of a bomb? Was there an imminent threat to the United States or our forces? What were the threats to U.S. personnel and facilities in the region, should Iran respond? How might Iran and its proxies escalate and harm U.S. interests, not only in the region but here at home and in other parts of the world? How much damage could U.S. military action do to the Iranian nuclear and missile programs, and for how long would it set them back? And, most important, what was the risk that such a bombing campaign could escalate into all-out war?

Days passed, no briefings. Even after last Saturday's strikes, still no briefing. Not until yesterday did the administration come to Congress to answer the most basic of questions, and only after suggesting, it was reported, that they would potentially choke off further information to the Congress.

The Constitution demands otherwise. The Founders split the government's wartime powers, just as they divided responsibilities for so many other things. It is Congress which declares a war, which raises an army and a navy and pays for the financial cost of defense and war.

And keep in mind that the need for congressional approval of warmaking was not hypothetical to the Founders. The United States had just fought a war against a King, and the Founders did not want to put the power to start

another war in the hands of any single person.

The Framers put their thinking on parchment, and in a letter to Thomas Jefferson, in the summer of 1789, James Madison reflected on how they had approached this question of war power, which was the subject of much debate in Philadelphia at the Constitutional Convention. He said:

We have already given, in one example, [an] effectual check to the Dog of war, by transferring the power of letting him loose from the Executive to the Legislative body, from those who are to spend to those who are to pay.

"From those who are to spend to those who are to pay"—that is because a decision as consequential as entering into war requires informed debate and buy-in from the people's representatives and the public, from us here in the Senate and from our colleagues in the House, because we need to weigh the benefits and the risks for our constituents and for the country as a whole, because a decision like this one should be insulated from partisan politics and not made with haste or with blinders on.

There are, perhaps, Senators in this body who will say: This debate is no longer needed. The mission is over. Iran has backed down. A lasting ceasefire is in place. The threat has passed.

And I would say to them: I don't know that to be true, and neither do you.

And on behalf of all those who could and would pay, we should not allow this great and solemn power to make war to be usurped any longer. The only way for us to know whether the United States might be drawn into a broader conflict is if we exercise our authority to prevent it or to determine that the Congress wants to affirmatively provide a President with the authorization to use force.

So I am a yes on this resolution.

And if the Senate votes to bring this resolution before the body, which I hope it will see the wisdom of doing, I will move an amendment that I have filed with Senators KIM and Kaine that I would hope would receive all of our support. Our amendment makes clear what is implicit in Senator Kaine's resolution already, and that is that terminating the use of U.S. Armed Forces against Iran does not affect the ability of the United States to defend itself, to share intelligence with Israel or our other partner nations, or to assist them in taking defensive measures to protect themselves from an attack by Iran or its proxies.

Our intent in this amendment is to make it crystal clear that calling up and passing this resolution would in no way restrict the United States' ability to defend itself or our partners.

And with that question settled, we should be able to turn to the real need for this debate: Should this Congress continue to abdicate our constitutional duty to an administration that, at every turn—at every turn—has deemed

us irrelevant; an administration that, for too long, deferred its obligation to brief Congress and has reportedly threatened to take steps to choke off the amount of information we have and need to assess the impact and the consequences of unilateral military action; an administration that openly disdains and threatens a free press, ignoring the fact that our fourth estate exists to ask questions for the people, even if those questions are uncomfortable—especially when those questions are uncomfortable—and shine a light on the places where tyranny and despotism can grow and fester and fester?

Because here is the bottom line: Article I, section 8 says that "the Congress shall have [the] Power . . . To declare War."

And every American should know that Congress is not giving up on its most basic constitutional right to debate and determine whether U.S. forces undertake further operations—offensive operations—against the Iranian regime or any other.

This resolution, with my amendment, would give Senators confidence that a vote on that question will in no way put American troops or our allies at increased risk, and the underlying resolution would give the American people the confidence of knowing that they will not be dragged into another war without their consent.

There must be a check on the dogs of war. There must be a voice for those who will pay the costs of going to war, and the Senate must be that voice.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. I appreciate the comments of my colleague from California and particularly appreciate that my colleague from Virginia Senator Kaine has proposed this War Powers Resolution, a resolution that reaffirms a basic principle: The decisions of war and peace belong under our Constitution to Congress, not to the President.

But on June 21, President Trump ordered strikes on three Iranian nuclear facilities. There was no congressional authorization. There was no debate in this Chamber. There was no vote in this Chamber. The President made a unilateral decision that risked bringing the United States into another extended war in the Middle East.

That is not how our Founders designed our Nation through the architecture of the Constitution. In fact, each Member here swore an oath to uphold that Constitution that places the responsibility for declaring war upon this body, not upon the individual who sits in the Oval Office. To be sure, the President, as Commander in Chief, has the responsibility to protect the Nation from an imminent threat. But in this case, there was not an imminent threat.

First, according to our own intelligence, Iran was not pursuing a nuclear weapon. Second, even though Iran possessed a significant amount of 60-

percent-enriched uranium—more than the 3 percent to 5 percent that is utilized for civilian energy—it was still not enriched to the level to build a bomb. It would have had to be enriched to 90 percent. It would have had to be converted to metallic form. It would have had to be arranged with an extensive system of explosives that compress it in order to start a chain reaction. That is a very difficult engineering feat. Third, prior to the U.S. strikes, Israel's Foreign Minister said Israel's attacks had already set back Iran's nuclear weapon program for at least 2 to 3 years.

So let's be clear, the threat was not imminent. It was not a situation where there was no time for the President to observe the Constitution, to honor the Constitution, to seek an authorization for the use of military force from the Congress of the United States.

The administration, instead, acted precipitously, putting American lives at risk, including the over 40,000 U.S. troops in the region, as well as diplomats and American civilians stationed or visiting the Middle East.

Wars are easy to start, but they are often hard to end, and the consequences can be enormous. Look, for example, at the cost of the wars in Afghanistan and in Iraq: more than 7,000 deaths of American men and women serving in uniform, more than 50,000 serious injuries—often life-altering injuries—to America's sons and daughters serving in uniform, more than \$8 trillion of American treasure spent.

That is why the Founders said the consequences of conflict, of entering into war, are so significant they must never be entrusted to a single person, not even the person who sits in the Oval Office. That is why they wrote the Constitution, placing the responsibility for that here where it can be wrestled with; where it can be debated; where different perspectives can be brought to bear; where experts can be interviewed; and all can be taken into account in making such an important decision for our Nation.

From where we are right now, two things need to happen: First, Congress needs to reassert its constitutional authority over matters of war and peace; second, we need to double down on diplomacy to secure a lasting peace.

And a lasting peace includes at least three elements: Iran does not develop a nuclear weapon; second, Iran stops funding militias across the region; and, third, Iran's economy is freed up to prosper. Those are the three elements that need to be addressed.

Let me begin, first, by addressing in some greater detail Congress's need to reassert its constitutional authority. On "Meet the Press" on Sunday, Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM said:

You can't have 535 Commanders in Chief.

He is exactly right. And that is why the Founders designed the Constitution with a separation of powers. Congress has the responsibility to decide if we go to war, and then the President commands our military to go to war.

Article I gives Congress the power to declare a war and article II gives the President the power to be the Commander in Chief to execute the war. Senator KAINE's War Powers Resolution says hostilities in Iran must be explicitly authorized by Congress, but that does not, in any way, prevent the United States from defending itself from an imminent attack should that need arise.

This is a privileged resolution, meaning that we will have the opportunity to wrestle with it. And we will be voting on whether to do so later today.

This resolution is urgently needed. We are already in the throes of a slide into an authoritarian state. Our President has been ignoring the Constitution or violating the Constitution by violating the rule of law that applies to the executive branch; by ignoring or suppressing or circumventing due process, the very issue that protects all of us from an overbearing Executive. In fact, it is the defender of our freedom; third, stiff-arming the courts; and, fourth, seizing Congress's power of the purse.

And then just this week, it was reported that Trump will limit intelligence sharing with Congress, another brazen attempt to centralize powers in the executive in a strongman Presidency.

With this resolution, Senator KAINE's resolution, Congress can reassert its constitutional authority as a coequal branch of government. It can stop this President from seizing even more dangerously unaccountable power.

In addition to Congress taking this action, there is an urgent need for diplomacy in order to secure a lasting peace in the Middle East. That lasting peace includes the three elements that I mentioned: that Iran does not have the path to developing a nuclear weapon; that it stops funding militias across the region; and that Iran's economy is freed up to prosper. They can reenter international commerce.

It is already clear that diplomacy is not just essential but that it is effective. In 2015, the United States helped negotiate the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, better known as the Iran nuclear deal, which blocked all paths for Iran to acquire a nuclear weapon. It blocked the plutonium path; it blocked the uranium path; it blocked the covert path.

That deal was so important for global security that it involved the United States, Russia, China, the United Kingdom, and France, all working together to create that framework in partnership with Iran. And Iran accepted massive inspections and oversight from the International Atomic Energy Agency to make sure that you not only had an act of trust, but lots of acts of verification. The deal worked. Iran was not developing a nuclear weapon. Instead, they dismantled their plutonium-based Arak heavy water reactor. They agreed not to enrich uranium beyond 6.7 percent, and they didn't do so. They

shipped all of their more highly enriched uranium out of the country—some 25,000 pounds—to be stored abroad.

But 3 years later, President Trump tore up that agreement. He did so over the objections of his own national security officials; over the objection of his Secretary of Defense General Jim Mattis; over the objection of his Secretary of State Rex Tillerson; over the objection of his National Security Advisor General McMaster; and over the objection of his Chief of Staff General John Kelly.

Had President Trump, in his first administration, not torn up that agreement, we would be celebrating Iran's tenth anniversary under the nuclear deal with no path to a nuclear weapon. By ripping up the Iran nuclear deal, Trump opened the pathway for Iran to enrich beyond 3.67 percent, leading to the concerns that prompted Israel to attack Iran's nuclear facilities and that led Prime Minister Netanyahu to ask President Trump to use our planes and our abilities to bomb Isfahan, Natanz, and Fordo.

To create an enduring agreement now that stops Iran from having a path to a nuclear weapon, restrictions like those that were in the Iran nuclear deal back in 2015 have to be recreated. And, in fact, we learned over the last few days how diplomats from President Trump's team have been working on this, were in conversation with Iran before Israel's attack to create such an arrangement. In fact, they continued those conversations even as bombs were dropping.

We have to succeed to put in place a permanent, detailed, enforceable plan for peace which Iran agrees to, that stops funding for militias outside Iran and blocks all those paths to a nuclear weapon.

Colleagues, we wouldn't be here today discussing this if President Trump hadn't torn up the first agreement that was working against the advice of his entire foreign affairs and security staff. That is what happens when you scoff at diplomacy—diplomacy that works, agreements that worked—and unleash events in the world that lead to circumstances that realized themselves this year in 2025.

The decision to strike Iran without authorization from Congress was wrong because there wasn't the imminent threat and, thus, there was time to go through the process of seeking authorization for the use of military force necessitated by our Constitution.

Wars are easy to start, but they are hard to end, and that is why the Founders wanted us to debate them before the American people. We must reassert Congress's congressional authority. We must double down on diplomacy to secure long-term peace. We cannot allow our servicemembers in uniform to be sent to war if we are not even willing to debate and vote on that war.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Madam President, I do not want the United States of America to be involved in yet another regime-change war in Iran. Have we not learned anything from what happened in Iraq? We deposed Saddam Hussein, and all hell broke loose. That was a war of regime change—no sense since it wasn't related to 9/11.

We had a regime-change war in Afghanistan and then went on to embrace nation building. Thousands of American men and women who answered the call of the President reported for duty, lost their lives, lost their limbs, or are suffering today with PTSD. Trillions of taxpayer dollars have been spent and wasted. Yet, in the Middle East, the flashpoint now is Iran, and we came within an eyelash of getting dragged into yet another war where the goal was regime change.

I want to acknowledge the professionalism of our Air Force and our men and women in the military. The strike they were ordered to perform they executed flawlessly. To them, I extend my congratulations.

But the question for us is, Who authorizes the use of force? Our men and women will do what it is the Commander in Chief requires and do what it is Congress authorizes. We all have confidence in that. But this was a wake-up call for us because we came within an eyelash of being in a conflict where the goal would have been the Netanyahu goal of regime change.

What we did in this action, with the President's decision to send our bombers in at the request of Netanyahu, was to essentially put in the hands of the Iranian Government the question of how far this war would go. Would they turn the other cheek, which is essentially what they did, or would they retaliate in a way, as President Trump said, that he would rain hellfire on them and have us in a war?

The point here of the Kaine resolution is that if this country is going to make that decision, it must be Congress that authorizes that decision. It must be Congress that has the debate about what are the national security concerns, what are the costs, and what are the benefits. We can't simply bypass that and continue to abdicate our responsibility and congressional authority and duty, and that is why this resolution is so important.

Now this question of, how did we get here? You know, a war oftentimes happens not by design; you stumble into it. That is what almost happened here. We do not want a nuclear Iran. There is nobody in this U.S. Senate who wants a nuclear Iran. Russia doesn't want a nuclear Iran. China doesn't want a nuclear Iran. Our Presidents—bipartisan—have worked hard to make certain that Iran didn't have it.

The Obama agreement was working. After President Trump was not President Trump, he challenged the agreement. When he got elected, he tore it

up. But he saw at some point the wisdom of diplomacy, and he was engaged in active negotiations about a non-nuclear Iran and was making progress on those.

That was objected to by Prime Minister Netanyahu. He was against the JCPOA that Obama was negotiating and actually, as a foreign leader, came to this U.S. Congress and gave a speech in conflict with the Commander in Chief of the United States wherein he lobbied in this Capitol against entering into an agreement that ultimately made us more secure.

That determination on his part continues, and the biggest act of sabotage to the Trump negotiations as to a nuclear agreement was the bombing campaign that Netanyahu did that sabotaged those talks.

Again, I say congratulations to our men and women in uniform who, when they were ordered by the President to do the strike on the nuclear facilities, did it and did it well, but we should not at all discount how precarious that situation was for our country. It was the result of a decision by Iran to turn the other cheek, to disregard the attacks and basically not escalate. I am so glad they did, and the President showed temperance there himself. But we can't be putting ourselves in a position where our future and whether we do get in a war is based on the actions of other people—particularly folks who run Iran.

So if we are going to protect the national security, if we are going to protect the men and women of this country who will always respond to the call of the Commander in Chief—that is what makes them such wonderful patriots. They cede the authority to make the decision about whether they will be put in harm's way to the men and women who serve in the Congress of the United States and the Commander in Chief. That is a profound responsibility that each of us has to debate the question of whether we should commit this country to war.

So this resolution is absolutely vital—to the well-being of this country and to the humility that is required of a country before it makes the ultimate decision to ask the men and women who are citizens of our country to potentially sacrifice their lives for the well-being of this country.

I urge my colleagues to support the Kaine resolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, the Constitution is clear: Congress, not the President, has the authority to declare war. The Founders were unanimous in proclaiming that the power to declare war belonged exclusively to Congress.

James Madison, the father of the Constitution, said that the executive branch was the branch most prone to war; therefore, the Constitution, "with studied care, vested that power in the legislature."

Madison would further state that "in no part of the Constitution is more wisdom to be found than in the clause which confides the question of war and peace to the legislature, and not to the executive [branch]."

Hamilton, who didn't always agree with Madison or Jefferson, wrote that "the Legislature can alone declare war, can alone . . . transfer the nation from a state of Peace to a state of War," and "if the Legislature have a right to make war on the one hand—it is on the other [hand] the duty of the Executive to preserve Peace til war is declared."

Madison and Hamilton had very different visions of Executive power. Yet they both agreed that it was vitally important to entrust the power to declare war to Congress, not the executive branch.

George Washington remarked that "the Constitution vests the power of declaring war with Congress; therefore no offensive expedition of importance can be undertaken until after they shall have deliberated upon the subject, and authorized such a measure." No offensive expedition without congressional approval.

St. George Tucker, a Revolutionary War-era law professor, wrote in 1803 of how our Constitution diverged from the English tradition.

He wrote:

In England the right of making war is in the King. . . . With us, the representatives of the people, have the right to decide this important question.

It is without question that Congress neither deliberated nor authorized the recent offensive military action against Iran.

Each of us has taken an oath to uphold the Constitution. Deferring the decision as to when, where, and why the country goes to war to any President is a dereliction of duty on the part of Congress.

To commit America's military to fight wars on behalf of the Nation is the most consequential and humbling responsibility that Congress is entrusted with. If we are to ask our young men and women to fight and potentially give their lives, then we in this body can at least muster the courage to debate if American military intervention is warranted.

Washington's record of involvement in the Greater Middle East is particularly abysmal, with dozens of campaigns costing thousands of American lives and trillions of dollars. Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Pakistan, Yemen, Sudan, Somalia, and now Iran—all countries in the region that the United States has bombed or is bombing. In each case, the hawks in Washington were adamant that U.S. military intervention would lead to a glorious future and great peace. Instead, after tragically losing thousands of lives and trillions of dollars, the United States is not in a better strategic position thanks to our interventions.

After September 11, a generation of brave Americans answered the call to

serve, many enduring multiple deployments in the region. Some 7,000 U.S. servicemembers paid the ultimate sacrifice in the War on Terror. Tens of thousands more carry with them the scars of war: living with missing limbs, shrapnel, nerve damage, brain injuries, burns, scars. Some live with paralysis and are confined to wheelchairs. The mental wounds of war are also present as we remember the more than 30,000 veterans who have committed suicide since Washington's misguided project to remake the Middle East.

While our soldiers carry out their missions with honor, the Washington establishment consistently fails them. In almost all cases, our interventions were counterproductive, making us less safe and less prosperous.

As the initial jubilation wears off from those who clamor for war, the regional situation remains precarious, and American servicemembers remain in danger. Many advocates for war, giving voice to their real feelings, have loudly opposed the current cease-fire. Those arguing against a cease-fire give a callous testimony, insensitive to the cruelties of war.

Some 40,000 U.S. troops are scattered throughout the Middle East as we speak—some on large, established bases, others on isolated outposts. It is impossible to ensure all of these locations have adequate air and missile defense capabilities.

Our troop presence in the region is therefore a significant liability, allowing Iran and its proxies an opportunity to target Americans, which they otherwise would not have. Yet the Washington foreign policy establishment seems content to allow our servicemembers to serve as sitting ducks. Should American soldiers get wounded or, God forbid, killed in a retaliatory strike, the calls for war emanating from Washington will surely be deafening.

History is replete with examples of leaders who, in their hubris, thought they could shape the fate of nations, but we are subsequently proven wrong as events ended up controlling them. Our own country, sadly, experienced this during Vietnam.

The needless tragedy of that war in which 58,000 Americans paid the ultimate sacrifice led Congress to pass the War Powers Resolution we debate today. Congress intended to ensure a President would never again unilaterally plunge the American people into war without the people's representatives in Congress debating the issue. We owe it to all Americans who have worn the uniform to honor that humbling responsibility.

Moreover, despite the tactical success of our strikes, they may end up proving to be a strategic failure. It is unclear if this intervention will fully curtail Iran's nuclear aspirations or, in fact, whether the Iranians may well conclude to double down on their efforts to obtain a nuclear weapon. At this time, it is unknown.

The lesson Tehran and other unsavory regimes around the world may learn is that the only way to deter a strike is to maintain a nuclear deterrent. Pandora's box has been opened, and the consequences remain to be seen.

Congress must now focus its efforts on deescalation and preventing the call for regime change, the consequences of which, if applied to Iran, risk the total destabilization of the Middle East. The American people are sick and tired of sending their children to fight and die in war zones on the other side of the world with no tangible U.S. interests at stake.

Abdicating our constitutional responsibility by allowing the executive branch to unilaterally introduce U.S. troops into wars is an affront to the Constitution and to the American people.

Today's vote offers every Member of this body an opportunity to stand up for the Constitution, to stand up for American servicemembers, and to stand up for America's strategic interests. I will vote in support of this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to do so as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEEHY). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, in a 1793 letter to William Cabell, James Madison said this:

In no part of the constitution is more wisdom to be found than in the clause which confides the question of war or peace to the legislature, and not to the executive department.

A few years later, in another letter, this time to Thomas Jefferson as part of their famous correspondence, Madison expounded on that very simple superlative, naming the war powers clause in the Constitution as the most important. He said:

The constitution supposes what the History of all Governments demonstrates, that the Executive is the branch of power most interested in war, and most prone to it. It has accordingly with studied care vested the question of war in the Legislature.

Our Founding Fathers didn't get everything right. They didn't see ahead of time that this Chamber would be divided in two: Republicans on one side, Democrats on the other side. But they knew, having watched the course of human history, that Executives—in their day, mostly all Monarchs and Kings—had all sorts of reasons to drag their Nation into war. Power often came from war, the funding that could be raised for war, the loyalty commanded by war, the glory that occasionally came to the leader, the ruler, through war and through conquest.

There was great risk in war, but there was also great reward in war. And there was far too much of it in the era in which our Constitution was being formed.

The purpose of the Founders was to give the American people a voice in government—a revolutionary idea at

the time—but it was also to order our government in a way that war would become less likely, would become less frequent. They imagined a world—this new America—in which peace would be the rule, not war, as it was at the time for the citizens of Europe who lived under the rule of Kings prone to war, incentivized to war, as James Madison wrote to Thomas Jefferson.

So this part of the Constitution, with more wisdom in it than any other part of the Constitution, according to James Madison, is this section of our Founding document that says it is not up to the ruler; it is not up to the executive branch; it is up to the branch of government most connected to the people to decide whether we go to war; to require that there be a debate, a conversation that involves everyone in this Nation; that requires, that necessitates, a collective decision as to whether to put the brave soldiers of this country and the collective security of the Nation at risk.

So we are here today because we still find wisdom in that clause of the Constitution. We still see great risk in moving into a world, which we are quickly moving to, in which that clause that James Madison named as the supreme clause of the Constitution, is a dead letter—is a dead letter.

That is the risk because there are very few wars that are planned so far in advance that there is time to come and have a monthlong debate. Wars happen quickly, and they necessitate quick action, according to the Constitution.

Yes, we have always accepted that there has to be an exception—but a limited exception—to that supreme clause in the Constitution. If there is an imminent attack against the United States, of course—of course—the people of the United States want the ability of the President of the United States to respond to that imminent attack. But in the absence of an imminent attack, there is no exception. There is no ability to go around Congress.

In the case of the hostilities against Iran that the President began last weekend, there was no imminent threat against the United States. There was no Army marching in this Nation. There was no nuclear bomb that even existed that could be dropped on the United States or our soldiers in the region.

So it was required—it is required under the Constitution—that the President come to Congress. If the President doesn't need to come to Congress to attack another Nation preemptively, preventively, absent an imminent threat, then that provision of the Constitution is dead letter. Period. Stop. And the most important piece of this document, according to our most revered Founding Father, is no longer operational.

And if we lurch into a world in which any Executive can send us to war without the participation of the American people, then we are in a world that our Founding Fathers could never have imagined.

So I am very glad to be on the floor today, as a big fan of the wisdom of our Founders, to support Senator KAINE's resolution. I appreciate his consistency in bringing this question before us.

I don't want to live in a world in which the greatest question that this country could envision, whether or not we send our brave men and women to fight on our behalf, is not a question that doesn't involve the collective conversation of this body and of the people of this Nation.

I think it is an important resolution to debate here, and I hope my colleagues will support it.

It doesn't really have to do with whether you think there is wisdom in this action or not, whether you think the President was right or wrong; this is an opportunity for us to stand up for our responsibility under the Constitution to be a coequal branch in setting foreign policy.

I have my thoughts on the wisdom of this action. I have stated that I think it is very dangerous when the President of the United States deliberately misleads the country about the efficacy of our military operations overseas or the threats presented to this country. It is unforgiveable anytime a President doesn't tell the truth, but it is especially unforgiveable when the President doesn't tell the truth about national security intelligence.

I know my colleagues here come to different conclusions, but if the reporting is correct that Iran, even after these strikes, still has centrifuges and still has enriched uranium and still has scientists who know how to put those things together, then it just is not true that the program has been obliterated. That is a program that can be reconstituted in a relatively short amount of time because, of course, knowledge is not able to be destroyed by bombs.

The only way that you are going to make this country and this world safe from Iran's nuclear weapons ambitions—and they have them—is diplomacy. I hope that diplomacy got easier because of these strikes, but I don't think they did. I don't think diplomacy got closer because of these strikes and whatever follow-on strikes may come as President Trump is currently threatening. So if diplomacy is the only path, if you can't bomb out of existence knowledge, then I don't think this is a very good week for American national security.

But I come to a different conclusion than many of my Republican colleagues do, even some of my Democratic colleagues. But Senator KAINE's resolution is so important because that is the debate that we should be having. That is the argument that we should be having in public.

That debate over the wisdom of dropping bombs in a far-off land that could put our troops at risk, that could drag us into a war, that is not a debate that the Founding Fathers thought should take place behind closed doors at the Department of Defense, at the CIA, and

the White House. That is actually the debate that they thought that this body should have—the U.S. Senate—that the House of Representatives should have, and that is the chance that we have today: to bring that debate out of the shadows, out of the secret, to the place where the Founding Fathers thought it should exist.

That is why I urge my colleagues to support Senator KAINE's resolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. HAGERTY. Mr. President, President Trump's actions to address Iran's nuclear weapons program last weekend didn't start a war; they ended a war. So I rise today to support President Trump's wisdom and leadership in decisively countering Iran's nuclear threat and, therefore, to oppose this ill-conceived joint resolution.

As a U.S. Senator and former Ambassador to Japan, I understand and respect the role that Congress plays in matters of war and peace, but I cannot and I will not support a resolution that removes the ability of the President of the United States to act decisively in defense of national interests, our allies, and our Armed Forces.

This resolution, if passed, would send a dangerous message not just to Iran's terrorist-sponsoring regime but also to every adversary who is seeking to exploit our domestic debates and internal divisions. This resolution would signal that America's resolve can be hamstrung by congressional hesitation at the very moment when clarity, unity, and strength are most needed.

I cannot state this strongly enough: President Trump acted entirely within his constitutional authority under article II and in accordance with his solemn duty to defend this Nation and to defend the American people. Operation Midnight Hammer was a targeted, strategic, and necessary use of force to eliminate immediate threats posed by the Iranian regime and its proxies. No American lives were lost or injured during this military operation, thanks to the leadership of President Trump, the advice and counsel of Vice President JD VANCE, National Security Advisor and Secretary of State Marco Rubio, Secretary of Defense Pete Hegseth, General Dan Caine, and the brilliant planning and flawless execution of the men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces.

For decades, the Iranian regime has been attacking U.S. personnel, our allies, and our interests through its Revolutionary Guard, through Hezbollah and Hamas and Houthi terrorists, and through its missile programs and multiple cyber attacks. For decades, the Iranian regime has cynically violated international agreements to overtly and covertly pursue the capabilities necessary to make nuclear weapons on short notice.

The idea that the President, in the face of escalating threats, can only sit idly by until Congress can hold hear-

ings and schedule votes is not just naive; it is reckless. This War Powers Resolution ignores the reality of modern warfare, and it would constrain the Commander in Chief at the precise moment when decisiveness is most critical. It elevates process over common-sense policy and political optics over operational necessity.

If the President had been forced to act in accordance with this resolution last week, the element of surprise would have been entirely lost, and the successful mission flown by our brave airmen would have been much different and, likely, much costlier.

Of course, Congress must be consulted. Of course, we can debate the scope and strategy of our military engagements. But we must not shackle our President in the middle of a crisis when lives are on the line. We must not embolden the Ayatollahs in Tehran by showing division and delay because that is the path to endless wars, rather than the path to decisive victories.

President Trump acted wisely and proportionately to protect American lives. He acted to reestablish the credibility of our strategic deterrence. And he acted after decades of Iranian aggression that went largely unanswered by the previous administrations of President Joe Biden and Barack Obama. President Trump, once again, demonstrated decisive leadership in the service of peace and stability. That is the actual job of the Commander in Chief.

Let me conclude by repeating what I said at the start. President Trump's actions last weekend did not start a war. His actions ended a war. And not a single American life was lost.

We should not be here debating how to constrain effective Presidential leadership but, rather, discussing how to recognize effective leadership and support it. For this reason, I urge my colleagues to oppose S.J. Res. 59.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, the most significant responsibility and heavy burden a President has is the determination of when to engage the Armed Forces of our Nation. Such decisions can both cost and save lives.

This past Saturday, President Trump directed our military to respond to a growing threat that Iran could weaponize nuclear material and deliver a nuclear weapon. With escalating tensions between our ally Israel and our adversary Iran, the President made the decision to deter and delay the capabilities Iran has to deliver a nuclear weapon. What we know to date from our intelligence sources is that the President's actions were significant and successful.

The U.S. Constitution splits the responsibility of the use of military force between the legislative and executive branches. Having received a classified and thorough briefing from our military, intelligence, and diplomatic officials, I conclude that the President

acted within his constitutional authorities.

I welcome the return to a stricter constitutional balance of power between the branches of government. Under the circumstances of the recent actions of the President and the timing of the offering of the resolution now before the Senate, we should not adopt the resolution, which states, in part:

Congress hereby directs the President to terminate the use of United States Armed Forces for hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran . . . unless explicitly authorized by a declaration of war.

With continuing threat from Iran against Israel, the dangers to American military men and women in the region, and because of the potential for terrorist acts upon U.S. interests within and without our borders, I believe the President has the constitutional authority and responsibility to defend the United States and its interests against imminent threats. I appreciate the President's decisive action and express gratitude and respect for the men and women of the military who carried out his orders, and I support the President in his efforts to find a peaceful resolution to hostilities in the region.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be permitted to speak prior to the scheduled vote: Senator SANDERS for up to 10 minutes, Senator GRAHAM for up to 10 minutes, Senator RISCH for up to 10 minutes, Senator KAINE for up to 3 minutes, and Senator SCHUMER for up to 3 minutes.

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

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, everyone knows that our country faces enormous crises. We have a healthcare system that is broken and is wildly expensive. We have a housing crisis in which millions of people are spending far more than they can afford to put a roof over their heads. We have the highest rate of childhood poverty of almost any major country on Earth and a childcare system which is dysfunctional. Millions of our kids cannot afford to go to college or are leaving school deeply in debt, and over 20 percent of our seniors are trying to get by on \$15,000 a year or less. And oh, by the way, we have an existential threat in climate change, which might very well make the planet uninhabitable for future generations. These are just a few of the crises that Congress and the President should be addressing.

In the midst of all of that, going to war against Iran and supporting Israel's unprovoked attacks against that country is not something that we should be doing. We do not need another unnecessary and costly war. We have had enough of them.

In 1964, Congress voted, with little debate, for a Gulf of Tonkin Resolution giving President Johnson the authority

to escalate American military involvement in Vietnam. As a result, the United States expanded its presence in that country, and we were dragged fully into Vietnam's civil war. Eventually, some 2.7 million Americans served in Vietnam; and more than 58,000 died, and over 300,000 were wounded. The Vietnam war devastated an entire generation; it killed millions of Vietnamese; and it destabilized the region. It cost U.S. taxpayers hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars.

The Vietnam war was based on a series of lies. Years later, the U.S. Government concluded that the supposed attacks that prompted the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution did not happen as reported. The so-called domino theory, the ideological foundation of that war, was bogus. That was a war that never should have been fought.

In 2002, as a new Member of Congress, I can recall vividly how politicians and the media relentlessly beat the drum about the need to go to war against Iraq and its leader Saddam Hussein. Over and over again, we were told that Iraq was building weapons of mass destruction and that if we did not act quickly, nuclear weapons would be falling on America. Among those pushing for war in Iraq in 2002 were none other than Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu, who testified to Congress:

There is no question whatsoever that Saddam is seeking . . . nuclear weapons. If you take out . . . Saddam's regime, I guarantee you that it will have enormous positive reverberations.

That was Netanyahu in 2002.

The U.S. Congress, against my vote, invaded Iraq and became involved in a brutal sectarian war that lasted for almost a decade. No weapons of mass destruction were ever found. That war was based on a lie, a lie that cost us 4,500 brave young Americans, 32,000 wounded, and \$3 trillion in taxpayer dollars. Hundreds of thousands of Iraqis also died.

War often has awful and unintended consequences. It should only be considered as a last resort. We should not go to war against Iran.

First, let me state the obvious. Trump's attack against Iran is unconstitutional. Congress, alone, has the authority to take this country into war, not the President. Trump does not have that authority.

Second, Iran did not pose an imminent military threat to the United States that would justify a preemptive attack. Just a few months ago, Trump's own Director of National Intelligence, Tulsi Gabbard, testified to Congress that the American intelligence community "continues to assess that Iran is not building a nuclear weapon and Supreme Leader Khamenei has not authorized the nuclear weapons programs he suspended in 2003"—from Tulsi Gabbard.

Trump dismissed that finding, saying:

Well then, my intelligence community is wrong.

Really? On what basis does he think that the entire U.S. intelligence community is wrong?

Third, diplomacy offers a better path to durably address Iran's nuclear activities than a military attack. This was proven in 2015, when the United States and world powers made an agreement that strictly limited Iran's nuclear activities and put in place blanket inspections. That agreement was working, but Trump pulled out of that deal in 2018, and Iran restarted its activities.

To his credit, Trump returned to diplomacy this year, and U.S. officials held five rounds of talks with Iran to address this issue. A sixth round of talks was scheduled for June 15, but Israel derailed those talks with a surprise attack and, in the process, assassinated the Iranian official overseeing those negotiations.

Fourth, Binyamin Netanyahu should not be dictating U.S. foreign and military policy. Trump's attack on Iran would not have occurred if Israel had not launched an illegal, unprovoked, surprise attack on Iran on June 13, sabotaging U.S. diplomatic efforts.

If the people of Israel support Netanyahu's decision to start a war with Iran, that is their business. That is their war. The United States should not be part of it.

Fifth, the United States should not be allied with the Netanyahu government in any military effort. Netanyahu is a war criminal indicted by the International Criminal Court for starving and killing civilians in Gaza. His government is systematically destroying the Palestinian people, killing over 55,000 and wounding nearly 130,000—two-thirds of whom are women and children.

Israel has destroyed the entire physical infrastructure of Gaza—housing, hospitals, schools, and water systems—and continues to prevent the delivery of humanitarian aid to starving civilians in violation of U.S. and international law.

Sixth, this war is about more than Israel and Iran. It is about the very concept of international law and preventing a world where every dispute is settled with force. Whatever you think of the brutal, authoritarian, and terrorist-supporting Iranian regime, Netanyahu's surprise attack was a clear violation of international law and the U.N. Charter.

The world appropriately condemned Russia for its unprovoked attack against Ukraine. The world appropriately condemned Hamas for their unprovoked terrorist attack against Israel. Israel should be condemned for its unprovoked attack against Iran, and the United States should not be part of that illegal action.

Finally, wars are expensive. We need funding to address the healthcare crisis, the childcare crisis, the education crisis, and many other crises our people face every day. We should be investing our resources in improving life for

the American people, not wasting money on illegal and unnecessary wars.

Last year alone, the United States provided \$22 billion in military aid to Israel. Enough is enough. It is beyond absurd that we continue to finance Israel's wars, while neglecting the needs of our own people.

Mr. President, for all of these reasons, I strongly support Senator KAINE's War Powers Resolution to make clear that only Congress has the power to declare war; that there is no legal basis for war with Iran; and that the American people do not want more unnecessary costly wars.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, this is a debate worthy of the body, and I would like to give my belief about what we are doing here—my opinion.

Senator KAINE has introduced a resolution that basically requires President Trump to come to the Congress before any other military actions can be taken against the Islamic Republic of Iran. I think that would be a disaster for the country. You can only have one Commander in Chief, not 535.

Mr. President, you have been in it. You have been right close to the face of the enemy, and you, probably above all others, know what warfare is like dealing with radical Islam, and I applaud your service as a Navy SEAL.

So it says in the Constitution:

The President shall be [the] Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into actual Service of the United States.

Well, they left out the Air Force because, back then, we didn't have one.

Since the founding of this country, it has been understood that the Commander in Chief can act as the Commander in Chief to protect our Nation from threats; that he is in charge of the military. He sits atop of the—he is the civilian in charge of the military, and it is his decision to use military force.

It is Congress's decision to declare war. How many times do you think we have declared war since the founding of our Nation?

I will give you the answer: Five.

Just think about all of the military conflicts that have existed in the history of our country, and we have only declared war five times: the War of 1812, the Mexican-American War, the Spanish-American War against Spain, World War I, and World War II.

So to my colleagues, if Congress has only declared war five times, does that mean all of these other military operations are illegal? No. That is ridiculous.

Because we have power to declare war—us, the Congress only—it doesn't mean the Commander in Chief can't be Commander in Chief.

This country cannot be put in a legal state of war unless the Congress decides to do that, but to suggest that means the Commander in Chief can't

do anything without our approval makes all of us Commanders in Chief.

Do you think they had that in mind? Do you think they really meant for the Congress to be the Commander in Chief, not the Commander in Chief?

The logic of this is as follows: Because we have the ability to declare war, therefore, the President can't act unless we agree. You have taken his power to be Commander in Chief away.

The War Powers Act of 1973, referenced by Senator SANDERS, is not worth, in my view, the paper it was written on. It was an effort by the Congress back then to limit President Nixon's involvement in the Vietnam war.

The way you do that constitutionally is that Congress has the power of the purse. If we don't like what a President is doing in terms of military engagement, we can stop the funding for that engagement.

Just think of the chaos that would ensue in this country if there were not one Commander in Chief but 535, and we had to sit down and talk among ourselves and debate as to whether or not we should go forward with the military operation in question. That would paralyze this country.

And this leak of the defense intelligence assessment tells you exactly what would happen if they brought this problem over to us to solve.

So it has been clear to me that only five times in the history of the country have we declared war, and we have had hundreds of military operations that the Founders never envisioned. The ability to declare war means the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief, cannot act unless we agree because that makes us the Commander in Chief. And that is not what they were trying to do.

They were trying to make sure the country could not go into a legal situation involving war without the body as a whole making that decision. But when it comes to how to use the military, when to use the military, we have a single person who does that. That is the Commander in Chief, and that person can be limited by Congress's ability to cut off funding for military operations they don't approve of.

So the War Powers Act, I think from its very founding, is unconstitutional, but this is a case study of the chaos that would be created if we accepted the proponents' version of this: that President Trump would have to come to the Congress as a whole before he decided to strike the next nuclear facility that maybe we don't know about, or there is some imminent threat to our troops in the region.

That is just not practical, and that is not what the Founders meant. They put a single person in charge of the military, and that was the President of the United States. They made sure that going to war was a group decision. And in this country, we have used that process five times in 250 years.

So not only did President Trump have the constitutional authority to

engage in Operation Midnight Hammer; it was an incredible success.

If you look up "obliterate" in the dictionary, it means to destroy utterly and wipe out. These three facilities were destroyed utterly, and they were wiped out. They were obliterated.

Now that doesn't mean that the threat from Iran is over. The desire of the regime still exists, and we will have to deal with Iran down the road. But on this vote, I think, we all need to vote no because what we are doing here, if we don't watch it, is having 535 Commanders in Chief. That would paralyze this country.

But something, maybe, we can agree on very quickly: Since the attack, the Iranian regime has gone on a terror campaign against their own people. They have arrested at least 700 people for ties to Israel. Dozens of people been hanged. They were basically drug out of their houses and hanged.

"Iran turns to internal crackdown in wake of 12-day war."

I will be doing a resolution condemning this regime's action. What they are doing is they are trying to maintain power over their people after this attack. People in Iran are getting fed up with the Ayatollah. Instead of listening to the people and changing the behavior of the regime, the regime is engaged in a terror campaign of extrajudicial killings, imprisonment, and beatings to suppress the people. And I think this body and the civilized world should condemn what is going on in Iran right now.

As to negotiations to solve the Iranian nuclear ambitions, to try to get a deal with Iran that we can all live with, count me in for that. But you have got to remember, the people you are negotiating with, as you talk to them, are killing their own people to try to keep them in control.

I have got one idea. Before we negotiate with Iran, they need to say one thing: We don't like Israel. We don't agree with Israel. But we recognize the right of the State of Israel to exist.

The policy of the Iranian regime is to destroy the State of Israel, purify Islam, and come after us, the infidels. Until they change that policy, nothing is really going to work.

So what I want to hear, before we sit down and talk to the Ayatollah and his henchmen, is that, for the first time ever since the founding of the Iranian regime, they recognize Israel's right to exist. Is that too much to ask?

Finally, this is the 80th anniversary of the end of World War II. Eighty years ago this past month, the Nazis surrendered. And one of the hallmarks of the Nazi regime was to kill all the Jews. Eighty years later, we are having a debate about a regime that wants a nuclear weapon to kill all the Jews, and we are wondering what to do.

You know what we should do? We should make sure they can't kill all the Jews. We should make sure that this homicidal maniac, the Ayatollah, who is a religious Nazi, is not allowed

to get a nuclear weapon and reign havoc on the region and come after us.

It is hard to believe that 80 years later, we would be having this debate: What should we do?

To my good friend Senator SANDERS, your solution will lead to World War III. You will appease evil.

World War II happened because people like Senator SANDERS did not stand up to Hitler. They did not choose wisely, and they did not stop him when they could. That is exactly what is going on now.

Until this religious Nazi regime gives up their desire to destroy the State of Israel, to wreak havoc on the region, and to come after us, chanting "Death to America," then we should stand up to them. I am not advocating invading Iran, but I am advocating being tough—no sanctions relief and don't reward this behavior.

Vote no to Senator KAINE's proposal. Stand up for the Constitution as it has been implemented for over 250 years. And all of us pray for the Iranian people and for our friends in Israel that better days are ahead. And these better days only come with sacrifice.

And as I speak, people in Iran are sacrificing because they just want to live free.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I rise today to oppose this unhelpful resolution. It is a clear attempt to take a slap at President Trump and nothing more.

President Trump's foreign policy successes have been several and should be celebrated not denigrated. For instance, recently his work when India and Pakistan started fighting, he got involved, and he had that shut down pretty quickly.

This morning, I had the good fortune to attend, with Secretary Rubio, an event at the State Department where a peace agreement was signed between Rwanda and the Congo. Both Rwanda and the Congo were effusive in their compliments of President Trump for negotiating the peace that happened.

So the President has been hard at work trying to be the President of peace that he really wants to be. First, I think that we ought to have a good statement from the administration as to why this resolution is not well-taken, and I am going to quote from the Executive Office of the President their statement on the policy.

S.J. Res. 59 fails to account for the dynamic security threat posed by Iran and its proxies and our commitments to force protection in the region.

On June 12, the International Atomic Agency Board of Governors found that Iran had failed to comply with its nuclear safeguards obligations. Iran immediately responded stating that it would establish a new uranium enrichment facility in a secure location and that other measures were being planned.

Israel took action against Iran, an action it believed was necessary for its self-defense.

The United States' top priority is protecting American forces in the region. President Trump will take all necessary steps to protect our forces, deescalate conflict, and remain in close contact with our regional partners.

S.J. Res. 59 should be rejected also because it purports to limit the President's article II authority under the Constitution and could hinder the President's ability in his constitutional role as Commander in Chief to protect the United States from the continued threat posed by Iran and its proxies.

S.J. Res. 59 also could hinder the President's ability to protect the United States' forces in the region through actions to deescalate the threat posed by Iran and its proxies.

The operative part of this resolution that is before us states:

Congress hereby directs the President to terminate the use of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran.

This might be appropriate if we were at war against Iran or, indeed, if there were hostilities against Iran, but we are not, and we do not intend to. You can't terminate something that is not going on. Every American is opposed to the long, drawn-out conflicts that we have, in our history, from time to time, experienced. I assure you that President Trump feels exactly the same way. He hates those long, drawn-out conflicts. He hates any kind of kinetic action but realizes that as Commander in Chief he has to take them at times.

The President did take a single strike against Iran at carefully calculated targets and in an even more carefully calculated time, much like what he did with General Soleimani in his first term that was so successful.

The strike on Iran was a single, brief strike at three nuclear bomb facilities that ended the conflict between Israel and Iran. It was on behalf of a close ally, Israel, and on behalf of the world, which is unanimously against Iran obtaining a nuclear weapon.

Most importantly, it ended a war; it did not start a war. If the United States or Donald Trump or any other President sought to declare war on Iran, this would be well-taken. The Constitution is clear that only this body, the Congress of the United States, can declare war, but the Constitution and statutes are equally clear that the President not only may but must act to defend America and Americans at a time or place that a threat presents itself.

Congress has also spoken on the power of the President in the War Powers Act. Now, we have heard a lot on the floor today about how important the Founding Fathers thought declaration of war was. They were absolutely right. It is just as right today as it was then. There is a lot of difference between then and now. Then we had oceans protecting us on each side, and for a war to take place, it took months to unfold and to start.

In today's world, it is the press of a button, and it happens instantaneously. That is why Congress went in

and passed the War Powers Act that gave the President the opportunity to defend America, and in that act, it provided things that the President had to do. He complied with that act exactly as it was put in place by Congress when he took the single-strike act against Iran.

Also, the Justice Department has opined to Republican and Democrat Presidents and created the precedent as to when the President could use power. This strike is in full compliance with that guidance. The guidance is very simple. No. 1, if the President is going to take action, it must, No. 1, be in the national interest and, No. 2, be limited in nature, scope, and duration. And, of course, that is further modified by the action that Congress has taken in the War Powers Act.

What this President did with this single strike was in full compliance with the constitutional statutes. Both open-source reporting and the classified briefing we received demonstrated this was a brilliant tactical move, which was brilliantly planned and executed after in-depth conversations with the intelligence community and the talented array of Presidential advisers that President Trump has.

My colleague on the other side of the aisle should do what we on our side of the aisle have been doing, and that is congratulate the President and the brave men and women who conceived and executed this spectacularly successful event and thank them and recognize that this ended the conflict between Israel and Iran.

Instead what we have seen is an attempt in every way to denigrate the action, downplay it, and berate this great and glorious victory. This resolution we have before us today is another sad attempt in that regard.

I understand that the hate and vitriol against our President precipitates this kind of thinking. It is wrong. This is ill-conceived and will telegraph that we Americans do not stand with our President or with Israel. That is also wrong.

Make no mistake, Iran is all alone in this. No one is coming to help them. This body, above all, should not be the entity that provides aid and comfort to Iran.

I urge a "no" vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, the remaining two speakers and Senator SCHUMER have yielded their time to me. I will be the last speaker before the vote.

My colleague from Idaho says this is driven by hate and vitriol toward President Trump. He well knows that from my first months in the Senate, I have taken this position, now, against four Presidents, Democratic and Republicans.

The principles that have been stated on this floor about the Constitution and War Powers Resolution are very,

very clear. Congress declares war. Once declared, the President is the Commander in Chief. There is no war without a declaration of Congress.

The President, as Commander in Chief, can defend the United States against imminent attack, but there was no such imminent threat posed by the Iranian nuclear program, as the President's own National Security Advisor testified to Congress shortly before this strike.

And as the Israeli Foreign Minister announced before the U.S. strike, that the Israeli actions had set the nuclear program back 2 or 3 years. No imminent attack on the United States, no imminent threat, that means Congress gets to declare war.

This is not about hatred for any President; it is about standing up and doing what we took an oath to do. My colleague from South Carolina says we have only declared war five times, ending with World War II. That is not accurate.

Congress has had the guts to at least vote on authorizing war up through 2002. But in 2002 something happened in this body; the Senate and the House got lied into a war with bogus intelligence about the weapons program of the nation of Iraq. We should be haunted by that. We should be haunted by that.

The claims that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction led us into a war where thousands of troops and thousands of U.S. contractors were killed. And so what should have been the learning that came out of that is that we should do a good job kicking the tires, as Congress, before we go into a war and not get lied into a war. Instead, what I fear, since there has been no willingness of Congress to vote on any war since 2002, is what Members of this body have decided is, Wow, we got it wrong. We were lied into a war. We voted in a way that we regretted so let's not vote at all. Let's not vote at all. Let's overturn the congressional and constitutional history that says we only go to war with Congress and try to hide in the grass.

Many of my colleagues have said things about Iran and how bad Iran is. None of them have ever introduced an authorization for war against Iran. If Iran is so bad, do that.

People in this body would rather not vote so they can't be held accountable. I get that. That is a human impulse. It is just a human impulse that so disrespects the service of our men and women in uniform. If we are going to send troops into harm's way, our sons and daughters, whether they are flying bombing missions or ground troops or covert operations, we ought to have the guts in this body to cast a vote saying that that war is necessary, not just act as cheerleaders and hide from culpability, hide from accountability, hide from responsibility.

If you vote against S.J. Res. 59, what you are saying is this President should be able to wage war without coming to

Congress. If you think the President should have to come to Congress, whether you are for or against the war in Iran, you will support S.J. Res. 59. You will support the Constitution that has stood the test of time. You will support your oath.

I urge a positive vote on the resolution.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on agreeing to the motion to discharge S.J. Res. 59.

Mr. KAINE. 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 senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 328 Leg.]

YEAS—47

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

NAYS—53

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

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORENO). The majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent, but had I been present, I would have voted yes on rollcall vote No. 322, on the cloture motion—Motion to Invoke Cloture: Daniel

Zimmerman, of North Carolina, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

I was necessarily absent, but had I been present, I would have voted yes on rollcall vote No. 323, on the nomination—Confirmation: Daniel Zimmerman, of North Carolina, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

I was necessarily absent, but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall vote No. 324, on the cloture motion—Motion to Invoke Cloture: Paul Dabbar, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of Commerce.

I was necessarily absent, but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall vote No. 325, on the nomination—Confirmation: Paul Dabbar, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of Commerce.

I was necessarily absent, but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall vote No. 326, on the cloture motion—Motion to Invoke Cloture: Kenneth Kies, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

S.J. RES. 59

Mr. OSSOFF. Mr. President, on Saturday, June 21, 2025, at President Trump's direction, U.S. forces struck certain nuclear facilities in Iran. As I stated this week in the Intelligence Committee: Those strikes having been taken, I certainly hope they were effective. Most of the Congress is united in our conviction that Iran must not build or acquire a nuclear weapon. An urgent unanswered question is whether the administration's use of force meaningfully advanced that longstanding foreign policy objective. Members of Congress are seeking further information from the administration in order to determine whether these strikes were effective.

Tonight, I voted to discharge S.J. Res. 59 from the Foreign Relations Committee. Such discharge would require the Senate to debate whether congressional authorization should be required for any further offensive military action against Iran. Given the stakes for U.S. national security, the safety of military servicemembers we represent, and the security of our allies, Senators owe the American people that debate, consistent with our constitutional role in the formation of U.S. foreign policy.

The administration has argued that last Saturday's strikes were within the President's inherent article II authorities as Commander in Chief. That debate is not relevant to Senator KAINE's S.J. Res. 59, which would pertain to future military action.

Indeed, the question for the Senate tonight was not whether the President's use of force to date has been legal and constitutional or whether the strikes themselves were necessary and effective. The question was: Should the Senate robustly debate whether any future offensive military action should require congressional approval? Given the stakes for our national security

and our constituents who serve in the Armed Forces, I regret that Senators refused to bring this measure to the floor for debate.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING THE FINAL AIDS/LIFECYCLE RIDE

• Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. President, I rise today to honor and congratulate the riders, roadies, staff, and organizers of the final AIDS/LifeCycle ride, a monumental journey from San Francisco to Los Angeles that has, for over two decades, raised critical funds and awareness in the fight against HIV and AIDS.

This ride has never been just about the 545 miles; it has been about hope, remembrance, and action. With each pedal stroke, riders have carried forward the legacy of those lost to AIDS, stood in solidarity with those living with HIV, and worked to ensure a future where no one suffers from this disease.

This year marks the end of an era. For 30 years, the San Francisco AIDS Foundation and the Los Angeles LGBT Center have partnered to organize this ride, and their leadership has transformed it into one of the world's most powerful displays of community, resilience, and compassion. Together, these two organizations have not only raised tens of millions of dollars, but have also provided direct services, prevention education, and lifesaving care to countless individuals across California and beyond.

I was proud to join AIDS/LifeCycle first as a Congressman in 2014 and even prouder to join it as a U.S. Senator representing California.

Each time, I was deeply moved by the strength, compassion, and unwavering commitment of the riders, roadies, staff, and volunteers who made this experience truly unforgettable. It was a privilege to ride alongside thousands who gave their time, energy, and hearts to this cause. To the riders who trained and sacrificed, to the roadies who made the journey possible, and to the countless volunteers and donors who fueled this mission: Thank you. You have made history. And your impact will be felt for generations.

Though this may be the final 545 ride, the movement it inspired will continue. The spirit of AIDS/LifeCycle—one of unity, determination, and love—lives on in the ongoing fight for health equity, LGBTQ+ rights, and a future free of HIV.●

TRIBUTE TO HELEN PARKE

• Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I rise to celebrate Helen Parke of Dover, FL, and recognize her 100th birthday. Helen was born on July 7, 1925, in St. Louis, MO, and it was there that she met and married Roy Parke, Jr., in 1943.

After World War II, she worked alongside her husband on a dairy farm

in Pennsylvania. In 1957, they moved to Dover, FL, to join her father-in-law, who had purchased 10 acres of land for a strawberry farm.

What began as 10 acres of strawberry crop has grown to over 300 acres of strawberries, blackberries, vegetables, and cattle. From a small farm, it has grown to include the legendary Parkesdale Farm Market, which garners lines of visitors, including myself, that come from all over to taste their world-famous strawberry shortcake. It has also expanded to include a plant nursery and a packing/cooling facility that was added under the Parkesdale Farms banner.

Any who have had the opportunity to visit Parkesdale Farms can attest to the hard work and legacy of Helen and her family. Helen has been key to the farm's success and operations; she has hoed plants, packed berries, picked squash, and is a well-known fixture at the market, the nursery, and, of course, the annual Strawberry Festival.

She is rightly very proud of what started as a 10-acre farm and has grown and diversified so much, but she is also a proud mother to 5 children, grandmother to 10, and great-grandmother to 22.

Helen has had a very busy and "fruitful" 100 years of life. She has had a lasting impact on the State of Florida, and I wish her happiness for many more birthdays to come.●

TRIBUTE TO GIFFORD H. ORMES, JR.

• Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, on behalf of the people of Mississippi, I commend Gifford H. Ormes, Jr., for his military service and lifelong dedication to his community.

Mr. Ormes served with distinction in the U.S. Air Force for 24 years. He was deployed primarily in the Far East, completing multiple tours in Japan, Thailand, and Vietnam, and he completed a unique assignment in the Khyber Pass near the border of Pakistan and Afghanistan. Mr. Ormes was later retrained as a cost analyst. He worked briefly in that capacity before being called back into a special assignment, this time to the Elmendorf Air Force Base in Alaska. To this day, Mr. Ormes bears the marks of his sacrificial service. During his career, he was exposed to Agent Orange. The Department of Veterans Affairs recognized him as 100-percent disabled from his exposure to the toxin.

After retiring from the Air Force, Mr. Ormes remained active. He earned a degree from William Carey University and transitioned to a civilian role at the Navy Seabee Base in Gulfport, MS, where he worked for 16 years before retiring once again.

Mr. Ormes military service is complemented by his dedication to his family and community. At Keesler Air Force Base, in Biloxi, MS, Mr. Ormes met the woman who would become his

wife. To this day, they have shared 57 years of marriage. Mr. Ormes is an active member of the Bridge United Methodist Church in D'Iberville, MS, where he leads courses to introduce people to the Christian faith and to strengthen marriage. He is also involved with the Backpack Buddies program, supporting food-insecure children by organizing and delivering nutritious food through church outreach efforts.

I join my fellow Mississippians in thanking Gifford Ormes, Jr., for his exceptional service to his country and community.●

RECOGNIZING THE GRAND GULF NUCLEAR STATION

• Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize and commend the Grand Gulf Nuclear Station in Port Gibson, MS, on the occasion of its 40th anniversary of commercial operation. As the largest single-unit nuclear power reactor in the United States, Grand Gulf stands as a pillar of reliable and resilient nuclear energy production, for Mississippi and for the entire region.

Since beginning operations on July 1, 1985, Grand Gulf has delivered nearly 1,500 megawatts of carbon-free electricity, enough to power over 800,000 homes. It is the only nuclear power plant in the State and currently supplies approximately 16 percent of Mississippi's total power generation. Its legacy is not only measured in megawatts but also in its role as a driver of economic development, technological excellence, and environmental stewardship.

Grand Gulf's contributions to Mississippi's economy are substantial. The plant pays nearly \$30 million in State and local taxes annually and brings in an additional 800 skilled contractors during routine maintenance and refueling periods—supporting local jobs and businesses. The Mississippi State Senate recently passed a resolution honoring Grand Gulf for its sustained service and economic impact to the State of Mississippi.

At the heart of Grand Gulf's success are its people. I would like to recognize the team of over 750 highly trained nuclear professionals that operate and service the plant. Grand Gulf's team has cultivated a culture of safety, continuous improvement, and community service. The station maintains some of the highest safety standards in the industry, with redundant safety systems and rigorous employee training.

Beyond its critical energy mission, Grand Gulf is also a valued community partner. In 2023, the plant donated more than \$120,000 to local causes and logged nearly 4,000 hours of volunteer service. In 2024, more than 1,600 students visited the station to learn about careers in nuclear energy, opening doors for the next generation of skilled professionals.

In an era when reliable, resilient, and emissions-free electricity is more critical than ever, Grand Gulf continues to lead by example. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Grand Gulf team on 40 years of excellence and thanking them for their enduring service to Mississippi, our communities, and the Nation.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Alli, 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. 275. An act to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to publish on a monthly basis the number of special interest aliens encountered attempting to unlawfully enter the United States, and for other purposes.

H.R. 875. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that aliens who have been convicted of or who have committed an offense for driving while intoxicated or impaired are inadmissible and deportable.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medals awarded under the Harlem Hellfighters Congressional Gold Medal Act.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker has signed the following:

H.R. 42. An act to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to exclude certain payments to aged, blind, or disabled Alaska Natives or descendants of Alaska Natives from being used to determine eligibility for certain programs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 43. An act to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to provide that Village Corporations shall not be required to convey land in trust to the State of Alaska for the establishment of Municipal Corporations, and for other purposes.

H.R. 618. An act to amend the Apex Project, Nevada Land Transfer and Authorization Act of 1989 to include the City of North Las Vegas and the Apex Industrial Park Owners Association, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2215. An act to redesignate the Salem Maritime National Historic Site as the "Salem Maritime National Historical Park", and for other purposes.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

At 7:09 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 bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1. An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of H. Con. Res. 14.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 275. An act to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to publish on a monthly basis the number of special interest aliens encountered attempting to unlawfully enter the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 875. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that aliens who have been convicted of or who have committed an offense for driving while intoxicated or impaired are inadmissible and deportable; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 1. An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of H. Con. Res. 14.

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-1201. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Hagerstown, MD" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2025-0606)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1202. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Nappanee, IN" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2025-0776)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1203. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Mineral Wells, TX; Correction" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2024-2529)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1204. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Ipeco Holdings Limited Pilot and Co-Pilot Seats; Amendment 39-23060" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2025-1101)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1205. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Iron Mountain Kingsford, MI" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2025-0775)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1206. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of

Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Fargo, ND" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2025-0670)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1207. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Chambersburg, PA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2025-0609)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1208. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D Airspace; Jupiter, FL" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2025-0107)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1209. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D Airspace and Establishment of Class E Airspace; Little Rock, AR" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2025-0433)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1210. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Engines; Amendment 39-23066" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-2712)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1211. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39-23001" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-1301)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1212. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Blue Hill, ME" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2025-0129)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1213. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Robinson Helicopter Company Helicopters; Amendment 39-23053" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2025-0011)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1214. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Israel Aircraft Industries

Ltd. Airplanes; Amendment 39-23050" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2025-0915)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1215. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39-23054" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2025-0207)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1216. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39-23035" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2025-0211)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1217. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1218. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Textron Aviation, Inc. (Type Certificate Previously Held by Cessna Aircraft Company) Airplanes; Amendment 39-23055" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2025-0334)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1219. A communication from the Legal Advisor, Space Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Assessment and Collection of Space and Earth Station Regulatory Fees for Fiscal Year 2024" (FCC 25-31) (MD Docket No. 24-85)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1220. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances (24-2.5e)" ((RIN2070-AB27) (FRL No. 12348-02-OCSPP)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1221. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Technical Amendment to the List of OMB Approvals Under the Paperwork Reduction Act" (FRL No. 12001-01-OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1222. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS) Program: Partial Waiver of

2024 Cellulosic Biofuel Volume Requirement" ((RIN2060-AW46) (FRL No. 12015-02-OAR)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1223. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Delegation of Authority to Oklahoma" (FRL No. 12482-02-R6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1224. 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. 12746-04-R8)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1225. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources and Emission Guidelines for Existing Sources: Other Solid Waste Incineration Units Review" ((RIN2060-AU60) (FRL No. 7547-02-OAR)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1226. 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; New York; Fuel Composition and Use" (FRL No. 10180-02-R2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1227. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Determination to Defer Sanctions; California; Eastern Kern Air Pollution Control District; Stationary Combustion Turbines" (FRL No. 12608-02-R9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1228. A communication from the Associate Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fee Schedules, Fee Recovery for Fiscal Year 2025" (RIN3150-AK95) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 24, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1229. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Notice of Intent to Remove 26 CFR 1.6011-18; Waiver of Penalties under Sections 6707A(a), 6707(a), and 6708; Withdrawal of Notice 2024-54" (Notice 2025-23) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2025; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1230. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extension and Modification of Transitional Relief Under Sections 3403, 3406, 6721, 6722, 6651, and 6656 with Respect to the Reporting of Information and Backup With-

holding on Digital Assets by Brokers under Section 6045" (Notice 2025-33) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2025; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1231. A communication from the Acting Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Part D Plans Generally Include Drugs Commonly Used By Dual-Eligible Enrollees: 2025"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1232. 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 the United Kingdom in the amount of \$1,000,000 (Transmittal No. DDTC 24-090) received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1233. 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 Norway in the amount of \$1,000,000 (Transmittal No. DDTC 24-110) received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1234. 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 amendment for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services to the United Kingdom in the amount of \$100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 25-005) received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1235. A communication from the Senior Bureau Official, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed transfer of major defense equipment with an original acquisition value of approximately \$270,000,000 to the Government of Romania's Armed Forces (Transmittal No. RSAT 25-10998) received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1236. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2025; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1237. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Oversight and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Reporting to the National Practitioner Data Bank" (RIN2900-AR83) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2025; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. KAINE, Mr.

BLUMENTHAL, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. SMITH, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 2201. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit panic defenses based on sexual orientation or gender identity or expression; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 2202. A bill to modify the responsibilities and authorities of the Director of National Intelligence, to reform the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, and for other purposes; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE:

S.J. Res. 60. 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 "Emissions Budget and Allowance Allocations for Indiana Under the Revised Cross-State Air Pollution Rule Update"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 317

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGOS) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 317, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and extend the deduction for charitable contributions for individuals not itemizing deductions.

S. 383

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 383, a bill to extend Federal Pell Grant eligibility of certain short-term programs.

S. 623

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 623, a bill to prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from using assessments generated by the Integrated Risk Information System as a tier 1 data source in rulemakings and other regulatory, enforcement, or permitting actions, and for other purposes.

S. 749

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 749, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend increased dependency and indemnity compensation paid to surviving spouses of veterans who die from amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, regardless of how long the veterans had such disease prior to death, and for other purposes.

S. 1555

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1555, a bill to increase loan limits for loans made to

small manufacturers, and for other purposes.

S. 1763

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1763, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the 7-year recovery period for motorsports entertainment complexes.

S. 1911

At the request of Mr. RICKETTS, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1911, a bill to amend the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to codify the Panel of Health Advisors within the Congressional Budget Office, and for other purposes.

S. 1926

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1926, a bill to encourage reduction of disposable plastic products in units of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 307

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 307, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate in support of the recent United States and Israeli military strikes on Iran.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO OBJECT TO PROCEEDING

I, Senator RICHARD J. DURBIN, intend to object to proceeding to the nomination of David Metcalf, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for the term of four years, dated June 27, 2025.

I, Senator RICHARD J. DURBIN, intend to object to proceeding to the nomination of Bart McKay Davis, of Idaho, to be United States Attorney for the District of Idaho for the term of four years, dated June 27, 2025.

I, Senator RICHARD J. DURBIN, intend to object to proceeding to the nomination of Ronald A. Parsons, Jr., of South Dakota, to be United States Attorney for the District of South Dakota for the term of four years, dated June 27, 2025.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

ONE BIG BEAUTIFUL BILL

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor to talk about debt and the challenge that confronts us.

Over the last few decades, we have seen a lot of sources of red ink. Among them are the war in Afghanistan, the war in Iraq. We saw the first Bush tax bill in 2001, massive red ink; 2003, massive red ink; Trump's tax bill in 2017, an ocean of red ink. I don't think anyone here would argue that these decisions didn't result in significant defi-

cits and significant additions to the debt.

Yet there is so much conversation here about fiscal responsibility and let's get this under control. Yet we see time and time again this body vote, under Republican leadership, for another ocean of red ink, another massive deficit, adding to an already bloated debt that so profoundly compromises the ability of our Nation to address issues in the next generation.

We are borrowing from the next generation, making it less likely that we can effectively provide the programs, the foundation of healthcare and housing and education and the investment in R&D that produces good-paying jobs for the next generation to thrive.

That is wrong. It is wrong to proceed to borrow and compromise the next generation in order to give tax breaks to billionaires. Wow.

You know, there are purposes for when we do need to borrow: when we are facing a recession and when we are facing a war. But we haven't been in a recession. We haven't been at war; although, we clearly had an attack on Iran. Maybe we are at war now, maybe not. We will see if the cease-fire holds. But we are not in a position yet where we should be proceeding to say this current year we should be creating even more deficits.

But the bill before us doesn't create this massive new additional ocean of red ink for the purpose of addressing a war nor to address a recession but, instead, for the lofty purpose of enriching the richest Americans.

I must say that driving 16 million people off of healthcare to give tax breaks to megamillionaires and billionaires may make the megamillionaires and billionaires who are serving in this Chamber quite happy, but it doesn't make America better.

I must say that leaving 4 million children hungry has a devastating impact on their ability to study and learn and thrive in their lives to come. And to do it for tax breaks for billionaires may make my colleagues who are really rich really happy, but it is really wrong.

In addition, my colleagues just aren't creating a sea of debt; they are also cutting down the bipartisan structure designed for Congress to exercise discipline over deficits and debt.

That architecture was crafted in 1974, the Budget and Impoundment Control Act, normally referred to as the Budget Act, the 1974 Act. It came about because two things were going on: One is that President Nixon had impounded funds, and the Supreme Court said, no, you can't do that. That is unconstitutional. You can't steal the power of the purse. In the Constitution, that power of the purse is given to Congress.

Senators were very concerned about the deficits that were existing in 1971, and 1972, and 1973. They averaged \$20 billion a year. They totaled \$60 billion. I can tell you that now when our deficit is running at something closer to

\$2 trillion a year, \$20 billion doesn't sound like much of a cause for alarm. But that is how determined 100 Senators were to get control over our budgeting process. All hundred voted for this structure, the Budget Control Act.

It had two basic features. It had a regular budgeting process, and then, for legislation that reduced the deficit, it had a special, fast-track, filibuster-free lane called reconciliation. But you could only use it for reducing the deficit.

That special, fast-track, filibuster-free lane really meant a lot here in the Senate because we are the ones who have the 60-vote requirement. The House doesn't have a requirement for 60 votes, for three-fifths of the body on anything. So it was really all about here, about the Senate's sense that we should only drop to 60 votes for bills that reduced the deficit.

Embedded in this were three fundamental provisions, three pillars of the architecture of getting control of deficits and debt. The first was that in the first 10 years that are presented in a reconciliation bill, the sum of the 10 years has to produce deficit reduction. That was pillar No. 1.

The second pillar was that in every single year that follows the first 10, it has to produce deficit reduction. It has to save money.

And the third was honest numbers. We are going to use honest numbers. We are going to create this organization, the Congressional Budget Office, and we are going to utilize it to cost out programs, do the modeling, be non-partisan. Then we are going to utilize this other organization that already existed, the Joint Committee on Taxation, to have their staff produce honest, nonpartisan numbers for the cost of revenue provisions.

The section of the law that controls this special reconciliation process says each provision, whether for a spending program or for revenue, has to be costed out in order to be able to hold ourselves accountable. If the provision is written down and it changes the law, how much will that cost? If the provision is not in the law, not in the proposed law, then, obviously, that is different than if the provision is in the law. New law versus existing law, that is what section 313 says is going to be costed out to see if we are meeting the goals laid out in the budget resolution. That is the discipline.

Those were the three things: No deficits created in the first 10 years; second, no deficits created in any year following the first 10 years; and, third, honest numbers about what each provision costs. Those are the three things.

Well, that was in 1974. You can picture Robert Byrd, who was a passionate defender of the 60-vote requirement, but he voted for this special, fast-track, filibuster-free lane for that one purpose: reducing deficits.

That was 1974. Well, 22 years later, along comes a moment when you have

a Republican Senate and a Republican House. And the Republicans said: Do you know what, we like this idea of a line-item veto, so they passed it. Fine. But the Supreme Court said that is unconstitutional because the Constitution says the power of the purse lies with Congress, not with the President—something that our current Office of Management and Budget and our Director of Management and Budget doesn't like and is contesting and told me he wants the Supreme Court to overrule what it ruled back then.

The second idea was to do a balanced budget amendment. But the Republican chair of Appropriations stood up and said: Do you know what, sometimes you need to spend more because of conflict; sometimes you need to spend more because of recession. And so, no, we shouldn't have a formalistic formula. And he refused to vote for it, and the proposal failed one vote short of the 67 it needed.

OK. But then the Republican majority said: But you know, we have got this other idea. We have got all these really rich and powerful corporations and individuals, and we want to give them a massive, beautiful tax cut and make them even more richer and powerful. They will love us, and they will keep us in power. What a win-win, to give away the Treasury to the richest people in this country.

But they had a problem. There was no filibuster-free, fast-track lane that allowed creating a deficit.

So what did they do? They fired the Parliamentarian. That is what they did. They brought in a new Parliamentarian, a Parliamentarian who had actually been on the parliamentary team back in 1974, a Parliamentarian who had then left that Parliamentarian team and gone to work for the majority leader and then came back off the majority leader's staff to rule and say: That deal that was crafted with all 100 Senators, we are going to break that deal. We are going to do a nuclear option. We are going to blow it up. We are going to say that this fast track can be used to create deficits in the first 10 years.

So there went pillar 1.

Pillar 2 has survived until now, until this moment: No deficits after the first 10 years.

Pillar 3—use honest numbers—has survived until now: Use the CBO numbers, use the comparison of a provision as described in section 313 and honestly relay what it costs for a program or for a revenue provision.

And I say "until now" because my colleague, whom I love to work with on a number of things, has an idea. And he said: There is a provision not in the section of the law that exists for reconciliation but in the section of the law as it deals with just the regular budget process that was created in 1974 that gives the budget chair some flexibility to solve technical problems, and I think I can use that to simply decree a new baseline so that things that ac-

tually cost a ton of money, we can tell the American people and ourselves they don't cost money.

Well, let's see. Here are some examples: the business passthrough. The Joint Committee on Taxation, passthrough for LLCs, says this revision in the law will cost \$736 billion. My good friend across the aisle says: I want to use a magic baseline to show things cost less. He says: We will use a technique here, some magic math, and tell the people that it only costs \$6 billion, even though the Joint Committee on Taxation tells us it costs \$736 billion, and reduce it to less than 1 percent of the true cost.

Let's take another example. There is a provision that extends the estate and gift tax exemptions. The honest broker, the Joint Committee on Taxation, says putting that provision in the bill will cost, as in increasing deficits and increasing the debt, \$212 billion. But my colleague across the aisle says: I want to tell people it doesn't really cost that—it only costs \$10 billion—by using my baseline as opposed to the honest baseline that we have used ever since 1974 passed, when 100 Senators said: Let's stop using smoke and mirrors and let's use honest numbers.

Or how about the exemptions being expanded for the alternative minimum tax? The cost of that, from the Joint Committee on Taxation: \$1.37 trillion. That is with a "t," trillion—\$1.37 trillion.

My good colleague across the aisle says: Using my magic math and my special baseline, that won't increase the deficit; it will actually reduce the deficit by \$6 billion.

Are you kidding me? We are going to destroy the principle, for 51 years, that we will use honest numbers with ourselves and honest numbers with the American people; and in the process, we are tearing down that second pillar that reconciliation will never be used to extend deficits past the reconciliation window of 10 years—because, you see, that has never been allowed by either party, never done.

In fact, the ruling in 1996, the one that tore down that it can only be used for deficits in the first 10 years, that ruling was explicit in reaffirming the second pillar of no deficits after 10 years.

So we have the plain language of the law. We have 51 years of precedent. We have the ruling from 1996. But my colleague says: I want to use magic math to pretend this bill doesn't cost what it costs.

Well, let's take a closer look at the provision that my colleague, the chair of the Budget Committee, is using. It is called section 312. Let's see how it has been used. Let's see if it has ever been used on reconciliation. Let's see if it has ever been used completely on the breadth of an entire reconciliation bill.

Let's start by asking the question: Has it ever been used in a partisan way? Well, in 2017, Crime Victims

Fund—no, no—a bipartisan decision. In 2023 and 2025, Power Marketing Administration: bipartisan. They were solving a technical issue, both parties working on it together. Preventing double counting of a dairy program: bipartisan. Adjustments to Fiscal Responsibility Act: bipartisan.

It has become traditional to say this power in section 312 rests with the chair of the Budget Committee, but that is not true. The law says it rests with the Budget Committee. The reason we think of it as resting with the chairman is because it has always been done in a bipartisan way, with the Democrats and Republicans together saying: We are solving a problem.

The second question: Has it ever been used on the breadth of a reconciliation bill or only upon a narrow provision? Well, it turns out, in every single case—the Crime Victims Fund, the Power Marketing, the dairy program, the Fiscal Responsibility Act—always a narrow provision. But not now.

How else can we take a look at this? How about if we look at whether it was resolving a technical ambiguity. Yep. Every single time, resolving a technical problem, in bipartisan fashion, narrow provision.

And most importantly, has this provision of 312, which is not in the section that controls reconciliation, ever been used in reconciliation? Nope. Not in 2017, not in 2023 through 2025, not on the dairy program, not on the Fiscal Responsibility Act—not ever. Never used in reconciliation.

So, colleagues, two big issues are here. Are you really going to invoke, for a bill that causes over \$3 trillion in debt over 10 years compared to current law—are you really going to invoke, for a reconciliation bill that, for the first time, continues that “Red Sea” in years 11 through 30—11 years, 30 years out, extending beyond the 10-year window, in direct violation of the ruling of the Parliamentarian in 1996, in direct violation of a section of 313 that says that only—you cannot run deficits after that?

You know, those 30-year estimates, over \$30 trillion of additional debt from this bill. Now, our current debt is pretty high: \$37 trillion. This adds another \$30 trillion-plus.

And the Congressional Budget Office costed out what happens if the interest rates are 1 percent higher than they put in the model—1 percent higher. And of course, it is easy to imagine that we could be off by 1 percent. So 1 percent higher, and the cost isn't \$30 trillion; it is closer to \$60 trillion—1 percent higher—of additional debt over 30 years. They said it would add another \$24 trillion on top of the over \$32 trillion to begin with.

Are you really going to vote for a bill that uses dishonest numbers?

So here is one reason to vote against this bill: It is a massive debt creator,

primarily to give tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans.

Here is the second reason: It tears down programs in healthcare and nutrition that are key to the success of our children and families who are in the 20 percent less affluent in America.

Here is a third reason: It creates debt far into the future, beyond the 10-year window, that will compromise the ability of us to address the challenges of America for decades and decades to come. It is really an attack on the next generation.

Here is a fourth reason: It tears down the framework of accountability, the last two standing pillars, crafted by 100 Senators all voting yes in 1974.

I encourage my colleagues, as they get together in their caucuses on the blue side of the aisle or the red side of the aisle, to say: Let's hold on. This is wrong. This is not what the President campaigned on. He campaigned on being a champion for families—not for billionaires, to screw over families, to make the rich richer. Wow.

Just that extension of the alternative minimum tax is going to cost \$1,368,932,000,000. Wow. In other words, almost \$1.4 trillion. What ordinary family uses an exemption under the alternative minimum tax? It is the megawealthy.

They listed it under chapter 1, which they titled “Tax Relief for Middle Class Families.” Find me a middle-class family in which this alternative tax exemption applies.

So we are just days away from voting on this. We are going through the Byrd bath, in which different policies are examined and, if they are primarily a policy, they are not allowed in here. That was part of the rules that were crafted long ago for the special fast-track reconciliation. Then we have 20 hours of debate, and then we have amendments.

We are very close to the point of making this tragic mistake. And I know that many of my new colleagues who were just recently sworn in, in January, have been folks who said we need fiscal discipline. You can't campaign on fiscal discipline and tell your constituents you are going to uphold that after you take office and then come here and not only vote for this massive debt but tear down, at the same time, the last two pillars of the architecture for controlling deficits this year and into the future. That doesn't square, so don't do it.

I will close by saying this is not the first time we have been down this road. And there are a few myths that people tell themselves to justify this: We will only do this once. In 2001, it was once. In 2003, it was twice; 2017 was the third time.

We are doing the same damn thing again: mortgaging our future and helping increase wealth inequality in this country by doing all these special provisions for really rich people. We have

done it now—this is the fourth time. Don't pretend you are fooled, like you didn't get it, because we have been down this road before. It is the wrong road.

“Families lose, billionaires win” is the wrong mission for America. It is the wrong mission for the U.S. Senate. The right mission is “Families thrive, and billionaires pay their fair share.”

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

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

The majority leader.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 1

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of H. Con. Res. 14.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR SATURDAY, JUNE 28, 2025

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Saturday, June 28; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 2 P.M. TOMORROW

Mr. THUNE. 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 7:33 p.m., adjourned until Saturday, June 28, 2025, at 2 p.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. VICENTE GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 2025

Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend votes due to unforeseen flight delays. Due to my absence, I was not present to vote on Roll Call No. 172, Roll Call No. 173, and Roll Call No. 174.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 172. I support safeguarding the economy and the national security interests of the United States. Global trade must be protected against the rising threat of piracy.

Likewise, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 173. I support expanding the accredited investor eligibility requirements to include individuals with qualifying education and job experience to participate in private investment offerings.

Moreover, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 174. I support initiatives that promote capital-raising opportunities for underserved small businesses and businesses in rural areas.

CONDEMNING THE ATTACKS ON MINNESOTA LAWMAKERS IN BROOKLYN PARK AND CHAMPLIN, MINNESOTA, AND CALLING FOR UNITY AND THE REJECTION OF POLITICAL VIOLENCE IN MINNESOTA AND ACROSS THE UNITED STATES

SPEECH OF

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 2025

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, Minnesota and our Nation suffered an unthinkable tragedy in the early hours of January 14th, when our state's elected officials were attacked in politically-motivated shootings.

Minnesotans are devastated by the assassinations of Speaker Emerita Melissa Hoffman and her husband Mark and the attempted murder of Senator John Hoffman and his wife Yvette. These are shocking and heinous acts of targeted political violence against elected officials. They were clearly intended to instill fear in our communities.

The additional attempt that night to target Senator Ann Rest and Representative Kristin Bahner demonstrate that this tragedy could have been much worse without the swift actions of Minnesota law enforcement personnel. They deserve our deep gratitude for their coordinated actions to apprehend the suspect.

Minnesotans of all political backgrounds must unite to condemn this and all politically motivated acts of violence. In a democracy, we do not respond to acts of public policy with acts of violence motivated by extremism.

The entire House of Representatives—both Democrats and Republicans will stand united to unanimously pass a resolution condemning the politically motivated violence against Speaker Emerita Melissa Hoffman, her husband Mark, and Senator John Hoff and his wife Yvette. We will speak in one voice to unequivocally denounce acts of political violence.

But even as Congress stands together to oppose this attack on our democracy, Minnesotans continue to mourn the unbearable loss of one of our Nation's finest public servants.

I first Melissa Hortman in 1998 when we knocked doors together during her first campaign for public office. Back then, I was a member of the Minnesota House of Representatives and Melissa was a young, determined candidate running in a district that would be difficult for any Democrat to win—but she clearly shared our Minnesota values and demonstrated her ability to form a meaningful connection to her constituents.

She didn't win that race, or the next one, but six years later, in 2004 I was thrilled when she won a seat in the Minnesota House, and was delighted when she was elected Speaker of the House in 2019.

Thanks to the work of Speaker Hoffman, together with Governor Walz and DFL legislators during the 2023 legislative session, Minnesota's students have free meals in school. Families have access to paid family leave. Women's reproductive rights are protected. All Minnesota individuals and families are supported and protected—with no exceptions.

Melissa was the best of Minnesota. She cared about others, treated everyone with dignity and respect, and she knew how to listen and lead. As a public servant and as Speaker of the House, she left Minnesota better than she found it. I will miss her dearly.

As we mourn the loss of Melissa and Mark, our hearts are with their children, Sophie and Colin, and their entire family.

We wish Senator John Hoffman and his wife Yvette a full recovery.

As we come together as a community to heal, may we find comfort in the words of Melissa and Mark's children:

Hope and resilience are the enemy of fear.

INTRODUCTION OF THE APPROPRIATIONS COMPLIANCE AND TRAINING ACT

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 2025

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, today alongside my dear friend and colleague, Ranking Member of the Appropriations Committee ROSA DELAURIO, I introduced a new bill called the Appropriations Compliance and Training Act. Unfortunately, this Administration has repeatedly demonstrated their lack of understanding and respect for the direction provided through the Appropriations process.

The Power of the Purse rests with the Article I branch here in Congress. That is established quite clearly in the Constitution, and it has been repeatedly affirmed by the Supreme Court.

We set policy, we provide direction, and we allocate funds. Then, based on those policies, directions, and allocations, the Article II branch, the Executive branch, can Execute what we, the Congress, dictate on behalf of We the People.

Instead of recognizing our authority, DOGE, Elon Musk, Russell Vought and the rest of the Executive Branch have ignored the will of the people. They withhold funds and cancel projects, they move money from one purpose to another without legal authority, and they just spend the money however they want, regardless of what Congress has directed.

Our legislation requires senior executive branch employees to complete yearly trainings on appropriations law. These trainings would include essential legal topics including: the Purpose Statute, the Antideficiency Act, and the Impoundment Control Act.

The trainings will also include a review of the direction provided by Congress in the annual Appropriations Act regarding each employee's agency so that they are unambiguously instructed of their responsibilities vis-à-vis Congress.

We must ensure that the Executive Branch follows the law and ensures Appropriated and obligated funds are used for their intended purpose.

I urge our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this commonsense legislation.

HONORING RAYAN MALIK

HON. CHUCK EDWARDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 2025

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Rayan Malik for his work as an intern serving in my D.C. office. I would like to take this opportunity to thank him for his hard work and recognize the meaningful contributions he has made to the office this summer.

Rayan is from Islamabad, Pakistan and attends the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Rayan is entering his third year at Wisconsin where he is studying Data Science.

Interns work with staff to serve constituents in North Carolina's 11th Congressional District. Rayan was chosen from a competitive pool of applicants and exceeded every expectation with his positive attitude and impressive work ethic. It was a pleasure to work with Rayan, and I am so proud to have had such an intelligent and ambitious intern representing my office.

Rayan exemplified the spirit of public service and represents the best that our Nation has to offer. I congratulate Rayan on the successful completion of his internship, and thank him on behalf of the people of Western North Carolina.

• 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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 2025

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I was delayed in arriving to the first vote of the vote series on June 10, 2025. Had I been present, I would have voted: YEA on Roll Call No. 162, H.R. 2096.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PAUL TONKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 2025

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 183, and NAY on Roll Call No. 184.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JAKE AUCHINCLOSS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 2025

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, during Roll Call Vote number 183 on H.R. 875, I mistakenly recorded my vote as YES when I should have voted No.

RECOGNIZING BARBARA COLLURA, PRESIDENT AND CEO OF RESOLVE: THE NATIONAL INFERTILITY ASSOCIATION

HON. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 2025

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Barbara Collura, a long-time advocate for family-building equality, who is stepping down after more than 20 years of leadership with RESOLVE: The National Infertility Association.

During her tenure, Barbara's leadership was key to furthering RESOLVE's missions: lifting up the voices of millions of Americans struggling with infertility and fighting to ensure that everyone, regardless of background, income, or geography, can access the care they need to build their families.

Her work included testifying before Congress, meeting with lawmakers and federal agencies, organizing advocates, and working toward a world where infertility is recognized as a disease that deserves attention, compassion, and coverage.

Her tenure has been marked by meaningful policy progress, including expanded insurance coverage for fertility care at the state level, and increased protections for IVF.

As someone who relied on access to IVF to have my twins, I know personally how important it is to raise more awareness about infertility and expand access to fertility treatments. I have been proud to work with RESOLVE under Barbara's leadership to push for com-

mon sense legislation that would offer hope to millions of families struggling with infertility.

At a time when reproductive freedom is under attack, Barbara has stood firm in defense of all paths to parenthood—because infertility is not only part of the reproductive health conversation, but central to it.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Barbara Collura for her extraordinary contributions to the infertility community. Her legacy is one of hope, progress, and an unwavering commitment to the idea that everyone deserves the chance to build a family.

CONGRATULATING DON JOHNSON ON HIS RETIREMENT AS THE CEO OF GOODWILL INDUSTRIES OF CENTRAL ILLINOIS

HON. DARIN LAHOOD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 2025

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize Don Johnson for his decades of dedicated service in the nonprofit sector and his impactful tenure as President and CEO of Goodwill Industries of Central Illinois. In this role, Johnson led the organization to expand workforce development efforts and launched new initiatives aimed at supporting some of the most vulnerable populations in Central Illinois.

Johnson earned his Bachelor of Science from Eastern Illinois University and a Master of Science from Western Illinois University. Before joining Goodwill in 2016, he served as Executive Director of the Hult Center for Healthy Living and as Vice President of Community Investments at the Heart of Illinois United Way. In those roles, he championed data-driven community investments, built expansive volunteer networks, and led public health and education initiatives, including 211, Success by Six, and Supporting Student Access.

During Johnson's tenure at Goodwill, the organization broadened its mission beyond traditional job training and donation-based stores. Under his leadership, Goodwill introduced innovative programs that supported children and families at risk of violence and created a new job placement program for neurodivergent young adults. One of his biggest projects being the expansion of the General Wayne A. Downing Home for Veterans, which helped raise nearly \$1.5 million for the strengthening of services for local veterans.

Don Johnson's tireless leadership and commitment to the non-profit sector has left a lasting impact on Central Illinois. His work has advanced economic opportunity, human dignity, and community well-being. I congratulate Don on his retirement and wish him, his wife Kim, and their two daughters all the best in this next chapter of life.

HONORING PASTOR WARREN STEWART, SR.

HON. GREG STANTON

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 2025

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a remarkable public servant, leader, and civil

rights trailblazer, Pastor Warren Stewart, Sr., on the occasion of his retirement as Senior Pastor at Arizona's First Institutional Baptist Church.

God called Pastor Stewart to Arizona 48 years ago, and he has been speaking truth to power in the state ever since. Each Sunday, Pastor Stewart's sermons and service work inspired Arizonans to better their community and uplift their neighbors. From the helm of Phoenix's oldest African American Baptist church, Pastor Stewart used his platform to advance justice and civil rights across our state. His guiding principle: Jesus and Justice work together.

His advocacy is well illustrated by the battle to establish Martin Luther King, Jr. Day as a state holiday. By 1992, Arizona was the last state refusing to recognize MLK Day, despite the federal holiday being signed into law nearly a decade prior. Pastor Stewart fought to correct this, leading multiple movements to get the holiday initiative on the ballot. He mobilized coalitions across political spectrums, religions, and cultural backgrounds to come together to win this historic, long overdue vote.

As the longest-serving leader of the First Institutional Baptist Church, Pastor Stewart has traveled extensively, preaching in 39 states and territories and 60 countries, and has received many accolades for his contributions to our community and beyond. Following the teachings of the Gospel, his work always focused on the poorest and neediest: immigrants, unsheltered people and veterans, and those suffering from mental health issues.

Pastor Stewart and the Church turned Christian values into action. FIBCO Family Services, Samaritan House for Homeless Families, Ujima House for Unwed Teenage Mothers and their Infants, and the Broadway House, all created under Pastor Stewart, minister to those most in need of compassion and care. FIBCO has become a hallmark in Phoenix's nonprofit scene and has even taken their mission abroad, expanding across Africa.

Pastor Stewart's impressive academic and public service record led to roles as Chair of the National Immigration Forum and President of American Baptist Churches of the Pacific Southwest. He was proclaimed a "State History Maker" by the Arizona Historical Society. Under unanimous direction of the Phoenix City Council, the street in front of the First Institutional Baptist Church was renamed "Dr. Warren H. Stewart Way".

Today, all of Arizona congratulates our very own "living legend" on his well-deserved retirement. Pastor Stewart's career and contributions have cemented him as one of Arizona's greatest religious leaders.

I have personally been blessed to know him as a friend and trusted advisor. He'll be the first to tell you he couldn't have enjoyed such a long career without the love and support of his wife, Reverend Dr. Karen Stewart, and their children and grandchildren. We thank the entire Stewart family for sharing him with us.

I thank Pastor Stewart for his decades of service to our community, and may your quest for moral justice continue in your next chapter. Godspeed.

HONORING THE NASWA RESORT'S
ANNIVERSARY AND THE LIFE
AND LEGACY OF HOPE MARKIS

HON. CHRIS PAPPAS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 2025

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the NASWA Resort's anniversary and in memory of their dedicated owner, Hope Markis.

The NASWA Resort is one of the Lakes Region's most iconic establishments, founded by Greek immigrants and its legacy carried on by their daughter, Hope Markis, and her family. Starting as just a few cabins, the Markis family has transformed the NASWA Resort into the hospitable and beautiful place it is today. Over the years, they have grown their business from an inn to the resort we know, expanding to include more options for entertainment, food, and adventure.

Hope Markis was truly a leader, through both her work in pioneering the resort and her active involvement in her community. Her legacy truly lives in her hospitality and generosity, whether that was in the way she welcomed guests to the resort or in her support of veterans and first responders. The way that she cared for her community will not be forgotten, and that care lives on in her children and grandchildren, who continue to run the NASWA Resort. Certainly, what she has built as a businesswoman and as a matriarch will be felt by all of those who come to the resort and experience her hard work and dedication.

The NASWA Resort is not just an important piece of New Hampshire's tourist economy, but a multigenerational family business that is a vital part of the Lakes Region. New Hampshire owes Hope and her family a debt of gratitude for all that they have brought to the region and the work they have done to better the community around them.

On behalf of the constituents of New Hampshire's First Congressional District, I share my condolences with the Markis family, including her children and her grandchildren. I would once again like to extend my condolences to her family and wish them all the very best in this time of grieving.

CELEBRATING SHIRLEY SMITH
SOUTHERLAND'S 90TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JENNIFER A. KIGGANS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 2025

Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate Shirley Smith Southerland's 90th Birthday on July 26, 2025. Shirley Smith Southerland was born in Wallace, North Carolina in 1935, and is a mother of 4 children, 1 boy and 3 girls. She was an award-winning hairdresser before working for Princess House Inc., becoming one of its top five independent sales managers in the country. Known as "Yaya" by her 21 grandchildren and great grandchildren, she is a devoted and loving grandmother. We celebrate her this month as a shining example of a civic-minded American—through her service dedication, hard work, respect for others, and active participa-

tion in democracy. She shows us what it means to be a model citizen.

CELEBRATING MARK RATNER'S 20
YEARS OF SERVICE IN CONGRESS

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 2025

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, on this 27th day in the month of June in the year 2025, we recognize Mark Ratner of Battle Creek, Michigan, for concluding his time on Capitol Hill after more than 20 years of outstanding service to the American people in the United States House of Representatives.

Ratner's career in public service has been marked by a steadfast commitment to the people of Michigan and the nation. A proud graduate of Michigan State University, Ratner began his journey serving Michigan Congressman Joe Schwarz and went on to devote 16 remarkable years working for Michigan Congressman Fred Upton. During his tenure with Congressman Upton, Ratner's leadership as Legislative Director and Deputy Chief of Staff was instrumental in advancing critical legislative priorities, particularly in the field of healthcare, where his expertise and dedication helped shape policies that improved the lives of countless Americans.

Ratner further distinguished himself by bringing his wealth of experience and steady hand to the office of Wisconsin Congressman BRYAN STEIL, where he served as Chief of Staff. His contributions extended beyond Michigan and Wisconsin, including his service with Louisiana Senator BILL CASSIDY, reflecting a career dedicated to principled governance.

Throughout his decades of service, Ratner has been known for his tireless work ethic, his keen understanding of complex policy matters, and his unwavering integrity. His efforts, especially in healthcare policy, have left an indelible impact on the legislative process and have helped ensure that the voices of his constituents were heard and represented with honor and diligence.

As Ratner concludes his exceptional career in the U.S. House of Representatives, we extend our heartfelt gratitude for his many years of faithful service. His dedication has set a standard of excellence in public service, and his contributions will continue to benefit the American people for years to come.

We wish Ratner all the best in his future endeavors and thank him for his extraordinary commitment to our country. Go Green.

INTRODUCTION OF THE INVASIVE
SPECIES RESPONSE ACT

HON. ED CASE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 2025

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to a critical and escalating threat to our environment and economy, invasive species, and to ask for support of my proposed Invasive Species Response Act.

Invasive species jeopardize the delicate balance of our ecosystems, as they can

outcompete, prey on or introduce diseases to our native flora and fauna. The consequences of these disruptions are severe, leading to declines in biodiversity, diminishing the resilience of our ecosystems in the face of environmental change.

Beyond ecological damage, invasive species impose billions in economic costs each year. They harm agriculture, forestry, fisheries and tourism by reducing crop yields, damaging forests, disrupting marine ecosystems and degrading natural landscapes that communities and industries rely on.

In Hawaii, this threat is especially urgent. Hawaii's isolation has led to the evolution of many endemic species that are found nowhere else on Earth. Unfortunately, these native species often lack the defenses to compete with or resist the pressures of invasive plants and animals, which can rapidly alter ecosystems and displace local species. In Hawaii, invasive species have caused significant ecological damage, threatening the survival of native birds and plants. Protecting Hawaii's unique biodiversity is not just an environmental necessity; it is a cultural imperative that reflects the identity and heritage of the Hawaiian people.

Invasive species are also not just a localized problem; they pose a significant threat to the integrity of our natural world. Addressing this crisis requires a coordinated and comprehensive approach, focusing on prevention, early detection and effective management strategies to safeguard our vulnerable ecosystems.

In response to this urgent need, I am jointly introducing the Invasive Species Response Act with my colleague, Congressman JIM MOYLAN of Guam. This legislation will codify the existing Invasive Species Strike Teams program currently operated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS). These specialized teams play an essential role in managing emerging invasive species, employing strategies tailored to local conditions across the National Wildlife Refuge System. With 21 teams strategically positioned in various FWS regions, they are on the front lines, addressing the unique challenges posed by invasive species.

The Invasive Species Response Act signifies a transformative shift within the FWS, moving us from a reactive, species-by-species approach to a more strategic, system-wide framework for managing emerging invasive species. Key provisions of the bill include formally establishing the Invasive Species Strike Teams program, which will create a stable and legally supported framework to ensure consistent funding and enhance our management efforts. The act also mandates enhanced coordination and reporting through integrated systems and standardized procedures, ensuring transparency and enabling us to track progress with annual reports to Congress and the public. Furthermore, it authorizes \$15 million annually from Fiscal Year 2025 through 2029, aligning with current FWS investment levels to support ongoing initiatives.

This legislation is a crucial step forward in protecting our natural resources and enhancing our capacity to respond swiftly to the threats posed by invasive species.

I urge my colleagues to lend their support to our Invasive Species Response Act. Together, we can ensure the preservation of our ecosystems and promote a resilient future for our environment.

CELEBRATING 100 YEARS OF
DEERFIELD BEACH

HON. JARED MOSKOWITZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 2025

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a truly special milestone for my district: 100 years since the incorporation of Deerfield Beach, Florida.

What started in June 1925 as a town of just 500 people has boomed into a vibrant city and one of the best places to live in South Florida. Deerfield Beach is special not just because of its natural beauty, but also because of the people who have built this city up for the past century and make it what it is today.

I'm proud to represent parts of Deerfield Beach, and I'm fortunate to work with Mayor Todd Drosky and its local commissioners to deliver the federal resources this city needs to support its infrastructure, boost its economic development, and keep families here safe. It is truly an incredible place to call home.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and our colleagues join me in wishing a happy 100th birthday to the City of Deerfield Beach. I look forward to what this next century brings for this community and its residents.

HONORING METRO TRANSIT POLICE OFFICER BEVERLY RODRIGUEZ

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 2025

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a dedicated public safety professional who was taken from us much too soon. Metro Transit Police Lieutenant Beverly Rodriguez was just 40 years old when she died on Sunday, June 22, 2025, in a tragic accident. Her death is a deep and profound loss for her family, especially her two sons Macallen and Macody, the Metro Transit Police Department, and our entire east metro community.

Ms. Rodriguez, posthumously and deservedly promoted to Lieutenant on June 23, 2025, served as a Metro Transit police officer for more than eight years. Lieutenant Rodriguez was a compassionate leader who served as head of the Homeless Action Team (HAT), building real relationships with those experiencing homelessness and personally guiding hundreds toward housing stability and hope. In addition to her police duties, Lieutenant Rodriguez served as Northern Vice President of the National Latino Peace Officers Association, where she was described as "a compassionate advocate, a trusted mentor, and a tireless servant."

I extend my deepest condolences to Lieutenant Rodriguez's family, friends, and colleagues. Her heroic works will never be forgotten.

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CITY OF COLEMAN, FLORIDA

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 2025

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to recognize and celebrate the 100-year anniversary of the City of Coleman, Florida. While unofficial records indicate that Coleman was first incorporated under general laws on June 20, 1908, it was in 1925 that the city officially received its charter, thus marking the beginning of its formal governance and development.

Coleman was first settled in 1882 by pioneers who farmed the fertile lands of the Warm Springs Hammock. The Florida Gazette of 1886–1887 listed Dr. B.F. Coleman, a physician and one of the area's earliest settlers, as the town's namesake.

Many early settlers came from nearby Adamsville, which had flourished through orange cultivation until the devastating freeze of 1894 through 1895. That natural disaster forced many to seek new livelihoods, and Coleman soon emerged as a center of diverse agricultural production. In addition to citrus, settlers in Coleman raised cotton, cattle, sheep, and hogs, with wool even shipped to Baltimore for processing. By 1923, Coleman had earned national recognition as the "Cabbage Capital of the World", attracting buyers from across the country.

Today, the City of Coleman is in the heart of Sumter County and is home to approximately 700 residents. The city retains its Old Florida charm, with a quiet rural character and deep historical roots. As we commemorate this centennial milestone, we honor the generations who have shaped Coleman's legacy as a city built on resilience, agriculture, and a deep sense of community.

Happy Centennial to the City of Coleman.

HONORING BETTY DOSTER AND
THANKING HER FOR HER SERVICE TO UNC CHARLOTTE

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 2025

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my friend, Ms. Betty Doster, for her dedicated service to The University of North Carolina at Charlotte, my alma mater, as Special Assistant to the Chancellor for External Relations and Partnerships.

After nearly fifteen years in this important position, Betty announced her retirement, with her last day being Monday, June 30, 2025. Throughout her many years of service, Betty played an immeasurable role in the growth of UNC Charlotte into an R1 research institution. Even though she is a proud UNC Chapel Hill alum, Betty's passion for UNC Charlotte was enormous. Her efforts significantly contributed to the growing influence of our university across the state of North Carolina, around the country and around the world. It was a pleasure to work with Betty on many of these initiatives over the years.

As Special Assistant to the Chancellor for External Relations and Partnerships, Betty worked closely with federal, state, and local officials, as well as economic development partners to secure important public investments for the University. Betty's efforts helped acquire major student-focused initiatives, including authorization for the University Recreation Center, expansion of the Collegiate Recovery Program, and support for UNC Charlotte's esports initiative.

It is my honor to take this opportunity to recognize Ms. Betty Doster for her incredible service to UNC Charlotte, and her significant impact on the University. While I'll miss working with Betty and discussing the 49ers, I wish her all the best in her next adventure and hope she will be able to enjoy more time with friends and family.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in honoring my friend, Ms. Betty Doster, for her nearly 15 years of dedicated service to UNC Charlotte and the lasting impact she made on the university and everyone she met along the way.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF SENATOR DAVID L. JORDAN UPON HIS RETIREMENT FROM PUBLIC SERVICE TO THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 2025

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great pride and deep respect to honor the life and remarkable public service of Mississippi State Senator David L. Jordan—a man whose journey from the cotton fields of Leflore County to the Mississippi State Capitol is not just inspiring—it's the story of Mississippi, and of America at its best.

Senator Jordan was born in rural Leflore County Mississippi, the youngest of five children in a sharecropping family. He began working in the cotton fields as soon as he was big enough to carry a sack. Like so many children in that era, he missed a lot of school during harvest season. But even then, young David knew education was the key to something more. And he never stopped pushing toward it.

He worked nights washing dishes at a Holiday Inn while putting himself through Mississippi Valley State University and later earned a master's degree in chemistry from the University of Wyoming. That kind of grit—working all night, studying all day—is something we don't talk about enough in politics. But that's the kind of man Senator Jordan is.

He began his professional life as a science teacher, but his heart was always with the community. In 1985, he made history as the first African American elected to the Greenwood City Council, where he served with quiet strength and fierce dedication for 36 years. He became a trusted leader, someone people turned to for guidance and fairness, no matter the issue.

In 1993, he was elected to the Mississippi State Senate, representing District 24. For over three decades, Senator Jordan has been a powerful voice for his constituents—a calm presence in moments of tension, a mentor to

younger legislators, and a relentless advocate for civil rights, public health, education, and voting access.

And he didn't just talk the talk—he marched, boycotted, organized, and educated. He helped people understand how to vote, how to be heard, and how to stand up for their communities. He's led with humility, wisdom, and a deep love for the people of Mississippi.

Now at 92 years old, Senator Jordan is preparing to conclude his official duties on June

30, but his legacy will not end there. He lives in Greenwood, Mississippi, with his wife, Christine Bell-Jordan, his partner in life and service.

Senator Jordan once said, "I didn't stop there. I just kept on pushing." That simple sentence says everything about him. He kept pushing—for himself, for his community, and for justice. He is the kind of public servant we should all strive to be.

His memoir, *From the Mississippi Cotton Fields to the State Senate*, tells the full story of his journey. It's a powerful reminder of what is possible when courage and commitment meet opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of a grateful state and Nation, I thank Senator David L. Jordan, not just for what he accomplished, but for how he did it. With integrity. With purpose. With heart.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

(Legislative Day of Tuesday, June 24, 2025)

Routine Proceedings, pages S3579–S3601

Measures Introduced: Two bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 2201–2202, and S.J. Res. 60. **Pages S3598–99**

Measures Considered:

War Powers: By 47 yeas to 53 nays (Vote No. 328), Senate did not agree to the motion to discharge S.J. Res. 59, to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, pursuant to section 601(b) of the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act.

Pages S3583–95

Messages from the House:

Page S3597

Measures Referred:

Page S3597

Measures Read the First Time:

Page S3597

Executive Communications:

Pages S3597–98

Additional Cosponsors:

Page S3599

Additional Statements:

Pages S3596–97

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—328) **Page S3595**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 3 p.m. and adjourned at 7:33 p.m., until 2 p.m. on Saturday, June 28, 2025. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S3601.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 35 public bills, H.R. 4214–4248; and 9 resolutions, H. Res. 553–561, were introduced. **Pages H3031–33**

Additional Cosponsors:

Page H3034

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Dr. Gary G. Dull, Faith Baptist Church, Altoona, Pennsylvania. **Page H3015**

Condemning the violent June 2025 riots in Los Angeles, California: The House agreed to H. Res. 516, condemning the violent June 2025 riots in Los Angeles, California, by a yea-and-nay vote of 215 yeas to 195 nays, Roll No. 185. **Pages H3016–23**

Work Period Designation: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he designated the period from Fri-

day, June 27, 2025, through Sunday, July 6, 2025, as a “district work period” under clause 13 of rule 1. **Page H3023**

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote developed during the proceedings of today and appears on page H3023.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 11:48 a.m.

Committee Meetings

No hearings were held.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR SATURDAY,
JUNE 28, 2025

House

No hearings are scheduled.

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

2 p.m., Saturday, June 28

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

2 p.m., Monday, June 30

Senate Chamber

Program for Saturday: Senate will be in a period of morning business.

House Chamber

Program for Monday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 2 p.m.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Auchincloss, Jake, Mass., E630
Bergman, Jack, Mich., E631
Case, Ed, Hawaii, E631
Diaz-Balart, Mario, Fla., E630
Edwards, Chuck, N.C., E629

Gonzalez, Vicente, Tex., E629
Hudson, Richard, N.C., E632
Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E629
Kiggans, Jennifer A., Va., E631
LaHood, Darin, Ill., E630
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E629, E632
Moskowitz, Jared, Fla., E632

Pappas, Chris, N.H., E631
Stanton, Greg, Ariz., E630
Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E632
Tonko, Paul, N.Y., E630
Wasserman Schultz, Debbie, Fla., E630
Webster, Daniel, Fla., E632



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, 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. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: 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.