AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 172 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 29, 2026 *No. 124*

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Thursday, July 30, 2026, at 8:30 a.m.

Senate

WEDNESDAY, JULY 29, 2026

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Gracious God of infinite goodness, confirm Your past mercies by empowering us to be faithful to Your commands.

Lord, help our lawmakers this day to use their understanding, time, and talents to do what You desire. May our Senators desire to please You with faithful service as You rule their hearts, guiding their thoughts, words, and works. Enable them to fulfill their duty to love You with all their heart, mind, and strength. Take possession of their desires and order their steps by the power of Your loving providence. Pour down Your blessings upon them, that they may ever promote liberty, justice, and faith.

We pray in Your wonderful 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. ARMSTRONG). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

SUPPORTING EARLY-CHILDHOOD EDUCATORS' DEDUCTIONS ACT—Motion to Proceed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 5334, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 454, H.R. 5334, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow early childhood educators to take the educator expense deduction, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today as a member of the Senate Finance Committee, which has jurisdiction over Social Security, and to remind everybody—because everybody knows or better know—that the Social Security primary trust fund will be depleted in just 6 years. As a result, come late 2032, the program will only have enough income from the payroll taxes to pay 78 percent of benefits due.

That surplus was built up since a Republican, President Reagan, and a Democrat, then-Speaker Tip O'Neill, sat down and said: We can't let anything bad happen to Social Security. So they put a plan together that passed almost unanimously in this U.S. Senate.

I presume those two gentlemen—bipartisan they were—they thought it may only extend the program for 20 years or something. But as we see now, they had a plan that built up the surplus for the next 50 years, and that runs out in 2032. In other words, to emphasize, unless Congress acts quickly, retirees will see a 22-percent cut in their benefits, about the same as what Reagan and O'Neill saw happening in 1983.

So this statistic alone should motivate the Congress to act expeditiously to ensure no disruption of benefits occur. Unfortunately, Congress has a tendency to put off action until too late and at the last moment. This is never the best approach.

But with respect to addressing the Social Security funding shortfall, it poses a serious risk not only to the tens of millions of retirees but also a risk to the national economy.

As a recent Mercatus Center paper documents, waiting until the last minute to act on Social Security puts this vital program on a collision course with the Nation's growing fiscal crisis. The longer Congress waits to act, the more likely it is that any solution to Social Security will lean heavily on debt financing to bridge the funding gap. And that is how it is tied to the entire national economy.

So come 2032, the Nation will already have outstanding debt larger than at

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

Printed on recycled paper.

any time in the Nation's history relative to the size of our economy. Flooding the bond market with trillions of dollars in new debt, in short order, then risks setting off a chain of events leading to a fiscal crisis. Bond markets are likely to demand higher interest rates to absorb all the national debt.

In other words, Congress needs to act in the same way that Reagan and Tip O'Neill acted in a bipartisan fashion, in 1983, to preserve Social Security. A bigger problem faces us today, and we should have a bipartisan agreement in this town, including a President who wants to get Social Security on a financially sound basis.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The majority leader is recognized.

SANCTIONS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, yesterday, we said goodbye to our friend and colleague Lindsey Graham. But though we said farewell, Lindsey's work continues.

Last night, we began consideration of the bill to which he devoted so much of his time and energy over the last year. He had worked on it with world leaders and Members of both parties here in Congress, and he was working on it on the day he died.

That bill is now known as the Lindsey O. Graham Sanctioning Russia and Iran Act. It will give the President important tools to hopefully end the war between Russia and Ukraine and bring peace where there has been war for too long.

Russia invaded Ukraine 4½ years ago. Back then, many believed Ukraine would fall in less than a week. But Ukraine has denied the Russians the quick victory that they had expected. This war continues because Vladimir Putin wants it to continue.

Over the course of the war, Russia has suffered 1.4 million casualties. By one estimate, Russian casualties are now 30,000 per month.

Ukraine has slowed Russia's advance. They have gone on the offensive within Russia's borders. And with the war reportedly taking up a significant share of Russia's budget, Putin is seeking to quash the opposition to it in his own country.

But the war continues, as I said, because Putin wants it to continue and because he is able to keep it going.

Russia funds its war effort in no small part through oil and gas sales facilitated by its so-called shadow fleet of ships flying under false flags. What the Graham Russia sanctions bill does is go after that source of funding. It gives the President authority to levy tariffs of up to 100 percent against the largest purchasers of Russian energy, of which China is the largest.

You might recall that before the Russian invasion in 2022, the leaders of China and Russia declared a ''no limits'' partnership between their two countries. Today, that partnership is most evident in China's financing of the war by purchasing Russian oil and gas.

This bill doesn't stop with the purchasers of Russian energy, however; it also sanctions the government officials, private individuals, and banks and other enterprises that facilitate the sale of Russian gas and oil.

In short, it takes direct aim at a key source of funding for Russia's war effort because this war will not end until Putin is forced to come to the negotiating table in a real way. This bill is about denying Putin the ability to continue to prolong this war.

President Trump has made his commitment to ending this war and bringing peace to Ukraine very clear. This bill will help him do that.

They say you can know a man by the enemies he has made. Lindsey Graham didn't have many fans in the Kremlin, nor was he liked in Tehran or Beijing, for that matter. I don't think this bill has many supporters in those places either. This is a bill that aims to shut off a key source of strength for Russia's war effort. It targets China's source of cheap energy. It ensures the President can continue putting maximum economic pressure on Iran as well by extending for another 5 years the legislation that underpins many of the sanctions that are in place against the Iranian regime.

We may have said farewell to Lindsey yesterday, but his work goes on. He believed in America, and he saw its promise in the hopes of men and women around the world who want their own democracies and freedom in their homelands. There was no greater friend to freedom-loving people than Lindsey Graham, and this bill is a part of that legacy—a legacy that will echo for many years to come.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SANCTIONS

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate honored the life of our dear friend Lindsey Graham. It was a remarkable gathering of people from around the world, people who came to honor a man who really has done so very much for this body, for his home State of South Carolina, and for the Nation.

I believe that today it is time to honor his tremendous legacy as well right here with a vote on the floor of the U.S. Senate. I think the way to do that is to pass the Lindsey O. Graham Sanctioning Russia Act. It truly is a ''peace through strength'' bill. No tribute I think would be more fitting to our friend Lindsey or be more forceful.

This bill strengthens America's national security while pressuring our adversaries to pursue peace; and that is what Lindsey was doing—pursuing peace.

This sanctions bill is a historic piece of legislation. They target Russia's largest oil importers, target Russia's leadership, target Russia's so-called shadow fleet. Russia uses that shadow fleet to evade sanctions on its illegal oil.

Most importantly, it targets other nations that buy Russian oil, that buy Russian natural gas, that buy Russian uranium. This is the way Russia is financing its brutal killing war in Ukraine.

The penalties are swift; the penalties are severe.

We know that energy is a cash cow of Putin's war machine. It is also Russia's Achilles' heel. You cut it off, and Russia cannot continue to fight.

Russia's biggest customer, we know, is communist China. Next is India, and they are going to be hit hard by this. This is the way to cripple Russia's war machine.

Allies of Ukraine can qualify for exemptions. Those exemptions come from taking serious steps to end their own dependency on Russian energy products.

For many years—and you and I have talked about this—Europe has spent more money on Russian energy than it has sent in aid to Ukraine. Mr. President, you are a warrior. You know this. You are from an energy State. You know these things are critically important, and they are true. This needs to change.

Of course, Russia isn't fighting Ukraine alone. In Putin's war of aggression, it is Iran partnering with Russia. Iran has supplied Russia with drones, with missiles, with munitions. Russia has used these weapons to kill Ukrainian civilians and to destroy Ukrainian infrastructure.

In return, Russia has shared with Iran—we know what they have shared with their regime: technology, intelligence, military support, all of those things. Iran has used this support to attack American troops.

And you have worn the uniform; you have borne the battle. And we have seen the attacks on the American troops that hold the area in terms of how Iran holds the Strait of Hormuz hostage. It is continuing today. There were attacks yesterday.

Russia and Iran both employ a shadow fleet of illegal oil tankers. They share sanctions-evading networks. They sell oil to many of the same buyers. They are all working together against us, against freedom-loving people. They both fund murder; they fund terrorism; and they do it with revenue from their energy products.

That is why Iran has rightfully been added to this sanctions bill. Lindsey started it about Russia, and now we have added Iran with President Trump's guidance.

Together, Russia and Iran have built an ''axis of aggression,'' and we know where the aggression is headed. Sanctioning those who buy oil from Russia and Iran disrupts this entire axis all at once.

Passing this bill will make our country safer, and it makes our adversaries weaker.

Senator Graham visited Ukraine shortly before he died. Lindsey was a friend of freedom in Ukraine. He never stopped working to build support for their cause.

Lindsey succeeded. This is a bill that has united a broad coalition of U.S. Senators. The motion yesterday to proceed to the bill, over 80 Senators voted positively, voted for this motion. And I am one of the many cosponsors.

Now it is time to pass this bill. Now it is time to push for peace. Today, Russia is at the point of maximum weakness, and so is Iran. Critical pieces of Russia's energy infrastructure are today in shambles. A significant portion of its oil refinery capacity is no longer operable.

Energy shortages are being felt all across Russia today. At the same time, Iran's military has been severely degraded.

Both Russia and Iran still refuse to accept plans for lasting peace. Russia and Iran respond only to strength, not to statements.

It is time for the Senate to act and act decisively and to work toward lasting peace. Today is the day to pass the Lindsey Graham sanctions bill.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORENO). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

SANCTIONS

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I would like to echo and reinforce the words of my good friend Senator BARRASSO, the majority whip, Senator from Wyoming, who was doing a great job yesterday and the beautiful service that we had here in the Capitol and at the National Cathedral in honor of my very good friend and Senate colleague, Senator Lindsey Graham. And, you know, the eulogies were great. It was a beautiful service.

He was, as I mentioned, a dear friend, colleague, a patriot, a veteran, a staunch advocate for his State South Carolina, staunch advocate for the Senate, and a staunch advocate for a strong America. As Senator BARRASSO just said, peace through strength in the sense of American freedom, not just at home but abroad.

He was one of a kind—witty, brilliant. Certainly, Mr. President, as you know, one of our Nation's most important and influential Senators. He had a great sense of humor. He loved to laugh.

And a lot of us here on the Senate floor are talking about his legacy and what we should be doing to honor that legacy.

Well, I think one of the things we should be doing—and we are doing it right now, and it is great—is this sanctions bill against Russia, against Iran. And Senator Graham had been leading the efforts on this sanctions bill for a couple years now, and we are passing it here in the Senate in an overwhelming bipartisan fashion. Over 80 Senators voted to get on the bill last night. I know Lindsey is looking down from Heaven very proud he made this happen.

I was honored to be an original cosponsor of this bill from the very, very beginning working with him on these issues.

And we have got more to do. I have a very analogous sanctions bill with regard to China and Taiwan that Senator Graham was a lead cosponsor of my bill. That is coming next.

But it is about honoring him, and this is a bipartisan win.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. President, I think there is another way we need to honor Senator Graham, and it is not happening. It is kind of a new thing. We have got the minority whip coming to the floor, and I hope he can maybe respond to this. But it is a new thing that I have seen— I have never seen, actually, in my career, and we need to change it. And what that is, is getting on the National Defense Authorization Act to start debating it and working on a defense supplemental because we need it. Now, we are talking about honoring Lindsey Graham. I knew Lindsey Graham really, really well. I guarantee you Lindsey Graham would be on the Senate floor right now saying: Wait. We are moving our sanctions bill forward? Great. Bipartisan? Great. What about the NDAA—the National Defense Authorization Act—that funds our military, pay raises for our troops. It came out of the Armed Services Committee in a big bipartisan vote and then came to the Senate floor—screeching halt because the minority leader blocked it.

By the way, I have been in the Senate almost 12 years. I have never seen that happen in my entire career. The bill that funds our military, that lays out the strategy and top-line number for our military during a dangerous time, is blocked by the Senate Democrats. Lindsey Graham would be on the floor raising hell about that.

I have never seen it happen, and I have never had anyone on the other side of the aisle explain to me: Why are you blocking the bill that came out of committee in a strong bipartisan way during these dangerous times? You are blocking the bill to fund our military to take care of our troops? Unprecedented.

So if we want to honor Lindsey Graham, which we all do, let's not just vote for the sanctions bill, but let's get on the NDAA and start debating it. I haven't heard one Democrat Senator give a reason why they are blocking it. I have never seen this happen. This is new territory.

Let me give you another one that I know Lindsey Graham would be on the floor right now advocating with me on. We need a defense supplemental, OK?

When President Biden was President and Senator SCHUMER was majority leader, the Biden White House sent over a defense supplemental on Ukraine. Now, Senators like myself, Senator Graham, others, we said: All right. We will look at that. We will work on that. We will improve it. We will make it better. We think it is important for the national defense of our Nation—which it was.

We put a lot in there for the defense industrial base, which we did. We beefed up stuff relating to China and Taiwan, which made it a better bill. We beefed up elements of that bill to make it stronger with regard to Israel and Iran—made it a better bill and then worked on it together.

We made it a stronger bill and then Senators like myself and Senator Graham whipped other Republicans to get it passed, and we got it passed. It was a bipartisan defense supplemental, primarily for Ukraine, Israel, Taiwan, and our defense industrial base.

Now we need a defense industrial base supplemental for us—for America, for our troops, for our munitions.

A couple years ago when the Biden administration with Senator SCHUMER in the majority, that happened, and a number of us—myself and Senator Graham—were like: All right. We will roll up our sleeves and work with you guys.

What is happening on the defense supplemental now? No cooperation. No one on the other side of the aisle wants to help our troops, wants to help our munitions.

This is new territory. I have been here two terms and on defense issues with Senator Graham—and, by the way, many other great Senators on the other side of the aisle. We have always locked arms and said: We are going to move forward on the NDAA; we are going to move forward on the defense supplemental, if our troops need it. And what is happening right now is new; it is different; and I think it is really bad for the country.

And do you know who would be down on the Senate floor right now with me making the same arguments that I am? Senator Graham would be. So let's keep talking about honoring Senator Graham. I love that guy. I am going to miss him every day. Such a great leader. So important to the Senate. Mind you, probably most the important Senator here given his work, given his relationship with the President.

But let's not say we are going to honor Senator Graham—and then we are going to block the NDAA? Lindsey Graham wouldn't be doing that.

We are going to not engage at all with the Trump administration on a defense supplemental that our Department of Defense needs? We didn't do that when you guys were in the majority and President Biden was President. We rolled up our sleeves and got to work to benefit the national security of our Nation, which is what Lindsey Graham was always about.

So let's honor Lindsey Graham. Let's have a strong vote on the sanctions bill that is named after him. But to my Democratic colleagues: You want to honor Lindsey Graham? Then let's start debating the NDAA. Quit blocking it. I have never seen that before in my entire time here. That doesn't help anything. All it does is undermine our national security and our troops. You are doing it. Lindsey wouldn't be for that.

And let's start engaging on a defense supplemental. We need it. We did it when you were in the majority. We did it when Biden was in the White House.

A lot of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle know that what they are doing is wrong, and I still haven't heard a good explanation. I know the far left is driving the energy of the party on the Democratic side right now and they don't like the military and they don't like supporting our troops. I know that. But the vast majority of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I know them. Let's get going on the NDAA. Let's get going on the defense supplemental bill. That is exactly what Senator Graham would be arguing today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, we start with this little document called the U.S. Constitution. Every one of us has sworn to uphold and defend this document. And we go to article I, the first article in the Constitution, section 8, and it spells out with clarity who declares war under this Constitution: The Congress of the United States.

We are now engaged in a war in Iran. Did the Congress declare war on Iran? No.

Did the President even ask Congress to declare war on Iran? No.

Well, were there public hearings in Congress about this decision to invade Iran, to attack Iran? No.

Did this President of the United States go to the allies of the United States, like the NATO allies, to discuss the invasion of Iran? No.

This President decided that we would go to war on his own—strictly on his own—without regard for what the Constitution requires.

Now, I am glad to concede that there have been many Presidents that have gone to war under similar circumstances, but almost without exception they at least took the case to the American people directly or through Congress. This President did not.

So where are we today? Mr. President, $88 billion—that is how much has been spent so far in Iran. We are in the fifth month of the first year of a never-ending war that this President promised over and over again at his rallies would never, ever, ever happen under his watch.

Now we have the Senator from Alaska coming to the floor raising questions about why we aren't moving on certain items. It is because there has been no involvement in the decision process that led up to this.

Do you know what the increase is in defense spending for next year: 40 percent of the Department of Defense budget—40 percent. Why? We have an $88 billion war going on in Iran. There are those of us who have serious doubts that that is the right thing to do.

We look at the Strait of Hormuz. Before we invaded Iran, they were open for the transport of energy, oil, and fertilizers. Now, they are virtually closed because of President Trump's decision to invade Iran.

Does it have any impact on you personally? Filled your gas tank lately? Do you know what is going on there? The cost of gasoline is going through the roof because of the invasion of Iran and the decision to move forward.

So you can tell from my comments here that I have serious doubts that we are doing the right thing in Iran. I am not going to be a defender of Iran. I have called for sanctions on that country over and over again for their misconduct. But to sit here and argue that we are somehow shirking our constitutional and congressional responsibility by not funding this war is to ignore the obvious.

This was the President's decision to go forward with this war. My advice to him over many years that I have served in Congress: It is easier to start a war than it is to end it. And we are learning that right now.

The Strait of Hormuz are still at risk, and other parts of the world are at risk because of that decision. It is not the right decision.

REMEMBERING LINDSEY GRAHAM

Mr. President, let me also say a word about Lindsey Graham. Lindsey was my friend. On some issues, my ally. He did things for me which I thought were politically risky but to help, for example, to pass the Dream Act. It was Lindsey Graham who was the sole Republican who would cosponsor my bipartisan Dream Act each year.

I respect him so much for doing it. It was a political risk for him to do it. But either for me personally—God bless him—or for the thousands of young people who were facing deportation, he stuck his neck out for me. That is why I went to the service yesterday in respect for this man. I do respect him.

We didn't agree on everything. Particularly when it came to issues of war, there were serious differences. But there are many things that united us.

The gentleman from Alaska raises the question of: What would Lindsey do? I'm sure we can come up with our own interpretation.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Now, here is the bottom line moving forward: We have got to reach a bipartisan agreement on how to fund this government after September 30 when this particular budget ends and a new budget starts. I want to do that. Senator MURRAY wants to do it. I think Senator COLLINS would like to do it. But now we have to do it together on a bipartisan basis. We come to an agreement on the top line about how to reach a budget and then we start setting out on appropriations bills.

I have been fortunate enough to serve in the Appropriations Committee in the House and the Senate. I have seen some extraordinary bipartisan good work. We can have it again, but we have got to sit down and, in good faith, start working toward a conclusion.

A conclusion that gives 40 percent increase to the Department of Defense and zero increase to the rest of the government is a mistake. It is a serious mistake. We have important things that need to be done to help families that are struggling with the cost of living.

And so to the Senator from Alaska: I just disagree with you on the premise. We can and should work on a bipartisan basis, and it needs to start with next year's budget.

TEMPORARY PROTECTED STATUS DESIGNATION

Mr. President, last month the Supreme Court paved the way for the Trump administration to end a program called temporary protected status designation without any judicial review.

The Supreme Court's conservative supermajority has supercharged President Trump's mass deportation campaign, with devastating consequences for temporary protected status holders and the American communities who rely on them.

Temporary protected status under American law was intended to prevent the deportation of immigrants to countries where it is not safe to return. By law, a TPS designation can only be made or extended in increments of 6, 12, or 18 months. It is truly temporary in nature.

Ahead of every TPS expiration, the Secretary of State must reassess the conditions in the countries and decide whether to renew the designation or let it end.

To take one example, there is no question that Haiti is unsafe. Our Department of State has issued a Level 4 travel advisory telling Americans it is unsafe to travel to Haiti due to the risk of crime, kidnapping, terrorism, and civil unrest. That is the official statement of the Department of State of the Trump administration.

So why has the Trump administration terminated TPS for Haiti and many other countries where it is not safe to return? Some of my Republican colleagues have claimed that TPS for countries like Haiti must end simply because it is the nature of the program—that it is temporary.

Here is the thing: Since 1990, 36 years ago, when TPS was established, there have been 30—30—TPS designations. Even before the Trump administration, at least 10 of them—countries like Angola, Rwanda, and Sierra Leone had their designations made and then officially terminated. They were temporary.

In some cases, like Haiti, conditions have never been safe enough to justify a termination.

Haitian TPS holders have bought homes in the United States, started American families, and become part of our communities.

Members on both sides of the aisle oppose deporting these Haitian immigrants. In fact, our former Senate colleague and my friend Republican Mike DeWine, now the Republican Governor of Ohio, called the Trump administration's decision to terminate Haiti's TPS ''a mistake'' and a ''job killer'' that is ''not in the best interest of the United States nor Ohio.''

Let me say parenthetically: Mike DeWine is my friend. We are opposite political parties. We served together in the Senate. It was Mike who encouraged me to join him and his wife when they visited Haiti, and I saw it for the first time. It opened my eyes to the poverty and danger of that island country.

The Trump-Mullin administration has ignored the comments of Governor DeWine and others. Instead, ICE is preparing to target Haitian immigrants for arrest and deportation as early as this week. Immigrants who have been lawfully present in the United States for years now risk being deported.

This is all so that Trump and his trusted adviser Stephen Miller can meet their 2,000-arrests-a-day quota. They are not looking for the worst of the worst with these Haitians. They are not looking for terrorists, murderers, sexual predators, human traffickers. It is just whether they are Haitian or not Haitian.

It is time for Congress to give these long-term residents the security that they deserve. That is why I am calling for the passage of the SECURE Act, legislation that will provide certainty for these individuals and their communities by giving them the ability to apply for legal permanent residency.

Later today, my friend and colleague Senator VAN HOLLEN of Maryland will ask for unanimous consent to pass this bill. I join him and appeal to my colleagues: In the name of humanity, for God's sake, don't send these people back to an island which we have already declared is too dangerous for any American to visit. Let them stay safe with their children and families here in the United States until things have improved in Haiti. If they are a threat in any way to any person in America, they need to leave; but if they are leading good lives, doing the best they can for them and their families, give them a chance. It is not too much to ask, and to deport them into this dangerous situation is not consistent with the basic values of America.

CONFIRMATION OF WALTER CLAYTON

Mr. President, on a separate subject, yesterday the Senate voted to confirm Jay Clayton to be the next Director of National Intelligence.

He replaces Acting DNI Bill Pulte, a Trump loyalist who purged career intelligence employees and who launched investigations into the President's political enemies as Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency.

Similarly, anyone hoping Clayton will show loyalty to the Constitution over the President who appointed him is sorely mistaken.

Much like his predecessor, Jay Clayton has peddled the Big Lie and worked to do the President's bidding, using the levers of government to target Trump's perceived enemies.

Don't believe me? I will show you.

Earlier this month, in a clear threat to freedom of the press, the Trump administration issued subpoenas targeting several journalists for the New York Times who reported on security concerns related to the President's brand-new, Qatari-donated Air Force One. Who issued the subpoenas? None other than Jay Clayton in his capacity as U.S. attorney for the Southern District of New York. After sharp questioning by a Federal judge, prosecutors withdrew the demands.

And 2 weeks ago, while appearing before the Senate Intelligence Committee for his nomination, Clayton refused—time and time again—to say who won the 2020 Presidential election.

We have seen this play out in the Judiciary Committee as the President's nominees for the Federal bench bend over backwards to avoid stating a simple fact: that Joe Biden won in 2020. And Donald Trump lost.

Why? Because these people are loyal to the President above all. And that has been his guiding light when picking nominees for appointments.

Most importantly, Clayton lacks the basic qualifications necessary for the job of overseeing and coordinating our Nation's 18 intelligence agencies. By law, the Director of National Intelligence is required to have ''extensive national security expertise.'' Not only does he lack extensive national security expertise, he lacks any.

The Trump administration has already spent the past 18 months politicizing and denigrating our intelligence community. In fact, both of Clayton's predecessors, Pulte and former DNI Tulsi Gabbard, who took the unprecedented step of meddling in a domestic law enforcement action on election interference, laid bare just how important it is to separate politics from the work of the IC.

I voted no on Jay Clayton's nomination to be DNI. Despite this, I hope Mr. Clayton will show fidelity to the rule of law and be an independent voice to safeguard our IC.

His track record does not inspire confidence, but time will tell.

TODD BLANCHE

Mr. President, tomorrow the Senate Judiciary Committee is scheduled to hold a key vote on Todd Blanche's nomination to be Attorney General.

The Attorney General oversees the Department of Justice—our Nation's premier law enforcement agency—as well as the FBI, DEA, and many other essential Agencies. The position demands that the Attorney General be someone committed to the rule of law and the Constitution more than any one person or political party. This principle is exactly why Todd Blanche is the wrong person for this role.

In his 16 months at DOJ, Blanche has shown that he is more concerned with serving Donald Trump than the American people. Pardoning January 6 rioters and cop-beaters wasn't enough for President Trump, so 2 months ago, Blanche colluded with President Trump's private lawyers to create a nearly $2 billion slush fund to benefit the January 6 mob that attacked the Capitol. When I met with Blanche earlier this month, he told me he recognized this decision for what it was: a ''mistake.''

But when I asked him under oath, Blanche insisted that he never made this statement, displaying either a short memory or a dangerous willingness to lie for President Trump. When pressed during his hearing, Blanche even refused to directly condemn those who assaulted law enforcement officers on January 6 and would not commit to permanently ending this slush fund.

Blanche has done more than just support the President's allies; he has also used his position to directly enrich the President himself. Earlier this year, Blanche personally signed a document to provide President Trump, his family, and his businesses with immunity for any past Federal tax law violations.

And last year, he dismantled DOJ's crypto enforcement team and shut down ongoing investigations of the crypto industry, an industry that has made President Trump more than $1 billion since returning to the White House. Blanche himself held crypto assets worth more than $150,000 at the time—and when he finally did divest himself of these assets, he did so by transferring them to his adult children and grandchild.

It is hard to believe how Blanche could possibly be an honest broker as Attorney General, especially when he refuses to even admit that the Department of Justice should decide who to prosecute without political interference from the President.

During his nomination hearing, one of my Republican colleagues asked Blanche if he and President Trump are friends. Blanche responded, ''I'm his lawyer.'' That Freudian slip sums up why he has been nominated. The Attorney General should be the people's lawyer. The Department of Justice should work on behalf of the people. But President Trump still views Blanche as his personal lawyer, a role he held up until he was confirmed to be Deputy Attorney General. And it is clear that Blanche still views himself as the President's lawyer.

Todd Blanche's DOJ has become one where the President and his allies are protected while ordinary Americans suffer and his perceived enemies are baselessly prosecuted. The position of Attorney General is too important to be held by someone unwilling to say no to the President, which is exactly why I will be voting no on his nomination.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2106

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, in a few minutes, I am going to ask unanimous consent to pass the SECURE Act to ensure that we don't force individuals who have been legally residing in the United States under temporary protected status—some for as many as 27 years—to return to countries where they will face danger and, instead, to provide them with a secure path toward lawful permanent residency.

The need for Congress to do this, to take this step, has never been more urgent because, just over a month ago, the Trump-packed Supreme Court, in a 6-to-3 decision, allowed the administration to move forward with terminating temporary protected status for hundreds of thousands of individuals who originally came to the United States from Haiti and Syria and to force them back—force them back—to countries where their lives would be at risk. That decision puts them and other TPS holders at risk of deportation to countries where violence, instability, and humanitarian crises continue to threaten their lives.

There are already reports that ICE is planning to target Haitian TPS holders for deportation as soon as this week, which would force hundreds of thousands of people to return to a country that our State Department warns is unsafe for travel. In other words, the Trump administration would force people back to a country where the State Department says: Don't go there because it is unsafe.

The Trump administration has also moved to lift lower court orders preventing the termination of TPS for other countries as well, putting thousands more lives at risk. In other words, these lower courts have said they have paused the ability for the administration to deport people on TPS, but the administration is moving to deport them anyway.

In 1990—in 1990—Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, came together to create the TPS program because we all agreed that keeping our neighbors safe should not be a partisan issue. When conditions in another country make it unsafe for people to return, America should not force those people back into harm's way. And for over three decades that bipartisan principle has guided the TPS program.

I think we all recall the Trump administration—at least the President—promised that they were going to target the ''worst of the worst.'' But that is not what they have been doing. Instead, it has targeted people, in the case of TPS recipients, with lawful status, targeting people who are here legally.

TPS recipients are people who have already been determined that it would be dangerous to force them to return to their countries of origin. They are here legally, and the TPS eligibility requirements are very strict. Recipients undergo repeated vetting and background checks. They work, they pay taxes, raise families, start businesses, and contribute every day to communities across this country. Many have lived here for years; others, for decades. They have become part of the fabric of our communities.

And yet the Trump administration's actions and recent reckless Supreme Court decisions place all of that at risk. The administration terminated work permits for Haitian and Syrian TPS holders on Monday. So people who had been legally here, had work permits, they have been terminated.

And for those who also apply for asylum, the administration's new policy announced just this week would funnel their pending asylum claims directly into deportation proceedings without ever receiving a hearing. So even people who could show individual cause of certain harm or danger could be deported under these new procedures. It is all part of the same effort to strip legal protections from people who have followed the rules.

Due to our country's broken immigration system, the TPS program is the only legal pathway for many to remain in the United States and keep out of harm's way, and the Court's decision is tearing up that pathway for many TPS holders, even as the facts on the ground are clear.

As I said, if you go to the State Department website, it says: ''Do Not Travel to Haiti.'' There are warning signs on that website of violent crime, gang activity, kidnappings, and widespread instability.

In the case of Syria, Syria continues to face armed conflict, terrorism, and an ongoing humanitarian crisis. The State Department warns—this is from our State Department—''Do not travel to Syria for any reason.'' That is what the State Department says, and yet the President and the Trump administration want to force people to go to Syria.

In other words, the same conditions that led the United States to grant these individuals TPS in the first place remain true, and yet the Trump administration wants to send them to these countries. So the State Department warns against travel but wants us to believe that it is safe for TPS recipients to be forced to return.

What has changed is this administration's determination to dismantle basic humanitarian protections that have been part of our bipartisan tradition in order to enact their mass deportation agenda, and now this Supreme Court has rubberstamped this administration's ongoing reckless efforts to gut the TPS program so they can terminate countries' designations across the board to advance that mass deportation agenda.

The Trump ''rubberstamp'' Supreme Court, on a 6-to-3 decision, made the decision that rather than follow the letter of the law as Congress enacted it, the Department of Homeland Security can do whatever it wants—and free from judicial scrutiny.

As Justice Kagan wrote in her dissent—she was one of three Justices dissenting from that Supreme Court decision—she said:

> After today, a Secretary can announce to the world that she didn't consult with anyone—more, that she didn't evaluate country conditions at all—before making, extending, or terminating a TPS designation. And the courts will be powerless to intervene, even though Congress loaded up the TPS statute with requirements about the (altogether different) way the Secretary is supposed to make her decision.

In other words, Justice Kagan pointed out that the statute does make clear there should be a determination about whether or not an action taken to terminate TPS would, in fact, lead to harm.

And Congress should not just sit back and allow this to happen. Decisions affecting hundreds of thousands of lives should be based on careful consideration of conditions on the ground, not political ideology or predetermined outcomes.

This decision makes one thing unmistakably clear, that we, the Congress, should act to reaffirm what was clearly our intent when we passed the TPS statutes to begin with. And, for years, TPS recipients have lived in constant uncertainty, and every extension brings another deadline. Every new administration brings another question about whether the lives they have built here will disappear with the stroke of a pen. This is no way to treat people who have been here legally and have contributed much to our country.

That is why we should pass the SECURE Act, legislation that provides qualified TPS and deferred enforced departure recipients with a pathway to legal permanent residence after years of continuous presence in the United States.

It protects applicants while their cases are pending and shields eligible individuals from deportation during the application process. It provides work authorization and travel authorization. It also protects applicants' information from being used for immigration enforcement, except in limited circumstances. It increases transparency—which I would hope we would all support—by requiring the Department of Homeland Security to explain and justify future decisions to terminate TPS designations—something they have failed to do. Most importantly, it provides the certainty these families deserve after years—in many cases, decades—of living here legally in the United States.

We have long used TPS to provide refuge to people who would otherwise face extraordinary danger if forced to return to their countries of origin. They sought safety and stability here. They have built new lives in our country and made lasting contributions to our communities, and the SECURE Act recognizes that reality.

As I said, we should not be forcing these individuals back to countries where our own State Department has determined it would be dangerous to go.

The Supreme Court decision does not have to be the end of the story. We can write the end of the story, and it is our responsibility as a Congress to preserve that bipartisan congressional intent from back in 1990. We must provide that certainty that these individuals deserve.

Mr. President, notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged and that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2106. I further ask consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I object to this mass amnesty bill. Last week, Democrats asked the Senate to extend Haitian temporary protected status. Today, they have dropped the quotation marks. Instead of extending temporary status, this legislation would convert temporary status into permanent status—green cards, permanent settlement. At least the bill last week continued the same old Washington lie.

Today, Democrats finally admit what this scheme was always designed to be. Temporary was always meant to be permanent. It is the final stage of the scam. But that is how Democrats do mass amnesty. First, they declare an emergency. Then, they import hundreds of thousands of people. They then extend the program over and over and over. Then, they unleash activist lawyers against anyone who tries to enforce the deadline.

When the American people finally elect a President to end this chaos, to end this abuse, Democrats demand mass amnesty. And when the American people finally elect a President who enforces the law, Democrats change the law and hand out green cards.

That is what this bill does. It turns a program created for temporary emergencies into a pipeline for green cards and citizenship not only for people who have temporary status—not only for people who once had TPS; this bill reaches beyond our borders and allows people who were already removed from this country to apply for permanent residency from abroad.

Think about how crazy that is. The law was enforced. The alien was removed. The case was closed. Yet Democrats want to erase the removal, reopen the border, and bring that person back with a green card. Under the radical, new Democratic immigration platform, deportation isn't deportation; it is merely an inconvenience before a green card arrives.

This bill does not merely reward those who broke our laws and remained in our country; it reaches around the entire globe to reverse deportations and to restart mass migration.

But even that is not enough. This bill also creates an ICE blackout. Information provided in these applications can't be used for immigration enforcement. The bill even threatens penalties against law enforcement who properly use the information. So Democrats want the information we have about foreigners to be placed behind a legal shield so it cannot be used to enforce immigration law.

Republicans want to handcuff illegal criminals; Democrats want to handcuff law enforcement officers so they can't do their jobs. They are not hiding the choice anymore. They will punish the officer before they punish the illegal alien. Why are illegal aliens more important to them now than protecting American citizens?

Oh, but it doesn't stop there. This bill ensures that any President—any future President—can't end TPS.

So what is missing from the bill? Americans; American citizens and the impact mass migration is having on our people. This bill has no consideration for American wages; no consideration for American housing; no consideration of schools, hospitals, or communities; no consideration of whether mass migration serves the national interest of the American people. Every question is about what the foreign country needs; no question about what America needs or what American families need. That tells you everything that you need to know.

To today's Democrat Party, immigration policy is written for foreign governments, immigration lawyers, activist groups, and leftwing organizations waiting to file the next lawsuit. The American people are treated as a logistical obstacle. Their votes—our votes—are an inconvenience. Their communities—our communities—are an afterthought. Their country is treated as common property for the rest of the world.

Democrats are becoming more and more radical by the day on this issue. Yesterday, they insisted that temporary programs must never end. Today, they demand permanent residency for all—permanent residency for people who already left, legal shields against law enforcement, and more ammunition for activist lawsuits. And they will turn around and call us cruel. You will hear it shortly. It will be said about me blocking this bill.

Let me speak clearly to my Democrat colleagues: There is nothing compassionate about betraying your own citizens—the very citizens who put you in office. There is nothing compassionate about flooding the labor market with more foreign workers while Americans struggle for a decent wage. There is nothing compassionate about flooding the housing market and putting young families behind the eight ball. There is nothing compassionate about diluting American citizenship.

America is a nation, not a global waiting room, not a refugee camp, not a lifetime stay at a taxpayer-funded hotel. Our immigration laws exist to serve the American people. Foreign nationals do not have a right to permanent settlement here.

Today, I speak on behalf of the American people who have been ripped off by this scam for far too long. No more. We had an election on this issue. The Democrats have not gotten the message. They want the United States of America to be a global refugee camp cloaked behind their compassion. There is no compassion for the American people—the guy that swings the hammer, who is working 7 days a week so he can pay for the benefits of an illegal alien who they don't ever want to leave this country.

The American people are a sovereign people who have the right to decide who enters this country, who remains, and who has to leave. This bill reverses that principle. This Democrat bill tells the American people that their elections cannot end a temporary program, that the President cannot enforce the law, that their officers cannot use information in front of them, that their country belongs to everyone but them. Only the migrant's claim matters. Only the foreign country matters. Only the ambulance-chasing immigration lawyer matters.

I reject all of that completely, in public, for the world to see, because I stand by my brothers and sisters of this country.

Last week, I objected to the Democrats' attempt to give 350,000 Haitians extended TPS. Today, I am objecting to this Democrat attempt to give millions of illegal aliens mass amnesty, green cards, and work authorizations.

I will always object to this mass amnesty. I will always object to this mass migration. I will always object to putting American workers last. I will always object to tying the hands of our law enforcement. So therefore I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, just to make a couple things very clear, the President has a mass-deportation agenda even though what the President says is that he is focused on going after the worst of the worst.

We had a vote on a resolution here in the Senate not that long ago about going after the worst of the worst, and it passed unanimously. It was a voice vote. There is no argument there.

The issue with these TPS holders is that they are here legally, with work permits. In fact, they are among the most vetted people in the country. Every year, they go through security and background checks in order to renew their work permits.

The reason we provide them with the opportunity to stay here is because there has been a determination that their countries of origin are such dangerous places that their lives would be put at risk—places like Haiti, places like Syria, where our own government has determined it is too dangerous to go, and they warn people about going to those countries. Yet what this Trump administration action would do is force people back into danger in those countries. That is what the Trump administration wants to do, and that is what this Supreme Court, on a 6-to-3 vote, allows them to do. It allows them not even to have to make that determination in any serious way about what the circumstances are in the country these people would be forced back into.

So there is a whole lot of misinformation that was put out there about this piece of legislation.

I will just say that in my State of Maryland, many of these folks on TPS have become very important and valuable members of our community. As I have said, many have been here for years and years and in some cases, for decades.

By the way, they are paying taxes. They are paying Federal and State taxes. They are paying into the Social Security trust fund. In many cases, they have started small businesses that actually create more economic opportunities for everybody in the community and the State. Go look it up. A lot of these TPS holders are small business men and women. They are hiring people in our communities and our State. Yet these are the people—some of the most vetted individuals in the country, people who pay State and local and Federal taxes—that the Trump administration wants to send back to countries where we say it is dangerous to go.

So that is why we are here on the floor right now, because the first wave of this is about to happen, and the Trump administration is about to deport folks who came here from Haiti who have been here under TPS, this protected status, and now they want to force them back into harm's way. We want to uphold what had been a bipartisan position, which is that we as a country should not do that. We should not send people who have this legal status now back to countries where they will face certain danger.

So it is disappointing to hear that our Republican colleagues don't want to move forward on this piece of legislation, but this debate is not over—not here in the Senate, not in the House, and not in communities across the United States.

And with that, I yield the floor. I see my colleague from California, who has been such an important, strong voice on these issues on the floor.

I yield the floor.

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

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues today in support of Senator VAN HOLLEN's SECURE Act.

Across the country right now, hundreds of thousands of Haitian men, women, and children are terrified. They are terrified for their futures, for their children's futures. They are terrified about being forced back to a country that is gripped by a catastrophic humanitarian crisis.

Nearly 1.5 million Haitians have been displaced by gang violence. Food insecurity is widespread. Basic services have collapsed. It is a country that the State Department—the State Department—warns Americans not to travel to because of the risk of kidnapping, violent crime, and civil unrest.

Think about that for a second.

The Trump administration itself is warning Americans not to travel to Haiti because of how unsafe it is. Yet the same administration wants to force over 300,000 Haitian nationals—who, until very recently, held temporary protected status—to go there.

Now, the President has made it very clear for years what he thinks about immigrants from Haiti. And we received reports in the past few days that the Department of Homeland Security is preparing for a mass roundup and swift deportation of these families in the coming days.

So now, thanks to the President's hostility toward immigrants, TPS holders from countries in turmoil—many of whom have lived in the United States for years, if not decades—are now in danger and at the mercy of this cruel administration.

But the fact of the matter is, the American people do not support the President's goal of kicking these men, women, and children out and forcing them back to a nation steeped in danger and turmoil, because the American people recognize the fundamental fact that TPS holders—who are legally granted protection in the United States, who registered with the Federal Government, who passed background checks and received authorization to live and to work here—are human beings—human beings that deserve respect and dignity, and we have a moral obligation to help when we can.

More than that, most Americans recognize how much TPS holders and immigrants, more broadly, contribute to our country—the economic, social, and cultural benefits they have provided us, as they have worked and lived among us for years, developing strong roots in our communities.

Yes, over time, TPS holders become our neighbors, our coworkers, and our friends. The more than 94 percent of TPS holders who participate in the labor force, as of 2017, are nurses and construction workers—vital jobs for the people of the United States and for our economy. They are home health aides, hotel workers, and entrepreneurs. Collectively, they contribute around $29 billion to the U.S. economy every year and pay more than $7.8 billion in Federal, payroll, State, and local taxes annually as well.

That is right. They pay nearly $8 billion in taxes every year.

If more than 300,000 Haitian workers suddenly drop out of the workforce, the impacts are going to be very real and very sudden.

And we can't forget that many are raising American children, not only as caregivers for other people's children but as parents to nearly 400,000 U.S. citizen children.

And that impact is only magnified when you pull back and consider the more than 1 million people who had TPS as of early 2025 and have been targeted by this administration and its cruel mass detention and mass deportation agenda.

So, colleagues, I am going to say something that I don't say very often: I agree with Governor Mike DeWine, the Republican Governor of Ohio, who has called ending TPS a "mistake" that is going to bring a steep economic toll with it.

Temporary protected status exists exactly for moments like this, when countries like Haiti—along with Venezuela, South Sudan, Afghanistan, and others—are experiencing exactly the kind of crisis that Congress had in mind when it created this program on a bipartisan basis.

But this administration is choosing to turn its back on the people that this program was meant to help and protect, while hurting our country in the process. So we need to do more to protect people who have built their lives here and who have contributed so much to our country.

So I want to thank Senator VAN HOLLEN for trying to pass the SECURE Act. He has my support. I urge all of you to support the SECURE Act as well.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Well, Mr. President, the Trump Presidency is just a disaster, and more and more people know it. Just about everyone is getting to know it now.

This morning's CNN poll—right over my shoulder—is further confirmation that Trump has completely lost the trust of the American people.

Americans can see it, smell it, feel it: Trump's priorities are completely out of whack. He is concerned not with average citizens and making their lives better, just his own ego.

Just look at some of these numbers: More than three in every four Americans say that Trump's disastrous war on Iran hasn't been worth the cost. The same numbers say they have experienced hardship because of gas prices: 79 percent.

And when asked: Does Trump have the right priorities? Seventy-three percent say no. A record 73 percent of Americans think Trump hasn't focused enough on the most pressing issues they face.

Pick any poll. Pick any issue. You will come to the same conclusion: Trump is totally out of touch. He is hurting America and not listening to America.

No one likes what you are doing. Are you listening, Donald? No one likes what you are doing.

Look at those numbers. They should make Donald Trump hang his head in shame: 72 percent disapprove of how he is conducting the war in Iran; 79 percent disapprove of him on gas prices; 73 percent say you have the wrong priorities for them.

When the overwhelming majority of Americans say you are taking the country in the wrong direction, you better change course.

Trump and his party can either take the hint or take a hike when it comes in November.

Democrats have been clear on appropriations. Democrats have been clear from the start: We want to fund the government, avoid a shutdown, pass strong appropriations bills that improve people's lives. Bipartisan negotiations are ongoing, and Senate Democrats are working in good faith to reach an agreement to keep the appropriations process moving forward.

We are fighting for a bipartisan funding package—not partisan bills that bankroll Donald Trump's war agenda while leaving working families behind. Any CR must be bipartisan. We must keep the government open without abandoning the needs of working families or giving Donald Trump a blank check for his destructive agenda.

There is a responsible path forward. Senate Democrats are ready to take it. Republicans must meet us to get that done.

MEDICARE

Mr. President, Trump's crusade against Americans' healthcare costs continues every single day. Listen to this: Yesterday, Trump doubled prescription drug costs for millions of seniors by making cuts to Medicare drug plans. Just 2 days before Medicare's 61st anniversary, no less, he is cutting the dollars we need and doubling prescription drug costs for millions of seniors.

Can Trump get any more heartless? We are talking about seniors splitting pills in half to ration life-saving drugs or skipping meals to afford their medication at the pharmacy counter. That is despicable.

This is just the latest salvo in Trump's war on Americans' healthcare.

A year ago, Trump ransacked over a trillion dollars from the healthcare system to bankroll tax giveaways to the wealthiest Americans and corporations.

And since then, millions of people have lost their coverage altogether while tens of millions get slammed while premiums double, triple, even quadruple.

But I guess that wasn't enough for Donald. Now he is coming after seniors—millions of them—by raising their prescription drug costs.

In Trump's America, families are fighting for their lives while the rich get richer.

IRAN

Mr. President, Trump is more concerned about protecting himself from the repercussions of his failed war in Iran than protecting our troops who are in the line of fire.

As Trump twiddles his thumbs without any plan for how to end his reckless misadventure, our servicemembers are facing down barrage after barrage of Iranian missiles and drones.

Donald, posting another lie on Truth Social won't stop the missiles from flying. Thumping your chest won't bring down the crushing gas prices you have sent skyrocketing. And brushing casualties under the rug doesn't get our men and women in uniform out of harm's way.

And those whose names were eliminated, before they put them back, do not come back to life when you just simply take their name off the roll.

There is only one way to do that—to do all of that—bring our troops home. End the war. Democrats will soon force another vote on our War Powers Resolution to end this aimless war and bring our troops back home to their families.

Every second Trump prolongs this war, our servicemembers' lives are at risk.

Senate Republicans, stand up for troops, not the President who sent them to war without a plan, without a mission, without an exit strategy. Senate Republicans, stand up with the American people and come join us in ending this war.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, let us stand in recess until 2:15 p.m.

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

SUPPORTING EARLY-CHILDHOOD EDUCATORS' DEDUCTIONS ACT—Motion to Proceed—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

DIGITAL ASSET MARKET CLARITY ACT

Ms. LUMMIS. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the Digital Asset Market Clarity Act, also known as the CLARITY Act, and about the years of work that brought us to this moment.

Now, I only have a few minutes to get started, but I am just getting wound up. I am going to talk for a little while. Then I am going to be back tomorrow, and I am going to talk about this some more because I have got a lot of pent-up things to say.

First of all, this is a very good bill—good for the country, good for consumers, and good for the people we all represent on both sides of this aisle. So, after 11 months of giving nearly everything that was asked of us, I am genuinely struggling to understand what else my colleagues across the aisle think it needs before we act.

When I was elected to the Senate in 2020, I knew I wanted to work on digital asset legislation because Wyoming's legislature was already years ahead of Washington. It was building a legal framework for digital asset companies before most of the country was even paying attention. I wanted to do everything I could to keep those companies in Wyoming and, more importantly, to keep them in America.

The person I have been most proud to work with is Democrat Senator KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND of New York. People have raised an eyebrow for years that a Wyoming Republican and a New York Democrat have worked hand in hand on this bill, but we have become genuine friends, and I trust her.

In June 2022, we introduced the Lummis-Gillibrand Responsible Financial Innovation Act together—the first real attempt at a comprehensive regulatory framework for digital assets, dividing oversight between the SEC and the CFTC and regulating stablecoins. That was a 168-page bill. We had to start by deciding whether to create a unique, new, stand-alone regulatory framework or lay digital assets over the existing framework. We chose the latter, and then we took off from there.

We reintroduced Lummis-Gillibrand in 2023. That was a 274-page bill. It contained provisions that cracked down on mixers and tumblers and crypto ATMs. It required plain-language customer agreements and regulated crypto advertising. It was a very strong bill for consumers. From a consumer protection standpoint, it had improved dramatically.

That partnership is now the foundation this bill stands on, and it is why I reject any suggestion that this bill is partisan. This bill is bipartisan. It has always been about keeping an industry we want here—here to stay—but regulated in the right way.

In Wyoming, we used to call it ''growth on our terms.'' This bill is growth on our terms. It is growth on American terms—protecting consumers and protecting us from illicit finance.

Today, we have a 616-page bill because I have listened to my Republican and Democrat friends, incorporated their priorities, and tried to create the best bill possible. That is how we got to a 15-to-9 bipartisan vote out of the Banking Committee in May.

Now, plenty of people have told me to try to move this through on Republican votes alone and skip the headache. I have rejected that every time because the only way to get a bill through Congress that actually lasts is to build it together. We have earned support not only from every corner of the digital asset industry, but we have earned the support of major cornerstones in our financial industry, like Goldman Sachs and Fidelity.

Just this past Friday, the National Fraternal Order of Police endorsed this bill—an organization that spent months telling us this legislation would tie the hands of law enforcement investigating crypto crime. We listened and worked to secure dozens of illicit finance and anti-money laundering provisions that give law enforcement the tools they need, and they can hold bad actors accountable now. When they saw that, they came around. That is what good-faith negotiations produce.

Before any one of my Democratic colleagues tells me this bill doesn't do enough, I want to show each of you what 11 months of negotiations produce—provision after provision. I want the record to show precisely what was asked for and what we delivered.

Title I alone reflects 33 separate Democrat-driven edits, including tightening the bill's core definitions so companies can't structure their way around Federal securities laws; building a mandatory SEC ''front door'' certification process; adding anti-evasion authority so the SEC can look at the totality of facts and circumstances, rather than being boxed in by a technical loophole; cutting the annual fundraising cap from $75 million to $50 million, with a hard $200 million lifetime limit; barring felons convicted of fraud or money laundering from using this framework at all; and tightening the related persons resale restrictions from a 5-percent ownership threshold down to a 3-percent so insiders can't quietly dump tokens on the public.

We also built three entirely new titles at the Democrats' request. We added 23 additional sections combating illicit finance, including determining when a decentralized finance platform is really decentralized or whether it is just decentralized in name only, and when they are subject to the securities laws and Bank Secrecy Act requirements; sanctions compliance for DeFi platforms; new sanctions authority that can be used to target crypto platforms that facilitate money laundering to Russia, Iran, and North Korea; $150 million in new FinCEN funding and mandatory Treasury and GAO studies on mixers, foreign adversary activity, and financial stability risk; Federal protections for digital asset ATMs, consumer disclosures, Federal Trade Commission authority, and a joint SEC-CFTC financial literacy mandate.

Democrats also got more than 30 wins in the agriculture division of this bill, the CFTC portion, including a private right of action for consumer protection violations; capturing meme coins in the CFTC's jurisdiction; a stronger ''conflict of interest'' rulemaking than the House-passed bill; exchange-based consumer protection disclosures; best execution rulemaking; anti-manipulation and credit rulemakings; $150 million in CFTC appropriations; a new office of the retail digital commodity advocate; and requirements for digital commodity exchanges to recruit culturally diverse boards of directors.

This isn't a courtesy list. Every single one of those items was something my colleagues across the aisle insisted on and something Republicans agreed to because a partisan bill doesn't survive the next election, the next administration, or the next market turndown. We put what is best for American innovation ahead of politics. I am simply asking my Democratic colleagues to do the same.

Nowhere are our concessions more apparent than on ethics. When my Democratic colleagues brought their concerns to me, I didn't ignore them. In fact, I took them straight to the President, and as a sign of good faith and commitment to American innovation, President Trump voluntarily delivered the strongest set of ethics provisions in U.S. history. I put my own relationship with President Trump on the line—so did BERNIE MORENO—to get a deal on ethics, and he agreed to it. No court, regulator, or statute compelled him to accept or offer any of this. He agreed to it because he believes so strongly that America, more than any other country, should be the one leading the way on digital asset innovation.

We are talking about a first-of-its-kind ban on any covered individual—the President, Vice President, every Member of Congress, every Federal judge, and their spouses issuing or sponsoring a digital asset for consideration.

He is willing to put his existing digital assets in a blind trust or to divest himself of them entirely under established ethics procedures. No sitting President has ever been asked to do such a thing, but President Trump will do it.

The Attorney General is directed to bring civil enforcement actions against any covered individual who knowingly and willfully violates the ban. Digital asset exchanges face civil penalties of up to $250,000 per violation per day.

Violating officials must disgorge every dollar of profit and pay a penalty of up to 10 percent of what they receive or $500,000, whichever is greater.

That is what my Democrat friends asked for, and that is what the President gave you. President Trump said yes to a standard no one else on Earth could have forced on him, and I still hear that it is not enough. If you give a mouse a cookie—children's literature informs us—he will ask for a glass of milk, too, but we have now given our Democrat friends the entire cookie, factory, and a tanker-load of milk.

I want to be very direct with this Chamber because I am done being careful about this. I have spent my entire term working on this, and for the last 11 months, I have been stuck in windowless rooms with my friends on the other side of the aisle who have told me, over and over, that ethics would be the sticking point; that if the President put his holdings in a blind trust and if he were to accept enforcement and penalties and disclosures, that would be the signal my colleagues needed.

We got it.

Senator MORENO and I were elated. We were amazed that the President would accept this.

But it is not yet enough.

I didn't come here today to accuse anyone of acting in bad faith. I believe my friends on the other side of the aisle are acting in good faith. I came here to simply ask: What specifically is left to give that is reasonable? Tell me the section number, because you have over 100 significant wins in the base text and an ethics agreement that has more teeth than George Washington had, with no precedent in American history.

My friends, at some point, continuing to say ''not yet'' isn't cautious; it is a deliberate decision to run out the clock and kill a bill, rather than risk a ''no'' vote on the record, with constituents and industry to answer to.

I have more to say. I am going to say it. I am going to say it before we get a vote on this bill—just not today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT GHISLAINE MAXWELL SHOULD NOT BE GRANTED A PRESIDENTIAL PARDON OR ANY FORM OF CLEMENCY FOR HER CRIMES WITH JEFFREY EPSTEIN RELATING TO THE SEXUAL EXPLOITATION AND ABUSE OF MINORS

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, tomorrow, the Judiciary Committee will vote on Todd Blanche's nomination for Attorney General.

There are a number of reasons the members of the committee should oppose Todd Blanche's nomination—from his willingness to enable Donald Trump's worst instinct to his role in helping to create Trump's corrupt slush fund to pay out to January 6 rioters who assaulted police officers here in this Chamber and others. Yet there is one reason that stands out far ahead of the others—that of his complete and total mishandling of the Jeffrey Epstein and Ghislaine Maxwell case.

Former Trump Attorney General Pam Bondi told the House behind closed doors that Todd Blanche, as her Deputy, was responsible for how the Department handled the Epstein files. Under his supervision, the Department of Justice promised the release of Epstein's client list, claiming there was a list they compiled for Pam Bondi and sent to Pam Bondi, only to backtrack and refuse to release the document for months.

It took Congress passing an overwhelmingly bipartisan, veto-proof Federal law to force the release of these materials. Even then—even then—the Trump administration and specifically the Department of Justice, under Todd Blanche's management, delayed their compliance with this law.

When files were finally released, the identity of many perpetrators—not victims—were redacted, raising serious questions and concerns about who the administration was trying to protect. They redacted perpetrators, not victims.

As the White House and Justice Department tried to manage the fallout from mishandling this case, Todd Blanche was purportedly in the Situation Room with senior Trump administration officials working on a public relations strategy—well, on behalf of the President.

According to the New York Times, one of the options was to have a Justice Department lawyer interview Ghislaine Maxwell in order to get her to clear Donald Trump. Well, Todd Blanche apparently offered himself up to interview Ghislaine Maxwell and strangely raised the possibility that Maxwell's lawyer ''might expect something in return for her candor,'' according to the Times. A convicted sex trafficker wishes something in return from the President of the United States.

White House Counsel then laid out the possibility that Ghislaine Maxwell might be pardoned or have her sentence reduced. You heard that right. There literally was a serious discussion at the White House to pardon or reduce the sentence of Ghislaine Maxwell just in order to get her to say nice things about Donald Trump. And mind you, this is the same woman—the same woman—who facilitated Jeffrey Epstein's horrific abuse of underage girls over many years, year after year, hundreds of young women.

Our justice system worked as it was supposed to. Maxwell was found guilty by a jury of her peers. She was sentenced to 20 years in prison for her crimes. That is why it was odd when Todd Blanche, in a highly unusual step, personally interviewed Maxwell. And days later, she was—whoop—magically, magically transferred to a minimum security prison. Imagine that.

That is not the only thing that is odd. Ghislaine Maxwell's attorney, who Todd Blanche calls a friend, said that Maxwell wanted a pardon from Trump in exchange for her public testimony that would help Donald Trump. At the same time, Trump has refused to rule out—refused to rule out—pardoning her.

Trump has said:

> I'm allowed to do it.

He has even gone as far as saying:

> I'll take a look at it. I'll speak to the DOJ.

This is our President. The President said he would speak to the DOJ, which would now be led by his former lawyer Todd Blanche.

It is frankly horrifying that Trump would entertain the idea of clemency for even a second—even a second—for a convicted sex trafficker. That alone should be enough for the Senate to speak up with one voice and affirm that there should be absolutely no pardon for Ghislaine Maxwell—not now, not ever. That is why, earlier this year, I introduced a resolution doing just that. But given that Senate Republicans are poised to soon confirm Todd Blanche to lead the Department of Justice, the time to bring this resolution is now.

Earlier this month, the Senate passed a similar resolution saying there should be no Presidential pardon for Sam Bankman-Fried, so we have already set that precedent here in this Chamber. So let us now send a message to the White House and the Department of Justice right now that there should be no pardon for Ghislaine Maxwell. There should never be a pardon for someone who helped a monster—a monster—abuse underage girls for years. That is why I am requesting that we pass my commonsense resolution today saying just that.

Mr. President, notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 608.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

> A resolution (S. Res. 608) expressing the sense of the Senate that Ghislaine Maxwell should not be granted a Presidential pardon or any form of clemency for her crimes with Jeffrey Epstein relating to the sexual exploitation and abuse of minors.

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

Ms. ROSEN. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 608) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of February 12, 2026, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, I am so pleased that we could find unanimous agreement on a resolution against a pardon for Ghislaine Maxwell. If Republicans advance Todd Blanche's nomination tomorrow in the Judiciary Committee, this is the least they can do to make their opposition to a Maxwell pardon clear.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative senior proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

REMEMBERING LINDSEY GRAHAM

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to pay tribute to an outstanding U.S. Senator and a dear friend, Senator Lindsey Graham.

When my husband first woke me with the news that Lindsey had died the night before, I couldn't believe it. I said to him: That can't possibly be true. I thought it was some tasteless internet hoax or a false report. Not Lindsey. Not our Lindsey. But sadly, it was true, although I still find it so hard to accept. I can only imagine how difficult this unexpected loss must be for his beloved sister DARLINE and the other members of his family.

Often when we think of a Senator, we ask: Did he or she make a difference? Did he or she have an impact on events here at home or abroad? Was the person a consequential Senator?

With Lindsey, the answer clearly was the resounding yes. Lindsey was a leader not only in national policy but also in shaping international events. How telling it is that the Prime Minister of Israel and the President of Ukraine both made the long voyage to attend his memorial service yesterday at the National Cathedral.

Whether he was leading a congressional trip to Israel in the wake of the

October 7 massacre to demonstrate America's solidarity with Israel or his many trips to Ukraine to show the Senate's unwavering opposition to Russia's unprovoked invasion, Lindsey time and again demonstrated strong, effective leadership. He was truly a player on the world stage.

And for me, Lindsey was also a close friend. Along with Senators John McCain and Joe Lieberman, I traveled four times with Lindsey to Afghanistan and Iraq. Believe me, on those long military trips, you get to know your colleagues very well. Lindsey's unsurpassed sense of humor, his self-deprecating wit, and his storytelling ability made serving with him delightful, and I always learned so much when I traveled with him as well.

I keep thinking that John McCain and Joe Lieberman—both treasured friends and colleagues of mine—were there waiting to greet what they called the third amigo when Lindsey Graham entered the heavenly gates, and I tried to take some comfort in knowing that the three of them are now reunited.

Yesterday, we celebrated the life of this extraordinary Senator. Lindsey's life on Earth ended far too soon, but his legacy will endure forever.

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. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. LUMMIS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4744

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, 2 weeks ago, House Republicans failed to advance the Take Care of America's Veterans Act. That failure in the House was the latest example of broad bipartisan opposition to the Republican proposal to cut more than $50 billion—that is $50 billion—in benefits for disabled veterans over the next 10 years.

This controversial proposal continues to divide Congress, and it also is dividing the veteran community. And it is something we could have easily averted if my Republican friends had engaged in a serious and substantive conversation about the process, a conversation not only with Democrats but with the veterans service organizations.

They pursued a take-it-or-leave-it approach. I would like to think that it is mainly the House of Representatives that is responsible for this take-it-or-leave-it approach because Democrats and veterans advocates have been very clear from the very beginning, we oppose the cuts in the Take Care of America's Veterans Act for more than 1 million veterans who are currently eligible to receive benefits because they suffer from sleep apnea or tinnitus.

These disabilities are not hypothetical or abstract; they are real. And they do disable people, and often they are the result directly from combat or training that inflicts the same kind of harms. For example, standing near artillery being fired for many hours a day, the result is impairments of hearing, tinnitus. And the toxic chemicals in training as well as in combat can result in sleep apnea.

So I am here to say again I oppose efforts to water down the Major Richard Star Act, a DOD-administered and funded policy, with cuts to veterans' benefits. I oppose watering it down by taking care and benefits away from veterans.

The Take Care of America's Veterans Act, to its credit, includes dozens of bipartisan priorities that Democrats have authored and championed. They are bipartisan, many of them. I support them. I want these priorities signed into law. Veterans, survivors, and caregivers deserve them. But we cannot accept the false narrative that accepting the Republican-proposed cuts is the only way to do it—our way or the highway—especially since it is a budgetary rule that has been selectively enforced in the past that somehow there needs to be an offset.

In fact, there should not be an offset to care for veterans by taking away from other veterans for a program that is an obligation of the Department of Defense. Call it the Department of War; it is still their obligation to provide full retirement pay without subtraction for disability benefits, as is now required. Unjustly, unconscionably, Republicans insist on offsetting new investments in veterans with those offsets, which is absurd, and I hope still my Republican colleagues will look to the compromise that I have offered.

I don't think there should be a need for an offset. There hasn't been for some benefits in the past. But if Republicans are going to continue to block the Major Richard Star Act with insistence on an offset or a pay-for, I have one. It is, in fact, contained in an alternative bill that I am offering today to address the two major concerns with the Take Care of America's Veterans Act. First, it would replace the watered-down version of the Major Richard Star Act with my bill to fully eliminate the wounded veterans tax, and it would strike the unprecedented cuts for disabled veterans who suffer from service-connected tinnitus and sleep apnea. In doing so, it would utilize unspent Department of Defense funds from H.R. 1, the so-called Big Beautiful Bill, to cover the entire cost of the bill. It is the only offset proposal for the Take Care of America's Veterans Act that has garnered bipartisan support, and it is the one that doesn't pit some veterans against other veterans.

More than $75 billion of the Department of Defense funds in H.R. 1, a bill signed into law more than 1 year ago, still remain unspent and unobligated, and CBO has confirmed—absolutely confirmed—enactment of my proposal prior to the Department's obligation of those funds would provide the savings we need. The CBO has said, if we pass this bill, the savings from unobligated funds can be counted as an offset.

Let me just say bluntly: There is a lot of rhetorical rigmarole that we can apply to pay-go and offsets and pay-fors. We make the laws here. We can pay for this program out of unobligated funds that the Secretary of Defense—call him the Secretary of War—has said is unobligated.

Now, he has said a lot of it will be obligated, but it is for things like the Golden Dome, where most military experts say that money will not be feasibly spent by the end of the year. We should use it if we need to have an offset.

I believe that veterans, survivors, and caregivers have paid for their benefits through service and sacrifice. The cost of caring for veterans is part of the cost of war, and for those combat-injured veterans who are receiving disability benefits for their injuries, they should not have to sacrifice their retirement pay that is an obligation of the Department of Defense. It should not be taken out of the VA. It may seem like an abstract principle, but to veterans who would lose sleep apnea and tinnitus benefits, it is a big deal. In fact, it can be a life-changing deal.

Costs that are dramatically increasing each day because of the President's blundering war of choice in Iran have resulted in 18 service members dying and more than 600 injured, and they will be among the ones who are penalized if they retire with fewer than 20 years. We are creating a new generation of combat-injured veterans. It is unconscionable to claim that we can only care for them by forcing other veterans to sacrifice. We need to do the right thing. Veterans deserve meaningful results from a grateful nation, and they should never be handed an invoice when the costs of war come due.

My Republican colleagues cannot claim that the Major Richard Star Act is unaffordable. If you want a chart to give you some idea of the comparatively minuscule cost of the Major Richard Star Act, here is $13 billion. It is over 10 years. Here is our fiscal year 2027 defense request for 1 year. It dwarfs. In fact, $13 billion is hardly a rounding error on $1.5 trillion. The NDAA benefits expansion in fiscal year 2020 and fiscal year 2021 was $13 billion—no pay-for. The estimated cost of the Iran war: $38 billion. That figure is a lowball. It is in excess, really, of $100 billion; we all know it.

Compared to all we spend on our defense capability, doing right by these veterans is basically a rounding error that the country can well afford.

Now, my colleague's bill also siphons off $500 million from disabled veterans for an IT slush fund that the VA does not need or request. The money that they are taking from veterans who suffer from sleep apnea or tinnitus covers, in their view, the Major Richard Star

Act, but it is only 17 percent of the money that they are taking away from these disabled veterans. The rest of it, of the $56.2 billion that they would save by, in effect, inflicting harm on these veterans—who knows.

Taking money from veterans with service-connected disabilities and giving it to President Trump's cronies or whoever else is going to lay claim to that compensation cut but not used is absolutely shameful—a staggering dereliction of our obligation to veterans. Cutting $56 billion worth of benefits when only 15 percent, 17 percent will go toward covering new VA benefits is cruel and unconscionable. Better to adopt my compromise proposal. Taking unobligated funds—$13 billion—out of the more than $75 billion that are unspent and unobligated, that the CBO says can be used for these savings, is the better way to go. It is the only one that has garnered bipartisan support. It is the only one that isn't opposed by the stakeholders. It is the only one that can pass. It is the only one that should pass.

So notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 433, S. 4744. I ask unanimous consent that the Blumenthal substitute amendment at the desk be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, reserving the right to object, it saddens me that we are here because I wish we were here with a vote on the Senate floor to pass the Major Richard Star Act and other pieces of legislation that are so important to veterans, their families, and their caregivers across the country.

The Senator from Connecticut outlined all the things that he says his amendment to this legislation would do and be supported by, but the reality is, the Senator from Connecticut has tried time and time again to pass legislation similar to that, never to succeed.

Earlier this year, I was on the Senate floor at my seat here, standing here telling folks that maybe for once we will quit sponsoring pieces of legislation that benefit veterans but never get to the point in which they are actually passed. And I committed myself to finding a way in which passage of the legislation could occur, not just remarks on the Senate floor or in committee or in gatherings of veterans or speaking to our constituents at home of our support. In most instances, this would be the Major Richard Star Act, which has nearly every Member of the Senate as a cosponsor and many Members of the House of Representatives as cosponsors. But that has been the case for 6 years. I was looking for a path that would result in a result.

At the heart of the debate today are those tens of millions of servicemembers, veterans and caregivers, survivors and family members, and VA employees who would benefit by the legislation that I have introduced—the legislation that the Senator from Connecticut is offering to accept with some amendments.

These men and women have been waiting years—years—for the lifesaving benefits this bill would provide. What we will decide today will determine whether they can access the mental health treatments they desperately need, whether they can put food on the table and pay their bills on time, whether they are able to remarry after the loss of their servicemember or veteran spouse without sacrificing benefits they need to support their families, and much more.

The point of that sentence or few sentences is that this is a comprehensive piece of legislation that begins with the Richard Star Act—the one that I said was sponsored by most Members of Congress but never sees the outcome those veterans and military retirees deserve.

The stakes in this debate are high. I think the legislation we are talking about—perhaps debating about—is one of the most consequential pieces of legislation that will affect veterans, their family members, caregivers, and others certainly in my time as chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs and perhaps my time in the U.S. Senate.

I have been a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee 14 years in the House and now 15 years in the Senate. I have devoted effort, time, and attention to making sure we do right by those who serve our country.

I appreciate my colleague Senator BLUMENTHAL—in fact, our shared determination, our dedication to the Richard Star Act. He has tried, as I understand by his words, eight times offering a unanimous consent, and each time, that effort has been unsuccessful.

Occasionally, I get complimented for effort. I appreciate compliments at any stage of what we are doing here, but what we really ought to be interested in is getting results—not results for a compliment but results because it makes such a difference in so many veterans' lives.

Today, the Senator from Connecticut—it is another example of his attempt to pass legislation—usually without an offset but today using an alternative offset. I respect his goal, but once again, as of July 22, the Congressional Budget Office has again confirmed to the committee that a rescission of unobligated funds to the Department of Defense in H.R. 1 does not offset mandatory spending and therefore does not qualify under the requirements of law to the Senate—excuse me—the requirements of law as the Senate does its work but as the House and Congress are obligated to abide by.

This plan does not meet the needs of the moment, and it will result in the failure by Congress once again to deliver to America's heroes.

There is a simple choice before us: We can either keep repeating failed efforts that result in no progress delivering for veterans and military families or we can step up and provide leadership needed to finally get them the help they need and deserve—action and results. We want action that has results. This is why shortly after this conversation, this discussion between the Senator from Connecticut and I, I will be asking for a unanimous consent agreement myself to pass the legislation with an offset that the Congressional Budget Office has determined to be a viable offset.

The Take Care of America's Veterans Act would expand benefits and healthcare to millions of veterans and their families, caregivers, and survivors across our Nation.

It combines 60—I think our committee, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, deservedly has the reputation of working in a bipartisan way to get results. We combined, in our efforts to get the Richard Star Act, other pieces of legislation that are hugely important to the veteran community—60 pieces of bipartisan legislation chosen in this process of putting this package together for their sponsorship and support by Democrats and Republicans.

This is not a partisan effort; this is a desire, an effort to accomplish something that would benefit all of us who have made efforts to support our veterans and to make certain that we do it in a way that gets 60 votes in the U.S. Senate.

That includes the Major Richard Star Act, of which the Senator from Connecticut has been a longtime advocate. That is to address a longstanding injustice—something that is totally wrong—by allowing medically retired, combat-disabled veterans—they are not allowed to receive both benefits. This would allow medically retired, combat-disabled veterans to receive both disability compensation from the VA and their earned retirement pay from the DOD.

The Senator from Connecticut talks about our committee and the committee that he serves on as well, the Armed Services Committee. The Armed Services Committee has jurisdiction, but there are so many veterans that have consequences from the current law that we decided—I decided it was time for us to step forward and find a path forward.

This legislation, in addition to the underlying Richard Star Act, includes the Love Lives on Act. That allows surviving spouses of fallen servicemembers and veterans to remarry without losing the benefits they need to support their families.

It includes the Veterans' ACCESS Act to make it easier for veterans to get lifesaving treatment—and particularly mental health capabilities—and expands access to high-quality care in VA medical facilities and in the community as well.

Those of us from rural places understand the value of that community care, and in today's time of challenges with our veterans' mental health and suicide prevention efforts, that community care becomes even more important. Quick access is critical.

It also includes the Sharri Briley and Eric Edmundson Veterans Benefits Expansion Act to increase compensation benefits for veterans with severe service-connected disabilities and their families.

There are dozens of other bills—bipartisan bills sponsored and led by Republicans and led by Democratic Members of the Senate—that are included in the Take Care of America's Veterans Act to make certain the VA is equipped with the right resources, staff, facilities, and authorities to provide the support servicemembers, veterans, and their families need.

The question we generally are arguing about is the pay-for. Again, the law requires that. To pay for these improvements, this bill would codify elements of a rule that the VA proposed 4 years ago in the Biden administration, in 2022. The VA indicated then and now that it plans to change how the Department evaluates claims for service-connected disability ratings for sleep apnea and tinnitus. VA officials testified before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs in January that the Department is moving forward, and VA officials confirmed that again just several weeks ago.

The reason this is important is that that means there are going to be changes that the VA is authorized to make in these two arenas in providing benefits to veterans.

The VA in the Biden administration—and apparently agreed to in the Trump administration—found there were ways to improve—they are required by law to evaluate the benefits they provide veterans, and if changes are appropriate because of medicine or science or changes in treatment, the VA can modify those benefits to reflect current science and medicine. The VA is going to do that. The offset is the fact that when the VA does that, it saves money. When the VA does that, however, it will be considered paying down the debt.

I don't know how it can be a radical idea or an unfair idea that if we are going to take the money out of the VA for those two circumstances—the VA is going to do that—why don't we capture a significant portion of that and actually use that money to provide benefits to veterans? It is not like we are taking something away. The VA is going to alter the formula in their normal course of business, and we are capturing the savings in part—we are capturing part of the savings to actually use it to help other veterans, their families, and their caregivers.

Once the Department finalizes the rule, the savings associated from that change in the rule will be lost. It will no longer serve as an offset for anything; it will just go into the General Treasury. It will be a lost opportunity for us to reinvest those funds in the long overdue improvements included in the Take Care of America's Veterans Act.

My colleague has stated that ''the costs of war include caring for our veterans.'' I share that sentiment. Military service is a family service. The cost of war also includes caring for spouses and children and caregivers and survivors. The Take Care of America's Veterans Act would do that and more.

So we had the opportunity to use something that is going to happen. We had the opportunity—we have the opportunity to make sure it is used to benefit veterans. The idea that we are taking a benefit away from someone is also false. This is prospective. After the rule changes, that is when we have the opportunity to make certain that we are still caring for our veterans. We are not taking anything away from any veteran that receives benefits today. In fact, there is a grace period in which veterans can continue to apply for these benefits after this legislation becomes law.

We are not taking anything away; we are using money that the VA says is no longer going to be spent and spending that money in a different way for veterans, often including the same veterans that receive those disability payments.

This legislation is strongly supported by many military and veterans organizations, including the Wounded Warrior Project, the Military Officers Association of America, Vietnam Veterans of America, AMVETS, the Tragedy Assistance Program—or TAPS—for Survivors, the Elizabeth Dole Foundation, the Veterans Justice Alliance, the National Defense Committee, the Military Coalition, and Mission Roll Call.

It is also supported by the American Legion—the largest veteran service organization in the country—and by Medal of Honor recipients Britt Slabinski and Earl Plumlee, the president and vice president of the Medal of Honor Society.

It is also supported by Richard Star's brother, who has been an advocate for the Richard Star legislation since the beginning of this issue's arrival and certainly since the passing of his brother and his interest in making sure that his brother is honored.

These organizations know the challenges facing the military and veteran community. They know firsthand the high cost of continued inaction by Congress, the cycle of delaying veterans, caregivers, and survivors from receiving earned benefits.

It is not a perfect analogy, but I remember my own mother lobbying me because she was a ''Notch Baby'' in the Social Security system. If you were born in a certain set of years, your benefits were less than the people before you and the people after you.

My mom accused me of—Congress—maybe she wasn't accusing me personally—but accused Congress of just waiting until she died before making the change.

I want to make sure that we do not lose another veteran, another servicemember. I want to make sure we get a result and we get a result fast.

When I introduced this legislation, my assumption was that we could accomplish this—even in the Senate and the House in this difficult world we work in—that this legislation could be passed by Congress and signed by the President, this legislation that is supported by the White House. We could get this legislation done in the miracle of a month.

I didn't anticipate the opposition that has arisen. I have indicated to the Senator—the ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs—an interest in working together to resolve differences, and we will work to do that.

But doing what we have done—what has been done time and time again—of a UC request that has no result is unsatisfactory to me and unsatisfactory to the veterans and the veterans organizations I just listed. I am tired of waiting. Don't wait until our veterans are no longer living before you do something to protect their benefits and resolve an injustice that has gone on far too long.

The cycle of delaying veterans, caregivers, and survivors from receiving their earned benefits must end and must end now.

And with that, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORENO). The objection is heard.

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am, frankly, astonished and appalled by the argument just made by my friend and colleague from Kansas, the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. His argument essentially is: The VA is going to take away these benefits through rulemaking and, therefore, we should take advantage of the savings that the VA is going to make by action that is wrong, unconscionable, and deeply hurtful to veterans.

Now, let's be very blunt here. The Biden administration was considering a similar proposal. I fought it. We fought it successfully. The Biden administration backed down because they knew it was wrong.

I predict that there will be this similar kind of outrage in the veterans community to taking away these disability benefits from well-deserving veterans and that the present Secretary of the VA will be forced to back down as well.

Why are we doing his handiwork when he has not even yet proposed the rule? We are assuming he will do something that is wrong, shameful, and unconscionable—and we should take advantage of it? Count me out.

I fought the Biden administration on this one. I will fight any rule that will inflict this harm on veterans. And even if he were to do it, why should we codify it, put it into statute so that it can't be reversed at some later point without another statute?

I am hopeful that we can reconsider this idea of depriving disabled veterans of benefits in order to help other veterans.

Now I want to be very clear. This is my eighth or ninth time here, asking for unanimous consent, but it is an entirely new proposal that I am offering. In fact, it is the same proposal that the Senator from Kansas is offering, except it doesn't take away benefits from veterans; it pays for the measure in another way.

The Senator from Kansas says it would be against the law for us to do it. Who makes laws here? The Senate and the Congress make the laws. If we made a law about how to pay for something, we can make an exception to that law. We are not bound inextricably and inevitably by other Congresses if we face an injustice under laws that other Congresses have passed. I am unwilling to accept the idea that we have to deprive benefits—gouge them, in effect—of benefits they have earned.

And let me just conclude by saying: All of the good things in this bill, count me in; but taking away benefits from veterans to pay for them, count me out.

I think we can do better as a nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I object. I indicated my objection.

Mr. President, I have described the Take Care of America's Veterans Act in my remarks following the unanimous consent request by the Senator from Connecticut.

But, again, I would highlight that these are changes that are going to be made under normal statutory law by rules at the Department of Veterans Affairs. And the end result is that the money, when saved, will be—the reductions and the savings that occur will accrue to the General Treasury, as compared to the benefits that we want to provide to the veterans in this country.

Notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to immediate consideration of Calendar No. 433, S. 4744. I ask unanimous consent that the Moran substitute amendment at the desk be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, for all the reasons that I have stated, this bill has all the right measures that I can support except taking away benefits in the expectation that the VA Secretary is going to promulgate a rule that has been beaten back in a prior administration, that we should be united in opposing.

Let me ask my colleague, the chairman of the VA Committee: Will you support the VA Secretary in proposing this rule that would, in effect, cut benefits for disabled veterans?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is reminded to direct his questions to the Chair.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I propose that question to my colleague through the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. You can answer; you cannot answer.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I look forward to continuing to work to make sure the veterans receive the benefits they are entitled to and to make certain that the VA does its job in a medical- and science-based manner and would await for the VA to accomplish that, which they indicated as recently as 2 weeks ago they were going to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am going to be really charitable because I know my colleague's heart is in the right place, and I know we share an objective here, which is to care for our veterans.

And I am going to interpret that answer as his being willing to join—if it comes to pass that we have this proposed rule, that he would oppose it.

I think the VSOs would oppose it. I think the veterans community would oppose it. I think the people of America would oppose it, which is why it was withdrawn under the Biden administration—because it is such a shameful, bad idea. And we should not incorporate it in a veterans bill, the Take Care of America's Veterans Act as a means to pay for benefits to other veterans when there is no need for a pay-for.

All of the good things in the Take Care of America's Veterans Act—I support. We have a path. We have a path. Use the money from H.R. 1: unspent, unobligated, unfeasible to spend before the end of the fiscal year. It will go back into the Treasury.

I think the path is clear. I hope we can come together and support it.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection to the underlying request?

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, the rulemaking process that was initiated in the Biden administration in 2022 has continued on the VA's list of work and has never been withdrawn and continues to be considered. And as I indicated now for the third time—indicated by the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs—the Department—that it will be implemented.

I just know that repeating the same political talking points without a realistic alternative has prevented these bills—and particularly the Richard Star Act—from passing for years. It has been too easy for us to put our name on the legislation and never see it accomplished.

We can tell our veterans we are supporting them, we are working for them—I want a path forward that actually demonstrates that we are able to accomplish the elimination of this injustice and the support for veterans who desperately need our attention.

Our veterans should not have to—they know the cost of war. They should not have to wait for us any longer.

And, again, the offer that the Senator from Connecticut indicated, it is the same kind of UC request with something as was—that doesn't result in a result because it is not an offset that satisfies the law.

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

SHIPS FOR AMERICA ACT

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, Americans are aware that many of the products we buy and sell in this country are manufactured in China, but fewer may know that most of the Chinese goods come across the ocean and into our ports on Chinese ships—whether they are flying the Chinese flag, whether they are owned or operated by Chinese companies, or are even built in Chinese shipyards.

But what may come as a shock is that those same ships could also carry deadly weapons. That is right. Hidden among the shipping containers carrying appliances, clothing, and household goods, might well be missile launchers and drone launching systems. Arriving undetected, they could target our cities, destroy our infrastructure, and kill our citizens.

This is a possibility American leaders must prepare for now. Naval analysts confirm that China is retrofitting cargo ships with deadly weapons: long-range strike and surface-to-air missiles, drone launching systems, and radar and tracking systems.

A large percentage of these vessels coming in and out of our ports are owned and operated by firms with direct ties to the Chinese Communist Party. What if one of these ships arrived in one of America's largest ports? Now, the best case scenario is our intelligence community would detect the weapons, enabling the Coast Guard to intercept and seize the Chinese ship. That is the best case scenario.

But there is a far more alarming possibility: An armed Chinese cargo carrier slips in, undetected, and it launches devastating attacks on the port, destroying vital infrastructure and killing hundreds, and possibly many, many more.

The Port of Houston is, for example, one of the largest by tonnage in our country. It is home to the world's largest petrochemical complex and a quarter of America's oil refining capacity.

The explosions caused by a Chinese attack on the port would send clouds of carcinogens into the air and over nearby communities. Meanwhile, America's energy supply would be devastated, causing painful shortages and draining the economy of millions of dollars a day.

A similar disaster could play out at any of our other major ports—Los Angeles, for example, our hub for transpacific trade; or Hampton Roads, VA, the east coast's deepest harbor and home to the world's largest naval base.

Now, neither of these situations is inevitable if we cut our reliance on Chinese vessels and we decide to make American ships again.

You see, the United States was once home to the world's largest commercial fleet, numbering 4,000 ships. Today, we manufacture only a handful of commercial vessels each year. China can build over a thousand. In total, the United States has fewer than 100 ocean-going commercial vessels; while China, they have nearly 6,000, the largest fleet in the world.

Letting our maritime industrial base continue to rust is a great risk. It doesn't just give China control over global supply chains and levers to constrain America's policy options; it presents the Chinese Communist Party opportunities every day to sneak weapons into our cities.

We have a choice. We can do nothing and invite a potential economic and national security disaster, or we can rebuild our fleet. We can end our dependence on Chinese ships, and we can open up a new era of American ship building.

I choose the latter. I choose restoring American maritime dominance.

The SHIPS for America Act is the best way to accomplish this. The bill will encourage the construction of new ships and shipyards through tax incentives. It will deliver deregulation and permitting reform to reduce costs and speed the delivery of new vessels. It also will modernize training programs at our maritime academies and recruit a new generation of mariners.

And the SHIPS Act will establish a maritime security trust fund to finance these programs, plus an expansion of the U.S.-flagged international fleet to 250 ships by the mid-2030s.

Now, we have a strong champion in President Trump, whose Maritime Action Plan is consistent with this bill.

China is retrofitting its commercial ships into covert warships. The evidence is clear. So too is the risk of allowing these vessels to dominate global trade and fill our ports because we have no ships of our own.

But we have a plan to protect our ports and people, to build and launch a new fleet manned by American mariners, flying the Stars and Stripes. And Congress should pass the SHIPS Act without delay.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

STOP INSIDER TRADING ACT

Mr. RICKETTS. Mr. President, integrity—integrity inspires confidence. We have a problem here in the Senate and in the House: 80 percent of Americans believe we do a poor job of keeping our financial interests separate from the insider information that we have. People don't have the confidence in us, and that leads to an approval rating of 15 percent for Congress.

But we can help restore integrity, and therefore confidence—confidence in the Senate, confidence in the House, confidence in our institutions. We can do that with a bill that I have introduced called the Stop Insider Trading Act.

Now, it is well known that Members of this body and the House have bought individual stocks. In fact, we have seen that people will post on social media the stock trades of the former Speaker of the House and trade off of her trades. In fact, as crazy as it sounds, that has become a legitimate investment strategy because it makes money. And that undermines the confidence people have in our institutions.

We have disclosure laws, which is how people can see those trades and make them. But it is not enough for the integrity of the institution. We need to make the rules stronger. We need to stop people from being able to buy individual stocks in the Senate and in the House.

We need my Stop Insider Trading Act because that is exactly what it does. It says that, if you get elected to the House of Representatives or the U.S. Senate, you can no longer buy stock. Trading on insider information will become impossible because you won't be able to make that purchase.

Now, we also want to make sure that if, say, you come from a successful business, we don't want to penalize you. We are not going to force you to sell your stock of your company. But we are going to say that you have to give notice, 7 days at least, to let people know if you are going to sell any positions you own. Remember, you can't buy any more. But if you have some already and you want to sell them, you have to give 7 days' notice.

And that will address the issue of, for example, when we had a member of the Intelligence Committee sell about a million and a half dollars' worth of stock right before the COVID pandemic selloff of the stock market.

Even the perception of impropriety undermines the integrity, and therefore the confidence the people have. So let's stop it altogether. Let's ban people's ability to use insider information to buy stocks and make sure, if they are going to sell any, that they have got to tell everybody well in advance so that Americans and the market can know.

My bill also has real teeth in it. It is a $2,000 fine or 10 percent of the proceeds. Let's say you sell a million dollars in stock, and you didn't tell the market ahead of time, like you were supposed to. You didn't follow that 7-day rule. It is a $100,000 penalty—a 10-percent penalty. So either $2,000 or 10 percent, whichever is bigger, plus you have to give up all your profits. That is a penalty with teeth that will get the attention of Members here on Capitol Hill.

It is time that we restore the integrity and the confidence in this body when it comes to inside information. We, because of our position, have access to this, but we should not benefit from it. This is supposed to be public service. No one should come here seeking a profit.

And yet, on Monday night, some of my colleagues tried to pass a unanimous consent, passing the Stop Insider Trader Act that the House of Representatives passed, and Democrats blocked it. Democrats blocked my Stop Insider Trading Act, which would have helped restore confidence in this body.

It is time that we got the Democrats on board, that we get this passed. It passed in the House with Democrat support. And 13 Democrats and 2 Democratic cosponsors are on the Stop Insider Trading Act in the House, which the House was able to pass. They have sent it here for the U.S. Senate—for us—to do our job.

I call on my Democratic colleagues—my colleagues across the aisle: Please, get on board. We need to restore faith in the institution. A 15-percent approval rating is terrible. We need to restore the integrity. We need to restore the confidence.

My Stop Insider Trading Act does just that. I encourage all of my colleagues to get on board this commonsense proposal to be able to restore integrity and confidence in the U.S. Senate and prevent insider trading from getting between us and the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, I want to talk about a subject people just love to talk about. I have come to the floor to talk about a big scam in our country. It is happening in broad daylight before our very eyes. Politicians here in Washington know what is going on, but they refuse to speak about it. They are too worried about getting reelected in most cases, and they think telling the truth about the scam will hurt their chances of staying in power.

Well, here is the sad truth: For decades now, the American people have paid into Social Security each month without having any idea if they will ever see a cent of the money they put in.

Since being signed into law in 1935 by Franklin Delano Roosevelt, our great President, Americans' money has been going in the front door of the Federal Government and then going right out the back door. Your dollar doesn't grow, and it doesn't come back to you or your children. It is a big, gigantic, blown-up Ponzi scheme, and the last time I looked, people who do Ponzi schemes usually go to jail.

Every American is forced to participate in it. You have no choice. You don't have a say in the matter. Whether you are 17 or 67, more than 6 percent of your paycheck is taken out by the Federal Government to pay for Social Security—your so-called retirement. That might not seem like a lot, but to millions of Americans struggling to live paycheck to paycheck, that 6 percent is a huge sacrifice.

Americans have been paying into this program for years, only to see a fraction of what they have been promised. It really makes you wonder how this government-approved Ponzi scheme is legal.

The truth is that this ''retirement savings'' program is 100 percent broke. It is absolutely broke, just like our Federal Government—$40 trillion in debt. The Social Security trust fund is projected to run out of its reserve money in 2032—just a few years from now. You know, when these funds are depleted, senior citizens could see a cut in their monthly check up to 22 to 25 percent of their benefits. On average, that is $500 a month.

You know, if the Federal Government were to try to save the program, it would most likely mean that your taxes would skyrocket.

Mr. President, 38 percent of mandatory spending within the Federal budget annually goes toward the failing Social Security Program. Yes, the money you send up here, 38 percent a year goes to Social Security—not the money that you already sent because, guess what, it has been sent and it has been spent and scammed out of our system. It is not there. In other words, almost $1.6 trillion every year of your taxpayer dollars is being spent on a program that is currently scheduled to go bankrupt in 6 years. So basically, the money you send up here has been spent and now is nowhere to be found.

The Social Security Program is the single largest program we are wasting our tax dollars on—the biggest. It is a mind-boggling program to say the least, but don't worry, it gets worse.

After decades of having Social Security taken out, millions of Americans have to pay taxes when they go to collect their Social Security. Yep, you heard exactly right. After you pay taxes and you put it in there for savings for many years and you get it back, guess what—you have to pay taxes on it now because our former President and former Senator, Mr. Joe Biden, when he was a Senator in 1983, got the great idea of, let's tax Social Security. What a scam. Depending on which tax bracket you are in, between 50 percent to 85 percent of your benefits can be taxed by the Federal Government.

Last year, I introduced the Senior Citizens Tax Elimination Act to stop the unjust double tax on Social Security benefits. Thankfully, the One Big Beautiful Bill included senior deductions that significantly reduce Federal taxes for the majority of retirees. Thank goodness.

In a day and age where the cost of living is skyrocketing, our seniors should not experience a second tax on their Social Security when they have already paid tax on that money. If we must keep this outdated program, the least we can do is to ensure that senior citizens don't get slapped with a double tax.

Despite what millions of Americans have been tricked into believing, it turns out that paying into Social Security does not entitle you to a fixed pot of money. Everybody thinks: We are going to pay in, and I am going to get a lot of money in the end. The sad reality is that many Americans won't see a cent of the money that they paid into Social Security.

Basically, Social Security is just, folks, another tax—a tax on both employees and employers since most companies have to match the 6 percent that their employees are forced to pay out of their paychecks. Yeah, they double the tax.

This is socialism. It is highway robbery. And for the last 60 years, we have known this program was going under, but no one up here has been willing to fix it. In fact, Social Security is known as the third rail of politics that no one up here is allowed to talk about.

Don't talk about Social Security because we don't have a solution, and we might lose our jobs.

In fact, Social Security is known as that third rail because nobody will touch it. It is taboo to talk about Social Security. But my question is: Why? Why is that? We work for the people. We work for the taxpayers. We have known this program was going bankrupt for years. It has been a disaster since day one.

When millions of Americans are going to reach retirement age soon, we had better look out. They are expecting to get their money. They are expecting to get the money that they paid into Social Security for years. They are going to get screwed over with nothing left, and this is going to be a serious problem.

The Social Security scam doesn't stop there. As you know, Joe Biden welcomed tens of millions of illegals into this country with open arms. They said that our borders are closed. Yep, after they let 20 million people in that shouldn't be here. These aren't nice people either, most of them. Many of them are rapists, murderers, drug lords, and gang members. Well, it turns out, the Biden administration and Alejandro Mayorkas, our great Homeland Security Director, they weren't just letting these illegals into our country without vetting them; they were handing them Social Security and Medicaid benefits as they were coming into the door.

Welcome to the United States of America. We are broke, but we are going to give you money. We are going to give you a Social Security number.

It is no wonder we are broke. While millions of Americans will never see the Social Security benefits that they worked hard to pay into throughout their career, illegals, they are getting money. They are getting rich off the money that Joe Biden said that they could have. It is disgusting, but it is not surprising. This is our Federal Government.

So why aren't we allowed to talk about it? It is almost like the system was set up to fail from the get-go. I caught a lot of flak when I brought this up in a hearing just a few years ago.

What is this guy talking about? We are going to get Social Security.

Yep. If you believe that, I got beach land I will sell you out in Arizona.

If every single American had invested the money that they are forced to pay in Social Security each month into a stock—if they had done that, they would have gotten 10 times the money that they put in, if it was just invested in the stock market.

But do you know where it was invested in? Most people don't know this. Your money, when it comes here, is put into Treasury bonds that have very low returns—very, very low—not even close to anything that you would ever invest in yourself. That is where your money goes.

Don't be naive. The reason Social Security is invested in bonds is because it is being used to basically prop up the Federal Government.

We are broke. We don't have any money. Please send more. Can we raise the Social Security tax and just tell them they are going to get more money at the end?

Folks, it is a scam. If this money had been invested in the stock market, again, you would have had 10 to 15 times more money. It is embarrassing, but apparently we are not supposed to bring that up.

To his credit, President George Bush tried to save Social Security in 2000. He tried to privatize a lot of this money. If we had just done that—if this body in here would have just said: OK, we know we screwed it up for 40 years. Let's go ahead and do it. Let's get out of this jam.

They didn't want any part of it because they wanted to steal the rest of the money, and that is exactly what is going on.

He suggested that younger workers divert their portion—young workers divert their portion—to a money market account that would pay for theirs in the future and ours today, those of us that are close to the Social Security. But, of course, the DC swamp up here, they shut that down fast: Let's don't talk about Social Security. It is taboo. It is a dang shame. The program might not be on the verge of bankruptcy today if they had just invested part of the young people's money into the market.

But you have to remember, the government relies on your money for their slush fund. The Federal Government stopped working in your best interest a long, long time ago. The average taxpayer earning the median wage is paying approximately $3,500 to $4,500 annually into the Social Security Program. Over a 40-year work period, that is around $140,000 to $180,000. That could have gone toward a 401(k), and you would have had money to retire on. People would be seeing much greater returns.

We had better start figuring this out, folks. We had better start figuring it out. This group up here, a lot of them say: I am going to be gone. I won't have to worry about it.

Somebody is going to pay the price.

It won't be long until people will be coming right around this building going: Where is my money?

Do you remember January 6? Yep. January 6 was a pretty bad day. I was here. I sat right over there. It was my very first day here. I was thinking: What a disaster I have gotten into.

Well, if you start telling people, ''You are not getting your Social Security money,'' it is going to get ugly. And I don't blame them—not one bit. We are $40 trillion in debt. There is no sign of it slowing down. The bottom line is we need to get bureaucrats and politicians out of this mess, stop the Social Security scam, let people really know what is going on, and give the money back to the people.

We need to make sure Americans get what they were promised, or we need to come up with an alternative solution that would allow Americans to make their own retirement investments. Give them their money, or let's put it in a money market account. The stock market is booming.

It is far past time Washington, DC, starts working for the people that we are supposed to represent. What a thought. That is mind-boggling, isn't it? Why would we do that? We work for ourselves up here. We don't work for the people. It is ridiculous. It is a scam. Not for special interests. Not for career politicians entrenched in bureaucracy or for Washington elite pet projects.

Instead of spending money we don't have on things we don't need, why don't we put the money back into the American people's pockets and tell them the damn truth: We stole your money, but we are going to try to get your money back.

Not only is it in America's best interest to do this; it is the right thing to do.

I yield the floor.

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

TRIBUTE TO MARIE CORDIVANO

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, all of us who hold the office of Senator know that we really only succeed in our service to the States which we represent because of the tireless dedication of the men and women who make up our teams, back home where we are from and here in Washington, DC.

While we may be the face or the voice on television—it is our name on the bills; it is our name on the door—it is really the folks who make up our teams that make it possible for us to make a difference every day for the people we represent.

I am blessed to represent a million Delawareans. And I know that I could not do that job at all, let alone well, without the gift and the blessing of the service of roughly 50 people.

But today I want to take some time out to thank and recognize the heart of my team in Delaware, someone whom I have long admired and whose service I greatly appreciate, Marie Cordivano.

What does it take to run a political campaign, to run a political party, to run a Senate office? It takes someone like Marie. I have known her so long I feel like she has been in my office for decades, but it has really only been 5 years that she has been a full-time part of my Senate office, but I have known her since I first ran.

She is the heartbeat of the Delaware Democratic Party and, in many ways, of my office in Wilmington, DE. She brings so much to her service to her job: kindness, hospitality, a charitable and upbeat spirit, a passion for serving others, a lifelong Democrat, someone who is because she believes in helping others.

When I have asked folks for what they associate with Marie, one word came up over and over: mushrooms. Now, that might surprise you if you are not from where I am from, but just on the northern border of Delaware is the center of mushroom horticulture in North America, and because of Marie's family connection to some of the leaders in the mushroom industry, every year she brings a pallet at Thanksgiving of boxes of mushrooms and won't let anyone go without accepting one.

Being as I am a little picky about the Ethics Committee on which I serve, I initially tried to reject these gifts of mushrooms, to donate them to the food bank, or give them to someone else. And yet, like so much of Marie's hospitality and kindness, they just kept coming.

They are a welcomed and appreciated gift but a reminder of the example of her kindness and her generosity to others.

That is the word that came up most often when I asked others who have served with her for now 5 years in my office: What do you think of when you think of Marie? Kind, someone who gives great, big, warm hugs, who, even if she is having a hard day, asks: ''How is your day,'' someone with contagious positivity, someone who every day has to answer call after call after call from constituents who more often than not are calling to complain.

And Marie doesn't just answer the phone, she listens. She doesn't just listen, she engages. She doesn't just engage, she educates. She handles it with incredible skill, making sure that the folks who call my office are heard and their concerns are conveyed, and, if possible, that they leave better understanding what it is they called in about because, let's be blunt, sometimes these calls are motivated by seeing something on cable TV that maybe isn't exactly true. And so in a gentle but positive way, she asks persistent questions and guides my constituents to better insight.

When I have asked others in the office, they have said this: I can't imagine a better person to represent you, CHRIS, to your constituents. Even over the phone, you get a sense of Marie's heart and warmth, and there is no one more dedicated, not just for the fight of democracy but for the values of CHRIS COONS and his office.

So, Marie, thank you. Thank you for sharing your kindness. Thank you for sharing your warmth. Thank you for sharing what you have done for Delaware for so long. You are loved across our DC and Delaware teams and will be dearly missed. I hope you get to spend more time now with your children Ben and Sarah, with your grandchildren Asher and Carter, with your dog Nico.

You are the best of Delaware, a proud Padua alumna with a passion for service, family, kindness, and democracy. I cannot wait to hear about the adventures ahead, and thank you for your service.

TRIBUTE TO JOSE ESTRADA

Mr. President, I want to take some time today to also speak about someone who has been the heart of my team here in Washington, Jose Estrada.

My wife and I have come to view Jose not just as a colleague, an employee, but a friend, a member of our extended family.

What makes for an incredible public servant? diligence, determination, insight, hard work, humor, trust, kindness. Jose has all of these and more.

When he initially got the job offer, he drove without stopping from San Diego to DC, just a first sign of the intensity of his commitment to this work. I have watched him grow from being a right-out-of-college 22-year-old to someone whose advice and counsel on a daily basis are key to me and how I do my job.

He is often the first person I see in the morning and the last person I see at night. And he is incredibly humble and would never take credit for all the contributions he has made to my team and my office, which is why I thought it was important to get it on the record so that in the future he could not deny that he was well-regarded, well-respected, and made a significant impact.

It is hard to capture everything Jose does for our team. He is someone who always has the answers to pressing questions, whether from me, from the scheduling team, or from interns. He remembers whom I was in a meeting with 3 years ago. He remembers the details of all sorts of memos. He remembers the details of my life; what church I grew up in, what neighborhood I grew up in.

He has now mentored more than 70 interns in my office, and I am very proud of our intern program because it is where I hire from. I began here as an intern for Senator Bill Roth and for Senator Joe Biden, and knowing that Jose has taken intense care of every intern, their interview and selection, their placement in making sure they have the chance to genuinely contribute, means a lot to Annie and me.

From one of our former interns, they said: In a role where Jose had to be everywhere and do everything, he still spent the time to get to know each of us and make sure our internship was special.

And he has been so good at it that they then come and work for us full time in our office.

From one of his colleagues in my office here in Washington: In any crisis, you know you can call Jose and he will just take care of it. Not only will he take care of it, but you know you have a friend through all of it.

Jose, you have served with selflessness, kindness, dedication, even joy. You are someone who is willing to put in the hard work, to work 14, 16, 18 hours a day. When we are here all night for vote-arama, he is the one who is with me at 3 a.m., 4 a.m., 5 a.m. He takes the time to get up early, get that extra cup of coffee, get in to talk to the interns early, get them doughnuts, be generous with his time and advice, and make our office a great place to be.

The most important accolade, of course, comes not from me but from my wife Annie, who literally said Jose is one of the most ''thoughtful and kind people'' we know. I know he will be an inspiration to his 11-month-old niece Valentina. I know his parents Jose and Marisela are so proud of him. They need to know that you raised a remarkable young man. I know they will be thrilled to have him back in California as he returns to attend Stanford Law School this fall.

I believe there is nothing this promising young man cannot do. He has demonstrated remarkable wisdom and talent, insight into politics, and I am confident his future is bright, and we will someday see him back here.

The next chapter of his life includes becoming a lawyer and using the skills and the talent of a lawyer to change lives, to help those whom the law does not protect, and to advocate for justice at a time when that is really at risk in our Nation.

Jose, the office will simply not be the same without you, but you leave us better. We all will carry a piece of your heart, your humor, your kindness, and your insight. And you won't be free of us either because you are a friend and a member of our family for life.

You are the best of what DC should be, someone here truly to do good and to make a difference, and I hope you know that you have.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

HONORING MARSHAL BRAD FISHER

Mr. BANKS. Mr. President, before I begin my remarks today, I must say that with a heavy heart I am grieving today for town marshal Brad Fisher, a 25-year law enforcement veteran who was tragically killed today in the line of duty in Indiana.

Marshal Fisher was assisting other officers in stopping a fleeing suspect when the suspect hit Marshal Fisher and ultimately killed him.

I am praying for Marshal Fisher, for his family, everyone in the town of Lynn, IN, and Randolph County. What a devastating loss, a tragic loss. May he rest in peace.

And may we always remember the sacrifice that all of our men and women of law enforcement make when they keep us safe. I just want to take a minute and remember him.

ELECTION INTERFERENCE

Mr. President, President Trump recently confirmed what many of us already knew: that foreign adversaries like China are working daily to interfere in our elections and our democratic society.

China especially seeks America's decline in hopes that they can establish a world order that runs through the Chinese Communist Party, and we must do everything possible that we can to stop them from doing that.

Historically, when countries have held that kind of ambition, they have started big, catastrophic wars. It should come as no surprise that the People's Liberation Army is undertaking the largest peacetime military buildup in human history.

That is why it is incumbent upon this body to fully fund our military—including President Trump's $1.5 trillion defense budget request that he has made of this body—so that we can deter exactly that kind of conflict.

It is outrageous that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle—the Democrats—are holding up this bipartisan NDAA and budget request to fund our military when our military desperately needs our support.

Yet, even if we successfully deter a hot conflict, we could still lose in other ways. That is because every day the CCP is waging economic and political warfare against us. The CCP is trying to nurture dependency, exploit our divisions, cause us to question the justness of our cause, and erode our democracy.

This political warfare campaign is not confined to the shadows. In many cases, it operates out in the open.

Just take a look at Neville Roy Singham. Singham is a 72-year-old American tech mogul who sold his company and immediately fled to China. From his Shanghai office—which he shares with a CCP propaganda outlet—whose avowed mission, by the way, is ''to tell China's story well''—Singham began funding a complex network of leftwing NGOs and nonprofits that advance the interests of the Chinese Communist Party.

Take a look at some of the radical organizations on this chart that he supports through the billions of dollars that he made selling his tech company to a Chinese Communist Party business.

This is all a matter of public record. Even the New York Times has marveled at the hundreds of millions of dollars that Singham-linked groups have funneled to radical nonprofits that ''mix progressive advocacy with Chinese Government talking points.''

Take one example that you and I know well—CODEPINK—you know, the radical organization that chases many of us around the hallways—around this building and our office buildings. You see, CODEPINK used to condemn CCP human rights abuses.

But after Singham started lavishly funding the group—and then, by the way, he married its cofounder—CODEPINK stopped criticizing the Chinese Government and started defending it. In fact, in recent years, CODEPINK has even provided cover for the CCP's shocking genocide in Xinjiang.

Meanwhile, a newer Singham nonprofit called No Cold War is entirely dedicated to advocacy designed to ensure America is defenseless against the CCP's economic, military, and political warfare.

But the Singham network is not limited to China-specific advocacy. Singham groups advance a wide variety of causes that are united only by their hatred of America, our allies, and the rule of law.

From anti-ICE boycotts, violence against law enforcement, rioting, obstruction, and support for Hamas' attempted genocide of Jews in Israel, Singham groups and their members advance division, chaos, and hatred.

All of this advances CCP interests and poisons our society. Thankfully, under President Trump's leadership, the Department of Justice is now investigating this and whether Singham has been fueling this lawlessness in violation of U.S. law. It has been a long time coming.

At the same time, the State Department under Secretary Rubio is leading from the front in identifying leftwing violence and building an international coalition to confront it.

It should come as no surprise that, as the CCP seeks to interfere in our society, it also seeks to interfere in our elections. As President Trump disclosed before the American people in a prime-time address earlier this month, China perpetrated the largest known compromise of United States voter information in history: stealing the personal data of over 220 million Americans in the 2020 election.

The President also exposed ongoing vulnerabilities when it comes to America's elections, and thank God he did that. As one newly declassified intelligence assessment found:

We judge that U.S. adversaries, including at a minimum Russia, China, Iran, and North Korea, as well as non-state groups, have the capability to compromise U.S. election infrastructure.

Our adversaries are actively coming for our elections, and if that is not enough to sound the alarm—what you just heard from President Trump in his prime-time press conference and what I just shared with you—I don't know what else is.

All Americans—especially my colleagues in this body—should be outraged by this vulnerability. We know that our adversaries like the CCP seek to do us harm and yet we stand by and often do nothing about it. Our inaction has no excuse.

We need to safeguard our democracy, and we need to do it right now.

If this Chamber does anything at all this year, it must ensure that American elections are for Americans only—now and always. That is precisely why we have got to pass the SAVE America Act, and we have to pass it now, ASAP.

In the face of the CCP's coordinated campaign, we need more election integrity—not less. We need to ensure that all votes in American elections come from Americans—not illegal aliens or foreign manipulation.

And by the way, it is not only because of our international adversaries that we need to pass the SAVE America Act. Just last week, a huge story hardly got any notice in the mainstream media. But the new Democrat Governor of New Jersey—a former colleague of mine in the House—she announced that 6,600 noncitizens were ''accidentally added to the New Jersey voter rolls.'' That is a hell of an accident.

But not only that, she also told us that nearly 400 of those voters, who were accidentally placed on their voter rolls, actually voted in the last two elections in New Jersey.

Some of my colleagues keep saying that stories like this are a figment of our imagination. It doesn't really happen. Illegals don't vote in American elections.

The Democratic Governor of New Jersey just told us it did happen. They keep saying that these stories are just, I suppose, ''accidents'' or ''software glitches'' is what the Governor called it. The fact of the matter is that these stories keep happening, and we need to do everything that we can to put an end to it. It destroys trust in our elections when Americans read about stories like that.

If we have to cancel the August recess to pass the SAVE America Act, so be it. Let's do it. Protecting our elections from fraud and international interference is a lot more important to me than vacation time.

Our adversaries—like the Chinese Communist Party—will stop at nothing to distract, divide, disrupt, and destroy America. Their campaign is not confined to election day. Election day is our last line of defense.

Americans must always be free to reject the CCP and its values, while choosing a path that embraces the timeless truths that have always been at America's core. The day that the CCP chooses the outcome of our elections will be the day that it won. And by then, it will be way too late to correct course and pass a commonsense bill like the SAVE America Act. We cannot wait for that day.

I urge all of my colleagues to wake up. It is time to pass the SAVE America Act to save our elections, protect our country, save America. It is fundamentally important.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise to speak to what Americans all over this country are deeply feeling at this moment.

America is not a nation that prefers wars, but we are being led by an administration that is foolishly choosing war to solve problems that could best be solved by other means or—more troublingly—it is choosing to wage war to distract public attention from larger problems of its own making.

This pattern of foolishly choosing war, whatever the legality and whatever the price, is sacrificing the lives of American troops, killing innocent civilians, stressing our Nation's budget, imposing devastating costs on American families and businesses, dividing us from our allies, and shredding our reputation as a stabilizing force in the world.

The chaos and damage from these wars are mounting, even as the President contemplates more military misadventures in Cuba, Mali, and who knows where else.

Our constituents know that Congress is the only institution with the constitutional power to stop unnecessary war, and they are begging us to do so.

President Trump has launched three wars that are currently underway. He has not sought the approval of Congress for any of them. The wars are all, therefore, illegal.

But in addition to the illegality that naturally flows from a President starting a war without a congressional authorization, each war is also burdened by numerous other legal, moral, and strategic weaknesses.

The first war is Operation Southern Spear, a campaign that began nearly a year ago to use the U.S. military to strike boats in international waters near South America. To date, more than 65 separate strikes have killed more than 250 people on boats chosen as targets by our military.

The operation has been repeatedly justified by the Pentagon as attacks on narcotraffickers. But the evidence suggests that many innocent civilians—unarmed noncombatants who are not transporting narcotics—are being murdered in these strikes, even while reporting confirms that this bloodshed is not accomplishing its stated purpose of decreasing the amount of drugs coming into the United States.

Now, the administration has worked exceptionally hard to maintain all aspects of Operation Southern Spear as secret, as classified. Because it is all classified, I am severely limited in what I can say about it.

The President created a secret list of what he calls ''designated terrorist organizations,'' last July, as subjects for military attack. There is no law giving the President such a power to create such an attack list. I have reviewed the list, but because it is classified, I am not able to describe it here. And as a result of the fact that the list has never been made public, those marked by the President for execution have never been notified that the United States has placed a target on them.

The Office of Legal Counsel in the Department of Justice produced a legal memo, last September, to justify boat strikes against narcotraffickers in very specific circumstances. The memo also carefully described prohibited activity that could not be legally justified. I have read that legal memo, but it remains classified. So I cannot discuss its contents.

In October, the Pentagon issued an implementation order to carry out the President's directive in accordance with the OLC legal opinion and limitations. That EXORD contains the targeting criteria that are to be used in choosing which boats to attack. I have reviewed the EXORD, but it has remained classified. So I cannot describe its contents.

Each of the attacks is accompanied by a file describing the strike. I have reviewed the files of nearly 50 of the strikes and will soon complete review of the remaining. Those files remain classified. So I cannot describe their contents.

So why—why—is the administration maintaining the classification of all of this Southern Spear information—the justification, the legal rationale, the target list, the targeting criteria, the strike files describing each attack? Why the secrecy?

It is obvious why the administration wants all this cloaked in secrecy. The President and the Pentagon don't want the American public to see what is being done in our name and with our tax dollars. They are trying to hide from the public—and even from this body—the flimsiness of their legal case and the exorbitant cost and ineffectiveness of the operation.

For example, the Pentagon is glad to show edited videos of an exploding boat to pat itself on the back about its lethality toward narcotraffickers. They proudly did so on social media, and all over mainstream media, following the first fatal strike of a boat last September—September 2.

But months after the administration produced this PR video of a fatal strike, it was revealed that the full video—the unedited video—also showed struggling survivors clinging to the boat's wreckage and seeking to be rescued.

In violation of U.S. and international law, the United States returned to the site in open international waters and killed the survivors.

I have seen the video, many of my colleagues have, and it is horrifying. The administration refuses to release it.

Now, remember that, at the time of that strike—September 2, 2025—the existence of Southern Spear hadn't even been announced. Those struggling for their lives, clinging to shipwrecked wreckage, had not even been informed that they might be targeted. The United States killed them anyway and then selectively edited the video so that the American public would only see the flashy initial boat explosion but not see the cowardly and cold-blooded murder of desperate shipwrecked people that took place later.

And, you know, that is not even the most shocking thing about Southern Spear. The most shocking thing is that the administration has been lying to the American public about whether the campaign is even against narcotrafficking.

While I am not allowed to discuss the contents of the legal opinion, and I am not allowed to discuss the EXORD's targeting criteria, I can say this: In reviewing the targeting criteria and trying to match it up with the legal opinion, I was immediately struck by what was missing. So I am not going to describe the contents of either, but I was immediately struck by what was missing from the targeting criteria.

It is hard to believe this, but the targeting criteria used by the U.S. military to strike boats and kill people on open waters contain no requirement that there be any evidence that there are narcotics on board—no requirement that there be any evidence that there are narcotics on board—nor is there any requirement that the sailors on any of these boats be armed.

Now, these criteria could have been included by the Pentagon in the targeting criteria that they chose, but they intentionally chose not to include the presence of narcotics or the presence of arms.

Why not restrict U.S. military attacks on boats to those we know to be carrying narcotics? How could it be legally justifiable for the U.S. military to strike boats and kill those aboard with no evidence that the boats contain narcotics or arms? How could this be deemed self-defense, which is the requirement for the President to use lethal force without a congressional authorization?

I ask these questions as a proud member of the Senate Armed Services Committee. I ask these questions as the proud father of a U.S. marine.

How could it be legally justifiable for the U.S. military to attack boats without evidence of narcotics and without evidence that those on board to be killed are armed?

Many of those killed in Operation Southern Spear—unarmed individuals not transporting narcotics—are not combat casualties. They are murder victims. Public reporting conclusively shows that some of those murdered have been humble fishermen, whose families saw them leave for an honest day's work and then never come home.

President Trump's second illegal war is Operation Absolute Resolve, the U.S. military invasion of Venezuela to topple the regime of dictator Nicolas Maduro.

I have long in this body, as the lead Democrat on the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, supported all kinds of policies to sanction and punish and isolate the dictatorial Maduro regime. But using the U.S. military to invade a sovereign nation without congressional approval, and without any explanation or strategy for what might come next, is another matter entirely.

The world follows the example of this country, and if invading another nation's sovereign territory to kidnap its President and topple its government is acceptable for the United States, we lose our standing to criticize dictators around the world who might decide to do the same thing—in fact, who are currently doing the same thing.

The actual military invasion of Venezuela was at least brief, and I think all recognize that the U.S. military performed in a very exemplary fashion in carrying out the mission they were ordered to perform.

But its aftermath has been highly problematic. The United States is now using the American military to control the Venezuelan economy and government, and thus contributing to the oppression and subjugation of the Venezuelan people.

Even though Venezuelans chose overwhelmingly to reject the Maduro regime in a 2024 Presidential election, in favor of the political opposition headed by the recent Nobel laureate Maria Corina Machado and the duly elected President Edmundo Gonzalez the United States has, following the invasion, thrown its support behind the Maduro regime by propping up his Vice President Delcy Rodriguez as the country's leader.

The United States just announced a potential process toward finding elections and democracy in Venezuela. And guess who is leading it. Vice President Rodriguez' brother, part of the Maduro regime that was and remains oppressive toward Venezuelan people.

Public reporting suggests that the administration has deliberately made it difficult for Maria Corina Machado, who just won the Nobel prize 7 months ago for her advocacy for Venezuelans, and for Edmundo Gonzalez, the duly elected President of the country. The United States has made it hard for them to return home to Venezuela, even in the aftermath of a horrible earthquake that has killed and injured thousands and thousands of their countrymen and women.

Why is this administration choosing to support the Maduro-Rodriguez dictatorship and impede authentic leaders who offer a new chapter for the Venezuelan people?

The Venezuelan people deserve a government by, of, and for Venezuelans. Maintaining Maduro's cronies in place and allowing them to continue the oppression of the Venezuelan people, primarily to benefit well-connected energy companies, is not a legitimate use of American military power.

Rodriguez and the remnants of the Maduro regime are moving aggressively to consolidate their hold on power that the overwhelming majority of Venezuelans want to dislodge. Like despots around the world, they have learned how to humor the administration in the short run and buy its affection, and then, hopefully, wait until we get distracted and move our attention elsewhere.

And it is Venezuelans who are suffering, especially in the aftermath of the earthquake, as they watch the government of the Maduro Vice President, Rodriguez, not be able to effectively provide services to those who are in need of disaster relief.

Finally, America has spilled much blood and treasure during President Trump's foolish war against Iran.

On February 27, we were not at war, and the Strait of Hormuz was open; and the price of gas and other key commodities were as normal as things can be in 2026. But President Trump—without a clear plan, a coherent rationale, the participation of allies, the approval of Congress, or the support of the American public—launched Operation Epic Fury.

The President ignored his own promise to avoid more war in the Middle East. He fulfilled a sad prophecy many of us made during his first term, when he tore up a diplomatic deal that was working to control Iran's nuclear program. Those who make diplomacy impossible make war inevitable.

Now, 5 months later, the folly of this illegal war has been made plain to all. Eighteen U.S. troops have been killed, and the President—it has recently been revealed—and the Pentagon are disrespectfully reclassifying some of those deaths as not being related to the war so that the President can downplay the true impact it has on service members. Hundreds of our troops have been injured, although the Pentagon is trying to downplay those numbers as well. Thousands of innocent Iranian civilians have died, including children—schoolchildren—who were killed when the United States bombed a school in the opening days of the war.

The costs of the war to the American taxpayer has ballooned into tens of billions of dollars, and the Pentagon is now seeking an astronomical extra increase in last year's record defense budget to pay for the costs of this war, which have all been self-imposed costs. American families are paying more for gasoline. American farmers are paying more for fertilizer and diesel. American businesses are paying more for goods and materials that normally flow through the Strait of Hormuz.

And, in recent days, a new challenge has emerged, one that the administration should easily have anticipated. The Houthis, who are together allied with Iran and are strategically positioned in Yemen, have started to cut off transit through the Bab el-Mandeb Strait in addition to the closures in the Strait of Hormuz. This is one of the world's major commercial routes and threatens even more inflation that will punish American consumers.

The endless rounds of start-stop and the frequent Presidential proclamations of victory or cease-fire, then to be interrupted by new rounds of the back-and-forth of attacks in the region, have produced a profound uncertainty that is endangering economic prospects in all corners of the Earth.

Now these three foolish and illegal wars—Southern Spear, Absolute Resolve, Epic Fury—are largely rejected by the American public. Our voters want us to make their lives better, not waste their money in pointless military engagements far from home, especially with regard to Trump's war with Iran.

Haven't we learned something from 20-plus years of war in the Middle East? The Global War on Terror cost the United States more than 14,000 lives, led to more than 65,000 American casualties, and skyrocketed costs into the trillions of taxpayer dollars that should have been spent on education and infrastructure and healthcare investments at home.

Americans want a President, but more than that, Americans want a government that will spend our dollars here to make energy, healthcare, childcare, and other necessities like groceries more affordable. The President has already punished us enough with his chaotic tariff taxes and his doubling down on illegal wars just to make things so much harder for everyday people.

So what can we do? What can we do?

Knowing that the President is likely to plow forward on this failed and destructive policy, Congress has to finally stand up. The Iran war is triply illegal.

First, it is unconstitutional because the President launched it without having the congressional approval required by article I of the Constitution.

Second, the war violates the War Powers Act of 1973. This act allows a President to initiate military action in very specific circumstances: if there is a declaration of war by Congress, which there hasn't been; if there is an authorization for use of military force passed by Congress, which there hasn't been; or in the case of a national emergency created by an attack upon the United States. None of those conditions were met prior to the President's launching of this war.

But even if one were to assume that one of those conditions had been met, the War Powers Act requires that any military activity started by the President without Congress has to hit a hard stop at 60 days unless Congress affirmatively votes to continue it. We are well past the 60-day point—we are now past the 5-month point—with no congressional authorization. Yet the President continues to send more troops to the region and threaten more attacks as the American public watches more flag-draped caskets come home.

Now both Houses of Congress, under Republican majorities, have passed legislation requiring the President to remove U.S. troops from hostilities against Iran unless Congress passes a war authorization. The President has not removed troops from hostilities. He is actually sending more into harm's way. The President has not sought a vote on a war authorization because he knows that such a vote would lose in both Houses in Congress in a dramatic fashion. Instead, he has taken the warmongering all on his own shoulders.

President Trump can ignore the law, and he can break the law, but he can't change the law. If the President won't abide by the Constitution, by the War Powers Act, or the express will of two Republican-majority Houses of Congress, we have one more power. Only Congress can appropriate funds for war or defense operations.

As the President and his Cabinet are here seeking even more funds to carry out his illegal wars and fighting against any guardrails against his warmongering, Congress has to stand up against him. We have to stand up against illegal wars. We have to stand up for our troops. We have to stand up for our military families. We have to stand up for citizens who want a government focused on making lives better, not waging warfare away across the world. And we have to stand up for America the peacemaker, not America the war wager.

It is telling that at the very moment we are in the middle of these three illegal and undeclared wars that are causing a huge cost to our troops and innocent civilians, the President and the Pentagon are choosing this moment to try to rename the Department of Defense as the Department of War. Of course, they are. They want performative war in the worst possible way. They care more about the optics and the trolling Twitter with flashy videos than they do about doing the hard work necessary to keep Americans safe and defend this country.

You know, most nations actually had a Department of War during much of their history, and the United States did too. America had a Secretary of War and a War Cabinet for many, many years during the history of this Nation. But after World War II, when President Harry Truman, who had seen the bloodshed of war as a military officer in World War I and had to make consequential decisions as the Commander in Chief to end World War II, stood back and said: Do you know what? The United States is a great nation. We shouldn't prefer war; we should prefer defense. Let's defend our Nation, and let's tell the world we will do anything necessary to defend our Nation, but let's make it clear to the rest of the world that the mission of our military is not war; it is defense. We changed, in 1947, the Secretary of War to the Secretary of Defense, and the Pentagon is the Defense Department, not the War Department. And guess what. It was a great thing the United States did.

When nations all around the world saw us do it, they did it too—Britain and France, also World War II enemies like Germany and Japan, and current adversaries like Russia and China. All other nations followed the diplomatic lead of the United States and said: The mission of military should not be war. We don't prefer war. The mission should be vigorous defense. Brazil was actually the last nation to make the switch. They did it about three decades ago.

So now, in the world, the use of war to describe the mission or the Cabinet or the Secretary is virtually unheard of, except the United States wants to bring it back. President Trump and his self-titled ''Secretary of War'' want to switch us back so that we, instead, brag about the fact that we are focused and interested in war. It is a pending matter that is contained within the National Defense Authorization Act that will be debated on the floor here in the next few months. The Pentagon has even changed its email address to war.gov.

This is juvenile and embarrassing, and it would be comical if it weren't so tragic.

Is this who the United States of America has become now—war.gov?

Is that how we want to be known in our history?

Is that how we want to be known by allies and adversaries around the world—as a nation that prefers war to diplomacy? as a nation that sends its troops into harm's way for needless wars of choice rather than being focused on the vigorous defense of our homeland and our way of life?

I don't believe that is who this country is after 250 years, so I am going to keep challenging the President's illegal and foolish wars at every opportunity and with every tool granted me as a U.S. Senator, being mindful of Mother Teresa's wisdom: We are not called to be successful. We are called to be faithful.

If we focus on being faithful to our history, to our values, to our troops and their families and to our citizens, we are likely to be successful. In doing so, we can reclaim the role for Congress that our Founders envisioned as they embarked upon this 250-year experiment in American democracy.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on adoption of the motion to proceed to H.R. 5334 at 6 p.m. today.

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

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote scheduled for 6 p.m. today on H.R. 5334 be allowed to begin.

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

VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

The question occurs on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Ms. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 84, nays 12, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 213 Leg.]

YEAS—84

Alsobrooks	Fetterman	Murkowski
Armstrong	Fischer	Murphy
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Banks	Grassley	Peters
Barrasso	Hagerty	Reed
Bennet	Hawley	Ricketts
Blackburn	Heinrich	Risch
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Booker	Hoeven	Rounds
Boozman	Husted	Schatz
Britt	Hyde-Smith	Schiff
Budd	Johnson	Schmitt
Cantwell	Justice	Schumer
Capito	Kaine	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Kelly	Scott (SC)
Collins	Kennedy	Shaheen
Coons	King	Sheehy
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Smith
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Cramer	Luján	Thune
Crapo	Lummis	Tillis
Cruz	Marshall	Tuberville
Curtis	McCormick	Van Hollen
Daines	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Moody	Warnock
Durbin	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Moreno	Young

NAYS—12

Blunt Rochester	Markey	Sanders
Hassan	Ossoff	Warren
Hirono	Padilla	Welch
Kim	Paul	Wyden

NOT VOTING—4

Gallego	McConnell	Whitehouse
Graham		

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JUSTICE). On this vote, the yeas are 84, the nays are 12. The motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

SUPPORTING EARLY-CHILDHOOD EDUCATORS' DEDUCTIONS ACT

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5334) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow early childhood educators to take the educator expense deduction, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

WAIVING QUORUM CALL

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture motion on S. Res. 817.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Executive Calendar No. 6, S. Res. 817, an executive resolution authorizing the en bloc consideration in Executive Session of certain nominations on the Executive Calendar.

John Thune, John Barrasso, Alan Armstrong, David McCormick, Kevin Cramer, John R. Curtis, Tim Sheehy, James E. Risch, John Boozman, Pete Ricketts, Chuck Grassley, Cynthia M. Lummis, James Lankford, Jim Banks, Bernie Moreno, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Tim Scott of South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the mandatory quorum call under rule XXII has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on Executive Calendar No. 6, S. Res. 817, an executive resolution authorizing the en bloc consideration in Executive Session of certain nominations on the Executive Calendar, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from South Carolina (Ms. GRAHAM), and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 214 Leg.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—45

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

NOT VOTING—5

Cruz	Graham	Whitehouse
Gallego	McConnell	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 45. The motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE RESOLUTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

An executive resolution (S. Res. 817) authorizing the en bloc consideration in Executive Session of certain nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

NATIVE CHILDREN COMMISSION IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I come to the floor this evening to speak about legislation that I have recently introduced as chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee, alongside my friend Vice Chairman SCHATZ. The bill that we have introduced is the Native Children Commission Implementation Act.

Before I get started explaining our legislation, I want to recognize the Tribal leaders, the elders, the youth, the children, and the families who flew in last week for a congressional staff briefing to share their perspectives on the bill and the importance of it but also to help educate members and staff about the importance of the bill.

As events turned out, it was unfortunate that I was not here on that day due to my having a family emergency back home, but I was able to tune in virtually. It was 5:45 in the morning Alaska time, and I was able to beam in. I have to say I can't tell you how proud I was to see the Senate Indian Affairs hearing room. It was packed literally wall to wall, which was a reminder to me of how this legislation has captured the attention of so many people who believe that Native children deserve every opportunity to thrive.

I was particularly grateful to the Tribal leaders, to Native youth, to advocates, and to commissioners who traveled from Alaska and across Indian Country all to be there. I really think that their presence, their stories, and their unwavering commitment have really brought this legislation to life.

I also want to acknowledge and thank my colleagues Senator SCHATZ and Senator SMITH for joining the event and helping to mark this important milestone. Together, they made it clear that this was more than just the introduction of a bill; it was the continuation of a movement—a movement that has been built on years of partnership, of perseverance, and on hope.

I want to take a moment to specifically recognize Gloria O'Neill, who chaired the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children. Gloria and her fellow commissioners have devoted years to traveling throughout Indian Country. They have listened to Native families and have brought forward recommendations that are rooted in the voices of the communities themselves, and we owe them a great deal of gratitude for their work.

Earlier this year, I joined the Alaska Federation of Natives and Tribal leaders for a gathering to recognize their work behind this effort. We were upstairs in the Hart Building, up on the ninth floor—a big room filled with Native leaders really from across the country—and I was deeply, deeply honored to be gifted the Mandan name ''Ho Hsiihe,'' meaning ''strong voice.'' This was gifted to me by Bheri Rose Hallam, who is the granddaughter of Alyce Spotted Bear. I was very humbled—very humbled—to receive the name, and I carry it as a reminder of the responsibility that we all share to continue the work that Alyce Spotted Bear and so many Native leaders began on behalf of Native children and families. That responsibility really is at the heart of why this legislation matters so deeply to me.

Thousands of bills, we know, are introduced each Congress, and every bill matters to someone, but this one is particularly important to me.

As I look at the Presiding Officer in the chair, I am reminded of his comments at an Energy hearing this morning when he spoke with deep passion and love and care for those children whom he didn't know—children who had cancer. All he wanted to do was to be able to help them with a playground—a place to be happy, a place to feel good about being a child. So I know—I know—that he can relate when we talk about the important work we do for our children.

The story of how the Native Children's Commission began didn't start here in Washington. It began in Tribal communities. It began with parents who wanted better opportunities for their children and with elders who were determined to preserve their languages and their cultures. It began with such a great story. It began with the young people who stood up in front of hundreds of grownups, hundreds of adults, in a convention in Fairbanks years ago, where they had the courage to tell the leaders what they were experiencing. They asked us—they asked us—to do something about it. That, to me, is really where it begins.

So more than anything, this bill is about children.

Across Indian Country, too many Native children experience challenges that no child should have to face. Some have watched their communities suffer from devastating storms or natural disasters. Some have lost loved ones to violence, to addiction, to suicide. Others have entered foster care. They have struggled to access healthcare or behavioral health services. Or perhaps they have carried the weight of the boarding schools era, which has caused historical trauma that continues to affect families today after subsequent generations.

Those experiences are very real, but they are also not the whole story. If there is one lesson that I learned from traveling across my State and meeting with Tribal communities across Indian Country, it is that resilience is every bit as real as hardship. Native communities possess extraordinary strengths, and their strengths include strong families, vibrant cultures, enduring languages, and generations of wisdom that is passed from elders to the children.

Time and time again, I have watched grandparents teach language to their grandchildren. I have seen parents work tirelessly to create opportunities for that next generation. I have seen elders reminding young people of exactly who they are and where they come from.

That sense of identity and culture is so, so powerful. It gives children confidence. It creates belonging. It fortifies our families. It reminds us that the future of Native children is built not only by overcoming hardship but by building—building—upon the remarkable strengths that have sustained Native communities for generations. That understanding has shaped every part of this legislation whose path began more than a decade ago.

I mentioned the Alaska Federation of Natives convention. This was back in 2013. During one of the sessions—again, this is the largest gathering of Native people in our State—a group of young leaders—kids, kids—from the village of Tanana stood up before Tribal leaders, community members, and elected officials. They stood on stage, and they spoke with an honesty and a bravery about what they were seeing in their community. They spoke of violence. They spoke of substance abuse and suicide. But what struck me most was not the hardship that they described; it was the hope they carried with them. Their message was so simple. It was so clear. It was ''Listen to us.'' The children were saying ''Listen to us, and then do something,'' and I have not ever forgotten those words.

Last summer, I heard from Natasha Singh. She is a leader from the Tanana region, and she shared that the chiefs there continue to meet with young people every year.

They ask: What progress have we made? What challenges remain? What more needs to be done? What more do we need to do to listen to you?

And that kind of accountability is really remarkable because it reminds us that leadership is not measured by the promises that we make but whether or not we are willing to answer for them.

It also reminded me that if Tribal leaders are willing to answer to their children, then Congress should be willing to do the same. So those young people challenged us more than a decade ago, and this new legislation is part of our answer. That conversation that we had in 2013 ultimately led to bipartisan legislation with my friend and former Senator Heidi Heitkamp, and we established the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children.

And the commission had a very straightforward but very important mission, and that was travel throughout Indian country, listen to Native children, listen to the families, to the Tribal leaders, to the service providers, the experts, and then come back and tell us here in Congress what is needed to improve outcomes for Native youth. That is exactly what they did.

Over several years, the commissioners visited communities across the country, and they heard some pretty tough stories. They heard some heartbreaking stories, but they also witnessed extraordinary examples of resilience, of innovation, and Tribal leadership. They saw communities creating culturally grounded solutions that were then strengthening families and improving health, supporting children, and really restoring hope.

And their work culminated in a report that they called ''The Way Forward.'' But that report was never meant to be the end of the conversation; it was only the end of the beginning.

And when the commissioners presented their recommendations to our Committee on Indian Affairs, they urged us; they said: Please, don't let this work become another report that just sits on the shelf and gathers dust. The families who shared their stories deserved more than that; they deserved action.

And so that is when we got to work. Over the last couple of years, we have worked closely with Tribal leaders, Native organizations, youth advocates, Federal Agencies, and Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle. We released draft legislation. We held hearings and roundtables. We invited the criticism. We made changes. We refined provisions, added new ideas, and we remained focused on one goal, and that was honoring what Native communities told us they needed.

This bill is stronger because it was built with Native communities, not for them. The Native Children's Commission Implementation Act reflects a simple idea, and that is: If we want to improve outcomes for Native children, we cannot look at just one issue at a time.

And we know when we are talking about kids, you can't talk about life in separate categories. A child does not experience life in neat, clean, separate categories. Health is connected to education. Education is connected to housing. Behavioral health is connected to family stability. Parents cannot succeed if they can't find childcare. Children can't reach their full potential if they are hungry, if they are dealing with untreated trauma or disconnected from language or culture or identity. So our policies should recognize that reality.

And we do that within this legislation. It strengthens access to healthcare and behavioral health services. It supports Native education and language revitalization. It improves juvenile justice, public safety, housing, nutrition, workforce development, and research. And, more importantly, it recognized that Tribal communities are best positioned to lead these efforts because they know their children and their families, and they know them better than anyone else.

During a hearing earlier this year on a draft legislation, Joan Johnson of the Fort Belknap Indian Community shared a story of a young woman who entered the Tribe's Tiwahe wellness program, and the Tiwahe Initiative is a pilot program at BIA that assists Tribes in providing holistic services that promote everything from child safety to family stability and Tribal self-determination.

And Fort Belknap testified that their wellness program has removed the stigma of intervention by meeting families in their homes and helping them access care.

To understand the need to make this initiative permanent, Joan shared the story of a young woman who had struggled with addiction and homelessness. And the young mother shared, she said:

> Tiwahe gave me the nudge I needed. They guided me to become closer to my Creator and helped me learn who I am.

And, today, that young woman is sober. She is raising her children. And she is helping build a brighter future for her family.

And that transformation doesn't happen because Washington has all the answers. It happened because a Tribal community invested in one of its own. And we have learned from that, and we are seeking to codify Tiwahe as one important section in our legislation.

Councilwoman Johnson also described children who came into the Tiwahe program knowing they were Native, but not knowing their language, not knowing their traditions, or even their own family stories. And elders helped connect those young people with their identity. They learned their Native names. They participated in ceremony.

And many of those same young people eventually became mentors for the children who followed them. So healing became leadership; one generation began lifting the next.

We heard similar stories from Alaska where the Association of Village Council Presidents redesigned the way that families receive services. So instead of forcing parents in crisis—maybe it is addiction, maybe it is homelessness. But it is hard when you have so many disconnected programs. And so through this initiative, they brought education, employment, childcare, family services all together in one place. And so when you have got a family that is just facing so many big, big, heavy burdens, that kind of coordination can make all of the difference.

And these stories, again, remind us that the best ideas rarely begin in Washington.

And while I am proud to get to this point, which is our bill introduction, it is also a reminder that our work is just beginning. This legislation represents more than a decade of listening, learning, and working alongside Tribal leaders, Native organizations, families, and young people. And it reflects the belief that lasting change happens when we listen first and legislate second.

While this is an important step, what matters is that we keep moving forward because every recommendation in the report which was translated into this bill began with a conversation in a Tribal community.

And I am going to keep coming back to those young people from Tanana, because they said—it was more than a decade ago. They asked us to listen. And I hope—I hope—today they can see that we are listening. We are acting. The Native Children's Commission Implementation Act is not about creating yet one more Federal program or one more report that is going to sit on a shelf somewhere. It is about strengthening what is already working in Native communities. It is about trusting Tribal governments, investing in Native families, and ensuring—ensuring—that every Native child—whether Alaska Native, American Indian, Native Hawaiian—has the opportunity to grow up healthy, to grow up safe, connected to their culture, and confident in who they are. And that is a goal that should unite all of us.

So, today, I invite my colleagues—Republicans and Democrats alike—to join Senator SCHATZ and me as cosponsors of the Native Children's Commission Implementation Act. Let's show that when Tribal communities speak, Congress listens. Let's turn their recommendations of "The Way Forward" report into meaningful action, and let's work together to build a future where every Alaska Native, American Indian, and Native Hawaiian child has the opportunity to not only overcome challenges, but to become those leaders of the next generation.

So I look forward to working with you and the rest of our colleagues to do just that.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUSTED). The Senator from Utah.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I would like to address the Senate today regarding a bill that has been passed by the House of Representatives known as H.R. 7008. H.R. 7008 performs two badly needed functions to restore faith and integrity in our system of government: Firstly, it bans Members of Congress from using their unique access and knowledge to profit through stock market speculation; secondly, it requires something very simple, a voter ID.

You have got to show an ID when you pick up something at will call if you are there to pick up tickets to the theater, if you are picking up a prescription at the pharmacy, if you are going to the bank, if you are boarding an airplane—you are doing all kinds of things that are part of Americans' day-to-day experience where it matters whether you are who you claim to be, you have got to show an ID.

We should require nothing less when it comes to the exercise of one of the most fundamental rights that Americans have; that is, their right to vote.

You see, when someone else votes in your place, they displace your vote. They offset your vote. If they are double voting, if they are voting when they are not allowed to vote because they are not a citizen or otherwise, if they do something foolish and they try to go and vote, they will be caught if they are asked to produce an ID at the balloting place.

So this bill accomplishes both of these things. And like I say, both of them would do a lot to restore faith, confidence, and integrity in our system of government.

Dealing specifically with the voter ID requirement in this legislation, this is a very straightforward requirement. When you show up to vote, you just have to show an ID, just like you do at the bank, just like you do at the pharmacy or the doctor's office or the bank or when boarding an airplane.

And if you vote by mail, then that is easy to accommodate. You just include a simple photocopy of your photo ID.

Now, we have gone to great lengths to make sure that everyone is taken care of here, to make sure that there is not a single U.S. citizen that would be disadvantaged or unable to vote if we were to pass this.

So for those who, let's say, for whatever reason, don't have access to a photocopier and they want to vote by mail, well, we have taken that into consideration. The bill requires States to provide the public to free access to photocopy machines so they can make a photocopy of their photo ID and send it in with their mail-in ballot if that is what they are using in their State.

Now, it is interesting. Right now the headquarters of the Democratic Party here in Washington, DC, displays a sign very prominently, and that sign makes clear that 100 percent of the visitors to the Democratic Party's headquarters have to show a photo ID when they enter.

Now, if they have to do that—and we know they have to do that when attending the Democratic National Convention to enter the convention hall, much less participate as a voting member of the Democratic National Convention. You have to prove who you are, and you have to show that you have the right to be there and the right to participate.

So far be it from us to second guess the Democratic Party in deciding people need to prove who they are to enter their convention hall or their party headquarters. We should have voters do the same thing.

And Democrats are smart in doing that because, after all, they don't want somebody showing up to their convention. I mean, good heavens, what if a Republican showed up to their Democratic National Convention and tried to skew the results of their convention by pretending to be a Democrat—a Democrat delegate no less. That wouldn't be fair.

So they are absolutely right to require photo ID and to require delegates to present their convention credentials so that they can show that they are who they claim to be and that they have the right to participate at their own convention.

Americans at every corner of our country and at every point along the political idealogical spectrum in this country agree that this makes sense to do, specifically in the context—not just of needing to produce ID where it matters whether you are who you claim to be, but specifically in the context of voter ID, of having to produce identification at the moment you vote, at the place where you vote. Mr. President, 83 percent of American voters, in total, support voter ID, and that includes a whopping 71 percent of Democrat voters.

So this is neither Republican nor Democratic. This is neither liberal nor conservative. This is simply an American issue because we don't want anyone's right to vote to be taken away. We don't want anyone disenfranchised, and that is exactly what happens when you allow someone who is not whom they claim to be, who is not entitled to vote, to show up and cast a vote, and that is wrong. So today we have got a really good opportunity to address these two issues that Americans are deeply concerned about, and I hope we can take advantage of this opportunity.

Now, the vote on the House of Representatives' side of this bill—like I say, it was just passed recently by the House of Representatives—it was bipartisan. You had Republicans overwhelmingly support it, but you also had a number of House Democrats voting with every House Republican in favor of this bill with the clean voter ID requirement attached.

So we are going to be talking about this for a little while tonight, and I just want to encourage my Democratic colleagues on this side of the Capitol right here in the U.S. Senate to follow the lead of the wise Democrats who joined every Republican to vote for this in the House of Representatives.

We need to get this done. We should get it done. We have the opportunity to get it done tonight, and we will be talking more about that in a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I want to commend my colleague Senator LEE and my colleagues Senator RICKETTS, Senator MORENO. We are all on the floor to seek unanimous consent to a bill that actually just makes common sense.

Senator LEE talked about the different provisions of the bill, but I think one thing that is important to underscore is it just passed the House. These are issues that are on the minds of the American people, and it passed the House in a bipartisan manner—a strong bipartisan manner. So I am hopeful that we can move that House bill on both of these issues that Senator LEE just talked about in a way tonight and get this bill to the President's desk.

As I mentioned, Mr. President, common sense. Senator LEE talked about the insider trading provisions. I think every American would agree that Members of Congress should be prohibited, as well as their spouses and children, from purchasing individual stocks while serving in office, particularly given that we have access to different kinds of information.

You know, this has been something that I have done a number of years ago. I moved stocks into index funds to kind of get rid of this issue, from my perspective, personally.

Senator RICKETTS has been the lead here in the U.S. Senate on this issue. I am actually a cosponsor of his bill that is very much focused on this commonsense approach to the issue of insider trading.

And then we need to go to the issue of integrity of our election system. As Senator LEE pointed out, it makes sense. It is very, very common sense—simple in many ways—that if you are going to vote, you have to have a valid ID to do that.

Now, this bill mandates that requirement, but it has a lot of provisional elements to this bill that accommodate States like mine that are very big, that have a dispersed population. So this bill includes those kind of accommodations. Eligible voters can access a provisional ballot. They can sign an affidavit attesting to their identity and citizenship if they don't have an ID.

There are many ways in which this bill accommodates the important element of making sure that American citizens vote in American elections. And I don't think that is some kind of radical idea. I think the vast, vast majority of Americans agree with this.

So I want to thank my colleagues for their leadership on this issue, and I am hopeful that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will agree with us, and let's pass this bill and send it to the President's desk.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. RICKETTS. Mr. President, integrity; integrity inspires confidence, and the reverse is true. If there is a perception of lack of integrity, it undermines confidence.

We have a problem here in the Congress: 80 percent of Americans believe that we do not do a good job of separating our financial interests from the insider information that we receive as part of our jobs. And because of this perception of lack of integrity, they don't think we are doing a good job. Our approval rating is 15 percent. Clearly, Americans are not trusting this institution on this issue.

But we have an opportunity to course-correct, to help restore the integrity and, therefore, the confidence that Americans have in the U.S. Congress, and that is by passing H.R. 7008 that includes the Stop Insider Trading Act that was introduced in the House and passed, as my colleagues pointed out, with bipartisan support. I introduced the companion bill here in the Senate.

What this bill does is it says: You cannot buy stocks when you get here.

Well, why is this important? Because we have disclosure laws right now, but yet we have the problem that 80 percent of Americans think that we do a bad job of keeping our financial interests and our insider information separate.

And indeed we have seen people post on social media, for example, the stock trades of the former Speaker of the House, and it has become a legitimate trading strategy, as crazy as it sounds, because it is successful; it makes money.

We have had a situation in the past where one of the members of the Intelligence Committee sold about a million and a half dollars' worth of stock right before the stock market tanked because of COVID. Even the perception of using insider information to benefit yourself financially is undermining the confidence.

And the same could be said as well for the voter ID. Thirty-six States have voter ID. In my State of Nebraska, when I was Governor, we passed it and put it on the ballot. It passed overwhelmingly, 65 to 35, that Nebraskans wanted to have that voter ID as part of the process of elections to make sure they could trust in the integrity and have confidence.

Now, the insider trading act has real teeth to it. It says that you cannot buy stock, and if you own stock already when you come into the Congress, you can only sell it on 7 to 14 days' notice.

Why is this important? Well, to make sure that the market and anybody in the country can see that if you are going to sell your stock positions, they can all do it first. They get that information first so that if you have some sort of insider information, it is not insider anymore because the rest of the world knows.

And if you do violate the rules and you buy stock or you sell stock out of turn without giving the proper notification, significant penalties: a minimum $2,000 fine or 10 percent of the transaction costs.

So, for example, if you sold a million dollars' worth of stock, that is a $100,000 fine—plus giving up all the profits that go along with it. That has the enforcement and the teeth that require Members of this body and Members of the House to take notice.

This bill would go a long way toward restoring the integrity of this institution, restoring the confidence in this institution. And as was mentioned already, it passed bipartisan in the House. But the President has called on us to pass it and recently the Vice President when he was speaking to House Republicans.

Let's restore the faith in this institution. Let's make sure people know that we are not using our insider information to financially benefit ourselves.

Coming to Washington, DC, to serve our communities is a privilege. We do it for public service. It is not to be a profit center for people who are coming.

So let's make sure there is no perception possible by passing H.R. 7008.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 7008, which was received from the House; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from California.

Mr. PADILLA. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. President, it is a shame that Senate Republicans seem particularly focused on scoring political points instead of passing real policies that can actually make a difference because, yes, all Americans—Democrats, Republicans, and Independents alike—are rightly concerned about insider trading by government officials. But the bill before us cannot address these concerns because, just like as was the case on Monday—that is right, 48 hours ago—we were having the same discussion, the same debate. This measure contains two giant poison pills.

First, it exempts the President and the Vice President of the United States, for that matter. But it exempts the President from the ban on stock trading, and I can list at least 21,000 reasons why we should not exempt the President from the ban on insider trading.

Last year alone, Donald Trump made over 21,000 stock trades—an average of 85 trades per day—85. Does that sound like somebody that is singularly focused on bringing costs down for hard-working Americans? I don't think so.

As I also said on Monday, Donald Trump is clearly the ''Trader in Chief.'' So you cannot be serious about reining in public officials' stock trading if you present a bill that gives the biggest stock trader in Washington a free pass.

My colleague from Nebraska spoke to the virtues of disclosure and advanced notice. Well, on the surface, that seems very attractive, but let me tell you what is really going on. President Trump's social media company is publicly selling inside information about his market-changing statements before the public sees them to hedge funds and Wall Street for the low, low price of $100,000 a month.

It is all in the open—inside information from the President himself for $100,000 a month. The average American earns less than that in a year. But the President isn't worried about them. He is focusing on profiting from his office.

So it is clear that Republicans in Congress are not actually serious about banning stock trading where it is happening the worst. And they are not about helping working Americans address the higher costs of gas and groceries and housing and healthcare.

So what is it that they do care about? Let's talk about the other big poison pill in this bill because the title of it seems like it is about insider trading—Stop Insider Trading Act—but the way it is before us includes the SAVE Act, a bill that we have debated for months and months and months on this floor. Republicans don't have the votes to pass it—a bill that would make it harder for eligible Americans to participate in our democracy.

We have debated this bill for months, and it has gotten nowhere because the Republican caucus isn't even united on this measure because the bill—it is not about voter fraud. The massive voter fraud they claim simply doesn't exist. There is no evidence of massive voter fraud across the country.

What the SAVE Act proposal does do is it sows distrust in our system and seeks to cause chaos in an election cycle that is already underway—a midterm election, by the way, where Republicans are afraid of voters holding them accountable for failing to do anything about rising costs and increased corruption, let alone this unauthorized war with Iran.

How do we know that? Because the SAVE Act, as written, is far more restrictive than the voter ID laws that exist in the States that already have a voter ID law. The House Republican bill would go further and require a photocopy of your ID in your absentee or mail ballot. Now, that violates the fundamental premise of a secret ballot, which is a sacred right; and, therefore, it would undermine mail voting itself.

As I mentioned on Monday, the Republican Governor of Ohio vetoed a similar bill because he saw no benefit in it and that the measure would be a ''significant burden'' on voters. So that is truly the point of the bill: to make it harder for some people to vote.

Now, let's get back to the title of the bill: Stop Insider Trading. If we are genuine about doing that, then there is a bipartisan solution that is available to us today, a bipartisan solution on stock trading.

Everybody watching at home, there is a bill that has been pending before the Senate for nearly a year. The Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee voted it out on a bipartisan basis. Senator HAWLEY is the lead sponsor; Senator MORENO is a cosponsor, along with a number of Democrats—S. 1498, the Halting Ownership and Non-Ethical Stock Transactions, otherwise known as the HONEST Act. So let's pass that—or at least set up a vote on that measure.

And if Republicans aren't willing to do that, then let's sit down—Republicans and Democrats together—to hammer out a real solution and stop with these political games.

So, therefore, Mr. President, I ask that the Senator modify his request to instead proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 294, S. 1498; that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection to the modification?

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MORENO. Mr. President, so I think it is important to clear up a couple of things in no particular order. First of all, I did not cosponsor the HONEST Act. I was the cosponsor of the PELOSI Act, which was a tribute—an honor—to the Member of the House of Representatives that made grift on this job an absolute master class.

Your Representative from Northern California came here almost five decades ago and has managed to build a $300 million net worth. Her Twitter account is one of the most followed accounts, as my colleague from Nebraska pointed out. So I was very proud to sponsor the PELOSI Act. In fact, it is extraordinarily similar to the exact same measure my colleague from Utah and my colleague from Nebraska have proposed, as has the Presiding Officer, my colleague from Ohio. So just to clear that up.

Then the next question was: Well, why would you not sponsor a bill called the HONEST Act? I mean—my God—how do you be anti-honest? Well, that bill basically bans the ownership of all assets. You can't even own them. So if you have mutual funds, stocks, equities, investments, you have to get rid of all of that.

So, basically, that would be insane. There is no other way to look at that. The Democrats put that in place during a Homeland Security meeting which went something like this. We sat down to talk about the PELOSI Act, and they gave us 15 pages of amended documents and said: Hey, we are going to vote on this right now.

And, again—I should have predicted it, honestly, because it was a tribute to NANCY PELOSI, who said: Well, you have to vote for the bill before you know what is in it.

Of course, Republicans said: We are not going to vote for something we haven't read—because, again, that is insane. But it wasn't as insane as what is actually in that bill.

Now, let's go back to what we are really doing here tonight. We could pass this today. Tomorrow, the President of the United States could sign into law a ban on insider trading. This is a 100-percent zero issue. Sometimes we talk about 80–20 issues. There is not an American citizen—well, maybe Paul Pelosi—who would be against this.

But all Americans want us to get this done, and it is very commonsense. My colleague from Nebraska worked diligently on this. It is a great bill. It says if you own stocks when you get here, you can't buy more—so, therefore, you can't use the information—and you can't sell stocks without a 7-day notice period, which, in effect, eliminates any kind of advantage that you would have.

It is a very good bill. It applies to all Members of Congress. We should be able to get that done. We should be able to ban insider trading without Democrats blocking that vote.

My colleague, I believe, from Nebraska—if the Presiding Officer could ask him; I want to be clear—he has asked for a vote at 60; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent.

Mr. MORENO. Mr. President, so I would ask unanimous consent that we do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. You are objecting.

Mr. MORENO. I am objecting. Sorry. Well, let me—just continuing. So let's talk about voter ID really quickly.

My colleague from California said that the Republicans are not united on voter ID, and that is absolutely, absolutely, positively false. This is really important because you can't make accusations here that are false.

My colleague from Ohio, the Presiding Officer, has put forward the exact, in essence, voter ID bill, and it was 53 out of 53 Republicans that voted for that—53 out of 53. That is 100 percent of Republicans. If I did that math correctly, I believe that 53 out of 53 is 100 percent.

Where he is correct is that Democrats are united in their opposition. There wasn't a single Democrat that voted for a stand-alone voter ID bill. Tonight, we have the opportunity to do that—ban insider trading and get voter ID on the floor.

Because my colleagues don't want to do what the American people want them to do, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the modification.

Is there an objection to the original request?

Mr. PADILLA. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. RICKETTS. Mr. President, what we were just attempting to do was to pass it with unanimous consent. That means all 100 Senators agree that we can move forward on H.R. 7008, which includes the Stop Insider Trading Act and the voter ID. And as I mentioned in my opening remarks, it is about integrity. Integrity inspires confidence.

Eighty percent of Americans don't believe we separate our inside information from our financial interests, and therefore we have a 15 percent approval rating. It is the lack of confidence in what we are doing, about how we are handling this, that is creating those low ratings.

So we have an opportunity to be able to address that with the Stop Insider Trading Act and the voter ID, to restore that integrity and, therefore, that confidence.

I certainly understand if my colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't wish to do that unanimously; that, for whatever reason, somebody objects going forward, as my colleague from California has. I offer an alternative that let's schedule a vote.

So, Mr. President, as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Democratic leader, the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 7008 and vote on the passage of the bill at a 60-vote affirmative threshold; further, that if the bill is passed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

The Senator from California.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, before I offer a good-faith counterproposal to my colleague from Nebraska, let me just clarify one item that my colleague from Ohio was seeming to correct—or attempting to correct, I should say, a measure that I was referencing.

So to folks watching at home, let me suggest: Don't take my word for it. Go to Congress.gov and look up S. 1498, and you will see that, indeed, Senator MORENO is a cosponsor. And if you read the measure itself, you will see that it does not ban mutual fund investments.

And with that true correction and clarification, Mr. President, let me ask that the Senator modify his request to, instead, at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Democratic leader, the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 294, S. 1498; that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to and the Senate vote on passage of the bill at a 60-vote affirmative threshold; further, that if the bill is passed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection to the modification?

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MORENO. Mr. President, reserving my right to object, the bill that my colleague from Nebraska, my colleague from Ohio, and my colleague from Utah is proposing is a bill that has already passed the House of Representatives. It has massive bipartisan support. Lots of Democrats voted for that in the House. If we pass it, it can become law. Putting that bill on the floor at 60 is a very low-threshold ask.

I think the American people deserve to know what each Member of this Chamber decides to do on banning insider trading and voter ID.

The proposal that my colleague from California is putting on the floor is a bill that has neither gotten through any committee where it has been actually read by committee members. It is a bill that has not been presented to the House of Representatives, so they would have to take it up over there. It would, of course, be modified and come back. In other words, it is what I say—it is the DC two-step—or if you want to have a headline that says ''I am for banning insider trading'' knowing nothing will actually happen.

Now, maybe you don't think that the bill that my colleague from Nebraska worked diligently on is perfect, but it is a massive step in the right direction. This would get us to 99.9 percent of the way there on banning insider trading. It could happen tomorrow. It could happen tomorrow. And the voter ID law, which virtually all Americans support, could happen tomorrow.

So what we are dealing with is one bill that can be signed into law that has been vetted, that has massive bipartisan support, versus a bill that, quite frankly, the person talking about it wasn't even on that committee, is not 100 percent sure what was in that bill, doesn't know the history of the bill. It wasn't a year ago; it was a few months ago. It is a smokescreen, and for that reason I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there an objection to the original request?

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, we see a lot of debates around here on a lot of different topics—too many topics, in my view, given the fact that the Federal Government is a government enterprise with narrow responsibilities.

In Federalist 45, James Madison described the powers of the Federal Government as few and defined while describing those reserved to the States as numerous and indefinite.

We are in charge of national defense, weights and measures, trademarks, copyrights and patents, regulating trade or commerce between the States with foreign nations and with Tribes, bankruptcy laws, intellectual property laws, coastal roads, declaring war, granting letters of marque and reprisal, serving as the sole sovereign lawmaking authority for what we now call the District of Columbia, the city where we stand today. That is about it. There are a few other powers, but the lion's share of it can be found somewhere in that list of relatively limited authorities that I just described.

We venture sometimes too far afield from those powers, and that is one of the reasons why a lot of things come up.

My point in reciting all this is that in all the debates we see, which probably range further than they should, we see some things that are weighty and some things that are more on the trivial side. Just to cite one random hypothetical, one minute, you could see something debated and maybe passed on this floor recognizing, I don't know, National Sofa Care Week or something like that that goes by sort of with a yawn, and then the next moment, we will be debating something more weighty, something more significant and more definitely relevant to the U.S. Government's powers.

Under article I, sections 4 and 5, this legislation that we have been discussing this evening, H.R. 7008, deals with a couple of core powers that Congress has, one of them involving the regulation of behavior and activities on the part of Members of Congress, Members of the House and the Senate. In the second instance, you have the regulation of the casting of ballots for Federal elections—for elections for Federal office, elections for the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives. We certainly have authority to act in both of those two areas.

There is not a lot of dispute—in other words, there is a lot of bipartisan consensus over the fact that it is time to restrict stock buying and selling on the part of Members of Congress. It is stunning, however, that the voter ID component of H.R. 7008 is at all controversial. This one should be a no-brainer. For the American people, it is a no-brainer. Democratic voters—71 percent favor voter ID requirements. When you add Republicans—so Democrat voters and Republican voters combined—you take it up to 83, 84 percent. If you poll Republican voters alone, we are talking in the mid- to high-90 percentile range for people who support voter ID requirements.

The reason for this is simple. This is obvious. It is intuitive. It is just as we have to prove who we are everywhere else we go where who you are matters and whether you are who you claim to be can make a big difference.

Americans intuitively understand that whatever mild inconvenience might accompany having to provide documentation for who you are, when most of the time, that can be done with a simple card like a driver's license, for example, a passport, something like that, something showing who you are that is issued by the government—we have come to accept as a society that that is just sort of the cost of living in our country. That is part of what it takes because if we didn't do that, the alternative would be bad.

You don't want to show up to your bank one day and discover that somebody else impersonating you, falsely claiming to be you, came in and withdrew all of your money. You don't want that.

We don't allow people to board aircraft without a photo ID, and the reason is there are all kinds of things that can happen in the sky that are dangerous, and you don't want to make it too easy for somebody claiming to be who they are not to board an aircraft and then carry out, you know, crimes of one sort or another—acts of terrorism, perhaps.

These are just a couple examples of the myriad instances in which we have to prove who we are. It is not an undue burden; it is a momentary detour from what we would otherwise be doing.

Most of the time, most people, when they show up to vote, already have their wallet with them, and in their wallet, they presumably have a driver's license or another form of government-issued photo ID, so why not require them to show that?

We saw tonight my friend and colleague, the distinguished Senator from California, contorting himself into a pretzel trying to explain why it is we can't pass this bill. To be clear, his objection, as far I can tell, didn't relate nearly as much to anything else in the bill other than the voter ID provision. That is the concern.

The question is, Why is it that when 70 percent of Democrat voters and 83, 84 percent of all voters, Democrat and Republican combined—why is it that my Democrat colleagues are so adamantly opposed to this? Why do they care? Why do they want the status quo?

I am always reluctant to speak on someone else's behalf because what they say—No. 1, I don't have the ability to read minds, but sometimes, what they say can give us an indication. We have had Democratic politician after Democratic politician part from their own Democratic voter base, which overwhelmingly supports voter ID, time and time and time again, showing up and saying: Oh, we don't want voter ID.

Why?

Now, they actually say this: We believe this would shut out a lot of our voters.

What? Is that an admission that a lot of their voters aren't who they claim to be? that a lot of their voters perhaps aren't U.S. citizens and aren't eligible to vote?

This ought to be concerning to everyone. It ought to be concerning especially to Democrat voters, especially in States that have elected a Democrat Senator who is now opposing any and every sort of voter ID requirement.

A few months ago when we had the SAVE America Act on the floor for, I don't know, 10 blessed days—should have been longer, but it was on the floor for about 10 days. During that time, I was on the floor a lot responding to arguments that they made, and I think I heard every single argument they made.

The overwhelming majority of them—and I mean probably 95-plus percent of the arguments they made against the SAVE America Act—weren't even against the voter ID provisions of the SAVE America Act. Overwhelmingly, they were instead about the proof of citizenship issue. In fact, many of them, Democratic Senator after Democratic Senator, intimated one way or another that they are OK with voter ID requirements. So why are they opposing it? You have to ask yourself that question.

In Latin, there is a word for this: "Cui bono?" Who benefits? Who benefits from people being able to show up and claim to be someone they are not or from someone showing up who is not entitled to vote because they are not a U.S. citizen? Who benefits from that?

I can tell you it is not Republicans. Why? Well, you don't see a single Republican politician making the ridiculous, absurd arguments against voter ID and citizenship verification that these guys are making. Who benefits from illegal voting? Their words seem to suggest that they are benefiting.

This issue isn't going away. The SAVE America Act isn't going away. Voter ID requirement demands aren't going away. I will be back. I will be back day after day, week after week, until this passes because the American people deserve to go to bed every night knowing that their government is run by people they themselves elected, not foreign nationals. They don't want a government that has been chosen with significant foreign influence in our elections.

There was a time when the Democrats in this august Chamber—a time not so very long ago indeed—spoke of little else other than their fear of foreign election interference.

If we don't face the real challenge as to foreign election interference right now, as long as we are not passing the SAVE America Act or its key components, it would appear that those who are against this are just fine now with foreign election interference.

The American people shouldn't be because, again, it is not free. When somebody else votes who is not who they claim to be, when somebody else votes claiming to be a citizen and they are not a citizen, it robs hard-working

Americans, actual American citizens, of their most sacred, their most fundamental right: their right to vote.

No. No. We can't look the other way, nor do we, in my view, have any business taking a 6-week recess until such time as we have done everything humanly possible to get these reforms put into law. The American people deserve better than this. Most of them don't have that luxury of doing that.

Now, I know it is a time-honored Senate tradition. I know it is a tradition that has its roots back to long before the advent of modern air-conditioning and to a time when Washington, DC—you know, it is typically not the most pleasant weather in Washington, and this Chamber, I am sure, became suffocatingly hot and muggy, so for a long time, we had that August recess. Well, we have air-conditioning now. We can handle it.

It is true we frequently do take a recess in August, but it is not written in stone anywhere, it is not written in law anywhere that we have to do that. I would be fine doing that if we had gotten our work done. I would be fine doing that if we knew how our government was going to be funded past September 30. Right now, we have no idea. So when the government remains unfunded and we have no idea how we are going to secure an election system that, quite frankly, is recklessly, criminally insecure—we have no business leaving this Chamber for 6 weeks when we have no idea how we are going to take care of any of that. These problems are not going to solve themselves while we are gone.

I remember 15 years ago when I was first sworn in. I was younger then. I had a full head of hair. I was only 39 years old. I was the youngest Member of the Senate when I got sworn in.

Right after I got sworn in, we were walking one evening around the Capitol. I was showing it to my family. My daughter Eliza was 10 years old at the time. She pointed to one of the little doors out in the hallway just outside the Senate Chamber.

It is a door that is maybe 18 inches tall at the most. I later learned that it was installed when they built this wing of the Capitol in the late 1850s. That was their source of water. They had a pipe in there. The custodial staff at the time used it to get water so that they could clean the floors. I didn't know that at the time.

As we were walking around, my 10-year-old daughter Eliza asked me: Dad, what is that door for?

Not knowing how to answer, I just said the first thing that came to mind. I said: Well, that is for the House elves. The House elves live in there.

Of course, there are no House elves here, but sometimes, we act as if we are relying on the House elves to not only clean the Capitol but also clean up the messes that we make and that we leave undealt with, unaddressed legislatively while we are gone. The cavalry is not coming. We are the cavalry. The House elves aren't going to show up and do our work for us if we retreat into the sunset for 6 weeks.

We have to do this. We had an opportunity tonight to make a meaningful dent in our election security problem. And it is tragic that the Democrats chose not to let this reasonable measure pass into law—a measure that 71 percent of their voters and 83 percent of all American voters support. They can't handle it—apparently because they benefit too much when people vote illegally. Shame on them for taking that position, but shame on us if we leave before the job is done.

Lastly, far too much gets said around here about, Oh, we can't do X, Y, or Z because we don't have 60 votes. I get that that is said. That cannot become our anthem. That is an absurd suggestion.

Now, I know it takes 60 votes to invoke cloture, but, you know, long before there even was a cloture rule—there has only been a cloture rule for 109 years. Before that time, we still had the filibuster, just no cloture. Remember, a cloture vote is just one way of breaking the filibuster.

If a supermajority of Senators—under the current rule, three-fifths, 60 votes in the Senate—if 60 Senators want to force debate to come to a close even if some Senators want to continue debating, then the Senate can do so, but that is not the exclusive means by which you can break a filibuster. Other techniques are available—techniques that were available for nearly 150 years before the first cloture rule was even adopted in 1917.

If you can't break a filibuster and you don't have 60 votes to bring debate to a close using cloture, you can put legislation on the floor, and you can debate it, and you can require any Senator wishing to filibuster to continue to show up and continue to speak to prolong debate.

The filibuster is about speaking; it is about debating; it is not about perpetually forestalling the passing of legislation until you have 60 votes for it.

Passage in this Chamber, with rare exceptions not relevant here, is set at a simple majority, at 51 votes. And if the Vice President is with you, you can do it at 50 votes. The Vice President supplies the tie-breaking vote of 51, and then it is passed. We could do that.

We should be putting this measure on the Senate floor. We should be debating it for weeks on end, if necessary, cutting into weekends and long-scheduled recess time, if necessary, making clear we are going to keep debating it until it passes, and making clear that the minute those filibustering it fail to show up and continue to speak, we will call the question, and we will pass it with a simple majority.

We could do that. We should do that. It takes time, yes. But time is on our side. We have got weeks in which to do this. We should do that.

Now, if we don't want to do that, there are other mechanisms available to us. We could continue to attach it to other must-pass vehicles. We could also push something in the form of budget reconciliation.

Now, that is a little trickier. You could bypass the need for cloture with budget reconciliation, but it has to be budgetary, and it has to meet a whole bunch of requirements.

It has to be budgetary, which means it needs to manage changes in mandatory outlays or revenues; and it can't, among other things, have budgetary features that are merely incidental to policy changes.

But there are ways that we could capture some of the benefits of the SAVE America Act through reconciliation.

But my point is just to say there are multiple ways of skinning this cat. I don't care nearly as much which way to skin it. I would personally prefer to bring it up on the floor and debate it until it passes. I think that is the cleanest way of doing it. But I am not a purist on that. I don't insist it be my way or the highway. I am just saying we do have to do it. We can't pretend this isn't here. This will not disappear simply because we leave.

The cavalry is not coming. We are the cavalry. There are no house elves who will come and fix our election security problems. So let's get this done. And for the love of all that is sacred and holy, let's not go on a 6-week recess with all of this undone. The American people deserve better.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session and 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.

RECOGNIZING THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF PEEVER, SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Peever, SD. The town of Peever will be celebrating its quasquicentennial on August 8, 2026. Peever will host anniversary events, including a parade, an antique tractor-pull, live music, and much more.

Peever is located in Roberts County and is nestled at the edge of the beautiful Coteau Hills in the northeastern corner of South Dakota. The town of Peever is named after settler Thomas Henry Peever, an entrepreneur who cultivated the community's growth through railroad development and early commerce. As part of the Lake Traverse Reservation, the area is deeply tied to the Sisseton Wahpeton Oyate and holds valued Tribal history. Despite a devasting fire, floods, and droughts, this community has continued to be a true testament to the resilience and tenacity seen across South Dakota. Home to more than 180 South Dakotans, Peever is known for its rich agricultural and Native American heritage. Since Peever's beginning 125 years ago, the community continues to exemplify South Dakota's strong values, emboldened traditions, and enduring spirit.

I offer my congratulations to the citizens of Peever on their town's quasquicentennial and wish them continued prosperity in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO AVA POWELL

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Ava Powell, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Ava is a graduate of Greens Farms Academy in Westport, CT. Currently, she is attending Vanderbilt University in Nashville, TN, where she is pursuing degrees in English and human and organizational development. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Ava for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF CASPER ORTHOPEDICS

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the 50th anniversary of Casper Orthopedics. This remarkable milestone reflects five decades of excellence providing comprehensive, compassionate, and trusted healthcare to thousands of patients across the Cowboy State.

Casper Orthopedics was founded on September 1, 1976, by decorated Vietnam veteran and orthopedic surgeon Dr. Jerry Behrens. It is Wyoming's great fortune that Jerry moved his family to Casper to start his own orthopedic practice. Shortly after opening its doors, Jerry was joined by Dr. John Bailey and then Dr. Tom Landon. Thus began Casper Orthopedics' 50-year journey providing the highest standard of patient care.

Everyone at Casper Orthopedics, from the physicians, nurses, therapists, technicians, and support staff, strives every day to put their patients first. They dedicate their time, talent, and treasure to helping people regain mobility, restore independence, and improve overall quality of life. Over the past 50 years, the practice has earned a reputation for specializing in a wide range of orthopedic care, ranging from trauma, spine, upper extremity, foot and ankle, joint replacement, and sports medicine to physical medicine and rehabilitation.

Casper Orthopedics is where I spent my 24-year career as a board-certified orthopedic surgeon. I joined the practice in 1983. Dr. Craig Smith and Dr. Clay Turner also brought their incredible surgical gifts to the practice during those first 25 years.

It was my honor to learn from these dedicated healthcare leaders as we worked every day to keep the practice at the forefront of orthopedic medicine. We embraced advances in surgical techniques, rehabilitation, and patient-centered care. It was this commitment to innovation that enabled people from all walks of life to return to the activities they enjoy with confidence.

In 2001, Casper Orthopedics opened its state-of-the-art medical facility at 4140 Centennial Hills Blvd. This new location included an ambulatory surgical center, physical and occupational therapy, and an imaging department. The practice continued to grow, and in 2003, Dr. Steven Orcutt joined the team. Shortly after that, Casper Orthopedics expanded further and added Dr. Matt Mitchell, Dr. Matthew Gorman, Dr. Robert Allaire, Dr. Eric Linford, Dr. Daniel White, Dr. Trevor Gessel, Dr. Jay Arthur, Dr. Marko Tomov, Dr. Ari Amitai, Dr. Taylor Harris, and Dr. Paul Hannon.

This golden anniversary is an opportunity to recognize the vision and dedication of the founders, the leadership that has guided the practice through decades of growth, and the generations of healthcare professionals whose unparalleled skills have made this achievement possible. Their work not only serves the healthcare needs of the region, but Casper Orthopedics also strives to be an active part of the Casper community. The practice regularly supports local organizations and has partnered with the Wyoming Symphony, Jason's Friends Foundation, and the National Historic Trails Interpretive Center.

Congratulations to the entire Casper Orthopedics team, past and present, on 50 years of healthcare excellence. May the practice continue its proud tradition of excellence, innovation, compassionate care, and public service for decades to come. I wish them continued success and know they will continue to provide high-quality care that supports the well-being of patients across Wyoming and the Rocky Mountain West.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is still available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications that have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such an annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD–423.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, DC.

CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION TRANSMITTAL LETTER

Please find enclosed the following notification from the Department of State.

Department Notification Number: RSAT 0C–23

Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(5)(C) of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA), as amended, we are forwarding Transmittal No. 0C–23. This notification relates to enhancements or upgrades from the level of sensitivity of technology or capability described in the Section 36(b)(1) AECA certification 21–48 of August 3, 2021.

Recipients:
Speaker of the House of Representatives
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
Senate Committee on Foreign Relations

Sincerely,

KAITLYN WOLFE,
Senior Bureau Official,
Bureau of Legislative Affairs.

TRANSMITTAL NO. OC–23

Report of Enhancement or Upgrade of Sensitivity of Technology or Capability (Sec. 36(B)(5)(A), AECA)

(i)(U) Purchaser: Government of Georgia.

(ii)(U) Sec. 36(b)(1), AECA Transmittal No.: 21–48; Date: August 3, 2021; Military Department: Army.

Funding Source: National Funds.

(iii)(U) Description: On August 3, 2021, Congress was notified by Congressional certification transmittal number 21–48, of the possible sale, under Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, of eighty-two (82) Javelin FGM–148 Missiles; and forty-six (46) Javelin Command Launch Units (CLU). Also included were Enhanced Producibility Basic Skills Trainers; Missile Simulation Rounds; Security Assistance Management Directorate Technical Assistance; Tactical Aviation and Ground Munitions Project Office Technical Assistance; other associated equipment and services; and other related elements of logistical and program support. The estimated total cost was $30 million. Major Defense Equipment (MDE) constituted $25 million of this total.

This transmittal reports the replacement of the previously notified forty-six (46) Javelin Command Launch Units (CLUs) with thirty (30) Javelin Light Weight Command Launch Units (LWCLUs) (MDE). The following non-MDE items will also be added: technical assistance, training and support equipment in support of Javelin program management, logistics, oversight, and successful delivery of the weapon system. The estimated total value of these additional items is $7.16 million. The total estimated MDE value remains $25 million. The estimated total value will increase by $7 million, resulting in an estimated total case value of $37 million.

(iv)(U) Significance: This notification is being provided to report the replacement of the previously notified Javelin CLUs with Javelin LWCLUs. The proposed sale will support Georgia's ability to build its long-term defense capacity to defend its sovereignty and territorial integrity to meet its national defense requirements. It is vital to the U.S. national interest to assist Georgia in developing and maintaining a strong and ready self-defense capability.

(v)(U) Justification: This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security of the United States by improving the security of Georgia which is a strategic partner and a key contributor to security and stability in the region.

(vi)(U) Sensitivity of Technology: The Javelin Weapon System is comprised of two major tactical components, which are a reusable Light Weight Command Launch Unit (LWCLU) and a round contained in a disposable launch tube assembly. The LWCLU incorporates an integrated day-night sight that provides a target engagement capability in adverse weather and countermeasure environments. It may also be used in a standalone mode for battlefield surveillance and target detection. The LWCLU's thermal sight is a 3rd generation Forward Looking Infrared (FLIR) sensor. To facilitate initial loading and subsequent updating of software, all on-board missile software is uploaded via the LWCLU after mating and prior to launch.

The highest level of classification of defense articles, components, and services included in this potential sale is SECRET.

(vii)(U) Date Report Delivered to Congress: July 28, 2026.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF H.G. GREENE GENERAL STORE

• Mr. BUDD. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize a multigenerational American small business that has proudly served the community of Ronda, NC, for 150 years: H.G. Greene's General Store. Founded in 1876 by James Clignman ''J.C.'' Greene, H.G. Greene's General Store is Wilkes County's oldest retail business.

Born in 1856, J.C. Greene was orphaned after the passing of his parents William and Frances Canady Greene in 1863. As a young man, J.C. Greene opened the doors to his first general store at the same four-way intersection in Wilkes County where it remains operational today.

The store is named after Harry ''H.G.'' Greene, who started working in the store at the age of 12 after his father J.C. was injured in a fall. He operated the store until about a year before he died at the age of 89 in 1993.

Harry's son Bob and his wife Darlene Greene now continue the family legacy, constructing a new storefront in 1973 near the original store site in the Yadkin Valley. Later, the Greene family expanded the general store's footprint to incorporate a second location in Jonesville.

Generations of North Carolinians have relied on this historic retailer as a one-stop shop for everything from produce and baked goods to artisanal goods, apparel, and outdoor gear. And the general store's front porch has long been a consistent community hub for North Carolinians to gather.

I firmly believe that what makes America's family-owned and operated small businesses endure across generations is not simply their longevity, but their unwavering commitment to the communities they serve. These businesses become more than places of commerce; they become gathering places, trusted neighbors, and cornerstones of local life. Through changing times and economic challenges, they continue to show up for their communities with the same dedication that first earned them the trust of their customers.

Without a shadow of doubt, H.G. Greene's General Store has lived up to that standard.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the 150th anniversary of H.G. Greene's General Store with a round of applause for this great American small business.•

RECOGNIZING WINN'S PIZZA & STEAKHOUSE AND WINN & SARA'S KITCHEN

• Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, as chair of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I recognize an outstanding Iowa small business that exemplifies the American entrepreneurial spirit. This week, it is my privilege to honor Winn Nguyen and his family's restaurants Winn's Pizza & Steakhouse and Winn & Sara's Kitchen of Warren County, IA, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

Winn Nguyen spent more than 13 years at Best Steakhouse, mastering every aspect of the restaurant business. Inspired by the American dream and driven by a desire to build a strong legacy, he opened Winn's Pizza & Steakhouse in Indianola in 2003. He grew the restaurant from a team of 7 employees to approximately 20 today, including several members of his own family. In 2015, as the Indianola location flourished, Winn opened a second restaurant in Norwalk, now managed by his son Andrew Sayasane. This expansion enabled the family business to serve a rapidly growing community while creating an opportunity for future generations to carry on the family's legacy.

In 2024, Winn and his wife Sara opened Winn & Sara's Kitchen. Operating primarily from a booth at the Iowa State Fair in Des Moines, the business quickly became a crowd favorite. The family hand-wraps more than 3,000 egg rolls each day during the fair—a remarkable testament to their craftsmanship, work ethic, and commitment to quality. Outside of the Iowa State Fair, Winn & Sara's Kitchen regularly hosts popular pop-up events at both Winn's Pizza & Steakhouse locations. Today, the Nguyen family operates a thriving, family-owned network of businesses across Indianola, Norwalk, and Des Moines. Their continued growth demonstrates the power of entrepreneurship rooted in family values.

Beyond their commercial success, the Nguyen family and their businesses remain deeply engaged in Warren County. They are members of the Indianola Chamber of Commerce, which has been a strong supporter of Winn & Sara's Kitchen at the Iowa State Fair. The businesses regularly participate in community events, providing catering for school functions, public graduation celebrations, and fundraising events benefiting Indianola High School. In 2017, the Des Moines Register named Winn's Pizza & Steakhouse best family-owned restaurant and best pizza restaurant. At the 2024 and 2025 Iowa State Fairs, Winn & Sara's Kitchen earned the People's Choice Award for Best New Fair Food and was named a top three finalist again in 2026, with a chance to claim the title for a third time this August. From a single restaurant in 2003 to multiple successful ventures today, the Nguyens credit the Indianola community for supporting their family over the past 23 years. Their entrepreneurial spirit, commitment to excellence, and dedication to serving others embody the qualities that make Iowa's small businesses exceptional.

It is my honor to recognize the Nguyen family and the entire team behind Winn's Pizza & Steakhouse and Winn & Sara's Kitchen. I look forward to their continued success and wish them the best in the years ahead.•

TRIBUTE TO RICH BRIERRE

• Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the retirement announcement of Rich Brierre as the executive director of the Indian Nations Council of Governments (INCOG) in Tulsa, OK. Under his leadership, the Tulsa region has experienced significant change and growth that will benefit generations to come. The transportation, housing, and economic development projects that have come to fruition over the past two decades can often be directly or indirectly attributed to Rich.

Originally from St. Louis, MO, Rich attended college at the University of Tulsa, graduating in 1973. Upon graduation, Rich started as a housing planner at INCOG, and what began as an entry-level planning position evolved into a remarkable career spanning housing, community development, transportation, environmental planning, and regional governance. Rich has worked at INCOG his entire professional career and has shared his passion for transportation, housing, and community development across Green Country.

In his more than 50 years working at INCOG, Rich has worked on countless projects that have improved communities and quality of life for all those living in the Tulsa region. Whether it was Vision 2025, construction of the Gilcrease Expressway, initiating the Tulsa/West Tulsa Levee project, establishing a new interstate, or creating a new county bridge program, Rich was there in the background ensuring that these major initiatives were pushed forward and completed.

Rich was appointed Executive Director of INCOG in January 2008, replacing long-time director Jerry Lasker. Rich assumed leadership of the region's principal planning organization, serving approximately 50 local governments across the five-county Tulsa metropolitan area. Under his leadership, INCOG continued to expand its role as a regional convener, providing expertise in transportation planning, environmental programs, community development, aging services, land-use coordination, economic development, and public infrastructure planning.

Rich's leadership was anchored in the unwavering belief that the best way forward was always when communities work together across jurisdictional boundaries. This belief was perfectly captured through his contributions in the planning and coordination of Vision 2025, an $885 million public investment initiative that the voters of Tulsa County approved in 2003. The initiative involved substantial coordination among local governments, businesses, and citizens that ultimately brought investments in economic development, education, recreation, and transportation.

One cannot recognize Rich without highlighting his passion for transportation projects and initiatives. Throughout his tenure, he has championed projects designed to enhance mobility, support economic growth, and improve connectivity in northeastern Oklahoma. Among the major infrastructure initiatives associated with his leadership are planning and development efforts related to the Gilcrease Expressway, Creek Turnpike, and the region's expanding trail network. He was able to utilize innovative financing programs to help fund the construction of the Gilcrease Expressway with the Oklahoma Turnpike Authority and Oklahoma Department of Transportation. His work helped advance the concept that transportation infrastructure should not only move people efficiently but also improve quality of life, create economic opportunities, and strengthen community connections.

During his tenure as Executive Director, Rich became a skilled advocate for securing Federal and State funding for regional initiatives. Over the past two decades, INCOG has successfully secured more than $80 million in competitive Federal grant funding. Rich was also able to successfully advocate and secure State funding for projects such as the Tulsa/West Tulsa Levee project, the Rural Economic Action Plan (REAP) program, and a new program dedicated towards structurally deficient bridges. Beyond large infrastructure projects, Rich has also consistently emphasized housing, community development, and neighborhood revitalization.

Rich was never the loudest person in the room, and in fact, he usually was the quietest. However, over the decades, he became a trusted adviser to local elected officials, civic organizations, State agencies, and Federal partners, helping communities navigate growth, infrastructure investments, and long-range planning challenges. When Rich spoke, people would listen because they knew he was a man of integrity and that his ideas and knowledge of the issues would be respected. He became a subject matter expert on transportation, economic development, planning, and State and Federal programs.

As Rich retires, he leaves behind a legacy that will have a lasting impact across northeast Oklahoma. His expertise and institutional knowledge acquired from his 53-year career will be sorely missed. If you ask him, he has plenty of stories he can share about his former neighbor and Senator Jim Inhofe and numerous other Federal, State, and local officials that he has had the chance to interact with over his career.

Rich currently resides in Tulsa with his wife Claudia, a fellow lifelong INCOG staff member. His daughter Catharine lives and works in Tulsa, OK, and his son Will and family live in Fort Collins, CO. He is an avid cyclist, a member of First Presbyterian Church, and a lifelong St. Louis Cardinals fan. I know that he will enjoy spending even more time with his children and family in the years ahead. Rich, thank you for your leadership.●

TRIBUTE TO HANK THORNTON

● Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, the Gem State is made strong by the hard-working, dedicated, and selfless actions of Idahoans. Across our State, hundreds of thousands of veterans, first responders, volunteers, and public servants go above and beyond for the communities they call home. These people are pillars of our State and are essential to keeping Idaho the best place to live, work, and raise a family.

To recognize these exceptional individuals, I am proud to launch the Idaho Service Spotlight to honor the Idahoans whose service and leadership have made a lasting impact on the Gem State. It is especially fitting that we begin this initiative on Idaho Day, the anniversary of Idaho's statehood and a celebration of the people whose contributions continue to shape our exceptional quality of life.

Today, I am pleased to recognize Hank Thornton of St. Maries as an Idaho Service Spotlight recipient for the month of July 2026.

Hank has devoted his life's work to those who served our Nation. An Air Force veteran himself, Hank has seen firsthand the struggles many men and women face when returning home from military service. After a young local veteran took his life, Hank recognized a severe lack of support for veterans in north central Idaho and took action. He started knocking on doors, talking to the community, and eventually founded the Veterans Outreach Center, Inc., of Benewah County in 2018.

The outreach center has since become a lifeline for local veterans, providing mental health resources, warm meals, and so much more. Hank and his team make house calls to any veteran who may be experiencing difficulties, offering support and connecting them with community resources. Their selfless actions have helped hundreds of veterans build a life worth living and dramatically reduced veteran suicides in the region. As the organization grew, the center expanded to include a food bank, serving hot meals twice a week and ensuring Benewah County families and veterans do not go hungry. While the center initially began as Hank's vision, the entire community has rallied behind it, donating a property in downtown St. Maries, funding to maintain daily operations, and providing grants.

Outside of the center, Hank is the heartbeat of the St. Maries community. He is president and commander of the St. Joes Valley Search and Rescue, team leader for the Idaho Governor's Challenge on suicide prevention, vice president of the Benewah County Public Gun and Archery Range, and 2nd vice commander of American Legion Post 25.

On behalf of the people of Idaho, I thank and congratulate Hank for being selected as an Idaho Service Spotlight recipient for the month of July 2026. You reflect the very best of our State, and Idaho is stronger because of your actions.●

RECOGNIZING TITAN BATTERIES

● Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, as a member and former chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each month I recognize and celebrate the American entrepreneurial spirit by highlighting the success of a small business in my home State of Idaho. Today, I am proud to honor Titan Batteries in Pocatello as the Idaho Small Business of the Month for July 2026.

Trent Clawson founded Titan Batteries in 2015 after learning that no commercially available drone battery could power a cross-country flight. He took matters into his own hands and began building high-performance, long-range batteries in the unfinished basement of his then-home in Bentonville, AR.

Four years later, in May of 2019, Trent moved the business to Idaho, where his wife grew up. As he became acquainted with the production process, Trent made the decision to keep all manufacturing right here in the Gem State. That investment paid off, as Titan quickly expanded from 11 employees to more than 80 in only 6 months.

Now, Titan engineers batteries for drone manufacturers supplying the U.S. military and other critical defense programs. Every battery design is crafted specifically to meet the unique demands of the mission it will power and support America's fleet of drones. Titan's success is proof that American ingenuity and domestic manufacturing remain strong, encouraging more companies to keep their supply chain in the U.S.

Congratulations to Trent and the Titan Batteries team on being recognized as the Idaho Small Business of the Month for July 2026. Your dedication to excellence makes Idaho proud, and I look forward to your continued growth and success.●

TRIBUTE TO NARS DESAUTEL

● Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, the Gem State is made strong by the hard-working, dedicated, and selfless actions of Idahoans. Across our State, hundreds of thousands of veterans, first responders, volunteers, and public servants go above and beyond for the communities they call home. These people are pillars of our State and are essential to keeping Idaho the best place to live, work, and raise a family. Today, I am pleased to recognize Narcisse ''Nars'' Desautel as an Idaho Service Spotlight recipient for the month of July 2026.

Corporal Nars Desautel's life has been defined by service, perseverance, and love of country. In 1944, he enlisted in the U.S. Army. During World War II, Nars was stationed in the Philippines as a warehouse foreman, supporting military operations throughout the Asiatic-Pacific Theater and participating in the Luzon campaign. He stayed in the Army until the very end of the war, earning several awards, including the Good Conduct Medal, Asiatic-Pacific Theater Service Medal, and the Philippine Liberation Service Ribbon with one bronze star.

After WWII, Nars returned home and built a life rooted in family and hard work. In 1957, Nars relocated to Lewiston, ID, where he began a successful 25-year career with Potlatch Corporation. Even in retirement, Nars' commitment to serving others did not waver. Alongside his wife Kathleen, he spent more than a decade as a campground host and maintenance employee at the Kelly Forks Work Center in the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest. There, he welcomed visitors and cared for Idaho's public lands until the remarkable age of 87.

During fire season, Nars often went beyond his regular duties to drive trucks and assist with transportation to help keep recreationalists and firefighters safe. Kathleen supported these same efforts, working in fire camps to feed firefighters. Their children have many memories of the camps where their parents would run around caring for those protecting Idaho's lands from fire.

Through it all, Nars has remained devoted to his family, which includes 9 children, 20 grandchildren, 33 great-grandchildren, and 10 great-great-grandchildren. Now a resident of the Idaho State Veterans Home in Lewiston, Nars continues to inspire those around him with his patriotism and joy. As he approaches his 106th birthday, Nars is a testament to the values Idahoans and the ''Greatest Generation'' embody: service to country, dedication to family, commitment to community, and gratitude for every day.

On behalf of the people of Idaho, I thank and congratulate Nars Desautel for being selected as an Idaho Service Spotlight recipient for the month of July 2026. You reflect the very best of our State, and Idaho is stronger because of your actions.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:15 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. 8595. An act making appropriations for national security, Department of State, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2027, and for other purposes.

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–4225. 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 $25,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 26–056); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4226. 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 Israel in the amount of $1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 26–055); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4227. A communication from the Senior Bureau Official, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to Spain in the amount of $100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 26–053); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4228. A communication from the Senior Bureau Official, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) and (d) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license amendment for the export of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to Singapore in the amount of $50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 26–046); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4229. A communication from the Senior Bureau Official, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to the United Kingdom in the amount of $50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 26–033); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4230. A communication from the Senior Bureau Official, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to Algeria and Germany in the amount of $50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 25–138); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4231. A communication from the Senior Bureau Official, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to Canada, Morocco, and the United Arab Emirates in the amount of $50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 25–132); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4232. 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; Mullin, Texas'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2026–3765)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4233. 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; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG Engines; Amendment 39–23376'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2026–4655)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4234. 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 Using Agency and Controlling Agency for Restricted Areas R–5301, R–5302A, R–5302B, and R–5302C; North Carolina'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2026–7162)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4235. 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 Canada Limited Partnership (Type Previously Held by C Series Aircraft Limited Partnership (CSALP); Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes; Amendment 39–23403'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2026–7211)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4236. 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; Bell Textron Canada Limited Helicopters; Amendment 39–23395'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2026–3476)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4237. 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; Springfield, Kentucky'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2026–3633)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4238. 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; Wickenburg, Arizona'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2025–0466)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4239. 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; Dover, Ohio'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2026–3637)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4240. 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 39–23373'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2025–5032)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4241. 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 39–23372'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2026–2281)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4242. 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 39–23374'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2026–3475)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4243. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to action on a nomination and discontinuation of service in an acting role for a position covered by the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998 for the position of Assistant Secretary for Research & Technology, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4244. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to action on a nomination for a position covered by the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998 for the position of Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs, Department of Transportation, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4245. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Office of International Affairs, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Review of Submarine Cable Landing License Rules and Procedures to Assess Evolving National Security, Law Enforcement, Foreign Policy, and Trade Policy Risks; Amendment of the Schedule of Application Fees Set Forth in Sections 1.1102 through 1.1109 of the Commission's Rules'' (FCC 26–42) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 20, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4246. A communication from the Chief for Regulatory Development, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''General Technical, Organizational, Conforming, and Correcting Amendments to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations'' (RIN2126–AC75) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 23, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4247. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Office for Civil Rights, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Rescinding Portions of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Title VI Regulations to Align with the Statutory Text and Conform to Executive Order 14281'' (RIN0945–AA29) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2026; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4248. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Office for Civil Rights, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Rescinding Guidelines for Eliminating Discrimination and Denial of Services on the Basis of Race, Color, National Origin, Sex, and Handicap in Vocational Education Programs'' (RIN0945–AA31) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2026; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4249. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Medicare-Medicaid Coordination Office Fiscal Year 2025 Report to Congress''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4250. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report to Congress: Evaluation of the Independence at Home Demonstration''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4251. A communication from the President and Chair, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a transaction involving exports to the United Arab Emirates; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4252. A communication from the Congressional and Public Affairs Specialist, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Enhanced Favorable Treatment for the United Arab Emirates under the Export Administration Regulations'' (RIN0694–AK54) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2026; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4253. A communication from the Research Director of the Administrative Conference of the United States, transmitting, a report of the recommendations adopted by the Administrative Conference of the United States at its 85th Plenary Session; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4254. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Restoration and Damage Assessment, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Natural Resource Damages for Hazardous Substances'' (RIN1090–AB26) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2026; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–4255. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's fiscal year 2025 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4256. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 26–306, ''Architect and Engineer Good Samaritan Amendment Act of 2026''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4257. A communication from the Acting Branch Chief of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Epyrifenacil; Pesticide Tolerances; Correction'' (FRL No. 13239–02–OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2026; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4258. A communication from the Acting Branch Chief of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Perchloroethylene (PCE) and Carbon Tetrachloride (CTC); Regulation under the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA); Compliance Date Extensions'' (FRL No. 13023–02–OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2026; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4259. A communication from the Principal Deputy General Counsel, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy and designation of an acting officer for a position covered by the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998 for the position of Chairman, Council on Environmental Quality, Executive Office of the President, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2026; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4260. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modernization of the Nation's Alerting Systems; Protecting the Nation's Communications Systems from Cybersecurity Threats'' (FCC 26–38) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4261. A communication from the Supervisory Program Analyst, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Upper C–Band (3.98–4.2 GHz); Expanding Flexible Use of the 3.7 to the 4.2 GHz Band'' (FCC 26–46) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4262. A communication from the Supervisory Program Analyst, Space Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Space Modernization for the 21st Century'' (FCC 26–47) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2026;

to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4263. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 26–330, ''Union Wesley Way Designation Act of 2026''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental 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. MARSHALL (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 5156. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for in-service rollovers for individual retirement annuity purchases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER (for herself and Mr. MARSHALL):

S. 5157. A bill to promote the use of accessible, seamless, intrastate data available through robust, secure, and tailored statewide longitudinal data systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. LEE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. PAUL):

S. 5158. A bill to abolish the Federal Insurance Office of the Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WELCH:

S. 5159. A bill to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to support microgrids, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 5160. A bill to require the Secretary of State and relevant executive branch agencies to monitor and address gray-zone operations of the People's Republic of China in the Indo-Pacific, to hold accountable gray-zone activities by national and international actors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. FETTERMAN, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. WARNOCK):

S. 5161. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to adjust the period during which amounts transferred by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to the account for customer education initiatives and non-awards expenses shall remain available, to strengthen anti-retaliation protections for whistleblowers, to ensure whistleblowers are informed of their rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. LUJAN (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 5162. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the authority of the National Taxpayer Advocate; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HAWLEY (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 5163. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to prevent the awarding of bonuses to the Postmaster General and Deputy Postmaster General for a fiscal year in which the United States Postal Service does not meet or exceed each on-time mail delivery target, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Ms. SMITH, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mrs. BRITT, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, and Mr. MARSHALL):

S. 5164. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to make improvements relating to the designation of rural emergency hospitals; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

S. 5165. A bill to authorize the Office of Polar Programs of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 5166. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to strengthen requirements related to nutrient information on food labels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KIM (for himself and Mr. HAWLEY):

S. 5167. A bill to require an assessment of program areas and administrative practices presenting the greatest risk to the integrity of Federal funds administered by States and local governments; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. HEINRICH, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 5168. A bill to provide paid family and medical leave to Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. JUSTICE (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 5169. A bill to expand the boundaries of the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District, to recognize and enhance the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District partnership model, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 5170. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to remove carbon dioxide directly from ambient air or seawater, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 5171. A bill to require a study of AI-enabled toys and development of a joint action plan regarding the marketing and sale of AI-enabled toys; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BANKS (for himself, Mr. KIM, and Mr. FETTERMAN):

S. 5172. A bill to amend titles XI, XIX, and XXI of the Social Security Act with respect to screening for childhood-onset fluency disorders, and to require coverage of certain speech therapy services under Medicaid and CHIP; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REED:

S.J. Res. 203. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency relating to ''Preemption Determination: State Interest-on-Escrow Laws''; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. TILLIS, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. Res. 818. A resolution recognizing the importance of trademarks in the economy and the role of trademarks in protecting consumer safety by designating the month of July as ''National Anti-Counterfeiting and Consumer Education and Awareness Month''; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 6

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Ms. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 6, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion.

S. 341

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 341, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act to establish a grant program for supporting local communities in detecting, preparing for, communicating about, or mitigating the environmental and public health impacts of wildfire smoke and extreme heat, and for other purposes.

S. 364

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BANKS) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 364, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove silencers from the definition of firearms, and for other purposes.

S. 704

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 704, a bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to reauthorize the voluntary public access and habitat incentive program.

S. 1289

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1289, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on the United States and to support programs at the National September 11 Memorial and Museum at the World Trade Center.

S. 1901

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCCORMICK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1901, a bill to address the effect of litigation on applications to export liquefied natural gas, and for other purposes.

S. 1939

At the request of Mr. WARNOCK, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr.

OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1939, a bill to provide protections for good faith donations of pet food and supplies.

S. 2006

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2006, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to prohibit discrimination in the Armed Forces on the basis of gender identity, and for other purposes.

S. 2195

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. SHEEHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2195, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the brave women who served in World War II as members of the U.S. Army Nurse Corps and U.S. Navy Nurse Corps.

S. 2229

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2229, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a coin in recognition of the Foreign Service of the United States and its contribution to United States diplomacy.

S. 2708

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2708, a bill to enhance the preservation, maintenance, and management of national historic trails and national scenic trails, and for other purposes.

S. 2903

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2903, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require a group health plan or health insurance coverage offered in connection with such a plan to provide an exceptions process for any medication step therapy protocol, and for other purposes.

S. 2955

At the request of Mr. BANKS, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2955, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish Federal penalties for the knowing and intentional administration of any abortion-inducing drug to a woman without her informed consent, if the abortion-inducing drug has been shipped or transported in interstate commerce, and for other purposes.

S. 3101

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of Florida, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mrs. MOODY), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BANKS), the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. SHEEHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3101, a bill to prevent citizens of foreign adversarial nations from entering into or enforcing surrogacy contracts in the United States.

S. 3226

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3226, a bill to provide for the creation of the missing Armed Forces and civilian personnel Records Collection at the National Archives, to require the expeditious public transmission to the Archivist and public disclosure of missing Armed Forces and civilian personnel records, and for other purposes.

S. 3259

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCCORMICK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3259, a bill to amend the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act to require remaining funds under the Broadband Equity, Access, and Deployment Program to be used for deficit reduction.

S. 3267

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3267, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of blood-based dementia screening tests.

S. 3427

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3427, a bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to establish the Domestic Organic Investment Program, and for other purposes.

S. 3524

At the request of Mr. MCCORMICK, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. SHEEHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3524, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to modify certain cost-sharing requirements for grant programs under the American Battlefield Protection Program, and for other purposes.

S. 3800

At the request of Mr. CURTIS, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. ARMSTRONG) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 3800, a bill to improve environmental reviews and authorizations through the use of interactive, digital, and cloud-based platforms, and for other purposes.

S. 3808

At the request of Mrs. BRITT, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCCORMICK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3808, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to increase civil penalties for, and improve enforcement with respect to, customs fraud, and for other purposes.

S. 4036

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 4036, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to expand the Project ECHO Grant Program, to allow for such program to disseminate knowledge and build capacity to address Alzheimer's disease and other dementias, and for other purposes.

S. 4343

At the request of Mr. HAWLEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. KIM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4343, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that a Member of Congress convicted of certain felony offenses relating to sexual abuse shall not be eligible for retirement benefits based on that individual's Member service, and for other purposes.

S. 4395

At the request of Mr. MCCORMICK, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 4395, a bill to reauthorize the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

S. 4429

At the request of Mr. MORENO, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) were added as cosponsors of S. 4429, a bill to prohibit the importation, manufacture, sale, resale, or introduction into interstate commerce in the United States of connected vehicles and related software and hardware associated with foreign adversaries.

S. 4528

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. KIM) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 4528, a bill to provide for the long-term improvement of Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and for other purposes.

S. 4576

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 4576, a bill to strengthen Federal efforts to counter antisemitism in the United States and protect the Jewish community.

S. 4621

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4621, a bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to reduce systemic risk while increasing geographical diversity and competition with respect to depositories for the storage of precious metals, and for other purposes.

S. 4634

At the request of Mr. HUSTED, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4634, a bill to amend section 477 of the Social Security Act to update the purposes of the John H. Chafee Foster

Care Program for Successful Transition to Adulthood to reflect research and the input of youth with lived experience regarding the importance of long-term relationships to future success.

S. 4744

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4744, a bill to amend titles 10 and 38, United States Code, and other Federal laws, to improve benefits for veterans and the administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

S. 4775

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4775, a bill to amend the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act to clarify liability protections for firearms and associated manufacturers and retailers, and for other purposes.

S. 4782

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4782, a bill to establish a Federal Government priority goal, Scams Steering Committee, Scams Action Plan, and website to promote scams information and prevention, and for other purposes.

S. 4847

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4847, a bill to establish a Summer for All program through summer enrichment expansion grants and summer programming State grants, and for other purposes.

S. 4906

At the request of Mr. WELCH, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4906, a bill to amend the Dairy Production Stabilization Act of 1983 to establish a dairy market stabilization program, and for other purposes.

S. 4916

At the request of Mr. KELLY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4916, a bill to address the effects of artificial intelligence-enabled systems, including artificial intelligence chatbots, on older adults, and for other purposes.

S. 4944

At the request of Mr. ARMSTRONG, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. MORENO) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) were added as cosponsors of S. 4944, a bill to streamline permitting under the Natural Gas Act, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and for other purposes.

S. 4946

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4946, a bill to prohibit data brokers from selling and transferring certain sensitive data.

S. 4993

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4993, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a precision oncology program for cancer of the prostate at the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 5021

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 5021, a bill to provide consumer protections for students.

S. 5046

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 5046, a bill to prohibit the transfer of certain offices and functions of the Department of Education to other Federal agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 5097

At the request of Mr. SHEEHY, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 5097, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for a pause on the issuance of H–1B visas until certain limitations on the issuance thereof are implemented.

S.J. RES. 181

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 181, a joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities within or against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress.

S. RES. 499

At the request of Mr. HUSTED, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 499, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of ''Creutzfeldt-Jakob Disease (CJD) Awareness Day''.

AMENDMENT NO. 5898

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 5898 intended to be proposed to S. 4784, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2027 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 6087

At the request of Ms. ALSOBROOKS, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 6087 intended to be proposed to S. 4784, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2027 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 818—RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF TRADEMARKS IN THE ECONOMY AND THE ROLE OF TRADEMARKS IN PROTECTING CONSUMER SAFETY BY DESIGNATING THE MONTH OF JULY AS ''NATIONAL ANTI-COUNTERFEITING AND CONSUMER EDUCATION AND AWARENESS MONTH''

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. TILLIS, and Ms. HIRONO) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

Whereas public awareness is crucial to safeguard consumers and businesses from unsafe and unreliable products that, through illicit activity, threaten intellectual property rights, the economic market, and even the health and well-being of consumers;

Whereas Federal statutes such as the Act entitled ''An Act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes'', approved July 5, 1946 (commonly referred to as the ''Trademark Act of 1946'' or the ''Lanham Act'') (60 Stat. 427, chapter 540; 15 U.S.C. 1051 et seq.) (referred to in this preamble as the ''Lanham Act''), and the Trademark Counterfeiting Act of 1984 (Public Law 98–473; 98 Stat. 2178) regulate the unlawful act of producing and selling counterfeit products;

Whereas the Lanham Act provided the foundation for modern Federal trademark protection, creating legal rights and remedies for brand owners suffering from trademark infringement, helping consumers make informed choices by reducing the amount of confusingly similar products, and making the marketplace more fair, competitive, and safer for all;

Whereas October 12, 2026, marks the 42nd anniversary of the enactment of the Lanham Act;

Whereas the year 2026 marks the 250th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776, and the protection of intellectual property enables people worldwide to recognize American brands that are synonymous with leaders in their product sectors and the United States of America as a nation;

Whereas, according to the World Intellectual Property Organization, there were an estimated 93,200,000 active trademark registrations around the world in 2024, a 6.1-percent increase from the previous year;

Whereas counterfeit products undermine laws, including the Lanham Act, that ensure the safety of consumers, businesses, and brand owners against illegitimate products in the marketplace, from which criminal groups and bad actors are benefitting at the expense of the public and private sector;

Whereas counterfeiters widely use online platforms to attract consumers to buy illegitimate goods, usually enticing consumers through cheaper prices;

Whereas the growth of both global commerce and electronic commerce has expedited the evolving problem of counterfeit goods, because that growth in commerce has given third-party actors an enhanced opportunity to reach consumers that they may have not previously been able to reach;

Whereas the deceptive tactics of counterfeiters and their counterfeit products pose actual and potential harm to the health and safety of the people of the United States, especially the most vulnerable consumers in society, such as senior citizens and children;

Whereas, according to the 2026 report by the United States Trade Representative required under section 182(h) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2242(h)) (commonly referred to as the ''Special 301 Report''), counterfeit items often do not comply with regulated safety standards ''endanger[ing] the public, . . . often fuel[ing] cross-border organized criminal networks, increase[ing] the vulnerability of workers to exploitative labor practices, and hinder[ing] sustainable economic development in many countries'';

Whereas, according to the United States Trade Representative and U.S. Customs and Border Patrol, goods originating in China and Hong Kong, valued at $6,400,000,000, accounted for more than 87 percent of all customs seizures of dangerous counterfeit goods in fiscal year 2025, including electronics, pharmaceuticals, cosmetics, and other goods;

Whereas counterfeit medical products and medications pose a particular threat to the safety and health of consumers in the United States because those counterfeit goods do not adhere to the same quality standards as authentic articles;

Whereas, in 2025, the Drug Enforcement Administration seized a staggering 47,000,000 fentanyl-laced fake prescription pills;

Whereas, in fiscal year 2025, U.S. Customs and Border Protection seized more than 78,000,000 counterfeit goods, with an estimated manufacturer's suggested retail price of more than $7,400,000,000 if the goods were genuine, which equates to over $20,000,000 in counterfeit goods seizures every day, constituting an increase in quantity greater than double the number of goods seized in fiscal year 2024 and nearly a 40-percent increase in the value of goods seized year over year;

Whereas businesses of all sizes collectively spend millions of dollars to protect and enforce their own brand and products by removing counterfeit products from both online and physical marketplaces;

Whereas businesses must devote resources to combating counterfeit products instead of using those resources to grow their business by hiring new employees and developing new products;

Whereas one of the most effective ways to protect consumers from the dangers of counterfeit products is through educational campaigns and awareness programs; and

Whereas organizations such as the Congressional Trademark Caucus, Federal enforcement agencies, the National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center, State enforcement agencies, and other organizations are actively working to raise awareness of the value of trademarks and the impact and harms caused by counterfeit products on both the national and State economies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the month of July 2026 as ''National Anti-Counterfeiting and Consumer Education and Awareness Month'';

(2) supports the goals and ideals of National Anti-Counterfeiting and Consumer Education and Awareness Month to educate the public and raise public awareness about the actual and potential dangers counterfeit products pose to consumer health and safety;

(3) affirms the continuing importance and need for comprehensive Federal, State, and private sector-supported education and awareness efforts designed to equip the consumers of the United States with the information and tools needed to safeguard against illegal counterfeit products in traditional commerce, internet commerce, and other electronic commerce platforms; and

(4) recognizes and reaffirms the commitment of the United States to combating counterfeiting by promoting awareness about the actual and potential harm of counterfeiting to consumers and brand owners and by promoting new education programs and campaigns designed to reduce the supply of, and demand for, counterfeit products.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 6710. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 5334, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow early childhood educators to take the educator expense deduction, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 6711. Mrs. BRITT (for Ms. GRAHAM (for herself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL)) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mrs. Britt to the bill H.R. 5334, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 6712. Mrs. BRITT (for Ms. GRAHAM (for herself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL)) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mrs. Britt to the bill H.R. 5334, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 6713. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 5334, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 6714. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6711 submitted by Mrs. BRITT (for Ms. GRAHAM (for herself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL)) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 5334, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 6715. Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. KIM, and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6711 submitted by Mrs. BRITT (for Ms. GRAHAM (for herself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL)) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 5334, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 6716. Mr. WELCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6711 submitted by Mrs. BRITT (for Ms. GRAHAM (for herself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL)) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 5334, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 6717. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5334, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 6718. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4784, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2027 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 6719. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6711 submitted by Mrs. BRITT (for Ms. GRAHAM (for herself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL)) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 5334, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow early childhood educators to take the educator expense deduction, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 6710. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 5334, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow early childhood educators to take the educator expense deduction, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DENIAL OF FOREIGN TAX CREDIT WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 901(j)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) SPECIAL RULE FOR RUSSIA.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—This subsection shall apply to the Russian Federation during the period described in clause (ii).

''(ii) PERIOD OF APPLICATION.—The period described in this clause with respect to any country is the period—

''(I) beginning on the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph, and

''(II) ending on the date on which the resumption of the application of the rates of duty set forth in column 1 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to products of that country takes effect pursuant to section 4(b) of the Suspending Normal Trade Relations with Russia and Belarus Act.''.

(b) DEDUCTION DENIED.—Section 901(j)(3) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''The preceding sentence shall not apply to any tax of any country to which paragraph (2)(C) applies.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) DEDUCTION LIMITATION.—The amendment made by subsection (b) shall apply to taxes paid or accrued (or deemed paid or accrued under section 960 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) after the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) NONAPPLICATION OF TREATY RULES.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall be applied without regard to any treaty obligation of the United States.

SA 6711. Mrs. BRITT (for Ms. GRAHAM (for herself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL)) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mrs. BRITT to the bill H.R. 5334, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow early childhood educators to take the educator expense deduction, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 1 and insert the following:

DIVISION A—LINDSEY O. GRAHAM SANCTIONING RUSSIA AND IRAN ACT OF 2026

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Lindsey O. Graham Sanctioning Russia and Iran Act of 2026''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this division is as follows:

TITLE I—SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

SEC. 101. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) ACCOUNT; CORRESPONDENT ACCOUNT; PAYABLE-THROUGH ACCOUNT.—The terms ''account'', ''correspondent account'', and ''payable-through account'' have the meanings given those terms in section 5318A of title 31, United States Code.

(2) ADEQUATE MARITIME INSURANCE.—The term ''adequate maritime insurance''—

(A) means verified documentation evidencing protection and indemnity insurance with audited financial statements of the insurer; and

(B) does not include insurance provided by an insurer organized under the laws of the Russian Federation or otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of the Government of the Russian Federation.

(3) ADMISSION; ADMITTED; ALIEN; ETC.—The terms ''admission'', ''admitted'', ''alien'', and ''lawfully admitted for permanent residence'' have the meanings given those terms in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101).

(4) ARMED FORCES OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.—The term ''Armed Forces of the Russian Federation'' includes—

(A) the Aerospace Forces of the Russian Federation;

(B) the Airborne Forces of the Russian Federation;

(C) the Ground Forces of the Russian Federation;

(D) the Navy of the Russian Federation;

(E) the Special Operations Command of the Russian Federation;

(F) the Strategic Rocket Forces of the Russian Federation;

(G) the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation;

(H) the Main Directorate of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation (formerly known as the Main Intelligence Directorate of the Russian Federation);

(I) the Federal Security Service of the Russian Federation;

(J) the Foreign Intelligence Service of the Russian Federation;

(K) cyber actors of the Government of the Russian Federation; and

(L) any successor entities or proxies of the entities described in subparagraphs (A) through (K).

(5) BLOCKED PROPERTY.—The term ''blocked property'' means any property blocked pursuant to the authority of the President under section 203 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702).

(6) CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''critical infrastructure'', with respect to Ukraine, means systems and assets, whether physical or virtual, so vital to Ukraine that the incapacity or destruction of such systems and assets would have catastrophic regional or national effects on public health or safety, economic security, or national security.

(B) INCLUDED SECTORS.—The term ''critical infrastructure'' includes assets in the following sectors:

(i) Biotechnology.
(ii) Chemical.
(iii) Commercial facilities.
(iv) Communications.
(v) Critical manufacturing.
(vi) Dams.
(vii) Defense industrial base.
(viii) Emergency services.
(ix) Energy.
(x) Financial services.
(xi) Food and agriculture.
(xii) Government facilities.
(xiii) Healthcare and public health.
(xiv) Information technology.
(xv) Materials and waste.
(xvi) Nuclear reactors.
(xvii) Space.
(xviii) Transportation systems.
(xix) Water and wastewater systems.

(7) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term ''foreign person'' means an individual or entity that is not a United States person.

(8) KNOWING; KNOWINGLY; KNOWS.—The terms ''knowing'', ''knowingly'', and ''knows'', with respect to conduct, a circumstance, or a result, means that a person had actual knowledge, or should have known, of the conduct, the circumstance, or the result.

(9) MILITARY INVASION.—The term ''military invasion'' includes—

(A) a ground operation or assault;

(B) an amphibious landing or assault;

(C) an airborne operation or air assault;

(D) an aerial bombardment or blockade;

(E) missile attacks, including rockets, ballistic missiles, cruise missiles, and hypersonic missiles;

(F) a naval bombardment or armed blockade;

(G) a destructive or destabilizing cyberattack against critical infrastructure; and

(H) an attack by a country on any territory controlled or administered by any other independent, sovereign country, including offshore islands controlled or administered by that country.

(10) RUSSIAN PERSON.—The term ''Russian person'' means—

(A) a citizen or national of the Russian Federation; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the Russian Federation or otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of the Government of the Russian Federation.

(11) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term ''United States person'' means—

(A) a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

SEC. 102. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS ON CERTAIN PERSONS AFFILIATED WITH OR SUPPORTING THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall—

(1) review any persons and vessels that may be described in subsection (b); and

(2) after conducting that review—

(A) impose the sanctions described in subsection (e) with respect to any persons the President determines are described in subsection (b); and

(B) identify as blocked property any vessels the President determines are described in subsection (b).

(b) PERSONS DESCRIBED.—The persons and vessels described in this subsection are the following:

(1) The following officials of the Government of the Russian Federation:

(A) The President of the Russian Federation.

(B) The Prime Minister of the Russian Federation.

(C) The Minister of Defense of the Russian Federation.

(D) The Chief of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation.

(E) The Deputy Ministers of Defense of the Russian Federation.

(F) The Commander-in-Chief of the Land Forces of the Russian Federation.

(G) The Commander-in-Chief of the Aerospace Forces of the Russian Federation.

(H) The Commander of the Airborne Forces of the Russian Federation.

(I) The Commander-in-Chief of the Navy of the Russian Federation.

(J) The Commander of the Strategic Rocket Forces of the Russian Federation.

(K) The Commander of the Special Operations Forces of the Russian Federation.

(L) The Commander of Logistical Support of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation.

(M) The commanders of the Russian Federation military districts.

(N) The Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation.

(O) The Minister of Transport of the Russian Federation.

(P) The Minister of Finance of the Russian Federation.

(Q) The Minister of Industry and Trade of the Russian Federation.

(R) The Minister of Energy of the Russian Federation.

(S) The Minister of Agriculture of the Russian Federation.

(T) The Director of the Foreign Intelligence Service of the Russian Federation.

(U) The Director of the Federal Security Service of the Russian Federation.

(V) The Director of the Main Directorate of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation.

(W) The Director of the National Guard of the Russian Federation.

(X) The Federal Guard Service of the Russian Federation.

(Y) Any other senior official of the Government of the Russian Federation, as determined by the President.

(2) Any foreign person that the President determines, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) knowingly sells, leases, or provides, or facilitates selling, leasing, or providing, goods or services relating to the defense industrial base of the Russian Federation, including—

(i) computer numerical control (CNC) tools and associated machinery, software, and maintenance or upgrade services;

(ii) lubricant additives;

(iii) nitrocellulose, wood cellulose, and associated additives and components necessary for the production of propellant or energetics for munitions;

(iv) chemical coatings;

(v) fiber optic cables with military applications and associated technologies needed to manufacture such cables;

(vi) advanced sensors;

(vii) items on the Common High Priority Items List maintained by the Bureau of Industry and Security of the Department of Commerce; or

(viii) any additional items determined by the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, to be critical to the defense industrial base of the Russian Federation;

(B) knowingly facilitates deceptive or structured transactions to provide the goods and services described in subparagraph (A);

(C) knowingly conducts a significant transaction with the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation;

(D) knowingly engages, directly or indirectly, in activities that—

(i) materially undermine the military readiness of Ukraine;

(ii) seek to overthrow, dismantle, or subvert the Government of Ukraine;

(iii) debilitate the critical infrastructure of Ukraine;

(iv) debilitate cybersecurity systems through malicious electronic attacks or cyberattacks on Ukraine;

(v) undermine the democratic processes of Ukraine;

(vi) undermine the peace, security, political stability, or territorial integrity of Ukraine; or

(vii) involve committing serious abuses of internationally recognized human rights against citizens of Ukraine, including forcible transfers, enforced disappearances, unjust detainment, forced deportation of children, or torture;

(E) is a leader, official, senior executive officer, or member of the board of directors of, or principal shareholder with a controlling or majority interest in, an entity that is operating in the defense industrial base or energy or transportation sectors of the economy of the Russian Federation in support of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation;

(F) is an oligarch in the Russian Federation who—

(i) has not demonstrated opposition to the Russian Federation's war on Ukraine; or

(ii) continues, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, to benefit from an association with the Government of the Russian Federation;

(G) is responsible for or complicit in, or has directly or indirectly engaged in, for or on behalf of, or for the benefit of, directly or indirectly, the Government of the Russian Federation—

(i) transnational crime, corruption, bribery, extortion, or money laundering;

(ii) assassination, murder, or other unlawful killing of, or infliction of other bodily harm or other crimes against humanity against, a United States person or a citizen or national of an ally or partner of the United States;

(iii) activities that undermine the peace, security, political stability, or territorial integrity of the United States or an ally or partner of the United States; or

(iv) deceptive or structured transactions or dealings that circumvent the application of any sanctions imposed by the United States, including through the use of digital currencies or assets or the use of physical assets; or

(H) is a leader, official, senior executive officer, or member of the board of directors of, or principal shareholder with a controlling or majority interest in, any of the following Russian energy projects:

(i) The Yamal Liquefied Natural Gas Project or a successor project.

(ii) The Arctic 1, 2, and 3 Liquefied Natural Gas Projects or a successor project.

(iii) Projects in the Arctic region carried out after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) Any foreign vessel the President determines, based on credible information, is used by the Government of the Russian Federation or Russian persons to move crude oil, uranium, natural gas, liquefied natural gas, petroleum, petroleum products, petrochemical products, coal, coal products, arms, or other goods for the purpose of circumventing sanctions imposed by the United States or other countries, including any vessel the owner, operator, or manager of which knowingly—

(A) exhibits or engages in unsafe or nonstandard maritime behavior in furtherance of the transportation of crude oil, uranium, natural gas, liquefied natural gas, petroleum, petroleum products, petrochemical products, coal, or coal products that originated in the Russian Federation;

(B) lacks adequate maritime insurance for the transport of goods described in subparagraph (A); or

(C) evades compliance with a price cap for crude oil and petroleum products that originated in the Russian Federation established by—

(i) the international coalition made up of Australia, Canada, the European Union, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the United States and known as the ''Price Cap Coalition''; or

(ii) the United States.

(4) Any foreign person that the President determines knowingly—

(A) owns, operates, or manages a vessel described in paragraph (3);

(B) provides underwriting services or insurance or reinsurance necessary for such a vessel;

(C) serves as a captain or senior leadership of the crew of such a vessel; or

(D) transfers to the Russian Federation, or provides for the use of by a Russian person, any vessel designed for the transportation of crude oil, uranium, natural gas, liquefied natural gas, petroleum, petroleum products, petrochemical products, coal, or coal products.

(5) Any foreign vessel that the President determines knowingly—

(A) transports crude oil, uranium, natural gas, liquefied natural gas, petroleum, petroleum products, petrochemical products, coal, or coal products that originated in the Russian Federation;

(B) engages in a ship-to-ship transfer involving crude oil, uranium, natural gas, liquefied natural gas, petroleum, petroleum products, petrochemical products, coal, or coal products that originated in the Russian Federation with a vessel that is subject to sanctions imposed by the United States; or

(C) provides services to a vessel described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

(6) Any foreign person that the President determines is the owner or operator of a foreign port that allows a vessel subject to sanctions imposed by the United States for supporting the Russian Federation to port or otherwise receive services.

(7) Any foreign person, including a foreign person acting on behalf of a person described in this subsection (in this paragraph referred to as the ''sanctioned person''), if the sanctioned person transferred property or an interest in property to the person—

(A) after the date on which the President imposed sanctions with respect to the sanctioned person; or

(B) before that date, if the sanctioned person did so in an attempt to evade the imposition of sanctions.

(c) VESSELS SUBJECT TO SANCTIONS BY THE UNITED KINGDOM OR EUROPEAN UNION.—In determining under subsection (b)(3) if a vessel is a foreign vessel used by the Government of the Russian Federation or Russian persons to move crude oil, uranium, natural gas, liquefied natural gas, petroleum, petroleum products, petrochemical products, coal, coal products, arms, or other goods for the purpose of circumventing sanctions, the President may use as prima facie evidence that the vessel is subject to sanctions imposed by the United Kingdom, the European Union, the Group of 7, or a member of the Five Eyes intelligence alliance.

(d) MAINTENANCE OF CERTAIN SANCTIONS RELATING TO SPECIFIED HARMFUL FOREIGN ACTIVITIES.—Sanctions and other measures provided for under any Executive Order issued to address the national emergency that the President continued on March 24, 2026, with respect to specified harmful foreign activities of the Government of the Russian Federation (91 Fed. Reg. 15515), as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, including with respect to all persons sanctioned under any such Executive Order, shall remain in effect.

(e) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this subsection to be imposed with respect to a person described in subsection (b) are the following:

(1) BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.—The President shall exercise all of the powers granted by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to block any vessel described in subsection (b), and block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of a person described in subsection (b), if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) INELIGIBILITY FOR VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—

(A) VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—An alien described in subsection (b) shall be—

(i) inadmissible to the United States;

(ii) ineligible to receive a visa or other documentation to enter the United States; and

(iii) otherwise ineligible to be admitted or paroled into the United States or to receive any other benefit under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

(B) CURRENT VISAS REVOKED.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The visa or other entry documentation of an alien described in subsection (b) shall be revoked, regardless of when such visa or other entry documentation is or was issued.

(ii) IMMEDIATE EFFECT.—A revocation under clause (i) shall—

(I) take effect immediately; and

(II) automatically cancel any other valid visa or entry documentation that is in the possession of the alien.

SEC. 103. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AFFILIATED WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall—

(A) impose 2 or more of the sanctions described in subsection (d) with respect to the Central Bank of the Russian Federation (Bank of Russia) and any subsidiary of, or successor entity to, that Bank;

(B) impose all of the sanctions described in subsection (d) with respect to—

(i) Sberbank;

(ii) VTB Bank;

(iii) Gazprombank;

(iv) any other financial institution organized under the laws of the Russian Federation and owned in whole or in part by the Government of the Russian Federation;

(v) any subsidiary of, or successor entity to, any of the financial institutions described in clauses (i) through (iv); and

(vi) except as provided by subsection (c), any foreign financial institution that engages in significant transactions with any of the financial institutions described in clauses (i) through (v); and

(C) impose the sanctions described in section 102(e) with respect to any leaders, officials, senior executive officers, or members of the board of directors of, or any principal shareholders with a controlling or majority interest in, a financial institution described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

(2) UPDATES.—Not later than 210 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall—

(A) review any persons that may be described in paragraph (1); and

(B) if sanctions have not been imposed under this subsection with respect to any person the President determines is described in paragraph (1), impose such sanctions with respect to that person.

(b) PROHIBITION ON TRANSACTIONS BY UNITED STATES PERSONS.—Effective on the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall prohibit any United States person from engaging in any transaction with a financial institution described in subsection (a)(1)(B).

(c) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—The President is not required to impose sanctions under subsection (a)(1)(B) with respect to a foreign financial institution described in clause (vi) of that subsection if the Secretary of the Treasury determines that imposing such sanctions is not consistent with the economic or foreign policy interests of the United States.

(d) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this subsection to be imposed with respect to a financial institution described in subsection (a) are the following:

(1) BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.—The President shall exercise all of the powers granted to the President under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in property and interests in property of the financial institution if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) CAATSA SANCTIONS.—Two or more of the sanctions described in section 235 of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (22 U.S.C. 9529) that are not already imposed.

(3) RESTRICTIONS ON CORRESPONDENT AND PAYABLE-THROUGH ACCOUNTS.—The President shall prohibit the opening, and prohibit or impose strict conditions on the maintaining, in the United States, of a correspondent account or payable-through account by the financial institution.

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) TREATMENT OF RETURNS ON IMMOBILIZED RUSSIAN SOVEREIGN ASSETS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A United States or foreign financial institution holding immobilized Russian sovereign assets under the Rebuilding Economic Prosperity and Opportunity for Ukrainians Act (division F of Public Law 118–50; 22 U.S.C. 9521 note) or any other provision of law is not required to return any interest earned on those assets and due to the Russian Federation.

(B) EXCEPTION FOR INTEREST EARNED.—Subparagraph (A) shall not be construed as affecting the treatment of interest earned on the assets of persons the assets of which have been blocked under any provision of law.

(2) LOANS TO UKRAINE USING IMMOBILIZED RUSSIAN SOVEREIGN ASSETS.—Sanctions imposed under this section shall not apply with respect to payments on—

(A) the loans provided by the United States and the Group of 7 or the European Union to Ukraine that are serviced and repaid with the proceeds of immobilized Russian sovereign assets; or

(B) any loans from the United States or countries that are members of the Group of 7 or the European Union made after the date of the enactment of this Act using proceeds from immobilized Russian sovereign assets.

SEC. 104. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO OTHER ENTITIES OWNED OR CONTROLLED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall—

(1) review any entity—

(A) in which the Government of the Russian Federation may have a controlling or majority ownership interest; or

(B) that may otherwise be affiliated with the Government of the Russian Federation; and

(2) impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to an entity if the President determines that—

(A) the Government of the Russian Federation has a controlling or majority ownership interest in the entity; or

(B) the entity is otherwise affiliated with the Government of the Russian Federation.

(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The President shall exercise all of the powers granted to the President under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in property and interests in property of an entity described in subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

SEC. 105. PROHIBITION ON TRANSFERS OF FUNDS INVOLVING THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided by subsection (b), effective on the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, a depository institution (as defined in section 19(b)(1)(A) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 461(b)(1)(A))) or a broker or dealer in securities registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.) may not process transfers of funds—

(1) to or from the Government of the Russian Federation, including any entity owned by the Government of the Russian Federation; or

(2) for the direct or indirect benefit of officials of the Government of the Russian Federation.

(b) EXCEPTION.—A depository institution, broker, or dealer described in subsection (a) may process a transfer described in that subsection if the transfer arises from, and is ordinarily incident and necessary to give effect to, an underlying transaction that is authorized by a specific or general license.

SEC. 106. PROHIBITION ON LISTING OR TRADING OF RUSSIAN ENTITIES ON UNITED STATES SECURITIES EXCHANGES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall prohibit the securities of an issuer described in subsection (b) from being traded on a national securities exchange.

(b) ISSUERS.—An issuer described in this subsection is an issuer that is—

(1) an official of or individual affiliated with the Government of the Russian Federation; or

(2) an entity—

(A) in which the Government of the Russian Federation has a controlling or majority ownership interest; or

(B) that is otherwise affiliated with the Government of the Russian Federation.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ISSUER; SECURITY.—The terms ''issuer'' and ''security'' have the meanings given those terms in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)).

(2) NATIONAL SECURITIES EXCHANGE.—The term ''national securities exchange'' means an exchange registered as a national securities exchange in accordance with section 6 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78f).

SEC. 107. PROHIBITION ON INVESTMENT BY UNITED STATES PERSONS IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

Effective on the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the following are prohibited:

(1) New investment in the Russian Federation by a United States person, wherever located.

(2) The exportation, reexportation, sale, or supply, directly or indirectly, from the United States, or by a United States person, wherever located, of any category of services identified by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to any person located in the Russian Federation.

(3) Any approval, financing, facilitation, or guarantee by a United States person, wherever located, of a transaction by a foreign person if the transaction by that foreign person would be prohibited by this section if performed by a United States person or within the United States.

SEC. 108. PROHIBITION ON ENERGY EXPORTS TO, AND INVESTMENT IN ENERGY SECTOR OF, THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) PROHIBITIONS ON INVESTMENT AND EXPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective on the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the following are prohibited:

(A) Any new investment in the energy sector of the Russian Federation by a United States person.

(B) The export, reexport, or in-country transfer to or in the Russian Federation of any energy or energy product produced in the United States.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection, the terms ''export'', ''in-country transfer'', and ''reexport'' have the meanings given those terms in section 1742 of the Export Control Reform Act of 2018 (50 U.S.C. 4801).

(b) SANCTIONS.—The President shall impose the sanctions described in section 102(e) with respect to any foreign person that the President determines knowingly sells, supplies, transfers, markets, or otherwise provides goods, services, technology, or other support that facilitates the maintenance or expansion of the production of oil, uranium, natural gas, liquefied natural gas, petroleum, petroleum products, petrochemical products, coal, or coal products for use by any person subject to sanctions under section 102 or 103.

SEC. 109. PROHIBITION ON PURCHASE OF SOVEREIGN DEBT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION BY UNITED STATES PERSONS.

Upon the enactment of this Act, the purchase of sovereign debt of the Government of the Russian Federation by any United States person (including a United States financial institution) is prohibited.

SEC. 110. PROHIBITION ON PROVISION OF SERVICES TO SANCTIONED FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS BY INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL MESSAGING SYSTEMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall—

(1) review any person that may be described in subsection (b); and

(2) impose sanctions pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) with respect to any person the President determines is described in that subsection.

(b) PERSONS DESCRIBED.—A person described in this subsection is—

(1) any entity that—

(A) operates with the intent to predominantly engage in the business of providing global financial messaging services; and

(B) is determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, as knowingly being used to circumvent any sanctions imposed under section 103 or any other provision of this title; or

(2) a leader, official, senior executive officer, or member of the board of directors of, or principal shareholder with a controlling or majority interest in, any entity described in paragraph (1).

(c) EXCEPTION.—The President may waive the imposition of sanctions under subsection (a) with respect to an entity predominantly engaged in the business of providing global financial messaging services for, directly providing such services to, or enabling or facilitating direct or indirect access to such services for, any financial institution subject to sanctions under section 103 or any other provision of this title if—

(1) the entity—

(A) is subject to a sanctions regime under its governing foreign law that requires it to eliminate the knowing provision of such services to, and the knowing enabling and facilitation of direct or indirect access to such services for, foreign financial institutions identified under such governing foreign law for purposes of that sanctions regime if the President determines that the sanctions regime under governing foreign law is not inconsistent with the economic or foreign policy interests of the United States; and

(B) has, pursuant to that sanctions regime, terminated the knowing provision of such services to, and the knowing enabling and facilitation of direct or indirect access to such services for, foreign financial institutions identified under such governing foreign law for purposes of that sanctions regime; or

(2) the entity provides significant financial messaging services to United States financial institutions, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the authority of the President pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

SEC. 111. PROHIBITION ON IMPORTING, AND SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO, URANIUM FROM THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) IMPLEMENTATION OF PROHIBITION ON URANIUM IMPORTS FROM THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.—Upon the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall take all necessary steps to implement the requirements of section 3112A(d) of the USEC Privatization Act (42 U.S.C. 2297h–10a(d)) regarding the importation of uranium from the Russian Federation, including the importation of any uranium from Rosatom State Atomic Energy Corporation or any subsidiary or successor entity.

(b) SANCTIONS.—Beginning on the date described in section 3112A(d)(2)(C) of the USEC Privatization Act (42 U.S.C. 2297h–10a(d)(2)(C)), and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall impose sanctions described in section 102(e) with respect to any leaders, officials, senior executive officers, or members of the board of directors of, or principal shareholders with a controlling or majority interest in, Rosatom State Atomic Energy Corporation or any subsidiary or successor entity.

SEC. 112. INCREASE IN DUTIES ON GOODS IMPORTED FROM THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, increase the rate of duty for all goods, including oil, natural gas, liquefied natural gas, petroleum, petroleum products, petrochemical products, coal, and coal products, imported into the United States from the Russian Federation to a rate of up to 500 percent ad valorem.

(b) DUTY RATE IN ADDITION TO OTHER DUTIES, FEES, TAXES, EXACTIONS, OR CHARGES.—The rate of duty required under subsection (a) with respect to a good described in that subsection shall be in addition to any other duty, fee, tax, exaction, or charge applicable with respect to the good, including any duty imposed under title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.), section 122, 201, or 301 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2132, 2251, and 2411), or section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. 1862).

SEC. 113. DUTIES ON COUNTRIES THAT PURCHASE RUSSIAN-ORIGIN CRUDE OIL OR NATURAL GAS OR FACILITATE SANCTIONS EVASION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, increase the rate of duty for all goods imported into the United States from a country described in subsection (c) (and only from a country described in subsection (c)) to a rate of up to 100 percent ad valorem.

(b) MODIFICATION TO RATE OF DUTY.—At any time after the initial imposition of duties under subsection (a) or (e), the United States Trade Representative shall modify or adjust any rate of duty imposed under subsection (a) or (e) to a rate greater than zero and up to 100 percent ad valorem upon submitting a written determination to the appropriate congressional committees that a country described in subsection (c) has taken significant steps—

(1) to increase the importation, sale, supply, transfer, or purchase of crude oil or natural gas that originated in the Russian Federation; or

(2) to decrease or cease engaging in the importation, sale, supply, transfer, or purchase of such crude oil or natural gas.

(c) COUNTRY DESCRIBED.—A country described in this subsection is a foreign country that—

(1)(A) knowingly made new purchases of crude oil or natural gas that originated in the Russian Federation on a date that is on or after 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) was among the 5 largest importers, by total volume, of crude oil or natural gas that originated in the Russian Federation during the most recent 12-month period preceding the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(2) was among the top 5 countries facilitating Russian oil sanctions evasion during the most recent 12-month period preceding the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) EXCEPTION.—A duty shall not be imposed under this section with respect to goods imported from a country described in subsection (c)(1) for the importation by that country of natural gas that originated in the Russian Federation if—

(1) that country's total imports of natural gas that originated in the Russian Federation during the 12-month period described in subsection (c)(1)(B) were less than 15 percent of the total annual exports of natural gas from the Russian Federation during that period; and

(2) that country has taken significant steps to reduce its imports of natural gas that originated in the Russian Federation.

(e) SUBSEQUENT DETERMINATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the initial imposition of duties under subsection (a), and every 180 days thereafter, the United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Energy, shall—

(1) determine, based on the most recent 12-month period preceding the determination, the countries that are—

(A) the 5 largest importers of crude oil, by total volume, originating in the Russian Federation; and

(B) the 5 largest importers of natural gas, by total volume, originating in the Russian Federation; and

(2) impose duties pursuant to subsection (a) with respect to goods imported from those countries.

(f) DUTY RATE IN ADDITION TO OTHER DUTIES, FEES, TAXES, EXACTIONS, OR CHARGES.—A rate of duty imposed under this section with respect to a good imported from a country described in subsection (c) shall be in addition to any other duty, fee, tax, exaction, or charge applicable with respect to the good, including any duty imposed under title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.), section 122, 201, or 301 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2132, 2251, and 2411), or section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. 1862).

(g) METHODOLOGY, DOCUMENTATION, AND REPORTS.—

(1) REPORTS REQUIRED.—Not later than 10 days before imposing a duty under subsection (a) or (e), or modifying or adjusting the rate of such a duty under subsection (b), the President or the United States Trade Representative shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a written justification for the duty that—

(A) provides a substantive rationale for the determination of the rate of duty imposed under subsection (a) or (e) or the modification or adjustment made pursuant to subsection (b), as the case may be; and

(B) details the methodology used to determine that the country subject to the duty is a country described in subsection (c).

(2) DETERMINATIONS OF IMPORTS OF CRUDE OIL AND NATURAL GAS.—For the purposes of determining whether a country is an importer of crude oil or natural gas described in subsection (c)(1)—

(A) crude oil is the substance described in Harmonized System code 2709; and

(B) natural gas is the substance described in Harmonized System code 2711.

(h) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Notwithstanding section 115, nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize the imposition of duties with respect to goods imported from any country not expressly described in subsection (c) or the Russian Federation.

(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

(2) COUNTRIES FACILITATING RUSSIAN OIL SANCTIONS EVASION.—The term ''countries facilitating Russian oil sanctions evasion'' means countries in which foreign persons are located or are operating, or under the laws of which foreign persons are organized, if such foreign persons are knowingly engaging in transactions, activities, or services that circumvent, or assist any third party to circumvent, any sanction related to oil that originated in the Russian Federation, including by—

(A) providing significant financial or other support for the purchase, loading, or shipment of oil that originated in the Russian Federation and is subject to sanctions; and

(B) engaging in any transaction, activity, or service related to a shadow fleet vessel that transported, is transporting, or is attempting to transport oil that originated in the Russian Federation and is subject to sanctions.

(3) NATURAL GAS.—Except as provided by subsection (g)(2), the term ''natural gas'' means natural gas, whether unmixed or any mixture of natural and artificial gas, including liquefied natural gas.

SEC. 114. EXCEPTIONS.

(a) EXCEPTION FOR HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Sanctions and other measures under this title shall not apply to—

(A) the conduct or facilitation of a transaction for the provision of agricultural commodities, food, medicine, medical devices, humanitarian assistance, or for humanitarian purposes; or

(B) transactions that are necessary for, or related to, the activities described in subparagraph (A).

(2) RULE OF INTERPRETATION.—This subsection should be interpreted to apply to an entity carrying out any internationally recognized agreement with the Government of Ukraine for the sale or provision of agricultural commodities, food, medicine, or medical devices to and from Ukraine unless the President determines that the agreement is being used to evade sanctions imposed by the United States, the United Kingdom, the European Union, or the Group of 7.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY.—The term ''agricultural commodity'' has the meaning given such term in section 102 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5602).

(B) MEDICAL DEVICE.—The term ''medical device'' has the meaning given the term ''device'' in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

(C) MEDICINE.—The term ''medicine'' has the meaning given the term ''drug'' in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

(b) EXCEPTION FOR INTELLIGENCE AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.—This title shall not apply with respect to activities subject to the reporting requirements under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.) or to carry out or assist any authorized intelligence or law enforcement activities of the United States.

(c) EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS.—Sanctions under this title shall not apply to the admission or parole of an alien into the United States if such admission or parole is necessary to comply with United States obligations under the Agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, or under the Convention on Consular Relations, done at Vienna April 24, 1963, and entered into force March 19, 1967, or other international obligations.

(d) EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH CIVILIAN NUCLEAR COOPERATION AGREEMENTS.—This title shall not apply to activities carried out under an agreement for cooperation between the United States and the Russian Federation entered into under section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2153).

(e) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN IMPORTS OF LOW-ENRICHED URANIUM FOR NUCLEAR REACTORS.—This title shall not apply with respect to imports into the United States of low-enriched uranium described in paragraph (1) of section 3112A(d) of the USEC Privatization Act (42 U.S.C. 2297h–10a(d)) or medical isotopes for which a waiver has been issued under paragraph (2) of that section.

(f) EXCEPTION FOR OFFICIAL GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.—This title shall not apply to transactions for the conduct of official business of the United States Government (including transactions necessary for the operation of the United States embassy or United States consulates in the Russian Federation) or the United Nations (including its specialized agencies, programs, funds, and related organizations) by employees, grantees, or contractors thereof.

(g) EXCEPTION FOR NON-RUSSIAN OIL THAT TRANSITS RUSSIAN TERRITORY.—This title shall not apply to oil originating in a country other than the Russian Federation that transits the territory of the Russian Federation, or to any entity that transports such oil, for export to international markets.

(h) GENERAL LICENSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—This title shall not apply with respect to a United States person that is operating under the terms of a general license issued by the Department of the Treasury before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to affect the terms of a general license described in paragraph (1), the authority of United States persons to continue to operate under such a license, or the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to extend or issue new general licenses.

(i) EXCEPTION FOR WINDDOWN OPERATIONS.—During the 270-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, sanctions under this title shall not apply with respect to—

(1) an activity related to the winddown or divestiture of operations in the Russian Federation by an entity located in the Russian Federation that is not owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by a Russian person; or

(2) an entity located in the Russian Federation that is owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by a United States person if that United States person is engaged in good faith efforts to winddown or divest operations in the Russian Federation, including providing ongoing operational support to wind down or divest operations.

(j) EXCEPTION FOR SAFETY OF VESSELS AND CREW.—Sanctions under this title shall not apply with respect to a person providing provisions to a vessel otherwise subject to sanctions under this title if such provisions are intended—

(1) for the safety and care of the crew aboard the vessel;

(2) for the protection of human life aboard the vessel; or

(3) to avoid any environmental or other significant damage.

(k) EXCEPTION RELATING TO ACTIVITIES OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—This title shall not apply with respect to activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to authorize the imposition of any sanction or other condition, limitation, restriction, prohibition, or other measure, that directly or indirectly impedes the supply by any entity of the Russian Federation of any product or service, or the procurement of such product or service by any contractor or subcontractor of the United States or any other entity, relating to or in connection with any space launch conducted for—

(A) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; or

(B) any other non-Department of Defense customer.

SEC. 115. WAIVER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President may, subject to subsection (b), waive the application of any sanctions provision with respect to a foreign person, any restriction with respect to a person, or any duty under this title.

(b) REPORTS REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Before issuing a waiver under subsection (a), the President shall submit to Congress—

(A) a certification in writing that the issuance of the waiver is in the national interests of the United States; and

(B) a report explaining the basis for the certification.

(2) CONSOLIDATION OF REPORTS.—If the President is issuing more than one waiver of a section of this title, the President may include, in one report submitted under paragraph (1), the certifications and explanations required by that paragraph with respect to each such waiver, as long as all of such certifications and explanations relate to a waiver of the same section of this title.

(3) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(4) APPLICABILITY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CERTAIN DUTY RATES.—The President is not required to submit a report under paragraph (1) for a modification or adjustment of a rate of duty pursuant to section 113(b). This paragraph does not modify or negate the requirement to submit a written determination required by section 113(b) or a report required by section 113(g)(1).

SEC. 116. SANCTIONS IMPLEMENTATION AND PENALTIES.

(a) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out sections 102 through 111.

(b) PENALTIES.—The penalties provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to any person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of any prohibition under any of sections 102 through 111, or an order or regulation prescribed under any of such sections, to the same extent that such penalties apply to a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

SEC. 117. TERMINATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the President may terminate the application of any sanction with respect to a foreign person, any restriction with respect to a person, or any duty under this title, if the President submits to Congress a report—

(1) certifying in writing that—

(A) in the case of the termination of the application of a sanction, restriction, or duty with respect to a Russian person or the Russian Federation, the Russian Federation has—

(i) signed a peace agreement that is accepted by the free and independent Government of Ukraine; and

(ii) ceased all military hostilities against and any activities to overthrow, dismantle, and subvert the Government of Ukraine; or

(B) in the case of the termination of the application of a sanction, restriction, or duty with respect to any foreign person or foreign country (other than a Russian person or the Russian Federation)—

(i) the foreign person or the government of the foreign country, as the case may be, is not engaging in the activity that was the basis for the sanctions or other measures being terminated; and

(ii) the President has received reliable assurances that the foreign person or the government of the foreign country, as the case may be, will not knowingly engage in activity subject to sanctions or other measures under this title in the future; and

(2) that includes, in the case of a report not relating to the termination of a duty under section 112 or 113, a determination of whether the termination is intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation.

(b) PERIOD FOR REVIEW BY CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—During the period of 30 calendar days beginning on the date on which the President submits a report under subsection (a) with respect to the termination of the application of a sanction, restriction, or duty under this title, the termination shall not take effect. If, after the end of that period, a joint resolution of disapproval with respect to the termination has not been enacted into law under subsection (c), the termination may take effect.

(2) CONSIDERATION BY CONGRESS.—During the period described in paragraph (1), the appropriate committee of the Senate and the appropriate committee of the House of Representatives should, as appropriate, hold hearings and briefings and otherwise obtain information in order to fully review the report.

(3) EXCEPTION.—The period for congressional review under paragraph (1) of a report required to be submitted under subsection (a) shall be 60 calendar days if the report is submitted on or after July 10 and on or before September 7 in any calendar year.

(c) JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—

(1) JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''joint resolution of disapproval'' means only a joint resolution of either House of Congress the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ''That Congress disapproves of the termination of the application of section ____ of the Lindsey O. Graham Sanctioning Russia and Iran Act of 2026, with respect to which the President submitted a report on ______.'', with the first blank space being filled with the appropriate section number and the second blank space being filled with the appropriate date.

(2) INTRODUCTION.—During the period of 30 calendar days provided for under subsection (b)(1), including any additional period as applicable under the exception provided in subsection (b)(3), a joint resolution of disapproval may be introduced—

(A) in the House of Representatives, by the majority leader or the minority leader; and

(B) in the Senate, by the majority leader (or a designee of the majority leader) or the minority leader (or a designee of the minority leader).

(3) CONSIDERATION IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(A) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—Any committee of the House of Representatives to which a joint resolution of disapproval is referred shall report it to the House of Representatives without amendment not later than 10 calendar days after the date of referral. If a committee fails to report the joint resolution within that period, the committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution and the joint resolution shall be referred to the appropriate calendar.

(B) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—After each committee authorized to consider a joint resolution of disapproval reports it to the House of Representatives or has been discharged from its consideration, it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the joint resolution of disapproval in the House of Representatives. All points of order against the motion are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. The motion shall not be debatable. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(C) CONSIDERATION.—The joint resolution of disapproval shall be considered as read. All points of order against the joint resolution of disapproval and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution of disapproval to its passage without intervening motion except 2 hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint resolution of disapproval shall not be in order.

(4) CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—

(A) COMMITTEE REFERRAL.—A joint resolution of disapproval introduced in the Senate shall be referred to the appropriate committee of the Senate.

(B) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—If the appropriate committee of the Senate has not reported the joint resolution within 10 calendar days after the date of referral of the joint resolution, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution and the joint resolution shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

(C) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—Notwithstanding Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order at any time after the appropriate committee of the Senate reports a joint resolution of disapproval to the Senate or has been discharged from consideration of such a joint resolution to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion to proceed is not debatable. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. Approval by the Senate of a motion to proceed to a joint resolution of disapproval shall require the affirmative vote of three-fifths of Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn.

(D) CONSIDERATION.—Consideration in the Senate of a joint resolution of disapproval and of all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith shall not exceed a total of 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between the majority and minority leaders or their designees. Any debatable motion or appeal is debatable for not to exceed 1 hour, to be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the motion or appeal.

(E) NO AMENDMENTS OR MOTIONS.—An amendment to a joint resolution of disapproval, a motion to postpone, a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

(F) VOTE ON JOINT RESOLUTION.—If the Senate has voted to proceed to a joint resolution of disapproval, the vote on approval of the joint resolution shall occur immediately following the conclusion of consideration of the joint resolution, and a single quorum call if requested. Approval by the Senate of a joint resolution of disapproval shall require the affirmative vote of three-fifths of Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn.

(G) CONSIDERATION OF VETO MESSAGES.—Consideration in the Senate of any veto message with respect to a joint resolution of disapproval, including all debatable motions and appeals in connection with the joint resolution, shall be limited to 10 hours, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

(5) TREATMENT OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION IN SENATE.—

(A) If, before the passage by the Senate of a joint resolution of disapproval, the Senate receives an identical joint resolution from the House of Representatives, the following procedures shall apply:

(i) That joint resolution shall not be referred to a committee.

(ii) With respect to that joint resolution—

(I) the procedure in the Senate shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the House of Representatives; but

(II) the vote on passage shall be on the joint resolution from the House of Representatives.

(B) If the Senate passes a joint resolution of disapproval before receiving a joint resolution of disapproval from the House of Representatives, the joint resolution passed by the Senate shall be held at the desk pending receipt of the joint resolution from the House of Representatives. Upon receipt of a joint resolution from the House of Representatives that is identical to the joint resolution passed by the Senate, the Senate shall proceed to its immediate consideration and the joint resolution shall be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

(C) If a joint resolution of disapproval is received from the House, and no companion joint resolution has been introduced in the Senate, the Senate procedures under this subsection shall apply to the House joint resolution.

(6) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—This subsection is enacted by Congress—

(A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, and supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

(B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

(7) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—The term ''appropriate committee of the House of Representatives'' means—

(i) with respect to the termination of a duty under section 112 or 113, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives;

(ii) with respect to the termination of any sanction or restriction under any of sections 102 through 111 that is intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; or

(iii) with respect to the termination of any sanction or restriction under any of sections 102 through 111 that is not intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation, the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

(B) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.—The term ''appropriate committee of the Senate'' means—

(i) with respect to the termination of a duty under section 112 or 113, the Committee on Finance of the Senate;

(ii) with respect to the termination of any sanction or restriction under any of sections 102 through 111 that is intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; or

(iii) with respect to the termination of any sanction or restriction under any of sections 102 through 111 that is not intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

TITLE II—OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 201. EXTENSION OF THE IRAN SANCTIONS ACT OF 1996.

Section 13(b) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended by striking ''2026'' and inserting ''2031''.

SEC. 202. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this division, or the application of any such provision to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of the provisions of this division, and the application of those provisions to any other person or circumstance, shall not be affected.

SEC. 203. SUNSET.

This division (other than section 201) shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

DIVISION B—SUPPORTING EARLY-CHILDHOOD EDUCATORS' DEDUCTIONS

SA 6712. Mrs. BRITT (for Ms. GRAHAM (for herself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL)) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mrs. BRITT to the bill H.R. 5334, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow early childhood educators to take the educator expense deduction, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: ''An Act to impose sanctions and other measures with respect to the Russian Federation, as championed by the late Senator Lindsey O. Graham, and for other purposes.''.

SA 6713. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 5334, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow early childhood educators to take the educator expense deduction, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PROHIBITION ON PREDICTION MARKET PARTICIPATION BY CERTAIN EXECUTIVE BRANCH INDIVIDUALS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CABINET OFFICIAL.—The term ''Cabinet official'' means—

(A) an individual serving in a position at level I of the Executive Schedule under section 5312 of title 5, United States Code; and

(B) any other individual who occupies a position designated by the President as a Cabinet-level position.

(2) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''covered individual'' means—

(i) the President;

(ii) the Vice President;

(iii) any Cabinet official; and

(iv) any immediate family member of an individual described in clause (i), (ii), or (iii).

(B) IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBER.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term ''immediate family member'' means a spouse, a parent, or a child of an individual described in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of that subparagraph.

(b) PROHIBITION.—No covered individual may enter into, or offer to enter into, an agreement, contract, swap, or transaction that provides for any purchase, sale, payment, or delivery of an excluded commodity, as defined in section 1a of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1a), that is dependent on the occurrence, nonoccurrence, or the extent of the occurrence of a specific event or contingency.

(c) ENFORCEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General, or the attorney general of any State, may bring a civil action seeking relief for a violation of subsection (b) in an appropriate district court of the United States.

(2) PENALTIES.—Any covered individual who violates subsection (b) shall be liable to the United States for—

(A) a civil penalty that does not exceed $50,000 per violation;

(B) disgorgement of any profit from the violation to the Treasury of the United States; or

(C) both.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to insurance for which the insured holds a lawful insurable interest.

SA 6714. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6711 submitted by Mrs. BRITT (for Ms. GRAHAM (for herself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL)) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 5334, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow early childhood educators to take the educator expense deduction, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 113, insert after subsection (e) the following:

(f) REVIEW OF IMPOSITION OF DUTIES.—

(1) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 48 hours after imposing or increasing a duty with respect to an article imported into the United States under this section, the President shall submit to Congress a notification of the imposition of or increase in the duty that includes—

(A) an explanation of the reasoning for imposing or increasing the duty; and

(B) an assessment of the potential impact of imposing or increasing the duty on United States businesses and consumers.

(2) EXPIRATION OF DUTIES; EXTENSION BY CONGRESS.—Any duty imposed or increased under this section shall remain in effect for a period of not more than 60 days, unless there is enacted into law a joint resolution of approval with respect to the duty under paragraph (4).

(3) DISAPPROVAL BY CONGRESS.—If a joint resolution of disapproval with respect to a duty imposed or increased under this section is enacted into law under paragraph (4), the duty shall cease to have force or effect.

(4) JOINT RESOLUTIONS.—

(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(i) JOINT RESOLUTION OF APPROVAL.—The term ''joint resolution of approval'' means a joint resolution the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ''That Congress approves the duty imposed or increased under section 113 of the Lindsey O. Graham Sanctioning Russia Act of 2026 with respect to _____, notice of which was submitted to Congress on __________.'', with the first blank space being filled with a description of the article and the second blank space being filled with the date of the notification under paragraph (1).

(ii) JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—The term ''joint resolution of disapproval'' means a joint resolution the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ''That Congress disapproves the duty imposed or increased under section 113 of the Lindsey O. Graham Sanctioning Russia Act of 2026 with respect to _____, notice of which was submitted to Congress on __________.'', with the first blank space being filled with a description of the article and the second blank space being filled with the date of the notification under paragraph (1).

(B) INTRODUCTION.—

(i) JOINT RESOLUTION OF APPROVAL.—A joint resolution of approval may be introduced in either House of Congress by any Member during the 60-day period described in paragraph (2).

(ii) JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—A joint resolution of disapproval may be introduced in either House of Congress by any Member at any time after the submission of a notification under paragraph (1).

(C) EXPEDITED PROCEDURES.—The provisions of subsections (b) through (f) of section 152 (19 U.S.C. 2192) apply to a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval to the same extent that such subsections apply to joint resolutions under section 152.

(D) RULES OF THE SENATE AND THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—This paragraph is enacted by Congress—

(i) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution of approval, and supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

(ii) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

SA 6715. Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. KIM, and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6711 submitted by Mrs. BRITT (for Ms. GRAHAM (for herself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL)) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 5334, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow early childhood educators to take the educator expense deduction, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike sections 113 through 117 of the amendment and insert the following:

SEC. 113. EXCEPTIONS.

(a) EXCEPTION FOR HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Sanctions and other measures under this title shall not apply to—

(A) the conduct or facilitation of a transaction for the provision of agricultural commodities, food, medicine, medical devices, humanitarian assistance, or for humanitarian purposes; or

(B) transactions that are necessary for, or related to, the activities described in subparagraph (A).

(2) RULE OF INTERPRETATION.—This subsection should be interpreted to apply to an entity carrying out any internationally recognized agreement with the Government of Ukraine for the sale or provision of agricultural commodities, food, medicine, or medical devices to and from Ukraine unless the President determines that the agreement is being used to evade sanctions imposed by the United States, the United Kingdom, the European Union, or the Group of 7.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY.—The term ''agricultural commodity'' has the meaning given such term in section 102 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5602).

(B) MEDICAL DEVICE.—The term ''medical device'' has the meaning given the term ''device'' in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

(C) MEDICINE.—The term ''medicine'' has the meaning given the term ''drug'' in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

(b) EXCEPTION FOR INTELLIGENCE AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.—This title shall not apply with respect to activities subject to the reporting requirements under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.) or to carry out or assist any authorized intelligence or law enforcement activities of the United States.

(c) EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS.—Sanctions under this title shall not apply to the admission or parole of an alien into the United States if such admission or parole is necessary to comply with United States obligations under the Agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, or under the Convention on Consular Relations, done at Vienna April 24, 1963, and entered into force March 19, 1967, or other international obligations.

(d) EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH CIVILIAN NUCLEAR COOPERATION AGREEMENTS.—This title shall not apply to activities carried out under an agreement for cooperation between the United States and the Russian Federation entered into under section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2153).

(e) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN IMPORTS OF LOW-ENRICHED URANIUM FOR NUCLEAR REACTORS.—This title shall not apply with respect to imports into the United States of low-enriched uranium described in paragraph (1) of section 3112A(d) of the USEC Privatization Act (42 U.S.C. 2297h–10a(d)) or medical isotopes for which a waiver has been issued under paragraph (2) of that section.

(f) EXCEPTION FOR OFFICIAL GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.—This title shall not apply to transactions for the conduct of official business of the United States Government (including transactions necessary for the operation of the United States embassy or United States consulates in the Russian Federation) or the United Nations (including its specialized agencies, programs, funds, and related organizations) by employees, grantees, or contractors thereof.

(g) EXCEPTION FOR NON-RUSSIAN OIL THAT TRANSITS RUSSIAN TERRITORY.—This title shall not apply to oil originating in a country other than the Russian Federation that transits the territory of the Russian Federation, or to any entity that transports such oil, for export to international markets.

(h) GENERAL LICENSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—This title shall not apply with respect to a United States person that is operating under the terms of a general license issued by the Department of the Treasury before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to affect the terms of a general license described in paragraph (1), the authority of United States persons to continue to operate under such a license, or the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to extend or issue new general licenses.

(i) EXCEPTION FOR WINDDOWN OPERATIONS.—During the 270-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, sanctions under this title shall not apply with respect to—

(1) an activity related to the winddown or divestiture of operations in the Russian Federation by an entity located in the Russian Federation that is not owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by a Russian person; or

(2) an entity located in the Russian Federation that is owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by a United States person if that United States person is engaged in good faith efforts to winddown or divest operations in the Russian Federation, including providing ongoing operational support to wind down or divest operations.

(j) EXCEPTION FOR SAFETY OF VESSELS AND CREW.—Sanctions under this title shall not apply with respect to a person providing provisions to a vessel otherwise subject to sanctions under this title if such provisions are intended—

(1) for the safety and care of the crew aboard the vessel;

(2) for the protection of human life aboard the vessel; or

(3) to avoid any environmental or other significant damage.

(k) EXCEPTION RELATING TO ACTIVITIES OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—This title shall not apply with respect to activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to authorize the imposition of any sanction or other condition, limitation, restriction, prohibition, or other measure, that directly or indirectly impedes the supply by any entity of the Russian Federation of any product or service, or the procurement of such product or service by any contractor or subcontractor of the United States or any other entity, relating to or in connection with any space launch conducted for—

(A) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; or

(B) any other non-Department of Defense customer.

SEC. 114. WAIVER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President may, subject to subsection (b), waive the application of any sanctions provision with respect to a foreign person, any restriction with respect to a person, or any duty under this title.

(b) REPORTS REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Before issuing a waiver under subsection (a), the President shall submit to Congress—

(A) a certification in writing that the issuance of the waiver is in the national interests of the United States; and

(B) a report explaining the basis for the certification.

(2) CONSOLIDATION OF REPORTS.—If the President is issuing more than one waiver of a section of this title, the President may include, in one report submitted under paragraph (1), the certifications and explanations required by that paragraph with respect to each such waiver, as long as all of such certifications and explanations relate to a waiver of the same section of this title.

(3) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 115. SANCTIONS IMPLEMENTATION AND PENALTIES.

(a) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out sections 102 through 111.

(b) PENALTIES.—The penalties provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to any person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of any prohibition under any of sections 102 through 111, or an order or regulation prescribed under any of such sections, to the same extent that such penalties apply to a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

SEC. 116. TERMINATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the President may terminate the application of any sanction with respect to a foreign person, any restriction with respect to a person, or any duty under this title, if the President submits to Congress a report—

(1) certifying in writing that—

(A) in the case of the termination of the application of a sanction, restriction, or duty with respect to a Russian person or the Russian Federation, the Russian Federation has—

(i) signed a peace agreement that is accepted by the free and independent Government of Ukraine; and

(ii) ceased all military hostilities against and any activities to overthrow, dismantle, and subvert the Government of Ukraine; or

(B) in the case of the termination of the application of a sanction or restriction with respect to any foreign person or foreign country (other than a Russian person or the Russian Federation)—

(i) the foreign person or the government of the foreign country, as the case may be, is not engaging in the activity that was the basis for the sanctions or other measures being terminated; and

(ii) the President has received reliable assurances that the foreign person or the government of the foreign country, as the case may be, will not knowingly engage in activity subject to sanctions or other measures under this title in the future; and

(2) that includes, in the case of a report not relating to the termination of a duty under section 112, a determination of whether the termination is intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation.

(b) PERIOD FOR REVIEW BY CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—During the period of 30 calendar days beginning on the date on which the President submits a report under subsection (a) with respect to the termination of the application of a sanction, restriction, or duty under this title, the termination shall not take effect. If, after the end

of that period, a joint resolution of disapproval with respect to the termination has not been enacted into law under subsection (c), the termination may take effect.

(2) CONSIDERATION BY CONGRESS.—During the period described in paragraph (1), the appropriate committee of the Senate and the appropriate committee of the House of Representatives should, as appropriate, hold hearings and briefings and otherwise obtain information in order to fully review the report.

(3) EXCEPTION.—The period for congressional review under paragraph (1) of a report required to be submitted under subsection (a) shall be 60 calendar days if the report is submitted on or after July 10 and on or before September 7 in any calendar year.

(c) JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—

(1) JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''joint resolution of disapproval'' means only a joint resolution of either House of Congress the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ''That Congress disapproves of the termination of the application of section ____ of the Lindsey O. Graham Sanctioning Russia and Iran Act of 2026, with respect to which the President submitted a report on ______.'', with the first blank space being filled with the appropriate section number and the second blank space being filled with the appropriate date.

(2) INTRODUCTION.—During the period of 30 calendar days provided for under subsection (b)(1), including any additional period as applicable under the exception provided in subsection (b)(3), a joint resolution of disapproval may be introduced—

(A) in the House of Representatives, by the majority leader or the minority leader; and

(B) in the Senate, by the majority leader (or a designee of the majority leader) or the minority leader (or a designee of the minority leader).

(3) CONSIDERATION IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(A) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—Any committee of the House of Representatives to which a joint resolution of disapproval is referred shall report it to the House of Representatives without amendment not later than 10 calendar days after the date of referral. If a committee fails to report the joint resolution within that period, the committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution and the joint resolution shall be referred to the appropriate calendar.

(B) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—After each committee authorized to consider a joint resolution of disapproval reports it to the House of Representatives or has been discharged from its consideration, it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the joint resolution of disapproval in the House of Representatives. All points of order against the motion are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. The motion shall not be debatable. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(C) CONSIDERATION.—The joint resolution of disapproval shall be considered as read. All points of order against the joint resolution of disapproval and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution of disapproval to its passage without intervening motion except 2 hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint resolution of disapproval shall not be in order.

(4) CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—

(A) COMMITTEE REFERRAL.—A joint resolution of disapproval introduced in the Senate shall be referred to the appropriate committee of the Senate.

(B) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—If the appropriate committee of the Senate has not reported the joint resolution within 10 calendar days after the date of referral of the joint resolution, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution and the joint resolution shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

(C) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—Notwithstanding Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order at any time after the appropriate committee of the Senate reports a joint resolution of disapproval to the Senate or has been discharged from consideration of such a joint resolution to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion to proceed is not debatable. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. Approval by the Senate of a motion to proceed to a joint resolution of disapproval shall require the affirmative vote of three-fifths of Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn.

(D) CONSIDERATION.—Consideration in the Senate of a joint resolution of disapproval and of all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith shall not exceed a total of 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between the majority and minority leaders or their designees. Any debatable motion or appeal is debatable for not to exceed 1 hour, to be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the motion or appeal.

(E) NO AMENDMENTS OR MOTIONS.—An amendment to a joint resolution of disapproval, a motion to postpone, a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

(F) VOTE ON JOINT RESOLUTION.—If the Senate has voted to proceed to a joint resolution of disapproval, the vote on approval of the joint resolution shall occur immediately following the conclusion of consideration of the joint resolution, and a single quorum call if requested. Approval by the Senate of a joint resolution of disapproval shall require the affirmative vote of three-fifths of Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn.

(G) CONSIDERATION OF VETO MESSAGES.—Consideration in the Senate of any veto message with respect to a joint resolution of disapproval, including all debatable motions and appeals in connection with the joint resolution, shall be limited to 10 hours, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

(5) TREATMENT OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION IN SENATE.—

(A) If, before the passage by the Senate of a joint resolution of disapproval, the Senate receives an identical joint resolution from the House of Representatives, the following procedures shall apply:

(i) That joint resolution shall not be referred to a committee.

(ii) With respect to that joint resolution—

(I) the procedure in the Senate shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the House of Representatives; but

(II) the vote on passage shall be on the joint resolution from the House of Representatives.

(B) If the Senate passes a joint resolution of disapproval before receiving a joint resolution of disapproval from the House of Representatives, the joint resolution passed by the Senate shall be held at the desk pending receipt of the joint resolution from the House of Representatives. Upon receipt of a joint resolution from the House of Representatives that is identical to the joint resolution passed by the Senate, the Senate shall proceed to its immediate consideration and the joint resolution shall be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

(C) If a joint resolution of disapproval is received from the House, and no companion joint resolution has been introduced in the Senate, the Senate procedures under this subsection shall apply to the House joint resolution.

(6) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—This subsection is enacted by Congress—

(A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, and supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

(B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

(7) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—The term ''appropriate committee of the House of Representatives'' means—

(i) with respect to the termination of a duty under section 112, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives;

(ii) with respect to the termination of any sanction or restriction under any of sections 102 through 111 that is intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; or

(iii) with respect to the termination of any sanction or restriction under any of sections 102 through 111 that is not intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation, the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

(B) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.—The term ''appropriate committee of the Senate'' means—

(i) with respect to the termination of a duty under section 112, the Committee on Finance of the Senate;

(ii) with respect to the termination of any sanction or restriction under any of sections 102 through 111 that is intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; or

(iii) with respect to the termination of any sanction or restriction under any of sections 102 through 111 that is not intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

SA 6716. Mr. WELCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6711 submitted by Mrs. BRITT (for Ms. GRAHAM (for herself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL)) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 5334, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow early childhood educators to take the educator expense deduction, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 113 of the amendment and insert the following:

SEC. 113. DUTIES ON COUNTRIES THAT PURCHASE RUSSIAN-ORIGIN CRUDE OIL OR NATURAL GAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, increase the rate of duty for all goods imported into the United States from a country described in subsection (c) (and only from a country described in subsection (c)) to a rate of up to 100 percent ad valorem.

(b) MODIFICATION TO RATE OF DUTY.—At any time after the initial imposition of duties under subsection (a) or (e), the United States Trade Representative shall modify or adjust any rate of duty imposed under subsection (a) or (e) to a rate greater than zero and up to 100 percent ad valorem upon submitting a written determination to the appropriate congressional committees that a country described in subsection (c) has taken significant steps—

(1) to increase the importation, sale, supply, transfer, or purchase of crude oil or natural gas that originated in the Russian Federation; or

(2) to decrease or cease engaging in the importation, sale, supply, transfer, or purchase of such crude oil or natural gas.

(c) COUNTRY DESCRIBED.—A country described in this subsection is a foreign country that—

(1) knowingly made new purchases of crude oil or natural gas that originated in the Russian Federation on a date that is on or after 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) was among the 5 largest importers, by total volume, of crude oil or natural gas that originated in the Russian Federation during the most recent 12-month period preceding the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) EXCEPTION.—A duty shall not be imposed under this section with respect to goods imported from a country described in subsection (c) for the importation by that country of natural gas that originated in the Russian Federation if—

(1) that country's total imports of natural gas that originated in the Russian Federation during the 12-month period described in subsection (c)(2) were less than 15 percent of the total annual exports of natural gas from the Russian Federation during that period; and

(2) that country has taken significant steps to reduce its imports of natural gas that originated in the Russian Federation.

(e) SUBSEQUENT DETERMINATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the initial imposition of duties under subsection (a), and every 180 days thereafter, the United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Energy, shall—

(1) determine, based on the most recent 12-month period preceding the determination, the countries that are—

(A) the 5 largest importers of crude oil, by total volume, originating in the Russian Federation; and

(B) the 5 largest importers of natural gas, by total volume, originating in the Russian Federation; and

(2) impose duties pursuant to subsection (a) with respect to goods imported from those countries.

(f) DUTY RATE IN ADDITION TO OTHER DUTIES, FEES, TAXES, EXACTIONS, OR CHARGES.—A rate of duty imposed under this section with respect to a good imported from a country described in subsection (c) shall be in addition to any other duty, fee, tax, exaction, or charge applicable with respect to the good, including any duty imposed under title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.), section 122, 201, or 301 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2132, 2251, and 2411), or section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. 1862).

(g) METHODOLOGY, DOCUMENTATION, AND REPORTS.—

(1) REPORTS REQUIRED.—Not later than 10 days before imposing a duty under subsection (a) or (e), or modifying or adjusting the rate of such a duty under subsection (b), the President or the United States Trade Representative shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a written justification for the duty that—

(A) provides a substantive rationale for the determination of the rate of duty imposed under subsection (a) or (e) or the modification or adjustment made pursuant to subsection (b), as the case may be; and

(B) details the methodology used to determine that the country subject to the duty is a country described in subsection (c).

(2) DETERMINATIONS OF IMPORTS OF CRUDE OIL AND NATURAL GAS.—For the purposes of determining whether a country is an importer of crude oil or natural gas described in subsection (c)(1)—

(A) crude oil is the substance described in Harmonized System code 2709; and

(B) natural gas is the substance described in Harmonized System code 2711.

(h) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Notwithstanding section 115, nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize the imposition of duties with respect to goods imported from any country not expressly described in subsection (c) or the Russian Federation.

(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

(2) NATURAL GAS.—Except as provided by subsection (g)(2), the term ''natural gas'' means natural gas, whether unmixed or any mixture of natural and artificial gas, including liquefied natural gas.

SA 6717. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5334, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow early childhood educators to take the educator expense deduction, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II of the amendment, add the following:

SEC. 204. REPORT ON THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION'S PERSECUTION OF RELIGIOUS GROUPS IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES OF UKRAINE; IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for 3 years, the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of the Treasury, shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes—

(A) a detailed description of the Government of the Russian Federation and its state-affiliated, quasi-state, or occupation-era activities that involve the persecution or suppression of, or discrimination against, or otherwise directly or indirectly involve engaging in or facilitating serious human rights abuse against, Christians, Jews, and Muslims (including Crimean Tatars), and other religious minorities not affiliated with the Russian Orthodox Church or its subordinate Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate, and their respective religious organizations in Russian-occupied territories of Ukraine;

(B) an identification of churches, synagogues, mosques, other religious facilities, including Christian, Jewish, Muslim, and other minority religious institutions, that have been destroyed, damaged, seized, repurposed, or otherwise appropriated directly or indirectly by persons operating for or on behalf of the Government of the Russian Federation in occupied territories of Ukraine;

(C) an assessment of—

(i) the number of Christians, Jews, Muslims (including Crimean Tatars), and other religious minorities who are not affiliated with the Russian Orthodox Church or its subordinate Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate, who have been subjected to persecution, imprisonment, or forced displacement in occupied territories of Ukraine;

(ii) restrictions imposed on Christian, Jewish, Muslim, and other religions not affiliated with the religious practices, worship services, or religious education of the Russian Orthodox Church or its subordinate Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate in occupied territories;

(iii) efforts to compel Christian organizations to affiliate with Moscow-based religious institutions or to suppress Christian activity not affiliated with Moscow-based religions;

(iv) efforts by the Government of the Russian Federation, by authorities exercising de facto governmental control in occupied territory, or by entities or individuals otherwise affiliated with the Russian Federation, to compel Christian organizations in Ukraine and in occupied territories—

(I) to affiliate with Moscow-based religious institutions; or

(II) to suppress Christian, Jewish, Muslim, or any other denominations not aligned with Russian state interests; and

(v) the overall impact of the Russian Federation's invasion of Ukraine, and its occupation of Ukrainian territory, on religious freedom in occupied territories of Ukraine, including Crimea and Sevastopol; and

(D) a list of individuals and entities affiliated with the Government of the Russian Federation, or exercising de facto authority in occupied territory, that—

(i) are responsible for persecution or suppression of, or discrimination against, Christians, Jews, Muslims, or other religious minorities in Ukraine and in the occupied territories of Ukraine; or

(ii) have otherwise engaged in or attempted to engage in any of the conduct described in this subsection.

(2) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in an unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(b) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—The President may impose sanctions pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) with respect to each foreign person on the list required by subsection (a)(1)(D).

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(1) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

SA 6718. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4784, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2027 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1252. REPORT AND BRIEFINGS ON DEFENSE SYSTEMS FOR CO-PRODUCTION WITH INDIA.

(a) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that identifies defense systems, subsystems, critical components, or capabilities suitable for co-production or co-development with India over the subsequent five-year period.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In identifying such systems, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall consider the following:

(A) Operational demand, and documented capability gaps, of the United States and India with respect to co-production and co-development of defense systems, subsystems, critical components, or capabilities.

(B) With respect to the meaningful participation in such co-production and co-development, the industrial capacity of defense firms of India, the Government of India, and any other relevant entity.

(C) The potential to enhance—

(i) supply chain resilience and United States-India interoperability; and

(ii) shared development of—

(I) hardware, such as munitions, combat vehicles, and space technologies; and

(II) capabilities, including software, artificial intelligence platforms, cyber platforms, and other advanced technologies.

(D) Technology security and export control requirements under the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.) and applicable regulations.

(E) The relationship of the Government of India and the defense firms of India with the Russian Federation, the People's Republic of China, Cuba, Iran, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and Venezuela, and the risk of sensitive technology transfer to such countries.

(3) STRATEGY TO ADVANCE CO-PRODUCTION.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include, for each system identified, a strategy to advance co-production that includes the following:

(A) An identification of the proposed co-production or co-development mechanism, such as Foreign Military Sales, Direct Commercial Sales, a government-to-government agreement, or another arrangement.

(B) An identification of key milestones and a timeline for achieving a co-production or co-development arrangement within the five-year period covered by the report.

(C) An identification of the lead Department of Defense or Department of State office responsible for execution of such arrangement.

(D) A description of known obstacles and steps to address such obstacles, including any required regulatory, policy, or legislative changes by the United States.

(4) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(b) BRIEFINGS.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall provide the appropriate committees of Congress with a briefing on progress in advancing co-production arrangements for each system identified under subsection (a)(1), including any systems removed from or added to the list and the rational for so doing.

(c) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—The term appropriate committees of Congress means—

(1) the congressional defense committees;

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(3) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SA 6719. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6711 submitted by Mrs. BRITT (for Ms. GRAHAM (for herself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL)) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 5334, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow early childhood educators to take the educator expense deduction, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II of the amendment, add the following:

SEC. 204. REPORT AND BRIEFINGS ON DEFENSE SYSTEMS FOR CO-PRODUCTION WITH INDIA.

(a) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that identifies defense systems, subsystems, critical components, or capabilities suitable for co-production or co-development with India over the subsequent five-year period.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In identifying such systems, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall consider the following:

(A) Operational demand, and documented capability gaps, of the United States and India with respect to co-production and co-development of defense systems, subsystems, critical components, or capabilities.

(B) With respect to the meaningful participation in such co-production and co-development, the industrial capacity of defense firms of India, the Government of India, and any other relevant entity.

(C) The potential to enhance—

(i) supply chain resilience and United States-India interoperability; and

(ii) shared development of—

(I) hardware, such as munitions, combat vehicles, and space technologies; and

(II) capabilities, including software, artificial intelligence platforms, cyber platforms, and other advanced technologies.

(D) Technology security and export control requirements under the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.) and applicable regulations.

(E) The relationship of the Government of India and the defense firms of India with the Russian Federation, the People's Republic of China, Cuba, Iran, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and Venezuela, and the risk of sensitive technology transfer to such countries.

(3) STRATEGY TO ADVANCE CO-PRODUCTION.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include, for each system identified, a strategy to advance co-production that includes the following:

(A) An identification of the proposed co-production or co-development mechanism, such as Foreign Military Sales, Direct Commercial Sales, a government-to-government agreement, or another arrangement.

(B) An identification of key milestones and a timeline for achieving a co-production or co-development arrangement within the five-year period covered by the report.

(C) An identification of the lead Department of Defense or Department of State office responsible for execution of such arrangement.

(D) A description of known obstacles and steps to address such obstacles, including any required regulatory, policy, or legislative changes by the United States.

(4) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(b) BRIEFINGS.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall provide the appropriate committees of Congress with a briefing on progress in advancing co-production arrangements for each system identified under subsection (a)(1), including any systems removed from or added to the list and the rational for so doing.

(c) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—The term appropriate committees of Congress means—

(1) the congressional defense committees;

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(3) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I have five requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 29, 2026, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 29, 2026, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 29, 2026, at 8:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 29, 2026, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 29, 2026, at 3:45 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privileges of the floor be granted to my second-session summer interns Leif Anderson, Bronwyn Brune, Lina Hischer, Victoria Bielefeld, Lydia Wies, Tessa Davis, Ole John Schuldt, Mary Cope, Preston Carter, and Soren Getti for the months of July and August of 2026.

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

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF TRADEMARKS IN THE ECONOMY AND THE ROLE OF TRADEMARKS IN PROTECTING CONSUMER SAFETY BY DESIGNATING THE MONTH OF JULY AS ''NATIONAL ANTI-COUNTERFEITING AND CONSUMER EDUCATION AND AWARENESS MONTH''

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 818, which is at the desk.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 818) recognizing the importance of trademarks in the economy and the role of trademarks in protecting consumer safety by designating the month of July as ''National Anti-Counterfeiting and Consumer Education and Awareness Month''.

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

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

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

The resolution (S. Res. 818) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 30, 2026

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m. on Thursday, July 30; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, morning business be closed, and the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of Executive Calendar No. 6, S. Res. 817, with no amendments or motions in relation to the executive resolution in order; further, that notwithstanding rule XXII, Senator MURRAY or her designee be authorized to return the Senate to legislative session for the purpose of making a motion to proceed to Calendar No. 533, S.J. Res. 199, and the Senate vote on the motion to proceed at 11:30 a.m.; further, that if Senator GILLIBRAND or her designee makes a motion to discharge S.J. Res. 181, while the Senate is in legislative session, the Senate vote on the motion to discharge immediately following disposition of S.J. Res. 199, and the Senate resume executive session; further, that at 1:45 p.m., the Senate vote on adoption of the resolution; finally, if S. Res. 817 is adopted, that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the Senate resume legislative session.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. LEE. 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 9:05 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, July 30, 2026, at 10 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, July 30, 2026 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

AUGUST 4

10 a.m.
Committee on the Budget
To hold hearings to examine the reality of Medicaid.
SD–608

Committee on Finance
Subcommittee on Health Care
To hold hearings to examine building a resilient health care future with biotechnology.
SD–215

10:15 a.m.
Committee on the Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine prescribing sunshine, focusing on how competition and transparency lowers prescription drug costs.
SH–216

2:30 p.m.
Committee on the Judiciary
Subcommittee on Crime and Counterterrorism
To hold hearings to examine data and profit, focusing on the consumer cost of AI surveillance pricing.
SD–226

4 p.m.
Committee on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings to examine tracking prediction markets' exponential growth, focusing on tribal implications and beyond.
SD–628

AUGUST 5

10 a.m.
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business meeting to markup S. 737, to require certain interactive computer services to adopt and operate technology verification measures to ensure that users of the platform are not minors, S. 1748, to protect the safety of children on the internet, S. 4199, to require entities that make artificial intelligence chatbots available to minors to implement certain safe design features, S. 4407, to require the creation of family accounts for children to be able to use artificial intelligence chatbots, to require verifiable parental consent for teens using artificial intelligence chatbots, S. 5171, to require a study of AI-enabled toys and development of a joint action plan regarding the marketing and sale of AI-enabled toys, and a promotion list in the Coast Guard.
SR–253

Committee on Finance
To hold hearings to examine exploring process approaches for addressing Social Security solvency.
SD–215

Committee on Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine pending nominations.
SD–419

10:15 a.m.
Committee on the Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine pending nominations.
SH–216

2:30 p.m.
Committee on the Judiciary
Subcommittee on Federal Courts, Oversight, Agency Action, and Federal Rights
To hold hearings to examine the Muslim brotherhood network in America.
SD–226

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship
To hold hearings to examine the next 250, focusing on small businesses leading the way.
SR–428A

3 p.m.
Committee on Foreign Relations
To receive a closed briefing update on the war in Sudan.
SVC–217

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4301–S4351

Measures Introduced: Seventeen bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 5156–5172, S.J. Res. 203, and S. Res. 818. **Page S4336**

Measures Passed:

Ghislaine Maxwell: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 608, expressing the sense of the Senate that Ghislaine Maxwell should not be granted a Presidential pardon or any form of clemency for her crimes with Jeffrey Epstein relating to the sexual exploitation and abuse of minors, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S4311**

National Anti-Counterfeiting and Consumer Education and Awareness Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 818, recognizing the importance of trademarks in the economy and the role of trademarks in protecting consumer safety by designating the month of July as "National Anti-Counterfeiting and Consumer Education and Awareness Month". **Page S4351**

Measures Considered:

SEED Act: Senate began consideration of H.R. 5334, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow early childhood educators to take the educator expense deduction. **Pages S4309–9, S4309–11**

Prior to the consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 84 yeas to 12 nays (Vote No. 213), Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Page S4323**

En Bloc Nominations—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of S. Res. 817, authorizing the en bloc consideration in Executive Session of certain nominations on the Executive Calendar. **Page S4323**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 50 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 214), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the resolution. **Page S4323**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the resolution, with no amendments or motions on or in relation to the Executive Resolution in order, at approximately 10 a.m., on Thursday, July 30, 2026; provided further, that at 1:45 p.m., Senate vote on adoption of the resolution. **Page S4351**

Restoring Flexibility in the Child Care and Development Fund Resolution and Hostilities Within or Against Iran Authorization Resolution—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding Rule XXII, Senator Murray or her designee, be authorized to return the Senate to legislative session for the purpose of making a motion to proceed to consideration of S.J. Res. 199, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Health and Human Services relating to "Restoring Flexibility in the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF)", and the Senate vote on the motion to proceed at 11:30 a.m., on Thursday, July 30, 2026; and if Senator Gillibrand or her designee, makes a motion to discharge S.J. Res. 181, to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities within or against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress, while the Senate is in legislative session, the Senate vote on the motion to discharge immediately following disposition of S.J. Res. 199. **Page S4351**

Messages from the House: **Page S4334**

Executive Communications: **Pages S4334–36**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S4336–38**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S4338–39**

Additional Statements: **Pages S4332–34**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S4339–50**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S4350–51**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S4351**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—214) **Page S4323**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10:30 a.m. and adjourned at 9:05 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, July 30, 2026. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S4351.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 1257, to amend the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act to authorize the use of funds for certain additional Carey Act projects;

S. 2498, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to extend certain leases within units of the National Park System without opening the lease to bidding, with an amendment;

S. 2767, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement with the Gateway Arch Park Foundation to host private events in Gateway Arch National Park buildings, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

H.R. 5254, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement with the Gateway Arch Park Foundation to host private events in Gateway Arch National Park buildings;

S. 2801, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to assess the suitability and feasibility of designating the Canterbury Shaker Village National Heritage Area, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 2887, to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the Route 66 National Historic Trail;

S. 2933, to redesignate a playground in the New River Gorge National Park and Preserve in the State of West Virginia as the "Hearts of Gold Playground: In Honor of West Virginia Children and Families Impacted by Childhood Cancer";

S. 3194, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to assess the suitability and feasibility of designating certain land in California as the Monterey Bay National Heritage Area, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3313, to require the Secretary of the Interior to issue a right-of-way for an emergency exit on certain National Park Service land in the State of Virginia, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

H.R. 6365, to require the Secretary of the Interior to issue a right-of-way for an emergency exit on certain National Park Service land in the State of Virginia;

S. 3635 and H.R. 7250, bills to reauthorize the Fort Peck Reservation Rural Water System Act of 2000;

S. 3715 and H.R. 6380, bills to establish the Chiricahua National Park in the State of Arizona as a unit of the National Park System, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3720, to amend the National Trails System Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study on the feasibility of designating the Bay Area Ridge as a national scenic trail, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3732, to amend the Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation Act to authorize assistance under the storage program, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3738, to amend the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act to reauthorize the large-scale water recycling and reuse program, to establish a Water Conveyance Improvement Program, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 4041, to reauthorize the Cooperative Watershed Management Program, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 4238, to amend the John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act to designate as a component of the National Heritage Area System the Endless Mountains National Heritage Area in the State of Pennsylvania;

S. 4399, to provide for certain conveyances under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act;

S. 4410, to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to provide for the payment of bonus payments of certain coal leases issued under that Act;

S. 4538, to amend the National Trails System Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study on the feasibility of designating Washington's Trail-1753 as a national historic trail;

S. 5039 and H.R. 7831, bills to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to extend the period of time during which the Secretary of the Interior is required to collect a fee for each new application for a permit to drill;

H.R. 5631, to appoint a Geothermal Ombudsman and establish a Geothermal Permitting Task Force from within the Bureau of Land Management.

TESTIMONY OF ANTHONY FAUCI

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the testimony of Anthony Fauci, after receiving testimony from Anthony Fauci, former Director, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services.

AI AND THE WORKPLACE

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Subcommittee on Employment and Workplace Safety concluded a hearing to examine the impact of AI on the workplace, after receiving testimony from Ken Clark, EmployIndy, and Carol O. Rogers, Indiana University Kelly School of Business Indiana Business Research Center, both of Indianapolis; Liya Palagashvili, George Mason University Mercatus Center, Fairfax, Virginia; Jonathan A. Liebert, Better Business Bureau of Southern Colorado, Colorado Springs; and Justin Heck, Opportunity@Work, Canton, Michigan.

LEGISLATION

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 3573, to amend the Aamodt Litigation Settlement Act to modify a provision relating to the extension of certain dates for the completion of the Regional Water System, S. 3617, to approve the settlement of water rights claims of the Yavapai-Apache Nation in the State of Arizona, to authorize construction of a water project relating to those water rights claims, S. 4368, to approve the settlement of the water rights claims of the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, S. 4417, to amend the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians Water Rights Settlement Act to make technical corrections, and S. 4890, to amend the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act to establish subaccounts in the Indian Water Rights Settlement Completion Fund, after receiving testimony from Scott Cameron, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Water and Science, Department of the Interior; Buddy Rocha, Jr., Yavapai-Apache Nation, Verde, Arizona; Jeff Grubbe, Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, Palm Springs, California; and Catalina Chacon, Pechanga Band of Indians, Temecula, California.

AI DECEPTION

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the AI deception machine, focusing on deepfakes, chatbots, and the new frontier of senior fraud, after receiving testimony from David Amron, The Roxbury Institute, Los Angeles, California; Paul Benda, American Bankers Association, Matthew F. Ferraro, Crowell & Moring LLP, and Ben Winters, Consumer Federation of America, all of Washington, D.C.; and Deborah Del Mastro, Martinez, California.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

The House was not in session today. The House will meet in Pro Forma session at 8:30 a.m. on Thursday, July 30, 2026.

Committee Meetings

No hearings were held.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 30, 2026

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Telecommunications and Media, to hold hearings to examine intelligent networks, focusing on powering artificial intelligence and transforming communications, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Finance: business meeting to consider an original bill entitled, "Taxpayer Assistance and Service Act", 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Sarah B. Rogers, of New York, to be Chief Executive Officer of the United States Agency for Global Media, Rebekah Jurata, of California, to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund, and Jennifer Johnson-Carroll, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago, Department of State, 10:30 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: business meeting to consider S. 5038, to prohibit the transfer of the functions of the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, S. 5046, to prohibit the transfer of certain offices and functions of the Department of Education to other Federal agencies, S. 2511, to establish a postsecondary student data system, S. 3010, to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to improve provisions relating to dyslexia, S. 3589, to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide students with disabilities and their families with access to critical information needed to select the right college and succeed once enrolled, S. 4097, to establish that a State-based education loan program is excluded from certain requirements relating to a preferred lender arrangement, S.

4689, to strengthen literacy outcomes for all students, to amend the comprehensive literacy State development grant program, and to ensure Federal accountability and investment in research, teacher preparation, and evidence-based instruction aligned with the science of reading, S. 3333, to modify the eligibility requirements and account contribution maximum for pension-linked emergency savings accounts, S. 4965, to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 to establish a Railroad Retirement Board Administrative Account, S. 3097, to provide additional protections with respect to health information, and the nominations of Erica Schwartz, of Florida, to be Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Sean Kaufman, of Georgia, to be Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response, Department of Health and Human Services, and Keith Sonderling, of Florida, to be Secretary of Labor, 9:45 a.m., SD–430.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Joint Meeting

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: to receive a briefing on Russia's exploitation and engagement in Africa, 2 p.m., 210, Cannon Building.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Thursday, July 30

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of S. Res. 817, En Bloc Nominations, post-cloture. If Senator Murray, or her designee, makes a motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 199, Restoring Flexibility in the Child Care and Development Fund, Senate will vote on the motion at 11:30 a.m. If Senator Gillibrand, or her designee, makes a motion to discharge S.J. Res. 181, Hostilities Within or Against the Islamic Republic of Iran, Senate will vote on the motion immediately following disposition of S.J. Res. 199. Senate will vote on adoption of S. Res. 817 at 1:45 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

8:30 a.m., Thursday, July 30

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 8:30 a.m.

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are 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.