



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 170

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 22, 2024

No. 89

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. EDWARDS).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 22, 2024.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHUCK EDWARDS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 9, 2024, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

JUSTICE ALITO'S UPSIDE-DOWN FLAG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, through recent confirmed reports, we now know that after the January 6, 2021, Capitol insurrection, Supreme Court Justice Samuel Alito flew an upside-down American flag in front of his home for several days.

This is just the latest brazen act by an out-of-control, extreme MAGA Jus-

tice whose conduct is directly responsible for the current public opinion on the Supreme Court being at record lows.

The inverted flag was a well-known symbol flown by far-right, extreme MAGA activists in early 2021. These were extremists who believed the former President's nonsensical election lie and who supported the goals of the January 6 assault on this body and our democracy.

Federal judges cannot make political displays, and Alito is a Supreme Court Justice. He knew exactly what he was doing when he expressed solidarity with January 6 criminals. To quote Esmeralda Santiago: "Tell me who you walk with, and I'll tell you who you are."

Time and time again, Alito has shown us who he is, a far-right, extreme MAGA ideologue who is anything but impartial with regards to justice.

In 2022, Alito followed the directives of the former President and the far-right, extreme MAGA camp to defy the will of the American people and 50 years of legal precedent by writing the decision to reverse *Roe v. Wade*.

Along with his fellow extreme MAGA Justice Clarence Thomas, Justice Alito has routinely failed to report large, luxury gifts paid for by some of his friends, private flights, and other payments to him and his family by wealthy, far-right extremists.

Worst of all, Justice Alito has also openly failed to recuse himself from any of the several January 6-related cases currently before the Supreme Court. His bias is clearly showing.

During last month's oral arguments before the Supreme Court in the Donald Trump election interference case, Alito cozied up to Trump's absurd legal argument that past Presidents are completely immune from criminal prosecution.

You should recuse yourself.

In last month's oral arguments in a separate case involving charges against January 6 Capitol insurrectionists, Alito revealed his view that prosecutors may have gone too far by daring to charge these defendants.

You should recuse yourself.

Justice Alito is someone who will do everything in his power to make sure Donald Trump and the January 6 insurrectionists evade prosecution and accountability for their crimes.

For the sake of our democracy, Justice Alito must immediately recuse himself from all and any January 6-related cases before the Supreme Court.

Justice Alito's behavior also underscores the need for Congress to immediately pass H.R. 926, the Supreme Court Ethics, Recusal, and Transparency Act. With H.R. 926, Supreme Court Justices like Samuel Alito will finally be held subject to the same ethics and recusal standards as other Federal judges in a manner that is meaningful and enforceable. Until this occurs, Justice Alito and his insurrectionist worldview will continue to dominate our highest court, representing a threat not just to the rule of law but also to American democracy itself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward presumptive nominees for the Office of President and to direct their remarks to the Chair.

RECOGNIZING CAPTAIN DAVID ROBERT WITTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Captain David Robert Witte for his exceptional service to Arkansas' Fourth Congressional District and to extend my heartfelt congratulations on his upcoming new role with

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H3403

the Arkansas Air National Guard as Chaplain for the 189th Airlift Wing at Little Rock Air Force Base.

David has been an invaluable member of my team for nearly a decade, demonstrating his dedication and commitment to public service. He currently serves as my deputy district director and military and veterans' affairs representative, as well as the assistant pastor at Grace Lutheran Church in Little Rock and as chaplain for the 777th Aviation Support Battalion for the Arkansas Army National Guard, all roles in which he has excelled.

Since 2015, he has played a crucial role in the service academy nomination process for Arkansas students and assisted thousands of his fellow veterans, helping them navigate complex casework and ensuring they receive the support they deserve. His work has not only benefited those individuals but has also had a significant impact on Arkansas' Fourth Congressional District.

David holds an impressive resume, with an undergraduate degree from Concordia University and master's degrees from the University of Arkansas at Little Rock and Liberty University.

He also shares my love for the great outdoors and loves visiting our national parks, as you can see pictured here, with his lovely wife, Megan, and their four children: Milo, Ike, Ames, and Etta.

It has been a pleasure getting to know David and watching his family grow over the past 10 years. I look forward to many more years of continued friendship.

While his absence from our office will be greatly felt, we wish David well on this next endeavor of service to our country. He will undoubtedly make a positive and faithful impact in his new capacity with the Arkansas Air National Guard.

HONORING MARICELA GARCIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mrs. RAMIREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Maricela Garcia, whose distinguished career we celebrate today.

Maricela will soon retire as the CEO of Gads Hill Center after 12 years of transformative impact.

A fellow Guatemalteca, Ms. Garcia immigrated to the U.S. in the 1980s seeking refuge from the civil war.

In her country, Garcia founded Casa Guatemala to support newly arrived refugees and cofounded Women for Guatemala to build solidarity among women in the U.S. and Guatemala.

Maricela's impact has been felt across the State of Illinois. In addition to her years at Gads Hill Center, she has led the Illinois Coalition for Refugee Rights and the Latino Policy Forum. Her work has empowered countless families, especially Black, Brown, and immigrant families, pro-

viding them with education, resources, and hope.

On behalf of Illinois' Third Congressional District and the Guatemalan community in my district, it is my great honor to commend Maricela Garcia for her exceptional leadership.

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

Her legacy reminds us of the strength, resilience, and contributions of immigrants in building a better future.

Su legado nos recuerda la fuerza, la resiliencia y las contribuciones de los inmigrantes a la hora de forjar un futuro mejor.

Congratulations.

HONORING DEBBIE REZNIK

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Debbie Reznik for 30 years of distinguished service to our communities, especially working to address homelessness.

It is well known that Debbie has a standout philanthropic career. She has changed systems, strengthened sectors, and launched life-changing programs.

What is lesser known is her legacy as a champion for young leaders.

I met Debbie at the age of 19, having just been promoted to a leadership position in a Chicago nonprofit, and she made a commitment to me then to support me that day and has honored it every single day since. Twenty-one years later, I am who I am standing here in Congress in no small part because of Debbie.

While Debbie is stepping down from her position at the Polk Bros. Foundation to pursue new adventures, we know that she will continue to be a tireless advocate for a more just and loving society.

On behalf of Illinois' Third Congressional District, it is my great honor to commend Debbie Reznik for the lives changed and the impact made through her service to our communities.

I congratulate and thank Debbie.

HONORING REVEREND WALTER "SLIM" COLEMAN

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Reverend Walter "Slim" Coleman, whose transformational leadership and powerful legacy has shaped the political and spiritual consciousness of so many. There is so much we have won in Chicago and across the Nation that would not be possible without the witness of Reverend Slim Coleman.

A retired United Methodist pastor, Reverend Coleman and his wife, Emma Lozano showed us how to truly love our neighbors when they opened the doors of Adalberto Memorial United Methodist Church in Humboldt Park to provide sanctuary to Elvira Arellano and many other undocumented immigrants fighting their deportations. They laid the groundwork for Chicago to declare itself a sanctuary city.

As a movement builder across several decades, his work with the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, Students for a Democratic Society, and, eventually, the Rainbow Coalition

showed us how to build multiracial, multicultural solidarity movements that center our mutual liberation.

He laid a foundation of solidarity for both Chicago's first Black mayor, Harold Washington, and Chicago's most recently elected mayor, Mayor Brandon Johnson, to take up their positions on the fifth floor of city hall.

□ 1015

As an organizer, Reverend Coleman showed us what people power can do. Whether through his work to establish local school councils throughout Chicago, register thousands of voters in the 1983 mayoral election, or build coalitions around housing, education, and jobs, his life and his legacy will continue to be a light in dark places, reminding us that "a united community will never be defeated," "un pueblo unido jamas sera vencido."

To his wife, Pastora Emma Lozano, she is loved: I am with her. Pastor Coleman may have preceded her in his homegoing, but she is not alone.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Illinois' Third Congressional District, it is my privilege to submit this commendation in the RECORD to honor the life and the legacy of Reverend Walter "Slim" Coleman.

May Pastor Coleman rest in power. May he rest in power.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois will provide a translation of her remarks to the Clerk.

RECOGNIZING SAM SIMMERMAKER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sam Simmermaker, who is retiring this week after 64 years with White River Broadcasting in my hometown of Columbus, Indiana.

Sam grew up in Pulaski County and graduated from Indiana University in 1954. He started his radio career in Goshen and later covered the Indianapolis Indians for WTTV. Sam joined WCSI on January 1, 1960, and over the past six decades, he has covered generations of high school athletes.

Receiving multiple awards, including the Indiana Basketball Hall of Fame and the Indiana Sportswriters and Sportscasters Hall of Fame, Sam and his trademark "holy cow" will be truly missed.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate and wish Sam the best of luck in his retirement.

RECOGNIZING ED JENKINS

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I recognize Ed Jenkins, who was named Indiana Teacher of the Year.

An Indiana native, Ed teaches English at Franklin Community Early College, a high school in my district. Those who know him say that Sam is dedicated to his students and passionate about instilling a love of reading.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Ed for his work to grow our next generation of leaders.

RECOGNIZING MIKE BUCKLEY

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I recognize former fire Captain Mike Buckley.

Mike served the Rushville Fire Department for 32 years, retiring as captain in 2017. He later worked for the Indiana State Police as a motor carrier inspector.

I recently met Mike and learned of his cancer diagnosis at a benefit in his honor at Glenwood Volunteer Fire Department. I am so proud that that community is supporting him in this challenge, and I am grateful to have met him.

God bless Mike and the entire Buckley family.

RECOGNIZING EMMA MCLEISH

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I recognize Franklin County college student Emma McLeish, who recently received the American Red Cross' Lifesaving Award for Professional Responders.

Last year, Emma used her Red Cross training to help save lives twice. In July she unexpectedly helped deliver a neighbor's baby, and then in October she saved a man suffering from cardiac arrest.

Emma is a true hero, and it is my honor to recognize her today.

108TH RUNNING OF THE INDIANAPOLIS 500

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, this weekend is the 108th Running of the Indianapolis 500.

Beginning in 1911, the first Indy 500 was unlike anything the world had ever seen, with 40 qualifiers fighting a 500-mile race for an overall total purse of \$27,000. Eighty thousand spectators came out to watch Ray Harroun drive into victory, and a tradition was born.

The Greatest Spectacle in Racing has evolved over the last century, but its time-honored traditions keep racing fans coming back every Memorial Day weekend, like I will this weekend.

This weekend promises to be no different, hosting hundreds of thousands of people from all over the world.

I wish all this year's drivers the best of luck, and I am glad to say: This is May.

OUR SOUTHERN BORDER

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, the state of our southern border is a travesty, and this administration refuses to face the facts. I am here to repeat what we all know and what we have all said: Border security is national security.

We have seen over 7.8 million illegal aliens cross over since President Biden took office, bringing chaos, crime, and terror into our country.

It is time to take a real action: Build the wall. Grow the Border Patrol, and reinstate the policies that we know work.

RECORD-HIGH INFLATION

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, inflation under this administration continues to hit record highs.

We are all paying the price for this administration's mistakes. In April, the average Indiana household was paying \$948 per month more than they were in January 2021. Everything, from

electricity to rent to groceries, costs more under this administration.

Numbers don't lie, and the Democrats can't keep pretending everything is okay.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the Biden administration to quit ruining the American middle class.

HONORING HEMET POLICE CHIEF
EDDIE PUST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate Hemet Police Chief Eddie Pust on his retirement after serving the city of Hemet for over 27 years.

Police officers spend their lives putting service before self, striving to make a positive change in their community, and Chief Pust embodies that through and through.

Chief Pust began his career with the city of Hemet Police Department in 1996. After the police academy, he started as a patrol officer. During his career, he worked a number of assignments including 16 years in SWAT, until eventually being appointed as the 18th police chief of Hemet Police Department.

In addition to his 4-year tenure as police chief, he also served for 10 months as the city of Hemet interim city manager.

After almost 30 years as a pillar of leadership in the Hemet community, Chief Pust has displayed accountability, strength, and compassion during his service.

In every rank and position Chief Pust held, he was incredibly committed to tackling the issues that improved the safety and quality of life for the residents he served.

On behalf of the people in Hemet, Jacinto Valley, and the entire district, we appreciate every moment Chief Pust dedicated to protecting and serving us. His service to the community is nothing short of exemplary.

I thank Chief Pust for tirelessly working to keep the people of Hemet safe for the past 27 years.

RECOGNIZING RICHARD RAMIREZ

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and legacy of Mr. Richard Moreno Ramirez, a pillar of the Coachella Valley and exceptional athlete.

Mr. Ramirez was an accomplished athlete, coach, athletic director, educator, loving husband, father, grandfather, and so much more.

Known as Mr. Green and Gold, the colors of his beloved Coachella Valley High School, Mr. Ramirez was a man of and for the community.

He was a beloved mentor for many and a leader in the community. He was my activities director and athletics director while I was a student athlete and ASB president at Coachella Valley High School.

His whole life he worked to foster a sense of school spirit and community

pride that empowered students to create the change they wished to see in the world.

I learned three key lessons from Mr. Ramirez that I will always carry with me: first, your roots matter; second, school and community pride are important; and third, to always serve the community.

Mr. Ramirez was born on October 16, 1941, on a ranch in Thermal, California, to parents Ramon and Dolores Ramirez. Raised in the eastern Coachella Valley, he attended Coachella Valley High School where his love for sports took root playing for their baseball and football teams where he excelled at sports, winning three baseball and two football championships.

After graduation, he attended Riverside City College and then went on to California State University-Long Beach where he achieved great success in both academics and baseball, so much so he brought home the university's first baseball title in 1964 and was recently inducted into their Sports Hall of Fame.

After college, wanting to give back to his community, he rolled up his sleeves and got to work. He returned home to serve the community that raised him at Coachella Valley High School for the next 40 years.

While athletic director at CV High School, he always instilled a sense of school spirit and community pride in all students. Even throughout his retirement, Mr. Ramirez always put service above self, and he served on the boards of many nonprofit organizations. He was also dedicated to cultivating the next generation of leaders through the CV High School Alumni Association where he raised funds to provide scholarships for local students.

Each athlete, student, teacher, neighbor, and friend will undoubtedly recall Mr. Ramirez as a pillar of the community.

Together, as we mourn his passing with his wife, Dr. Diane Ramirez; his children, Ronan and Roderic Ramirez; grandchildren, Rossen and Sofia; and all his friends and loved ones, we honor his legacy as a man who returned home to his roots and gave his all to serve his community and others.

HONORING GEORGE HYAK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CLOUD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLOUD. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor George Hyak, a native of Victoria, Texas, who passed away on May 4, at the age of 104 years.

George's 104 years marked a life well lived. He was a wonderful man whose life truly emulated the values of faith, family, and freedom that built the American miracle.

Growing up in the family grocery store business, George learned early the value of hard work and the importance of family. These values guided him throughout his long life.

When his country called, George answered the call without hesitation and served in some of the most significant battles of World War II, including D-Day, the Battle of the Bulge, and the Ardennes campaign.

It is because of the bravery of men like George that we enjoy the freedoms we do today.

After returning home from the war, George continued his journey and became an entrepreneur, where his work ethic and dedication helped him to grow a successful local business.

He was always ready to give back to the community and even served as a volunteer firefighter, but it was at home where George truly thrived and where he built his beautiful family with his devoted wife of 75 years. He loved nothing more than spending time with his children, grandchildren, great-grandchildren, and even great-great-grandchildren.

Quite the storyteller, those closest to him tell of him captivating family and friends with tales of those significant battle campaigns that he was in.

Faith was the key central focus to George's life. Oftentimes George's powerful voice could be heard singing hymns loudly in worship, praising the Lord with all his heart. This faith guided him, giving him strength and comfort his whole life.

As we look back on George's life, we are reminded of the profound impact one person can have on a family, a community, and a nation. George's life is a testament to service, love, and faith, and he lived fully, loved deeply, and served honorably.

As we honor him today, let's remember the legacy that he left and strive to live with the same courage, dedication, and love that he showed every day of his 104 years.

HONORING OFFICER KYLE HICKS

Mr. CLOUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Officer Kyle Hicks of the Corpus Christi Police Department who tragically died in the line of duty on April 24, 2024.

Kyle was a dedicated husband, father, and public servant to all who knew him. He was known for his selflessness, steadfast integrity, and tireless commitment to his community.

Kyle was 12 years old when he became a Texan. He graduated from Grace Preparatory Academy in Arlington, marking the start of a life devoted to public service and dedication to others.

Family was central to Kyle's life. In his early years as an employee of Chick-fil-A, he met his future wife, Cassie, whom he married in Arlington, and they soon became proud parents of four.

It didn't take long for Kyle and Cassie to pursue public service as a family. Even after being promoted to general manager at Chick-fil-A, Kyle decided to follow his dream to serve and protect his community, and in January of 2023, he graduated from the police academy to become an officer

with the Corpus Christi Police Department.

As an officer, Kyle Hicks was beloved by his colleagues. He was known for his quiet strength, his unique sense of humor, and his unwavering integrity.

Throughout his career as a police officer, Kyle devoted himself entirely to the safety and well-being of our families and our community, serving to make Corpus Christi a better and safer place for everyone.

As we grieve his loss, we take comfort in knowing that he lived a life of profound purpose. His sacrifice is a testament to the courage and dedication of our law enforcement officers, inspiring all of us to honor his memory through our commitment to service.

John 15:13 says this: Greater love has no man than to lay down his life for his friends.

It is humbling to think that we get to enjoy the blessings of liberty because of people like Kyle who have committed their life to service.

May God bring comfort to his loved ones and grant them His peace which surpasses all understanding during this very difficult time. Our prayers are with them.

□ 1030

HONORING BARRY ROMO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GARCÍA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor my friend Barry Romo, who passed away earlier this month.

Barry was a decorated Vietnam veteran who, having seen the horrors of the U.S. role in Vietnam, became a leading organizer. He challenged the Pentagon and White House narratives about the conflict, and he organized actions on The National Mall, at the Supreme Court, and at Arlington National Cemetery to protest the war.

Barry was the national coordinator for Vietnam Veterans Against the War for more than 40 years. In that role, he advocated for greater healthcare coverage for veterans affected by Agent Orange and other toxins. His activism later extended to other social justice causes, like affordable housing, veterans homelessness prevention, and workplace fairness.

Barry was a longtime resident of the Logan Square neighborhood in Chicago, where he was a mentor to other veterans, as well. Our community will miss Barry.

Rest in peace.

SUPPORTING 2024 FARM BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CLOUD). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of the 2024 farm bill. The farm bill touches the lives of

every person in this country no matter who you are or where you are from—rural, urban, or suburban.

That is why it is such an honor to be the southern Illinois voice on the House Agriculture Committee. I have been given the opportunity to build an incredible relationship with our farmers across my district, and I have sought their input in traveling around to meet with them where they are at. Their feedback has been critical in this process.

For me, this farm bill is a partnership with my people. Farmers and producers in my district understand the positive impact the farm bill has on rural communities.

In southern Illinois, agriculture is our second largest employer, just behind Scott Air Force Base. I am proud to serve the 10,000 producers in one of the most diverse agricultural districts in this United States.

In addition to growing staples like corn and soybeans, we are also home to a variety of specialty crops, livestock, and dairy. While each one might be different, they all share the same goal: a strong farm safety net.

Our farmers produce the food, fuel, and fiber that this Nation runs on. They play an essential role in our communities. It is only right that we support them and have their backs in times of need. That is why the farm bill exists. It is not just written for good times. It is also written for the bad.

When your crops fail, the farm bill provides a safety net. When you need a loan to save a family farm, the farm bill ensures access to credit. When your community needs an updated water system, the farm bill secures that funding.

When your rural home lacks internet access, the farm bill bridges that gap for broadband service. When you need help feeding your family, the farm bill supports healthy nutrition programs to make sure Americans don't go to bed hungry.

The farm bill has always been a top priority for me. By reinforcing crop insurance and boosting commodity reference prices, we are supporting the agricultural industries on their worst days and investing in tomorrow. This is vitally important.

Another key priority of mine is ensuring farmers not only feed folks at home but around the world. My district is blessed to be located between the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers. We are strategically placed to export our commodities abroad. In 2022, Illinois exports for corn and soybean totaled over \$3.5 billion.

The MAP and FMD programs play a critical role in moving commodities from farmers' fields to foreign markets. However, these programs are often oversubscribed and underfunded, leaving producers at a competitive disadvantage on the global market. We need to bolster these programs, expand into new markets, and strengthen our trade relations.

Lastly, we need to establish guidelines for large solar panel projects that are eating up acre after acre of prime farmland. My constituents have had enough. We must give local communities a say in the approval process.

That is why I am pleased that my bill, the SOLAR Act, has been included in this legislation. We are giving producers the flexibility to use solar energy on their farms while setting guidelines for large projects.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to restate my support for the farm bill. The bill is a big win for our farmers. It will have a big impact across the country, and I urge my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee to support this bill as it moves through the markup process tomorrow. I hope it will receive strong support on the House floor, as well.

STORIES OF SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today during Military Appreciation Month and ahead of Memorial Day to recognize some of the many Virginians who have contributed to Virginia's proud legacy of military service and those who have paid the ultimate sacrifice.

Earlier this month, I reached out to families across the Seventh District asking them to share "Stories of Service," recognizing the unwavering courage and commitment of their loved ones who have answered the call to serve our country.

I am honored to work on behalf of so many military families and veterans, and I am grateful for the opportunity to stand here today to read some of the extraordinary stories I received.

Lisa Harms from Stafford County recognized her daughter, Second Lieutenant Sabrina Harms, who is currently serving in the U.S. Air Force.

A UVA alumna, granddaughter of World War II and Korean war veterans, and the niece of Vietnam and Persian war veterans, Sabrina is in her third year of medical school at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences and will graduate as a family medicine doctor next May to care for our servicemembers, veterans, and their families.

I thank Sabrina for her devotion to our country and fellow servicemembers. Lisa must be incredibly proud.

Bonnie, who lives in Stafford County, shared with me the story of her father, Jesse James Verling, a lifelong Orange County resident.

Mr. Verling never talked much of the details of his service in the Philippines and the European theater during World War II. However, following his passing, Bonnie opened his safe deposit box and discovered his military decorations, getting to understand more about her father's brave and dedicated service on behalf of our country.

Our Nation owes an immense debt of gratitude to every one of our neighbors who put on the uniform. I thank Bonnie for recognizing her father's service and allowing me the opportunity to do so in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

William Hosp from Prince William County shared his father's story of service. William Brokaw Hosp, Sr., served in the U.S. Army during World War II, having enlisted straight out of high school.

After seeing combat during the Battle of the Bulge, he was transferred to Okinawa following Germany's unconditional surrender. He ultimately served on both fronts of the war. His resolve, courage, and commitment to democracy are an inspiration. I am glad to have received his story and have the opportunity to recognize his service.

Stephen from Orange County recognized many members of his family who served to preserve the freedoms we enjoy as Americans: his father and two uncles who served during World War II, his brother who served in Vietnam, and his brother who served stateside as a member of the detail at Fort Myer responsible for interring the honored dead at Arlington National Cemetery.

Stephen wrote: "As they say, freedom isn't free, and we should all be thankful every day for those willing to pay the price."

I am grateful for Stephen's family's sacrifices on behalf of our country.

As we head toward Memorial Day weekend, we remember the Virginians who bravely defended and died for our country, Virginians like Second Lieutenant Leonard M. Cowherd III. Leonard's sister, Lauren Salinas, wrote to me about her brother's career in service.

After growing up in Culpeper County, Leonard graduated from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point in 2003, and he was deployed in early 2004. He was killed in action in Iraq on May 16, 2004. He is buried at Arlington National Cemetery.

Lauren wrote: "Twenty years have passed, but I remain grateful for the support and the love we still receive from many who knew Leonard in the community."

We will never forget the Virginians whose individual sacrifices allow us to enjoy the promises of freedom. My heart is with Leonard's family as they continue to hold his memory and spirit with them.

We honor every one of our neighbors who are serving or have served in the United States of America's uniform and those who have paid the ultimate sacrifice in defense of our freedoms.

This Memorial Day, I encourage all of my colleagues and all Americans across the country to reflect on the service and the sacrifice of the brave servicemembers—our neighbors, friends, and loved ones—who paid the heavy price of freedom as we remember those who never came home.

HONORING CENTENNIAL OF FOREIGN SERVICE

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 100th anniversary of the U.S. Foreign Service.

Over the past century, Foreign Service officers, many of whom call Virginia home, have worked tirelessly around the globe to help maintain the global leadership of the United States.

Throughout my career, I have had the privilege of working alongside many Foreign Service officers. These Americans display an unwavering commitment to our diplomacy and our national security.

As we celebrate 100 years of modern American diplomacy, let's pause to reflect on the invaluable contributions made by these public servants on behalf of our country, even while facing threats and working far from their hometowns and, oftentimes, their families.

I stand here today to express my profound gratitude to these officers, as well as to honor the hundreds of members of our Foreign Service who have given their lives in service abroad.

To recognize this important centennial, I encourage my colleagues to support the bill to mint a commemorative coin celebrating 100 years of the U.S. Foreign Service.

HONORING JACQUIE WALKER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor Jacquie Walker on her remarkable career after 40 years of service as an anchor and reporter for WIVB Channel 4 News in Buffalo.

Today, Jacquie steps away from the anchor desk for the last time. For decades, Jacquie Walker has been a trusted and beloved journalist tasked with delivering the very best news with joy and the very worst news with grace.

There is a reason she has been awarded an Emmy as well as the prestigious Silver Circle Award by the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences. Jacquie has also been inducted in the New York State Broadcasters Hall of Fame and the Buffalo Broadcasters Hall of Fame. These are a few of her awards and achievements. If I were to read the entire list, I would be here all day.

As she signs off today, western New York is losing a universally trusted voice delivering the news of the day to the Buffalo-Niagara region.

Jacquie is an immense talent who has helped to shape so many historical moments for our community. In fact, Jacquie is the longest tenured news anchor at one station in the history of the Buffalo media market. She leaves huge shoes to fill behind Channel 4's anchor desk tonight. She will be sorely missed.

Mr. Speaker, Jacquie's integrity, her commitment to excellence, and her dedication to her craft set a standard

for journalism that will continue to inspire future generations of reporters and anchors. As Jacquie Walker embarks on the new chapter of her life, I thank her for her immense contributions to our community.

HONORING JOHN MURPHY

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the career of John Murphy, the voice of the Buffalo Bills, who announced his retirement just a short time ago.

When you are from western New York, the Buffalo Bills are part of your DNA, and John Murphy was a fixture of the Bills' announce team for over 30 years.

John Murphy served side by side with the legendary Van Miller, and they embodied the spirit and passion of the Bills Mafia. As he steps away from his role as the voice of the Bills, we not only reflect on his career with immense gratitude but also celebrate the legacy he has left behind.

John's journey with the Bills began as a color analyst, but it was his last 19 years as the voice narrating every play that made him a household name. His voice became synonymous with Bills football, and the excitement and the authenticity John brought to the booth made it feel like you were right there on the sidelines with him.

We all have fond memories of listening to John. Whether it was describing a game-winning drive or a critical defensive stop, John captured every second of the drama, joy, and sometimes heartbreak that is Bills football.

I thank John Murphy on behalf of the Bills Mafia for his years of service. He is truly one of the greats, and we will miss hearing him each and every game day.

Go Bills.

□ 1045

HONORING THE CAREER OF JIM ZEHMER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the career of my good friend Jim Zehmer, who has dedicated 32 years of his life to keeping manufacturing jobs in Southern California.

Jim is retiring from his position as president of Toyota's first North American manufacturing facility in our community. Under his guidance, that manufacturing auto plant in Southern California is still there.

As a fellow Bruin, Jim started his career with the finance team in 1992. By working hard, he made his way up to management. His dedication and his efforts led to the manufacturing plant's success, and they recently celebrated 50 years of existence in Southern California.

Jim has also been a committed member of our community, serving on the boards of the Long Beach Chamber of Commerce, the California Conference

for Equality and Justice, and the Long Beach Ronald McDonald House.

I want to take this moment to thank Jim for his leadership, his dedication, and for always recognizing the backbone of America's manufacturing workers. Jim exemplifies the key values in our Southern California community.

I thank Jim very much and let me say to you: Week 5 will live forever.

1944 WATER TREATY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. DE LA CRUZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. De La CRUZ. Mr. Speaker, it was 9 months ago that I introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives expressing support for diplomatic action to ensure water deliveries from Mexico to the United States under the 1944 water treaty that is still in effect.

This resolution passed with bipartisan support, and still to this day, the Department of Agriculture, the IBWC, and senior leadership at the State Department have not been able to secure water for our south Texas farmers.

Mr. Speaker, you may ask: Well, what does this mean to us? What is the result of their lack of action?

Well, let me tell you what the result is: In south Texas, one of our largest employers, the Rio Grande Valley Sugar Growers, closed. That means job losses for 500 people. Just like those crops that have no water, 500 jobs in our district went to dust.

What is the bigger impact of that? The bigger impact of that is that we no longer have a sugar mill in Texas.

What does that mean to all Americans across this country? That means that we will now have to rely on other countries to supply that sugar that was being produced in south Texas. That means that we are more reliant on other countries when we in the United States have the capabilities and have the businesses to produce our own sugar.

It is simply unacceptable.

The situation continues to get worse. In fact, as of May 4, Mexico owes the United States more than 850,000 acre feet of water under this treaty.

In December, I had a call with Secretary Blinken, and I was left with the impression that he viewed this as just as important as we did in south Texas.

However, our attempts to have follow-up meetings with the Secretary have proven unsuccessful. I have called both the Secretary of State, Secretary Blinken, and I have talked to and called the U.S. Ambassador to Mexico to put pressure on Mexico. Our phone calls and our emails go unanswered. They are leaving south Texas farmers to fend for themselves.

What does that mean? That means that our citrus industry is now at risk of no longer being around. One day we will look at the citrus industry and we, too, may see them close their doors forever. It is simply unacceptable.

The lack of progress from this administration is an outrage to the men and women who are now out of work. It is an outrage to our farmers and our communities in south Texas who depend on these industries. This is an outrage to all Americans.

Food security is a matter of national security. I wish that Secretary Blinken, our Agriculture Secretary, and our U.S. Ambassador to Mexico were just as outraged as I am, just as outraged as the people of south Texas who have lost the sugar mill and who are watching the slow death of our citrus industry. I am encouraging Secretary Blinken, the U.S. Ambassador to Mexico, and the IBWC to start making this a priority.

I am working with the Appropriations Committee because I believe that if we cannot get our water, if we cannot save our citrus industry, if we cannot save the jobs that that industry allows, if we cannot save our farmers, then Mexico does not deserve to have any money appropriated to them.

I believe that we need to use every tool that we have available to force Mexico to abide by the treaty.

We want our water.

We demand our water.

National security is food security.

PSP AWARENESS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MALLIOTAKIS). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. WEXTON) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WEXTON. Madam Speaker, as you may know, last year I was diagnosed with progressive supranuclear palsy, or PSP. It is basically Parkinson's on steroids, and I don't recommend it. It has affected my ability to speak, so I am using this text-to-speech app to make it easier for you and our colleagues to hear and understand me.

I rise today in support of PSP Awareness Month. Over the past year, I have come to personally know how scary and devastating a condition PSP can be for those of us battling it and for those close to us who love us and want us to be well again.

Despite its life-changing impact on more than 30,000 Americans, PSP remains relatively unknown to the general public. I am on a mission to change that. For those of you who are not familiar, PSP is a neurodegenerative condition that occurs when a buildup of a protein called tau damages brain cells, particularly in the parts of the brain that control speech, balance, coordination, and eye movement.

With a rare disease like PSP, there is a lot of confusion about what it is and also what it is not.

As you have noticed, it has affected my mobility. In less than a year, I have gone from striding confidently into and around this Chamber to relying on my walker to get around.

PSP affects how loudly and clearly I can speak, which is not an ideal situation for a politician.

In conversation, I have asked people to just ask me to repeat myself if they can't understand me or find a quieter space to talk so I can be heard. I am grateful that I have received such accommodating support from my colleagues and the staff here in the House that allows me to use this text to speech technology to be able to participate in committee hearings and to speak on the floor.

PSP has no cure, and its cause is unknown. Some medications may help temporarily alleviate some symptoms, and an active lifestyle and physical therapies can help to slow its progress. Whatever your politics, when it comes to illness, progressive is not a good thing to be.

While I will never train for or compete in another triathlon, by working out regularly and doing physical therapy I have improved my posture and balance to help prevent falls, a common source of serious injury for people with PSP. I have a rescue inhaler and certain medications I can take immediately before social engagements that can help improve my affect and my speech.

While PSP has clearly taken a toll on my body, it has not affected who I am inside. My fellow women Members know I will still chime in on the group chat with a joke or barb, which do not need to be repeated on the House floor. I still keep my staff on their toes by riding down ramps around the Capitol complex on my walker as if they were mini roller coasters, and I am still just as dedicated to doing my job of serving my community in Congress as the very first day I got here.

I share the personal details of my journey with PSP not because I want to be told how inspiring I am or for you to feel sorry for me. I speak about what I am going through because there are tens of thousands of other Americans out there who are fighting the same battles I am, and many of their loved ones, colleagues, and neighbors are having similar struggles with how to deal with the rapid and scary changes happening to the person that they know and love.

They are likely spending months or even years going to doctor's appointment after doctor's appointment anxiously hoping for answers but are left with more questions because too few medical providers are familiar enough with PSP to know what telltale signs to look for and diagnose.

In fact, one of the most common ways to diagnose and to differentiate PSP from Parkinson's is signs of brain atrophy seen on an MRI scan which appears in the shape of a hummingbird. The hummingbird sign has become a symbol for PSP, which is why I will be wearing a PSP Awareness hummingbird pin today.

Raising awareness of PSP can mean a quicker, accurate diagnosis; the development of more effective treatments; and more time for those battling PSP to take on this disease with all the resources and support available.

I am determined to use my platform to raise awareness of what PSP is and the urgent need to do more to fight against it. I am proud that over 80 of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle have joined me on a resolution to recognize May as PSP Awareness Month.

I have also championed the National Plan to End Parkinson's Act that would help bring greater resources to discovering the causes, effective treatments, and a cure for Parkinson's and related parkinsonisms like my PSP. This bipartisan legislation passed the House last year with overwhelming bipartisan support, and I hope that the Senate will take it up very soon and send it to President Biden's desk.

Madam Speaker, I have spent my career uplifting the stories of those in need. I am committed to continuing that work now on behalf of the PSP community and making the most of this platform that I have for as long as I am able.

I urge my colleagues to join me this month to raise awareness of PSP and work together to fight this terrible disease.

DIRE SITUATION AT THE SOUTHERN BORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS. Madam Speaker, today I rise on behalf of my constituents in western North Carolina to highlight the dire situation at the southern border and to advocate for the enforcement of our Nation's immigration laws.

The Biden administration continues to break records and not in a good way.

The number of individuals on the terrorist watch list that were apprehended illegally crossing the southwest border increased 2,500 percent from fiscal year 2020 to fiscal year 2023, and a record-breaking 301,000 migrants were caught trying to illegally enter our country in the month of December alone.

Our country's border control agents are overwhelmed, and they are underfunded.

What has President Biden done? He has done nothing but open our southern border up to more illegal immigrants and chaos.

I went to the Tucson sector of the southern border last year to witness the crisis for myself. I saw millions of taxpayer dollars in the form of unused border wall materials rusting away in the hot Arizona sun.

□ 1100

Local law enforcement pointed out to me where the border wall ends at the top of a hill and shared how cartel members sit on the Mexico side of the mountain peak to serve as a lookout. These cartel members are able to see for miles and signal to illegal immigrants when the coast is clear so that

migrants can then flood our open border.

Many of the illegal immigrants trying to cross our border are military-aged men. They are not families and children. They are cartel members trying to smuggle fentanyl into our borders and cause harm to our communities. Local law enforcement shared how difficult it has been to step up when executives in the Federal Government refuse to prioritize our national security.

I sympathize with Cochise County law enforcement, and I think every law enforcement officer across this country can sympathize, too.

Sheriffs across this country have told me that they have asked to meet with Joe Biden to tell him firsthand of the problems that they are having and their request, for some reason, has not been granted. Why won't the President not meet with them? Is he afraid of the truth?

Since 2021, America has seen an unprecedented surge at our southern border. Customs and Border Patrol reports over 7.6 million encounters, and the Secretary of Homeland Security has affirmed more than 85 percent of the migrants caught illegally crossing our southern border are ultimately released back into the country. That is nearly 6.5 million migrants released into the interior of the United States by the Department of Homeland Security since January 2021.

Now, we have record levels of fentanyl flowing across our borders, courtesy of the Mexican cartels. Over 27,000 pounds were seized last year, and it is destroying the very fabric of our communities.

In 2022 alone, illicit opioids claimed the lives of 313 members of my district. That is 313 sets of mothers, fathers, sisters, brothers, friends, and loved ones gone due to drug trafficking promoted at our southern border and ignored by our country's President.

During my time in Congress, I have written, cosponsored, and helped pass legislation in the House to secure the southern border and end this administration's radical and dangerous border policies. I was proud to cosponsor and vote for H.R. 2, the Secure the Border Act over a year ago, last May.

Senate Democrats and President Biden could take real concrete steps to solve this migration crisis and to address everything from court backlogs to the trafficking of unaccompanied children if they would just get behind H.R. 2, but they haven't.

Why are Democrats so adamantly opposed to commonsense legislation to protect Americans and close our southern border once and for all? Instead of supporting the strongest border security package in American history, the Senate has proposed a do-nothing border bill that enriches criminal networks, uses taxpayer dollars to fund organizations that facilitate mass illegal immigration, and codifies Biden's open-border policies like catch and release.

As terrorists, drugs, and weapons flow freely into our country, I believe that we should be putting the American people first, not playing political patty-cake.

DEVELOPING A BIPARTISAN, COMPREHENSIVE, AND FISCALLY CONSERVATIVE FARM BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MANN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Madam Speaker, this is a week that farmers, ranchers, and agricultural producers in my State of Kansas have long awaited. The House Agriculture Committee will finally mark up a 5-year farm bill.

I will start by thanking Chairman G.T. THOMPSON for leading the committee and developing a bipartisan, comprehensive, fiscally conservative farm bill that gives our farmers, ranchers, and agricultural producers the certainty they deserve.

Around this time last year, the chairman and I hosted a farm bill listening session next to a wheat field in my district. We heard from 150 Kansans about their priorities for a farm bill. They were clear: They need a farm bill that gives them certainty as they work day in and day out to feed, clothe, and fuel the world. The Farm, Food, and National Security Act does just that.

This farm bill strengthens the farm safety net and protects crop insurance. Agricultural producers in Kansas understand firsthand how important that is. In February 2021, Kansas had 13 consecutive days of below-freezing temperatures, which is a 40-year record. Our producers worked around the clock to protect their cattle and ensure they survived. Just last summer, drought and market conditions in Kansas caused producers to abandon the highest number of acres of wheat since World War I. Wheat farmers have seen a 35 percent decrease in production in the last year as a result.

Madam Speaker, the reality is Mother Nature is a very difficult business partner. One bad crop year could put the livelihood of our producers and their families at risk. This farm bill gives these hardworking individuals more certainty by strengthening the farm safety net, adjusting reference prices, and modernizing the Livestock Indemnity program, dairy supports, and Conservation Reserve Program.

The committee's farm bill also maintains American food independence and invests tax dollars in places we can see a return on those dollars. America is the freest country in the world, in part because we have never had to rely on another country to feed us. At the heart of that independence is agricultural research and innovation.

The Big First is home to some of the crown jewels of the animal health corridor: Kansas State University and the National Bio and Agro-Defense facility. These institutions give the Nation a scientific hub of world-renowned re-

search. Kansas State University is conducting groundbreaking research into areas, including new heat-tolerant wheat varieties and higher yielding sorghum. The U.S. Department of Agriculture's state-of-the-art NBAF in Manhattan will conduct research into serious animal disease threats to be an important backstop in protecting our Nation's food supply. This work, and America's continued ability to feed ourselves for generations to come, depend on a 5-year farm bill that prioritizes food security as national security.

Madam Speaker, this farm bill makes robust investments in the Market Access Program and Foreign Market Development programs that ensure our American producers remain in the international marketplace. It proactively addresses issues like deferred maintenance costs at land-grant institutions and the country's veterinarian shortage before that problem gets even worse.

I have been to this floor nearly 30 times to push for my priorities in this farm bill: to protect and strengthen crop insurance, to promote trade programs that help America remain competitive and secure, conduct rigorous oversight of the executive branch to fight Big Government overreach, and invest in agricultural research at America's land-grant universities. I am pleased that the Farm, Food, and National Security Act does just that.

We need to pass a 5-year fiscally conservative farm bill that is long enough to provide certainty and short enough for Congress to respond to market changes. Farm bills feed every corner of the Nation from New England to the islands of Hawaii, both our coasts, down to the Gulf, and even the heartland of this country, including Kansas. American agricultural producers and consumers are counting on it. The legislation we mark up this week will have ripple effects for years to come. This body and Congress must use this legislation to address the concerns we have all heard over the last several years.

When we kicked off our farm bill listening session last year, there were three combines parked behind us: John Deere, Case, and Gleaner.

When you grow up on a farm, you are born into loyalty to one of these trusted American brands. They have different styles and features, but they are all designed to do the same thing: harvest. Our listening session that day and the bill that House Agriculture marks up this week are no different. We all have different priorities and backgrounds, but we are all here to do the same thing: harvest, work hard, and effectively churn out a product, the farm bill.

America's farmers, ranchers, and ag producers deserve it, America's food and national security depend on it, and Congress must deliver it.

This farm bill is something our ag community can be proud of. It puts

dollars in places where Americans can see a good return on their investment. It tightens budgets and reins in reckless spending that doesn't serve taxpayers. Most importantly, this bill ensures that American farmers, ranchers, and ag producers can continue to keep us all fueled, fed, and clothed. The Farm, Food, and National Security Act is the first step in the right direction, and I look forward to this week's markup.

REMEMBERING U.S. AIR FORCE LIEUTENANT GENERAL EUGENE D. SANTARELLI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. CISCOMANI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CISCOMANI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember U.S. Air Force Lieutenant General Eugene D. Santarelli, who passed away on September 21, 2023, at 79 years old.

Lieutenant General Santarelli was a highly decorated three-star general who commenced his military career following his graduation from the University of Notre Dame in 1966.

A remarkable pilot, instructor, and mentor, he was qualified in and flew a dozen different aircraft types. Over the course of his career, he accumulated approximately 3,600 flying hours, including 901 combat hours.

He commanded a numbered air force, an air division, and three flying wings in his 32-year career. General Santarelli is survived by his spouse, Kay Santarelli; sister, Paula Anthony; and brother, Francis.

His dedication and service to our country did not go unnoticed. During his lifetime, he was awarded the Legion of Merit, Distinguished Flying Cross with Valor, Meritorious Service Medal, Air Medals, Aerial Achievement Medal, Air Force Commendation Medal, and Combat Readiness Medal.

General Santarelli was at his best when teaching, mentoring, or leading through his own example. In the hearts of the Tucson community and AZ-06, Lieutenant General Santarelli remains a true hero. We extend our gratitude for his dedicated service and are eternally thankful for all his contributions.

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA'S WILDCATS FOR PAC-12 CONFERENCE CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. CISCOMANI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the University of Arizona baseball team for clinching the PAC-12 conference championship after defeating Oregon State.

The Wildcats lost their first two games and were in a must-win game on Saturday night. In Arizona fashion, they had a walk-off double, scoring two runs and winning the game, 4-3.

Head Coach Chip Hale has a current season record of 33 wins and 20 losses and conference record of 20 wins, 10 losses. He is the first coach in conference history to be named PAC-12 Player and Coach of the Year.

I met Coach Hale a year ago at Hi-Corbett Field and know that he will continue to do great things for this program.

As a former Wildcat, I know he has what it takes to take this team to the college world series.

Lastly, I recognize Dawson Netz, a former intern in my Tucson district office, who is a team captain and pitcher. He was voted PAC-12 Preseason All-Conference player and is currently eight games away from being the all-time leader in appearances for Arizona baseball. I am excited to see what the future holds for these athletes and wish them good luck in the PAC-12 tournament. Bear down.

HONORING TALENTED ART STUDENTS FROM
COCHISE COLLEGE

Mr. CISCOMANI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize a group of talented Cochise College art students for the mural they painted in the city of Sierra Vista.

The mural depicts the beauty of the San Pedro River and the wildlife in Cochise County, serving as a reminder of our connection to nature and the need to steward it wisely.

Through its Neighborhood Partnership Initiative Grant program, the city of Sierra Vista provides funding for projects like the mural and inspires community members to help beautify the city. The mural, which wraps around the Oscar Yrun Community Center, is a passion project of Cochise College art instructor JenMarie Zeleznak and her students and is a testament to the creativity of our Sierra Vista community.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. Zeleznak and her students for their work and for making Sierra Vista an even more beautiful city.

□ 1115

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE
OF LEE COVINO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MALLIOTAKIS) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the life of Lee Covino, a friend, a U.S. Army veteran, and a Staten Islander who dedicated his life to making our country and community a better place for those who served.

Lee served our country in the U.S. Army during the Vietnam war. After his service, he attended the College of Staten Island on scholarship from the GI Bill. It was here that his passion for veterans' affairs flourished. He became a peer counselor for local veterans and, almost a decade later, began working as an intervention counselor for the VA's Vietnam Veterans Outreach Center, assisting nearly 1,000 Vietnam-era and combat veterans across Staten Island and Brooklyn.

In July 1990, Lee was appointed to the cabinet of Staten Island Borough President Guy Molinari, where he

served as the veteran affairs adviser and director of contracts and procurement. His service to our borough continued for another two decades, extending his tenure at Staten Island Borough Hall through the administrations of James Molinaro and James Oddo until his retirement in March 2014.

In 2002, Mayor Michael Bloomberg appointed him to the city's Veterans Advisory Board, where he served until April 2015, retiring as the board's vice chairman.

During his time at the borough and city halls, Lee played a major role in bringing the vet center and the Veterans Affairs clinic to Staten Island and obtaining a Staten Island bus link to Brooklyn's VA Medical Center.

This week, New York City also will celebrate its 36th annual Fleet Week, a show of appreciation for our Nation's Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard teams. Lee was instrumental in helping coordinate local activities and events for this grand recognition of our Armed Forces. He also worked tirelessly to expand veteran services to minority-based areas and assist veterans with resume development and learning computer skills so that they could find employment and readjust to civilian life.

Lee's dedication to New York City veterans did not end with his official duties. After his retirement, he continued to serve as an invaluable resource for many elected officials, including myself, where he helped our office organize our veterans' roundtables and became reliable counsel for veteran-focused legislation and ideas.

Because of the profound impact he has had on our community, Lee was installed into the College of Staten Island Alumni Hall of Fame in 1989 and was set to be inducted into the New York State Veterans Hall of Fame later this year.

He was a member of the VFW, The American Legion, Vietnam Veterans of America, Catholic War Veterans, AMVETS, New York City Veterans Alliance, the 369th Veterans Association, and he served as treasurer of the United Staten Island Veterans Organization, which sponsored our borough's annual Memorial Day parade.

Here we are at the Staten Island Memorial Day parade in 2021, which Mayor de Blasio had originally canceled, citing COVID, until Lee's advocacy and leadership made the mayor reverse his decision, and we marched together honoring our fallen.

On Monday, Memorial Day, we, the community, will march again, and Lee's absence will be noticed and his presence immensely missed.

Lee was a true American patriot who dedicated his entire life to the service of others, and I know I speak for our entire community and city when I say his commitment to fighting for our veterans is extremely appreciated.

My office sends its deepest condolences to his daughter, Mariel, and three grandchildren, Melina, Michael, and Samantha, as they grieve this tre-

mendous loss. They should rest assured that, today, they are in the history books of the United States Congress and that his legacy of service and dedication will inspire us all as we continue to advocate for the rights and well-being of our veterans.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF BILL
REYNOLDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MALLIOTAKIS). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MIKE GARCIA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a dear friend, a war veteran, and a real hero of California's 27th Congressional District who was taken from us way too soon. Mr. Bill Reynolds crossed into Heaven and joined the Lord on January 11, 2021, a couple of years ago.

As a young man, Bill crossed oceans and fought for this Nation in the jungles of Vietnam. He fought in some of the war's fiercest battles while in Vietnam, including the Mekong Delta, where he was wounded but continued fighting alongside his brothers, the famous and heroic Boys of '67.

Bill earned a Bronze Star and a Purple Heart for his extraordinary bravery, but he never forgot his brothers who made the ultimate sacrifice, those who didn't come home, and he never stopped serving our Nation when he returned home.

Bill Reynolds dedicated himself to fellow veterans in California's 27th Congressional District and around the country. His work led to the establishment of the Veterans Memorial Wall in Newhall, California, and he personally documented the stories of countless veterans to ensure their service and sacrifices will be remembered for future generations.

I am proud to say the endless service and sacrifice of Bill will now forever be etched in the heart of Santa Clarita, as well. Right in the middle of my district, today we celebrate the official renaming of the Valencia post office to the William L. Reynolds Post Office Building, an honor that has been signed into law by the President of the United States.

This commemoration is a fitting tribute to a man who dedicated so much of his life to this beautiful Nation, both on the battlefield and in our communities. It should be noted, and frankly a fitting tribute, that about 63,000 postal workers themselves are veterans, so this is very apropos.

Bill was a devoted husband to his beloved wife, Meg, who lives in Santa Clarita, a loving father and grandfather, and a friend to thousands. His legacy not only lives on in the medals he won and the landmarks that bear his name, but in the lives he touched and the community that he strengthened.

Bill left an indelible mark on me personally, and he continues to inspire me

to serve this beautiful country in this capacity.

In a time marked by stark political division, it was inspiring to witness both Democrats and Republicans unite in support of honoring this great man who epitomized the pinnacle of American valor and empathy.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring Bill Reynolds, a true American hero, by supporting this special tribute.

May God bless Bill Reynolds and his family, and may God continue to bless this beautiful country, the United States of America.

CELEBRATING MEMORIAL DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Memorial Day. Our Nation's greatness was earned by the sacrifices of a few so that freedom and liberty would come to all. This weekend, we remember their sacrifices and service.

We are very proud that the tradition of Memorial Day originated in a Pennsylvania community located in my district, Boalsburg, Pennsylvania.

Dating back to 1864 in Boalsburg, Pennsylvania, the birthplace of Memorial Day, three ladies decorated the graves of fallen Civil War soldiers. They met in the graveyard and promised to come back the following year to do the same thing. From that simple beginning act of love and remembrance came the observance of Memorial Day.

Now, every year, on the last Monday of May, the people across this Nation gather in town squares, at memorials, and in the cemeteries of fallen heroes to pay tribute to those who gave their all. This includes our servicemembers who are missing in action or are prisoners of war.

According to the Defense POW/MIA Accounting Agency, more than 80,000 American citizens who served in the Vietnam war, Korean war, and World War II are still missing in action.

That is why I am proud to have introduced H. Con. Res. 64, which urges our mutually beneficial trade agreements to include a commitment from trading partners to continue search and recovery efforts of our Nation's missing servicemembers.

In August 2023, I was notified by the POW/MIA Accounting Agency that two MIAs from my district were identified and returning home. Army Corporal Francis James Jury of Clearfield, Pennsylvania, and Army Sergeant Richard M. Sharrow of Marienville, Pennsylvania, were deemed missing in action during the Korean war. Thanks to the hard work and dedication of the POW/MIA Accounting Agency, these two heroes were able to be returned home and receive the proper burial that they deserved.

This Nation is united by our liberties and freedoms that our men and women

in uniform take an oath to protect and defend. We will always honor our brothers and sisters who fought in battle to uphold our way of life.

May God carry them in the palm of His hand and all of our servicemembers in the palm of His hand.

This Memorial Day, as we raise the Stars and Stripes, as we lay wreaths at monuments, memorials, and cemeteries, let us remember that our freedom is thanks to those who served and died in sacrifice.

PROTESTS AT UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN AT MILWAUKEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I would like to comment on a controversy affecting the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee this past week.

Wisconsin at Milwaukee, like many universities in America, has been the site of bizarre protests in favor of Hamas. Milwaukee is the second largest university in the State of Wisconsin. While the response to these protests by universities around the country can best be described as pathetic, Milwaukee is one of the worst.

Israel has suffered an attack almost unprecedented in its brutality in which Hamas and its supporters reveled in the horrific deaths of civilians, including young children. Israel's response can best be described as very measured, particularly given that Hamas has decided to hide among hospitals and other civilian locations.

Certainly, Israel's response was more measured than our response during World War II when you look at what was done to Tokyo and Dresden, so by comparison, there is no comparison.

Hamas could end this war tomorrow if they would surrender, show Israel its tunnels and its arms, and surrender the hostages. They are entirely responsible for allowing this war to go on.

The university's statement to the protesters appears to blame Israel. Even before the October attacks, it should have been obvious who wears the white hats here.

Israel is a modern, prosperous, and tolerant country in which even Muslims can build mosques and are allowed to vote. In Gaza, from childhood on, children are raised to hate Jews. People from Thailand, the Philippines, and Latin America—non-Jewish people—flow to Israel to live and work there.

Hamas' leadership, meanwhile, takes their foreign aid from Europe and lives in Qatar and Turkiye. The descendants of Yasser Arafat himself don't want to live in Gaza. They live in Paris.

Even with this, UWM feels they should side with Hamas. The university has tried recently to amend their position, but they still display a moral equivalence in which they can't bring themselves to say there is a right and

a wrong, a good and an evil, in this conflict. Their bias shows further in that their first impulse was to meet only with representatives of the protesters and not with the broader community, this despite the fact that public opinion polls consistently show the American public as a whole, including presumably the taxpayers who fund the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee, have no problem figuring out who is good and who is evil.

The university should apologize for developing their own foreign policy and spend some time with the broader community to learn what the vast majority of Americans and Wisconsinites think.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 27 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Immortal and invisible God, all power belongs to You. Gracious and merciful God, in You is found unending love.

With You, O Lord, are not competing natures but the whole of life. In You we discover both tenderness and strength. You love us with a parent's compassion and guide us with Your firm hand.

In our lives may we learn to strike the balance between patience and persistence. May we show no ill will toward others but have the wherewithal to bear their criticism and their ridicule. And when our anger is justified, may we be just as quick to forgive those who repent of their offenses.

May those who are strong bear the feelings of the weak, and may those who are vulnerable bear witness to the strength of their empathy.

In this body may we acknowledge that we belong to one another and reconcile with those who attempt to dismantle our mutual purpose. In You, may we strive for restoration, encourage one another, be of one mind, and live in peace.

God of justice and mercy, abide with us this day. In the power and love of Your eternal name, we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the

last day's proceedings and announces to the House the approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. TAKANO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

FARM BILL

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, farming is more than a profession. It is the true cornerstone of American society. Moreover, no group has had a more significant impact on the evolution of modern society than our hardworking farmers. From the earliest days of our Nation's founding, the work ethic and devotion of our producers is what pushed us forward.

Before the sun rises, our Nation's farmers, ranchers, and foresters have already been hard at work for hours tending to their fields and caring for their livestock. Providing for our families goes beyond putting food on our tables. It includes clothes on our backs, heat in our homes, and fuel for our vehicles.

With each harvest, our farm families ensure that America and the world has access to a safe and abundant food supply.

American agriculture remains America's backbone, and we must support the families who give us so much by passing an effective 5-year farm bill.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL R. MCCORMICK

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Michael R. McCormick, the remarkable superintendent of the Val Verde Unified School District, as he embarks on a well-deserved journey into retirement.

With over 27 years of dedicated service to the field of education, Michael McCormick's career has been defined by an unwavering commitment to fos-

tering educational excellence and nurturing innovation.

Before assuming the role of superintendent, Mr. MCCORMICK served as the assistant superintendent for education services at Val Verde. Under his stewardship, the district earned numerous awards and accolades owing to his thoughtful and diligent focus that put students first.

From championing STEM education to striving to close the racial education gap for his students, Val Verde has thrived under his guidance. Superintendent Michael McCormick's dedication to education has left an enduring legacy of inspiration and empowerment.

I congratulate Mr. MCCORMICK on his retirement. We thank him for his tireless commitment to excellence in education.

REMOVAL OF KLAMATH DAMS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, in my district in northern California there is this catastrophic removal and destruction of the Klamath dams. These are hydroelectric dams that provide clean, CO₂-free power for about 70,000 homes. It is reducing the renewable grid that everybody seems to want, eliminating recreational assets, hurting property values, damaging the local economy, and making it tougher on agriculture in the Klamath Basin.

Mr. Speaker, many of these products right here that are grown in California, 90 to 99 percent of what America relies upon. Even 100 percent of some of those same crops are grown in the Klamath Basin. They won't be able to do that much longer if they keep tearing down our infrastructure and taking water away.

The removal of these dams currently has released many millions of cubic yards of accumulated silt which has ruined the water quality and killed hundreds of thousands of fish and their spawning beds that they have laid new smelts in.

We have seen even full-sized deer getting stuck and dying in the mud. The Governors of California and Oregon seem willing to ignore these because they think it is a win to tear out the dams.

Local farmers, again, are suffering. The project borrowed water from the dams to extend irrigation systems. We won't have that flexibility anymore with that out. We won't be able to grow some of these crops that Americans enjoy and rely upon.

We have this devastation going on all in the name of the environment and all in the name of saving some fish, and in the meantime they have destroyed and killed hundreds of thousands of fish and will continue to do so with this reckless dam removal that won't end here. It will keep going. We will have

less hydroelectric power, less stored water, and less recreation with this crazy type of thinking.

ISRAELI HOSTAGE FAMILY

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

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, 228 days. That is how long it has been since scores of people were violated, maimed, tortured, and killed in Israel.

It has been 228 days since 252 people, including children and the elderly, were abducted from Israel into Gaza.

Yesterday, I met with four of their families, Alex Danzig, a 75-year-old, was taken from Kibbutz Nir Oz. He spent the last 30 years working at Yad Vashem, Israel's Holocaust remembrance center, educating about the lessons of World War II.

Ohad Ben Ami, a dual Israeli-German citizen, was kidnapped from Kibbutz Be'eri. Ohad's daughter showed me one of the last photos she has of him which depicts him being dragged into a van by a terrorist.

Shaked Dahan, whose dog tag I wear in his honor, was a 19-year-old IDF soldier killed on October 7. Footage of his lifeless body being dragged from the tank he drove was shown to me by his family. His body was taken to Gaza, and his family prays for its return so they can give him a proper burial.

Matan Angrest, a 21-year-old IDF soldier, also abducted, status unknown, is believed to be alive. He shares a November 28 birthday with his younger sister. This past year was the first time they had ever marked their birthday apart.

Mr. Speaker, it has been 228 excruciating days for these families. We must not forget them. Until they are released, I will keep saying their names and standing with their families.

NATIONAL EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES WEEK

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

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate National Emergency Medical Services Week and honor the EMS professionals and paramedics who provide lifesaving care across the Nation every day.

EMS professionals like Nick Oleck, chief of Scott County EMS in my home State of Indiana. Ever since he started serving in Scott County more than a decade ago, Nick and his team have turned around the Emergency Medical Services department, and it is now self-funded, saving taxpayer money while also saving lives.

This can be a heart-wrenching line of work. Last year, Nick suddenly lost a friend and colleague, and yet still he perseveres. While suffering through his

own grief, he continues to respond to calls for service. Nick has also started a community paramedic program to train future EMS personnel. He is an outstanding medic and an exemplar of the EMS profession.

This week we celebrate every EMS professional across the country as they contend for our communities whenever emergencies happen.

ARIZONANS ARE SUFFERING FROM RADIATION EXPOSURE

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

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, in the mid-20th century, the United States Government conducted nuclear weapons development tests in the Southwest, exposing thousands of Arizonans downwind of the test site to ionized radiation from the fallout.

Women, men, and children were diagnosed with terrible cancers from the radiation exposure, and many tragically lost their lives.

Nearly 25 years ago, Congress attempted to make amends by passing the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act, but without congressional action, RECA is set to expire next month, denying Arizona families the compensation they need to pay for healthcare treatments.

The House has an opportunity to act right now to correct this injustice. More than 2 months ago, the Senate overwhelmingly passed the bipartisan RECA Reauthorization Act, a 5-year extension of the program.

It mirrors my Downwinders Parity Act by expanding the scope of the RECA's coverage to Arizonans in lower Mohave County who were previously denied compensation.

For too long, these downwinders have been left behind and overlooked. I urge my colleagues to give these people the justice they deserve and put this bill to a vote.

HONORING FALLEN SERVICEMEMBERS MEMORIAL

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

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize all men and women in uniform who have made the ultimate sacrifice for our Nation.

Since our Nation's founding via the Revolutionary War, more than 1 million Americans have given their lives to protect the freedoms that we hold dear today.

Every fallen member of the armed services and their families deserve our deepest expression of gratitude, not only on Memorial Day, but every day.

The words of Jesus Christ in John 15:12-13 apply to these heroes most deserving of remembrance, when He said: This is My commandment, that you love one another as I have loved you.

Greater love has no one than this, that someone lay down his life for his friends.

As we reflect upon the ultimate sacrifice of more than 1 million American servicemembers this Memorial Day, may we also remember the family and friends they left behind.

Their pain and grief are unimaginable, tempered only by the joy of their memories and the knowledge that they gave their lives in service to the greatest country the world has ever known.

I join other Americans in offering them my prayers and heartfelt appreciation. May God bless them, and may God continue to bless the United States of America.

RECOGNIZING 100 YEARS OF ROCKINGHAM COUNTY BASEBALL LEAGUE

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

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Rockingham County Baseball League as they celebrate 100 years of America's favorite pastime.

Founded in 1924, the Rockingham County Baseball League is the second oldest continuously operating league in the United States. J.R. "Polly" Lineweaver, a sportswriter for the Daily News-Record, helped organize the league. This effort brought players together from seven communities across Rockingham County in both spirit and game, with a consistent schedule and designated rules. From there, the league would go to include teams up and down the Shenandoah Valley.

The league has a rich history. It survived the Great Depression, World War II, and integrated with African-American players in the 1950s. RCBL boasts players who went on to play in Major League Baseball and even the National Basketball Association. Today its fields remain a welcoming place that brings athletes together.

Recently, the league's storied history and many accomplishments were highlighted in a new exhibit at the Rocktown History Museum in Dayton. It calls attention to the hard work of players, coaches, fans, and other community members who have shown care toward each other through the common love of baseball.

I congratulate RCBL on the many wonderful seasons they have enjoyed over the last century, and I wish them many more to come.

□ 1215

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4763, FINANCIAL INNOVATION AND TECHNOLOGY FOR THE 21ST CENTURY ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5403, CBDC ANTI-SURVEILLANCE STATE ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 192, PROHIBITING VOTING BY NONCITIZENS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ELECTIONS

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1243 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1243

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4763) to provide for a system of regulation of digital assets by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendments in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committees on Agriculture and Financial Services now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-33, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5403) to amend the

Federal Reserve Act to prohibit the Federal reserve banks from offering certain products or services directly to an individual, to prohibit the use of central bank digital currency for monetary policy, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 192) to prohibit individuals who are not citizens of the United States from voting in elections in the District of Columbia. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Accountability now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Indiana is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, last night, the Rules Committee met and produced a rule, House Resolution 1243, providing for the House's consideration of several pieces of legislation.

The rule provides for H.R. 4763, the Financial Innovation and Technology for the 21st Century Act, to be considered under a structured rule. It provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their designees and provides for one motion to recommit.

Additionally, the rule also provides for H.R. 5403, the CBDC Anti-Surveillance State Act. H.R. 5403 would be considered under a structured rule, and it also provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their designees and provides for one motion to recommit.

Finally, the rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 192, a bill which would prohibit noncitizens from voting in elections in the District of Columbia, to be considered under a closed rule. It also provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability or their designees and provides for one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of the underlying pieces of legislation beginning with H.R. 4763, the Financial Innovation and Technology for the 21st Century Act, or FIT21.

Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the rule provides for consideration of this legislation. As a member of the Financial Service Committee, we have spent countless hours trying to develop a responsible regulatory structure for blockchain technology and digital assets.

These conversations have become increasingly necessary as regulators like the Securities and Exchange Commission have failed. Instead of developing a targeted and purposeful framework that would promote innovation and protect consumers, they have led with regulation by enforcement action.

This approach threatens the United States' leadership in the future of digital assets, a future that could better protect privacy, reduce business costs, and empower more Americans.

This flawed approach by the SEC has required congressional action, and FIT21 is the joint response of the Financial Services Committee and the Agriculture Committee. FIT21 establishes a framework consistent with existing law but also appropriate for the

digital assets in question and their unique characteristics.

First, there is no current clear market structure for the regulation of digital assets in the United States. The SEC has merely been regulating by enforcement action.

This leaves digital asset innovators and consumers to play a guessing game. This not only stifles innovation but lends itself to the SEC picking winners and losers.

Meanwhile, there is currently no way for digital asset commodities to be registered or regulated by the CFTC. Chair Gensler has repeatedly said most digital assets are securities. However, by his own admission, we know that not all digital are securities. In fact, it is estimated that 70 percent or more are commodities.

This is among the most important reasons for the passage of FIT21. The SEC does not regulate commodities. It regulates securities. The CFTC does not regulate securities. It regulates commodities. The advent of digital assets, which can be either securities or commodities, has created a regulatory black hole that FIT21 seeks to remedy.

By defining digital asset commodities and securities and creating a clear regulatory market structure, FIT21 protects consumers and provides the regulatory clarity for digital asset developers to innovate.

The framework offered by FIT21 will give clear guidance to regulators and thus allow consumers to better judge digital assets for themselves, avoid scams, reduce instances of data theft, and lessen the potential for market manipulation.

FIT21 is good for our constituents and good for the country. Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of us to support this important legislation.

Moving on to H.R. 5403, the CBDC Anti-Surveillance State Act, I am proud of H.R. 5403 because I share the concerns of many of my colleagues about the consequences of a Federal Reserve Bank digital currency and what that could mean for our constituents and their privacy.

If issued, a government-controlled CBDC, central bank digital currency, would give Federal bureaucrats the ability to track every transaction Americans make, as well as the ability to block any transaction they so choose. This would be an unprecedented level of surveillance on the daily lives of everyday Americans, and we should all be concerned about the potential threats to individual rights and privacy.

A CBDC would give the government the power to shut off access to payments and freeze the bank accounts of law-abiding citizens and institutions for political reasons, just like we saw with the Canadian trucker protest or with Operation Choke Point.

Mr. Speaker, I hope all of my colleagues will join me in standing against the creation of a central bank digital currency by supporting this bill.

Finally, this rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 192, a bill which would prohibit noncitizens from voting in elections in the District of Columbia.

Americans are rightly concerned with election integrity. Free and fair elections are essential to any democracy. We all agree on that.

What we should also agree on is that noncitizens voting in elections undermines confidence in elections.

That is why the District of Columbia's Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act is so objectionable. It allows noncitizens to vote in D.C. elections, including illegal immigrants and foreign agents.

It goes without saying that these individuals, in particular, have interests that are at odds with our own. They literally represent the interests of other countries, including countries hostile to the United States. Why would we want to allow Russia or China or any foreign agent to vote on policies that impact the U.S. Capital? It defies logic, but that is exactly what D.C. has aspired to do.

My colleagues might ask why we even have an interest in the affairs of local laws in this respect. The answer is quite simple: D.C. has a unique and constitutional relationship with the United States Congress.

A lack of confidence in American elections anywhere threatens the confidence in American elections everywhere. It is incumbent upon us to protect the integrity of D.C. elections when the District's elected officials fail to do so and when they allow noncitizens and people with loyalty to other countries to vote.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to consideration of these three important pieces of legislation and urge the passage of this rule.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, there is really not much to say. If you were to listen to my friend on the other side, you would think these bills are going to change the world the second the ink dries, but they are not.

This is just another week of wasted time, more of the same from the Republican leadership here in Congress that is completely out of touch with what the American people actually care about.

H.R. 192 is another GOP attempt to meddle in D.C. politics. They spend more time worrying about Washington, D.C., than they do about their own constituents.

It is astounding to me that the party that claims to care about small government and local control wants to have the Federal Government tell local leaders here in D.C. how to run their local elections.

Apparently, they are all for local control unless it is local control by Democrats—in which case, never mind.

To hear anybody on the Republican side talk about election integrity is rich, especially from a party that is filled with election deniers.

We are also here to consider H.R. 4763, a bill that provides an upper hand to the crypto industry instead of meaningfully addressing gaps in digital asset regulation.

□ 1230

Finally, we will meet on H.R. 5403, a bill that prevents the U.S. from exploring digital currency. I know my friends on the other side of the aisle are afraid of innovation, but 130 countries representing 98 percent of global GDP are looking into digital currency. Maybe, just maybe, it is something we should look into as well.

Unfortunately, I think some of my friends on the other side want to go back to stone tablets. It is our job in Congress to address the privacy concerns, not to bury our heads in the sand and pretend like the world isn't moving forward.

Mr. Speaker, it is all stunts instead of solutions, extremism over bipartisanship, and it is really a shame. This narrow majority could have given us a chance to work together in a bipartisan way, but instead, my friends over on the other side of the aisle have pandered to their most extreme Members over and over and over again.

They let the extremists kick out their own Speaker. They let the extremists dictate the agenda on the House floor. They let the extremists take down seven rule votes since January 2023, a stunning indictment of their ability to get anything done.

Speaking of indictments, Republicans are skipping their real jobs to take day trips up to New York to try to undermine Donald Trump's criminal trial.

Republicans have no time to work with Democrats but plenty of time to put on weird matching cult uniforms and stand behind President Trump with their bright red ties like pathetic props.

Maybe they want to distract from the fact that their candidate for President has been indicted more times than he has been elected. Maybe they don't want to talk about the fact that the leader of their party is on trial for covering up hush-money payments to a porn star for political gain, not to mention three other criminal felony prosecutions he is facing.

Now, I understand why my Republican friends want to distract from Donald Trump.

They don't want to talk about how Trump had the worse jobs record since the Great Depression, how he sold out our allies and empowered our adversaries.

They bring silly things like this to the floor to deflect blame and distract from the fact that they have no real vi-

sion, just division, and no real plans to make life better for the American people.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward presumptive nominees for the Office of the President.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to note that the bury-the-head-in-the-sand approach is the very approach that Chairman Gensler has been taking with regard to the regulation of digital assets.

Our colleagues seem to be less concerned about getting a regulatory framework for consumer protection and are hurrying to put in a central bank digital currency for digital surveillance.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago, I was admonished for stating the simple fact that the former President was indicted by a Grand Jury and is on trial in a court of law. That is not my opinion. It is just the truth. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, has the Chair determined it is unparliamentary to state a fact?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is not in a position to determine the veracity of remarks made on the floor. Members must avoid personalities.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, that is unbelievable. Last week during debate, a Republican Member of this House said: "Watch the former President of the United States being hauled into court day after day with a sham trial." He wasn't admonished. I just referenced the same trial, and I was.

Mr. Speaker, I have to ask a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, is it correct that Members of Congress can mention the trial of the presumptive nominee for President, call it a sham and question the integrity of the judge, but a reference to the mere existence of that same trial without any characterization, that is out of order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not issue an advisory opinion.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I have one last parliamentary inquiry. Is this restriction originally founded at least in part on the principle in Jefferson's Manual that "in Parliament, to speak irreverently or seditiously against the king is against order," is that what this is about? I have Jefferson's Manual here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members must avoid personalities in debates. The Chair will direct Members

to rule XVII and section 370 of the House Rules and Manual.

Mr. MCGOVERN. So it is, in fact, based on what is in Jefferson's Manual.

Mr. Speaker, Donald Trump might want to be a king, but he is not a king. He is not a presumptive king. He is not even the President. He is a presumptive nominee. And I know you are trying to do your job and follow precedent, but frankly, at some point it is time for this body to recognize that there is no precedent for this situation.

* * *

Ms. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand that the words of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) be taken down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts will be seated.

□ 1330

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARL). The clerk will report the words.

The CLERK. We have a presumptive nominee for President facing 88 felony counts, and we are being prevented from even acknowledging it. These are not alternative facts. These are real facts.

A candidate for President of the United States is on trial for sending a hush money payment to a porn star to avoid a sex scandal during his 2016 campaign and then fraudulently disguising those payments in violation of the law.

He is also charged with conspiring to overturn the election. He is also charged with stealing classified information, and a jury has already found him liable for rape in a civil court.

Yet, in this Republican-controlled House, it is okay to talk about the trial, but you have to call it a sham. It is okay to say the jury is rigged but not that Trump should be held accountable. It is okay to say the court is corrupt but not Trump is corrupting the rule of law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The words of the gentleman from Massachusetts accuse a presumptive nominee for the Office of President of engaging in illegal activity.

Presumptive nominees for the Office of President are accorded the same treatment under the rules of decorum in debate as a sitting President. This practice is memorialized in section 370 of the House Rules and Manual. This is warranted even though a candidate may not have officially obtained the party's nomination once there is no reasonable dispute that the candidate will receive the nomination.

The Chair reaches this conclusion in part based on the statement of Speaker Wright of September 29, 1988. On that day, the Speaker made it clear that actual party nomination is not a prerequisite for treatment under the precedents as though a nominee. The Chair has admonished Members on this basis on numerous occasions and as recently as earlier today.

This standard entails an application of the strictures against personality to references to candidates under the rules of decorum in debate. Therefore, although remarks in debate may include criticism of such a candidate's official positions as a candidate, it is a breach of order to refer to the candidate in terms personally offensive, whether by actual accusation or by mere insinuation.

Also as stated in section 370 of the Manual, an accusation that the President has committed a crime, or even that the President has done something illegal, is not in order. The Chair relies on the precedents of March 19, 1998, and September 10, 1998, and finds that the remarks constitute a personality.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the offending words are stricken from the RECORD.

There was no objection.

□ 1345

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Indiana is recognized.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY).

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Indiana for yielding time. It is great to finally get to make a speech here.

Mr. Speaker, I am a strong supporter of the legislation being considered under the rule before us today, including the Central Bank Digital Currency Anti-Surveillance State Act, which will prohibit the Federal Reserve from pursuing a path that could jeopardize the financial freedoms and privacy of the American people.

Around the world, we are seeing authoritarian regimes embrace digital currencies, and why?

It is because it is a means to more effectively and tightly control their people.

That is why the Chinese Communist Party is actively developing a digital currency that will allow them to throttle the Chinese people's access to bank accounts and subject them to Orwellian social credit systems, among other forms of oppressive state control.

Yet, we have also seen freer democratic governments, not too different from our own, pursue policies in recent years to try and control their citizens' access to basic financial services, destroying their livelihoods in the process. In fact, it was our neighbors in Canada who recently shut down access to personal bank accounts of protesters who had the audacity to exercise their right to demonstrate in opposition to their government's draconian lockdowns and vaccine mandates.

Mr. Speaker, before coming to Congress, I joined our healthcare workers and others in the State of New York to protest against Governor Cuomo's oppressive COVID vaccine mandates that led to thousands of New Yorkers, including many frontline healthcare workers, losing their jobs.

With tools like digital currency at their disposal, it creates a new path-

way for the government to retaliate against those who speak up and voice a difference in opinion.

If they had that power back then, would they have used it?

Based on our experience with the Biden administration over the past 4 years and the weaponization of government agencies, I am not surprised that the American people can clearly see the danger here.

This administration with regulation after regulation and policy after policy has chipped away at the freedoms of the American people.

Under President Biden, everyday Americans are left wondering if they will be able to purchase a gas stove, drive an affordable car, do what they like with their private land, or even whether they can safely voice a conservative viewpoint without some form of reprisal from their government.

We cannot take for granted our rights as Americans, especially when we have an administration, captured and intimidated by the radical left, that has weaponized our Federal agencies against the freedoms of individuals as the Biden administration has done over the past 4 years.

The American people are sick and tired of giving up their freedoms and being spied on by our Federal Government. First, it was warrantless surveillance through FISA. Today, it is a government-controlled digital currency.

If we allow this dangerous trend to continue, what is next?

Mr. Speaker, we need to pass the underlying legislation to prevent any further pursuit of authoritarian policies like the creation of a centralized and controllable digital currency. Let's pass this rule and protect the financial privacy and the freedoms of the American people.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROSE).

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5403, the CBDC Anti-Surveillance State Act, a bill I was proud to cosponsor. I thank Majority Whip TOM EMMER and Chairman MCHENRY of the House Financial Services Committee for their work on this legislation to protect Americans' privacy and financial data.

A central bank digital currency, or CBDC, would have devastating consequences for the Fourth Amendment rights of all freedom-loving Americans. Just as we have seen the Federal Government weaponized against conservatives, whether it is the IRS, the DOJ, the FBI, or even the Fed, no three-letter government agency should be able to trample on our Constitution.

In 21st century America, the freedom to purchase goods and services necessary to care for and protect our families shouldn't be left up to the government. A CBDC is a slippery slope toward ceding that liberty.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this bill.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, Americans have always been a leader in innovation and technology, particularly in financial services. In order for this to remain the case, we must support regulatory structures that continue to foster that same innovative spirit without sacrificing privacy while providing necessary consumer protections and preserving market integrity.

Before us is the opportunity to move legislation that could have a positive effect on the everyday lives of all Americans.

H.R. 4763, the Financial Innovation and Technology for the 21st Century or FIT21, is a bill that delivers on all of these fronts for the future of digital assets here in the United States.

Speaking of protecting Americans, H.R. 5403, the Central Bank Digital Currency Anti-Surveillance State Act ensures that the government is never in a position to weaponize the financial system against the American people.

Innovation cannot come at the cost of sacrificing individual liberties. The issuance of a CBDC would only work to compromise Americans' rights and privacy.

Finally, H.R. 192 protects the integrity of American elections here in the District of Columbia, and we must prevent it. Congress must step in when local officials in the District fail to protect election integrity in this most basic sense. Noncitizens, including illegal immigrants and agents of foreign governments, must not have the ability to vote in American elections at any level anywhere. This is a basic issue of responsible governance.

To ensure government is responsive to and protective of the people it serves, elections must not include non-citizens or foreign actors.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to moving these bills out of the House this week, and I ask my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" on the previous question and "yes" on the rule.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YAKYM). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 205, nays 203, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 221]

YEAS—205

Aderholt Arrington Banks
Alford Babin Bean (FL)
Allen Bacon Bentz
Amodei Baird Bergman
Armstrong Balderson Bice

Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burchett
Burgess
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chavez-DeRemer
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Crane
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
D'Esposito
Davidson
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duarte
Duncan
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Foxy
Franklin, Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Gaetz
Garbarino
Garcia, Mike
Gimenez
Gonzales, Tony
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Graves (LA)

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amo
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragan
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bush
Caraveo
Carbajal
Cardenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu

Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Harshbarger
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Harris
Burgess
Hern
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Houchin
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kean (NJ)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langworthy
Latta
LaTurner
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lesko
Letlow
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luna
Luttrell
Mace
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McHenry
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Molinaro
Moolenaar

NAYS—203

Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Fletcher
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu

Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moran
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Obernolte
Ogles
Owens
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rogers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Strong
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dwyne
Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Robert
Cohen
Goldman (NY)
Correa
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Gotthelmer
Green, Al (TX)
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jacobs
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kamrager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer

Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nickel
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Pelosi
Peltola
Perez
Peters
Pettersten
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Ross
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan
Salinas
Sanchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozi
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill

NOT VOTING—22

Barr
Blumenauer
Evans
Ferguson
Granger
Grijalva
Hunt
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Landsman
Loudermilk
Magaziner
Massie
McCauley
Moore (WI)
Murphy
Nunn (IA)
Scalise
Smith (NJ)
Stansbury
Velázquez
Wilson (SC)

□ 1430

Mr. TORRES of New York, Mses. HOYLE of Oregon, and CRAIG changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. CARTER of Georgia and MCHENRY changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 204, noes 203, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 222]

AYES—204

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bean (FL)
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burchett
Burgess
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chavez-DeRemer
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Crane
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
D'Esposito
Davidson
De La Cruz
DesJarlais

Diaz-Balart Johnson (SD)
 Donalds Jordan
 Duarte Joyce (OH)
 Duncan Joyce (PA)
 Dunn (FL) Kean (NJ)
 Edwards Kelly (MS)
 Ellzey Kelly (PA)
 Emmer Kiggans (VA)
 Estes Kiley
 Ezell Kim (CA)
 Fallon Kustoff
 Feenstra LaHood
 Finstad LaLota
 Fischbach LaMalfa
 Fitzgerald Salazar
 Fitzpatrick Latta
 Fleischmann LaTurner
 Flood Lawler
 Foxx Lee (FL)
 Franklin, Scott Lesko
 Fry Letlow
 Fulcher Lucas
 Gaetz Luetkemeyer
 Garbarino Luna
 Garcia, Mike Mace
 Gimenez Malliotakis
 Gonzales, Tony Maloy
 Good (VA) Mann
 Mast Mast
 Gosar McCaul
 Graves (LA) McClain
 Graves (MO) McClintock
 Green (TN) McCormick
 Greene (GA) McHenry
 Griffith Meuser
 Grothman Miller (IL)
 Guest Miller (OH)
 Guthrie Miller (WV)
 Hageman Miller-Meeeks
 Harris Mills
 Harshbarger Molinaro
 Hern Moolenaar
 Higgins (LA) Mooney
 Hill Moore (AL)
 Hinson Moore (UT)
 Houchin Moran
 Hudson Nehls
 Huizenga Newhouse
 Issa Norman
 Jackson (TX) Obernolte
 James Ogles
 Johnson (LA) Owens

NOES—203

Adams Cuellar
 Aguilar Davids (KS)
 Allred Davis (IL)
 Amo Davis (NC)
 Auchincloss Dean (PA)
 Balint DeGette
 Barragan DeLauro
 Beatty DelBene
 Bera Deluzio
 Beyer DeSaulnier
 Bishop (GA) Dingell
 Blunt Rochester Doggett
 Bonamici Escobar
 Bowman Eshoo
 Boyle (PA) Espallat
 Brown Fletcher
 Brownley Foster
 Budzinski Foushee
 Bush Frankel, Lois
 Caraveo Frost
 Carbajal Gallego
 Cárdenas Garamendi
 Carson Garcia (IL)
 Carter (LA) Garcia (TX)
 Cartwright Garcia, Robert
 Casar Golden (ME)
 Case Goldman (NY)
 Casten Gomez
 Castor (FL) Gonzalez,
 Castro (TX) Vicente
 Cherfilus-Gottheimer
 McCormick Green, Al (TX)
 Chu Harder (CA)
 Clark (MA) Hayes
 Clarke (NY) Himes
 Cleaver Horsford
 Clyburn Houlihan
 Cohen Hoyer
 Connolly Hoyle (OR)
 Correa Huffman
 Costa Ivey
 Courtney Jackson (IL)
 Craig Jackson (NC)
 Crockett Jacobs
 Crow Jeffries

Omar Sarbanes
 Pallone Scanlon
 Panetta Schakowsky
 Pappas Schiff
 Posey Schneider
 Reschenthaler Pelosi
 Rodgers (WA) Peltola
 Rogers (AL) Scholten
 Rogers (KY) Schrier
 Rose Scott (VA)
 Rosendale Scott, David
 Rouzer Sewell
 Roy Sherman
 Rutherford Sherrill
 Salazar Slotkin
 Scott, Austin Smith (WA)
 Self Sorensen
 Sessions Soto
 Simpson Spanberger
 Smith (MO) Stanton
 Smith (NE) Stevens
 Smith (NJ) Strickland
 Smucker Ryan
 Luna Salinas
 Stauber Sanchez
 Steel

NOT VOTING—23

Alford Jayapal
 Blumenauer Lamborn
 Evans Landsman
 Ferguson Loudermilk
 Granger Luttrell
 Grijalva Magaziner
 Hunt Massie
 Jackson Lee Moore (WI)

□ 1443

So the resolution was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. YAKYM. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 222.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NUNN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, due to a natural disaster event in the district, I made an emergency trip back to Iowa to provide assistance to my constituents who have been left devastated by the tornado. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 221, ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 1243 and YEA on Roll Call No. 222, Adoption of H. Res. 1243.

FINANCIAL INNOVATION AND TECHNOLOGY FOR THE 21ST CENTURY ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill (H.R. 4763).

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1243 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4763.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. GUEST) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1448

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole

House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4763) to provide for a system of regulation of digital assets by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission, and for other purposes, with Mr. GUEST in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their respective designees.

The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, Congress will establish a new high-water mark for digital asset policy. To be clear, this joint effort between the Financial Services Committee and the Agriculture Committee did not come together overnight. Far from it. We formed subcommittees, convened working groups, heard from countless stakeholders, and received input from Members across the ideological spectrum in the House of Representatives.

Last July, we passed the bipartisan Financial Innovation and Technology for the 21st Century Act, FIT21, out of our respective committees. Each step in this process has created a new high-water mark.

The next step will be a broad bipartisan vote today to finally provide the robust consumer protections and clear regulatory framework established by this bill. FIT21 will cement the United States' global leadership in technological innovation, invention, and adoption.

Unfortunately, our current regulatory framework is preventing digital assets innovation from reaching its full potential. The SEC and the CFTC are currently in a food fight for control of these asset classes. They have created an impossible situation where the same firms are subject to competing and contradictory enforcement actions by the two different agencies, leaving consumers behind, leaving innovators behind.

FIT21 fixes this by creating a regulatory framework that will provide clear rules of the road and strong guardrails for Americans engaging with the digital asset ecosystem.

At its core, FIT21 applies time-tested consumer protections to ensure that the 20 percent of Americans who engage in the digital asset ecosystem can do so safely and so more Americans can engage, as well.

Today, we have the opportunity to answer the calls of consumers, digital asset innovators, and the Biden administration. We can establish the next

high-water mark for digital assets here in the United States.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support consumer protection, innovation, and American leadership by voting for FIT21, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 4763, which I am calling the not fit for purpose act.

This bill would deregulate a substantial portion of the crypto industry, taking them out of the purview of the Securities and Exchange Commission, or SEC. It would allow them to operate either under a lighter touch regulatory regime under the Commodity Futures Trading Commission or in what I have called a regulatory no-man's-land, with no primary regulator and virtually no regulations. For crypto that would remain under the SEC's purview, this bill still provides major exemptions from critical securities laws.

If this wasn't bad enough, this bill is not just about crypto. Language was added to the bill after it was marked up by the committees of jurisdiction that would allow even some traditional securities to also exist in this regulatory no-man's-land.

Specifically, I am referring to title II of the bill that defines the term "investment contract asset." Assets that fall under this definition are explicitly deemed not to be securities and, therefore, not under the SEC's purview, but the bill doesn't provide an alternative legal framework for these assets.

This represents an extreme MAGA, libertarian approach where companies can operate without regulatory scrutiny, and consumers and investors are on their own in detecting and avoiding fraudulent schemes.

While Republican defenders of this bill have argued that this definition of investment contract asset is limited to digital assets under the bill, this is disputed by legal experts and SEC Chair Gary Gensler himself, who confirmed in a recent statement regarding this bill that it would have a broader impact on traditional securities.

Interestingly, I didn't hear any arguments from the Republicans at the Rules Committee hearing disputing that this would, in fact, be a regulatory no-man's-land, even if they insist it is just for crypto.

Even for crypto that would be transferred over to the CFTC, I have serious concerns about the loss of protections for consumers and investors. The CFTC is generally designed to deal with sophisticated institutional investors and traders. It doesn't have the same kind of protections that the SEC has for retail investors and consumers.

Under all three avenues provided for crypto under this bill: The CFTC's lighter touch regulatory regime, SEC's weaker regulatory regime for restricted digital assets, or the regulatory no-man's-land, these are just a few examples of protections that would

be stripped away: the right of an investor to sue, gone; protections against conflicts of interest, gone; the right to critical disclosures that help investors make informed choices, gone; and enforcement by States against fraud; and enforcement by the SEC for all of the above protections, including antifraud.

H.R. 4763 would also upend more than 170 enforcement cases the SEC has brought related to crypto violations. These actions have been brought by both Democratic and Republican administrations to protect investors against crypto bad actors.

The SEC is the Federal agency on the front lines of enforcing our existing securities laws on crypto firms that have willfully chosen to ignore the law and defrauded consumers out of billions of dollars with these get-rich-quick schemes. Giving this industry a free pass to avoid most all regulations cannot be the answer to the serious concerns that Members have raised about crypto fraud.

I have seen many efforts by Republicans, acting at the behest of the industry to pass deregulatory regulation, but this is perhaps the worst, most harmful proposal I have seen in a long time. This bill would deregulate crypto and certain traditional securities to the extent that I and other experts have expressed serious concerns about this bill causing a potential market crash and recession.

I am also reminded of how, over the warnings of regulators, Congress moved to deregulate the over-the-counter derivatives. Remember the derivatives market back in 2000? The resulting financial crisis triggered the implosion of financial institutions, a wave of foreclosures, and trillions of dollars in lost wealth.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues not to forget. They should not repeat history with this bill.

The Biden administration has released a Statement of Administration Policy opposing this bill. The bill is also opposed by a long list of investors and consumer advocates, State securities administrators concerned about State preemption, labor organizations worried about the retirement funds of their members, environmental groups concerned about the undisclosed risk of crypto mining, civic organizations worried about the undue influence of the financial and crypto industry over Congress' actions, academics, legal experts, and technologists.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to stand up and to not be afraid of Big Crypto, to stand up for everyday investors and consumers.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1500

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON), the chair of the Agriculture Committee and partner in FIT21.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 4763, the Financial Innovation and Technology for the 21st Century Act, or FIT21, which establishes a regulatory framework for digital assets while protecting consumers and fostering innovation within the United States.

This legislation has been a long time coming. Since 2018, the House Committee on Agriculture has held numerous hearings, roundtables, and meetings and introduced multiple pieces of legislation to bring certainty and clarity to the digital asset markets.

For Congress to establish a comprehensive digital assets market framework, it was clear the House Committee on Agriculture and the House Committee on Financial Services needed to work in a collaborative manner.

Chairman MCHENRY and I first met nearly 2 years ago to discuss this ambitious plan, and together, we aimed to develop the best policies possible.

Over this Congress, members of both committees have engaged in robust and collaborative debates and educational sessions on current securities and commodities laws and regulations, as well as gaining a deeper understanding of the digital asset ecosystem.

Through this process, we learned several key points, including: that the current process to determine if a digital asset is a security or not is unclear, unworkable, and impractical; the Commodity Futures Trading Commission lacks essential regulatory authority over retail-serving intermediaries in the digital commodity spot market; and the treatment of customer assets held by intermediaries needs to be strengthened.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have claimed that this bill will allow a substantial portion of crypto and some traditional securities to escape nearly all laws and regulations, operating without any primary regulator. That is far from the truth. The legislation before us today enhances existing securities and commodities regulations to create an appropriate framework for digital assets.

For example, a registered digital commodity exchange would follow regulations similar to those of the CFTC for derivatives exchanges, including monitoring trading activity, prohibiting abusive practices, reporting trading information, managing conflicts of interest, ensuring governance standards, upholding cybersecurity, and more.

Mr. Chairman, Congress has a historic opportunity to enact legislation that not only protects consumers but also ensures that the United States remains at the forefront of technical innovation.

By supporting FIT21, we can foster and create a safer, more transparent, and more competitive environment for digital assets.

Let us seize this moment to provide clear guidelines and robust protections,

fostering a future where innovation can thrive responsibly within our borders.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that the gentlewoman from Washington State, the chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee, has a few questions for clarification.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4763.

Blockchains are a new foundational technology that will reshape our daily lives. Through innovative design approaches, blockchains can be used in all kinds of applications, like tracking products through supply chains or facilitating the tokenization of financial assets.

Unfortunately, many American innovators are being pushed abroad by overzealous regulators. According to a report by Electric Capital, the U.S. share of blockchain developers has declined from 40 percent in 2017 to 29 percent in 2022.

I am excited about this legislation providing clear rules of the road. This is a clear complement to some of the work that we have been doing in the Energy and Commerce Committee to ensure American leadership in blockchain technology.

I will clarify some of the non-financial applications and uses that may be unintentionally captured by the bill.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Based on conversations I have had, it is my understanding that the intent of this bill is to ensure that the current authority over certain restricted digital asset transactions remains with the SEC and that the CFTC would only be authorized to regulate certain intermediaries in spot digital commodity markets. Is this correct?

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman's understanding of the legislation is correct.

The intent of FIT21 is to draw jurisdictional lines between the SEC and the CFTC as it relates to certain spot digital asset transactions.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Can the gentleman clarify the intent when it comes to exclusive jurisdiction of the CFTC and how this would impact the current protections for Americans against fraud and market manipulation?

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. FIT21 provides the CFTC with exclusive jurisdiction over digital com-

modity spot market transactions that occur on or through entities registered with CFTC. FIT21 does not provide CFTC with the authority to directly regulate any transaction between two people which is not intermediated by an entity registered with the CFTC.

Separate from FIT21, CFTC has existing authority to police spot market commodities for fraud and market manipulation, which FIT21 does not change.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman THOMPSON, Chairman MCHENRY, and Representative HILL for the clarification and for all of their work.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH), who is also the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Digital Assets, Financial Technology and Inclusion.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, I have been a Member of Congress for over 20 years, and I have to say that while this may not be the worst, it is in the top three in terms of the worst bills that I have seen actually progress to the floor of the House.

Anybody who is excited about this bill either has not read it or does not understand it. This bill is a radical rewrite of the securities laws in this country.

As most people who know our history realize, in 1929, when the markets crashed, we established the Securities and Exchange Commission in 1934, shortly after the crash.

What that did was it created an agency that became the cop on the beat in financial services. They became the protectors of investors.

Since that time in 1934, as courts have interpreted that law that is protecting investors, we built up a body of case law that now makes the United States financial markets the most robust, and they have become the marvel of the world. Everyone comes to the United States for investment because they know that their investment is protected and that they will be treated fairly in the courts because we have well-defined laws.

This bill undoes all of that. This bill is a radical rewriting of the securities laws since 1934. It redefines what a security is. It allows financial companies to escape the cop on the beat. Now, they can leave the jurisdiction of the SEC and go over to the CFTC, which is about six times as small as the SEC.

What will happen here is you will see a migration of companies going out from under the SEC jurisdiction over to the CFTC, and this will cause havoc in our financial markets eventually.

The one amendment I would have liked to see on this bill is that any company that becomes insolvent because of their involvement with crypto cannot receive a taxpayer bailout because that is where this bill is heading. This is going to cause infirmity in the

financial institutions in this country as they get commingled with crypto, and eventually, we will be forced into a situation where we are going to have to bail some of these banks out because of their involvement in crypto.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very bad bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Digital Assets, Financial Technology and Inclusion, who has shepherded this bill along very well.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, for those watching at home, it is like the tale of two cities, where one side is offering a work of fiction and the other side a work of non-fiction.

I think, over here, those who support this bill are supporting exactly the opposite of what I have heard on the other side of the aisle.

Since last January, our two committees, Agriculture and Financial Services, have collaborated to make sure that we protect consumers and investors in the digital marketplace by preventing fraud, manipulation, front-running, and other abusive practices; applying Bank Secrecy Act/AML requirements and know-your-customer rules; mitigating conflicts of interest; requiring firms to hold capital and segregate customer funds; have the right kind of custody policy; have registration for exchanges, dealers, and brokers that are working in digital assets; imposing reporting and bookkeeping requirements; and building on the existing exemption regime for the offer and sale of digital securities to include robust disclosures to anyone considering a purchase.

With that said, we hear a lot about the lack of legal clarity for the treatment of digital assets, which was the impetus for this legislation. What does that even mean?

Mr. Chairman, to this day, the SEC and the CFTC still contradict each other in court about whether a digital asset like Ethereum should be treated as a security or a commodity. Both cannot be true.

When two Federal agencies in the same administration cannot agree on the law, it should be up to Congress, and that is the regulatory clarity that this FIT21 bill will bring.

In fact, I would argue, Mr. Chairman, that FIT21 is responsive to President Biden's own executive order and the Financial Stability Oversight Council report calling on Congress to enact a framework for digital assets that are not securities. That is what we have done.

I am also proud that this measure is the product of committee work done through regular order and through good-faith bipartisan efforts.

Mr. Chairman, all Members should support this bill, and I encourage a full "yes" vote from both sides of the aisle.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CASTEN).

Mr. CASTEN. Mr. Chairman, we have heard several times this legislation is better than the status quo. There are a whole lot of reasons that is not true, but I want to focus specifically on this bill's utter failure to address the use of cryptocurrency by terrorists, foreign adversaries, and criminals.

By the way, Treasury asked us specifically to address those issues with a whole bunch of reasonable changes. We introduced amendments. Every one of those amendments was rejected.

The anti-money laundering provisions that are in this bill simply duplicate existing requirements. Yet, the bill's supporters have actually argued, and Treasury has agreed, that the status quo is not sufficient to address the challenges created by cryptocurrencies.

How do we know that cryptocurrencies are a problem for money laundering? Because the bad guys love crypto. Let's give some examples.

North Korean hackers have stolen \$3 billion in cryptocurrency since 2017. White House national security officials said last year that crypto theft and cybercrime have funded half of North Korea's nuclear program.

Russia and Venezuela are both using crypto to evade U.S. sanctions.

Venezuela recently said that because of the bite of sanctions, they are now moving to accept payments in crypto because that allows them to get money that we, in Washington, cannot track.

The Treasury Department is reviewing more than \$20 billion of cryptocurrency that was laundered through a Russian-based cryptocurrency exchange.

The Treasury Department has noted that Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, ISIS, and al-Qaida are all using crypto to finance terrorist attacks globally.

Crypto is the preferred means of payment for fentanyl trafficking. Chinese businesses that sell fentanyl chemical ingredients to Mexican cartels have accepted millions in crypto payments. They have sold enough ingredients to make more than \$54 billion worth of fentanyl pills. That is enough to kill 8.6 billion people, if you are counting.

Blockchain analytics firm Chainalysis said in January that virtual currency is the dominant choice for buyers and sellers of child sexual abuse content.

FinCEN basically said the same thing. It said that perpetrators of online child sexual exploitation are increasingly using convertible virtual currency to avoid detection.

I could go on and on. These are not cherry-picked statistics. These are statistics from U.S. officials and from crypto firms, people who are entrusted with protecting our national security and who care about this stuff.

The Treasury Department asked for new rules to address this. Every single

one of those proposals was objected to either in the Financial Services Committee, the Ag Committee, or in the Rules Committee.

□ 1515

If that was all this bill did, that would be one thing. In fact, this bill goes out of its way to make it weaker by basically saying that anybody who uses unhosted wallets, decentralized, or DeFi services is exempted from regulation, ignoring recommendations from both the Trump and Biden administrations.

My Republican colleagues will boast that in this rule there is specific language that says brokers and dealers are required to comply with anti-money laundering requirements. They are already required to do that. This bill does nothing to address that. It is exactly the same. They are going to brag about saying it is now illegal to speed.

What we should have done is we should have made provisions to ban anonymous actors, to prevent you from saying: I want to move crypto from my account to yours, and I am going to move it through an anonymous party so you can't tell what a bad guy I am. It should have banned people from using digital asset mixers that allow you to take a whole bunch of people, combine all their money together, and then give you something where you can't trace it through.

If you want to understand how crazy this is, I would encourage you to go to your bank and try to deposit \$10,000 in cash at your bank. Your bank will say: You have to tell me where that money came from. I am going to take you behind the counter, and we are going to have to take your picture and get your fingerprints, because I do not like money laundering, and I am obliged to protect it.

By comparison, if you want to move a million dollars of crypto from one person's account to another, send it through these mixers or send it through these anonymizers, you can do it.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CASTEN. Mr. Chair, we have got all of these mixers that are used. Why were they not included in there? I don't know.

I know why the crypto industry doesn't want them included in there, because they are profiting from people who are using these illicit services.

The largest cryptocurrency exchange that stands to benefit from this regime helped to finance a legal challenge to the Treasury Department's case against Tornado Cash, which was the largest asset mixer in the world.

This is a bad bill. It fails to address known problems. What it does do, however, is make the United States safer for drug traffickers, for terrorist funders, for child and drug traffickers,

and for those who buy and sell child pornography. I did not know those groups had such advocates in Congress, but I am proud to oppose them and encourage all my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), my good friend and the chair of the Commodity Markets, Digital Assets, and Rural Development Subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chair, here in Congress, we are supposed to be in the problem-solving business. My, oh, my, do we have problems in the digital asset space.

In recent years, we have seen the FTX debacle, a debacle that happened under the regulatory regime that some Members are apparently so enamored with, a regime that does not work today. We have seen chronic and disruptive overreach by the Securities and Exchange Commission.

We have seen innovation and investment flow overseas. Mr. Chair, they seek markets that are more predictable. We are the only G7 country that hasn't figured this out yet.

Clearly, we have problems. I would submit that FIT21 is the solution. For more than a year, FRENCH HILL and I, working with Chairs MCHENRY and THOMPSON and Members on both sides of the aisle, have worked hard together to craft a solution that increases regulatory predictability, which increases consumer protection, and that will foster innovation.

I know that success has many fathers and mothers, and so I do thank Messrs. MCHENRY, THOMPSON, HILL, EMMER, and DAVIDSON on the Republican side, and I do need to especially recognize my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle, particularly Mr. NICKEL and Ms. CARAVEO, who have invested countless hours in getting this bill right. They have been joined by Representatives HIMES, CROCKETT, TORRES, SOTO, GOTTHEIMER, and DAVIS. This success would not be possible without their good-faith efforts, and I thank them.

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

It is no mystery why the crypto industry prefers to be regulated by the CFTC rather than the SEC. Let's start with the substantial differences in funding and staff for the CFTC compared to SEC.

In 2023, the CFTC employed roughly 680 full-time employees with an annual budget of \$365 million. Wow. The Securities and Exchange Commission, the SEC, employed over 4,500 employees and had a budget of over \$2 billion.

Even with the limited funding provided to the CFTC under this bill, which is capped at \$40 million and set to expire after 4 years, the CFTC's funding would be only one-fifth of the SEC's budget. Mr. Chair, \$40 billion is not sufficient to oversee more than 16,000 cryptocurrencies.

Let's not forget that the same Republicans who are bringing this bill to the floor are the same ones who proposed cutting CFTC's budget last year. Moreover, the CFTC is designed to deal mostly with sophisticated institutional investors and traders rather than retail investors and consumers. Therefore, the CFTC does not have the same level of protections for retail investors and consumers.

Mr. Chair, I would simply say that we should look at this example. The CFTC has no mandate like the SEC that requires entities to act in the best interests of the investors or to put their clients' interests first. This is just another reason why I am very concerned about the light-touch regulatory regime under the CFTC.

Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), who is also the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Capital Markets.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chair, last week we had police week. This week, the Republicans show us that they support crime in the suites. The effect of this bill in the short term will be to disempower the most effective investor protection crime investigation organization in the world, the SEC.

The long-term objective of the crypto billionaire bros is to create a new currency, and they have named it well. Cryptocurrency literally means hidden money. If it ever becomes a currency, it means we will not be able to enforce our tax laws, except on wage earners, and we will not be able to enforce our laws against child traffickers, drug dealers, and those who violate our sanctions.

The crypto bros have a lot of money. They make money by literally making money. They spread it around all of Washington. They had Sam Bankman-Fried do it. Now he is in jail, and others have stepped forward.

They have a PR campaign. The Lakers don't play at "enforce tax laws arena." They don't play at an arena dedicated to law enforcement. They play at Crypto.com Arena.

In spite of all that money and power, three-quarters of Democrats voted "no" on this bill when it was before our committee. There are those who say they want clarity. We have clarity. The SEC has jurisdiction. What they really want is a patina of regulation, as little regulation as possible to claim to be regulated.

Now, this bill would be bad enough if we were dealing with the original statute. I know a lot of my colleagues have had meetings in their offices, and they were told about this bill weeks ago or months ago. Some are leaning toward voting for it because they don't know that they dropped a new title in the bill just a few weeks ago.

What does that new title do? Does it prohibit secret wallets, self-custody wallets? No. Does it outlaw the mixers whose sole purpose is to mix up law enforcement? No. What does this new

title do? It defines an investment contract in a new way, designed to make this bill not just applicable to crypto, but it says our regular stocks and bonds can be put on blockchain and have no regulation from the SEC. It is a dagger at the hundred-trillion-dollar capital markets we have that finance our whole economy. It doesn't just say you are moving from the SEC's tough regulation to the CFTC's weak regulation. It allows crypto to get no regulation by defining themselves as an investment contract.

This is a bill that will gut regulation of crypto and may gut regulation of all our capital markets, but it goes beyond that. Its ultimate purpose is to move forward with this cryptocurrency project.

Right now, crypto is not a currency. There are very few purchases of goods with crypto. You can't buy a sandwich, but the very few times, as Mr. CASTEN pointed out, that crypto is used as a means of exchange, it is used by the worst criminals in the world. If crypto does become a currency, then we will not be able to enforce our other laws.

Now, we have to understand every time a billionaire cheats on his taxes, a member of the Freedom Caucus earns his wings. The patriotic anarchists come forward and say we want a strong America and we want to destroy the power of the American Government. You can't have it both ways.

This is a bill that in the short term means no regulation of crypto; not just lighter regulation under the CFTC but no regulation under their new title. It is a bill that could gut all securities regulation for the stocks and bonds that power the American economy.

In the longer term, it creates a competitor to the U.S. dollar which has one advantage right in the name: hidden money. Hide your money from the IRS, from our sanctions enforcers, from everyone involved in the U.S. Government.

Finally, crypto declares that it wants to partially displace the U.S. dollar as a reserve currency.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CURTIS). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chair, you have to understand how important it is.

We, frankly, are not fiscally responsible in this House. We don't collect nearly as much in taxes as we spend in benefits. We are able to do that without too much harm because of the role of the U.S. dollar as a reserve currency. We have fiscal policies that would make Argentina blush, but we are able to do it. The crypto bros see the incredible amount of money and power the U.S. Government has by being the world's reserve currency and they say no. They want to appropriate that for themselves.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina has 19½ minutes remaining.

The gentlewoman from California has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. NICKEL), my colleague and friend who has been a great leader on digital assets and pragmatic policy here in the House.

Mr. NICKEL. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the Financial Innovation and Technology for the 21st Century Act, or FIT21, which I am proud to cosponsor.

This legislation is a product of hundreds and hundreds of hours of bipartisan collaboration, and I was proud to work with Chair MCHENRY, Digital Assets Subcommittee Chair HILL, and members of the House Financial Services Committee to get this bill on the floor.

This is a big deal. We are currently relying on 90-year-old securities laws written before the internet even existed. Congress has never voted on a regulatory structure for crypto.

Roughly 20 percent of Americans have invested, traded, or used crypto. It is not going anywhere. Whether you love crypto or you hate it, you should support regulation, because the status quo just isn't working. We can't wait for the next FTX to take action.

It is clear there are regulatory gaps between the SEC and the CFTC. Right now, the United States is the global leader in financial services and technology. If we still want to hold this position in 50 years, then we need to pass FIT21.

Support for U.S. leadership in digital assets shouldn't be a partisan issue. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter of support from the Chamber of Progress outlining how FIT21 lays out strong rules of the road, consumer protections, and supports innovation.

[From Chamber of Progress]

HR 4763: FINANCIAL INNOVATION AND TECHNOLOGY FOR THE 21ST CENTURY ACT (FIT21): STRONG RULES, CONSUMER PROTECTIONS, AND MORE OVERSIGHT OVER DIGITAL ASSETS

We need strong, clear federal rules and oversight over the digital assets industry that embrace innovation while protecting consumers and the integrity of markets.

HR 4763, the Financial Innovation and Technology for the 21st Century Act (FIT21), is the first bill regulating the digital assets industry that has received bipartisan approval from both the House Financial Services and House Agriculture Committees. It is scheduled for a floor vote this week.

HOUSE DEMOCRATS SUPPORTED THIS LEGISLATION

A cross section of Members spanning the Democratic Caucus have recognized that this bill provides an effective and needed regulatory framework for digital assets. The legislation:

Passed the House Financial Services Committee on July 26 with six Democratic votes: Reps. Himes, Gottheimer, Torres, Horsford, Nickel, Petterson.

Passed the House Agriculture Committee by voice vote on July 27.

WHAT HOUSE DEMS ARE SAYING ABOUT HR 4763

Rep. Ritchie Torres (D-NY): "For me, the lack of protection for retail investors underscores the fierce urgency around passing a

market structure bill to protect the average American consumer.”

Rep. Jim Himes (D-CT): “I’m a deep skeptic of this industry, but we deserve better than the status quo.”

Rep. Wiley Nickel (D-NC): “I firmly believe in the SEC’s mission to protect investors, but for this to be effective, Congress needs to pass legislation with a clear regulatory framework.”

Rep. Yadira Caraveo (D-CO): “This is not a perfect bill. But I believe that it is a good step in the right direction.”

**BILL EXPANDS THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT’S
ROLE IN REGULATING DIGITAL ASSETS**

Current securities laws and regulations do not account for the complexities of digital assets. This legislation expands the authority of the CFTC and SEC, giving them joint oversight over all digital assets, allowing them to issue joint rulemakings, and ensuring market safety and investor protection. HR 4763 also gives the SEC clear authority over certain digital assets that do not meet requirements to be regulated by the CFTC. This allows the SEC to allocate their limited resources to regulating solely those digital assets that fall within its jurisdiction. Additionally, the CFTC will receive an increase in funding to adequately fulfill their oversight responsibilities.

HR 4763 also requires the GAO to conduct studies on the development of emerging technology in digital assets, like non-fungible tokens (NFTs), and directs the CFTC and SEC to study the impact of digital assets on markets and investors through codified FinTech programs and Joint Advisory Committees.

PROTECTS CONSUMERS FROM THE NEXT FTX

Given that roughly 20 percent of Americans have invested, traded or used cryptocurrency, the digital asset industry will continue to attract American investors for years to come. HR 4763 provides much-needed consumer protection by filling the regulatory gaps between the SEC and CFTC, creating accountability for digital asset companies through registration and disclosures, requiring companies to establish policies to mitigate potential conflicts of interest, and giving regulators increased power over bad actors.

Communities of color are investing in digital assets at a higher rate than most Americans. According to Pew Research Center polls in 2021 and 2022, some 20 percent of Black, Hispanic and Asian U.S. adults have bought, traded or used cryptocurrency, compared with 13 percent of white adults. These communities are at increased risk of losing their investments if similar events like FTX, Terra/Luna and others continue to happen without regulatory safeguards for Americans.

**PROTECTS AMERICA’S NATIONAL SECURITY &
ENSURES AMERICAN OVERSIGHT OVER CRYPTO**

By enhancing oversight of digital assets through the CFTC and SEC, HR 4763 ensures all digital assets will be subjected to transparency and compliance metrics that would deter illicit financing, money laundering and other financial crimes. The ability for regulators to issue clear rules for the digital asset industry will prevent threats to our financial system and keep digital asset companies from relocating abroad to countries with fewer rules.

There are good national security reasons to keep the industry under the Federal government’s watchful eye. For example, after Vladimir Putin ordered an invasion of Ukraine, the U.S. government released economic sanctions against Russia that included instructions for American digital asset exchanges to block Russian users from handling currency through their services.

While U.S.-based digital asset exchanges abided by our sanctions, international exchanges like Binance refused, continuing to serve Russian users and creating a potential loophole for Russian actors to finance war operations through their markets. Throwing away our jurisdiction over an emerging global financial industry, no matter its flaws, would jeopardize America’s influence on the world stage.

□ 1530

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER), who is the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Monetary Policy.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chair, I thank Chair WATERS for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this bill.

I am encouraged by the dialogue and collaboration that has taken place between the House Financial Services Committee and the House Ag Committee on this bill. I believe in the potential of distributive ledger technology. I am, in fact, the co-chair of the Congressional Blockchain Caucus and perhaps the only Member of Congress who has actually programmed a blockchain client.

However, I cannot support this bill in its current form. To that end, my office submitted three constructive clarifying amendments, none of which were made in order by the Rules Committee.

This legislation contains several fatal flaws.

First, this legislation largely shifts oversight of the digital assets industry away from the Securities and Exchange Commission which has a long track record of successfully protecting retail investors from abuse in the financial markets toward the CFTC which has traditionally overseen markets with significantly less retail participation.

Secondly, it would create a safe harbor for wannabe pirates through a so-called intent to register that shields crypto firms from SEC investor protection rules before the agencies even have time to write the rules.

Thirdly, the bill was not crafted through regular order. This version of the bill contains a new and dangerous title that was never considered by the Financial Services Committee, title II, which would create a new class of investment in contract assets which has the potential to undermine decades of legal precedent governing the securities laws, and it would create opportunities for regulatory arbitrage.

Instead, it was airdropped in during closed-door negotiations and before it was materialized for a final vote today. That is not regular order.

Finally, this bill also fails to address fundamental challenges of digital assets related to uncontrolled anonymity of self-hosted digital wallets that I believe must be addressed for the digital asset industry to accede to a healthy and sustainable future over the long term.

For example, to be regulated as a commodity under this bill, no person

or group can have owned more than 20 percent of the assets at any point over the preceding 12 months.

Mr. Chair, how can this possibly be guaranteed when unknown fractions of ownership are held in anonymous self-hosted wallets?

This bill requires the SEC to issue beneficial ownership disclosure rules, however, the SEC has little or no means of compelling individuals or firms in other countries to comply with such a requirement.

This beneficial ownership test could be skewed by noncompliant foreign owners, by individuals spreading their holdings across multiple wallets, or by dead or lost crypto that artificially inflates the amount of the asset that is currently judged to be in circulation.

The list goes on.

This legislation actually ties the hands of the top financial crimes watchdog, the FinCEN, by limiting their ability to respond to issues related to self-custody of digital wallets which they will tell you is the main issue that they struggle with every day in trying to prevent financial crimes.

Given the widespread use of digital assets by bad actors, we should strengthen the authorities of FinCEN and not weaken them.

My colleagues and I, as I said, offered several constructive amendments to this bill to clarify and address these issues, and the Rules Committee, controlled by the majority, unfortunately, chose to exclude every one of them from today’s debate.

Given the content of this bill and its failure to address these issues, I cannot support this bill, and I encourage my colleagues to vote “no.”

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER), who is a great leader for digital assets, cryptocurrency, and innovation.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Chair, today we have an opportunity to determine whether the next iteration of the internet will be designed by Americans or if it will, instead, reflect the values of some other nation. FIT21 gives us that opportunity and unlocks a larger conversation beyond innovation.

This bill is about national security. It is about consumer protection. It is about global competitiveness. It is about shaping what the future global digital economy looks like and how it functions.

Currently, all online transactions are intermediated, but as we move deeper into the digital age, digital assets are key to decentralizing the internet so Americans can transact directly with each other, no intermediary needed.

Without crypto, we don’t have this ability, and I think giving Americans the choice to do business through an intermediary or directly with each other is important. Having that choice will fundamentally alter the digital economy, unlocking new opportunities for Americans and individuals across the world in ways we haven’t even begun to contemplate.

However, this Congress can no longer stand by as regulators squander this opportunity right within our grasp. This administration has demonstrated they simply are not willing to allow the digital asset industry to innovate in the United States. For every legal inconsistency or regulatory hurdle they produce, instead of coherent and informed guidance, they drive American digital asset users into less safe jurisdictions.

Mr. Chair, this is why FIT21 is significant. It sets clear and consistent rules for American innovators. Among the many important provisions in this bill is my Securities Clarity Act, bipartisan language tailored specifically to digital assets that provides the legal flexibility for a digital asset project to transition from centralization to de-centralization.

This transition is critical to the future of the peer-to-peer digital economy. I thank the chairmen and my friends on the other side of the aisle for working with me to incorporate this section into the bill today. Their work on this extensive framework will allow Americans to, once again, lead the way.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to the time remaining on both sides.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. VAN DREW). The gentleman from North Carolina has 16 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. CARAVEO), who has been a fantastic leader on the Agriculture Committee on digital assets.

Ms. CARAVEO. Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. MCHENRY for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 4763, the Financial Innovation and Technology for the 21st Century Act, because the time has come for us to establish a comprehensive regulatory system for digital assets.

About 70 percent of digital assets are currently unregulated. That leaves a large number of retail investors unprotected in a volatile market where many people have already lost their life savings.

There is clearly a gap in oversight over our digital asset cash markets, and I believe the status quo is unacceptable. Despite previous volatility, a significant number of Americans continue to own and invest in digital assets in an unprotected manner.

As Congress falls behind other nations in the race to establish a clear regulatory framework, we run the risk of industry players taking their services and customers abroad, including to foreign jurisdictions with insufficient regulations.

Since we began this process over a year ago, I made it a point to work across the aisle with Chairs THOMPSON and JOHNSON to improve this bill as

much as possible. I am happy to report that the bill retains many of the provisions that I fought for, with one of the most important pieces being a funding mechanism for the CFTC. Increased funding will be vital for the CFTC as they take on further oversight activities and engage in a rulemaking process.

I thank my colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans, who have helped strengthen the consumer protections in this bill, including strengthening disclosure requirements, market integrity, and transparency. Further protections include stricter regulatory requirements for emerging financial technologies, prohibiting commingling of customer funds with firm funds, and establishing a process of temporary oversight before rulemaking is complete.

I am excited about the innovation these technologies have to offer, which is why I believe they deserve a comprehensive regulatory environment, but making sure customers and retail investors are protected as they navigate this space remains a top priority. I believe we have made significant improvements in that direction.

I am looking forward to continuing to move this bill forward and taking a first real step toward regulation of a market that more of our constituents are engaging in every day.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, the gentlewoman from California has indeed been a great advocate for consumer protection.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER).

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bipartisan Financial Innovation and Technology for the 21st Century Act. This well-reasoned and thoughtful bipartisan legislation is the result of rigorous research and bipartisan negotiation by the Financial Services Committee, which I proudly helped lead with Representatives MCHENRY and HILL.

I thank them both and all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have worked so hard to make sure that consumers in our country are protected.

Cryptocurrency is here, and it has a tremendous economic potential for our country. My State, New Jersey, ranks second nationwide in crypto ownership by proportion, and the key is now in making sure we protect Americans who own it and ensure our country can realize the economic and jobs potential it has to offer.

For that to happen, we need rules of the road to guide entrepreneurs and businesses, to embrace innovators, and to protect consumers.

This bill offers protections that are fit for the 21st century. FIT21 takes commonsense steps to safeguard consumers in their investments and strengthen market oversight.

The legislation includes key transparency and accountability measures.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. At the same time, FIT21 eliminates regulatory redundancies so the SEC and CFTC work together to protect investors and crack down on nefarious crypto users.

Finally, this legislation spurs American-led innovation, encouraging entrepreneurs and businesses to invest here instead of going abroad to other nations with no consumer protections.

Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues to vote for this important innovative and bipartisan legislation. It is fit to become law if we work together.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MOLINARO), who is a leader on the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Chairman, for far too long, the U.S. digital asset ecosystem has been plagued by regulatory uncertainty. Consumers, yes, have fallen victim to scams, hacks, market manipulation, and bankruptcies after intermediaries misused customer funds and were unable to meet their obligations.

Thanks to the leadership of Chairmen McHenry and Thompson, Representatives DUSTY JOHNSON and FRENCH HILL, we finally have a framework, thanks to the work of many before us today that will set a regulatory foundation to protect consumers and innovators alike all the while ensuring future American leadership in this space.

This bipartisan bill does, in fact, provide consumer protections in a functional, regulatory framework that will ensure the digital asset ecosystem is safe for investors.

This bill accomplishes this by delivering the transparency consumers expect and need to make informed decisions and prevent brokers from engaging in manipulative practices that harm American investors.

This regulatory certainty will also drive financial inclusion by promoting technology that can foster economic growth in underserved communities and expand opportunities for economic participation.

Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues to support the bill.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON), who is the vice chair of the Individual Assets and Financial Technology Subcommittee and the OG, as they say, in the crypto space.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of this long overdue legislation. It builds on the framework that my colleagues and I have worked on for at least 6 years beginning with the Token Taxonomy Act in 2018.

Its core is a bright-line test to define what digital assets or securities are regulated by the SEC and which are commodities under the jurisdiction of the CFTC.

Innovators and investors will no longer risk their freedom and their fortunes by simply launching a company and raising capital. The law will be clear, and regulation by selective enforcement must end.

Additionally, and perhaps most notably, this bill also provides first-ever Federal level protection for self-custody of digital assets. This protection, which is very intentional, mirrors my Keep Your Coins Act, and it is a giant step toward restoring the right to privacy and private property protecting permissionless transactions using digital assets.

In an account-based financial system where Americans must rely on intermediaries, self-custody provides the only protection against third parties controlling the individual's transactions.

Thirdly, self-custody provides the first line of consumer protection where individuals can eliminate third-party liabilities who hold their assets.

For too long we have pushed innovation and investment in digital asset projects overseas as Congress has constantly failed to bring the clarity that we need. We finally have the chance to end this trend and solidify ourselves as the leaders in this industry.

Mr. Chair, I urge the Senate to quickly take up this bipartisan legislation and send it to the President's desk as soon as possible. Please vote "yes."

□ 1545

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD the following statements:

The Statement of Administration Policy from the Biden administration opposing this bill;

The statement from SEC Chair Gensler raising serious concerns about this bill;

A letter from the Treasury Department to me, dated July 20, 2023, expressing serious concerns about this bill;

A letter from the North American Securities Administrators Association opposing this bill; and

A letter from 48 stakeholders opposing this bill.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 4763—FINANCIAL INNOVATION AND TECHNOLOGY FOR THE 21ST CENTURY ACT—REP. THOMPSON, R-PA, AND 11 COSPONSORS

The Administration opposes passage of H.R. 4763, which would affect the regulatory structure for digital assets in the United States. The Administration is eager to work with Congress to ensure a comprehensive and balanced regulatory framework for digital assets, building on existing authorities, which will promote the responsible development of digital assets and payment innovation and help reinforce United States leadership in the global financial system. H.R. 4763 in its current form lacks sufficient protections for consumers and investors who engage in certain digital asset transactions.

The Administration looks forward to continued collaboration with Congress on developing legislation for digital assets that includes adequate guardrails for consumers and investors while creating the conditions needed for innovation, and further time will be needed for such collaboration.

MAY 22, 2024.

STATEMENT ON THE FINANCIAL INNOVATION AND TECHNOLOGY FOR THE 21ST CENTURY ACT (By Gary Gensler, Chair, Securities and Exchange Commission)

INTRODUCTION

For 90 years, the federal securities laws have played a crucial role in protecting the public. These critical protections were created in the wake of the Great Depression after many Americans suffered the consequences of inadequately regulated capital markets. We saw sky-high unemployment, bread lines, and shantytowns springing up due to mass foreclosures.

Back then, the rules didn't exist. That's why President Roosevelt and Congress created the SEC and the laws it administers.

At their core is the critical concept of registering securities that will be offered to the public and registering the intermediaries that facilitate the exchange of those securities. For securities, registration means that issuers provide robust disclosures and are liable if their material statements are untruthful. For intermediaries, registration brings with it rulebooks that prevent fraud and manipulation, safeguards against conflicts of interest, proper disclosures, segregation of customer assets, oversight by a self-regulatory organization, and routine inspection by the SEC.

Today, these rules do exist.

Many market participants in the crypto industry, however, have shown their unwillingness to comply with applicable laws and regulations for more than a decade, variously arguing that the laws do not apply to them or that a new set of rules should be created and retroactively applied to them to excuse their past conduct. Widespread non-compliance has resulted in widespread fraud, bankruptcies, failures, and misconduct. As a result of criminal charges and convictions, some of the best-known leaders in the crypto industry are now in prison, awaiting sentencing, or subject to extradition back to the United States.

The SEC, during both Republican and Democratic Administrations, has allocated enforcement resources to holding crypto market participants accountable. Courts have time and again agreed with the SEC, ruling that the securities laws apply when crypto assets or crypto-related investment schemes are offered or sold as investment contracts.

THE FINANCIAL INNOVATION AND TECHNOLOGY FOR THE 21ST CENTURY ACT

The Financial Innovation and Technology for the 21st Century Act ("FIT21") would create new regulatory gaps and undermine decades of precedent regarding the oversight of investment contracts, putting investors and capital markets at immeasurable risk.

First, the bill would remove investment contracts that are recorded on a blockchain from the statutory definition of securities and the time-tested protections of much of the federal securities laws.

Further, by removing this set of investment contracts from the statutory list of securities, the bill implies what courts have repeatedly ruled—but what crypto market participants have attempted to deny—that many crypto assets are being offered and sold as securities under existing law.

Second, the bill allows issuers of crypto investment contracts to self-certify that their

products are a "decentralized" system and then be deemed a special class of "digital commodities" and thus not subject to SEC oversight. Whether something is a "digital commodity" would be subject to self-certification by "any person" that files a certification. The SEC would only have 60 days to review and challenge the certification that a product is a digital commodity. Those that the SEC successfully challenges would be reclassified as restricted digital assets and subject to the bill's lighter-touch SEC oversight regime that excludes many core protections. There are more than 16,000 crypto assets that currently exist. Given limits on staff resources, and no new resources provided by the bill, it is implausible that the SEC could review and challenge more than a fraction of those assets. The result could be that the vast majority of the market might avoid even limited SEC oversight envisioned by the bill for crypto asset securities.

Third, the bill's regulatory structure abandons the Supreme Court's long-standing *Howey* test that considers the economic realities of an investment to determine whether it is subject to the securities laws. Instead, the bill makes that determination based on labels and the accounting ledger used to record transactions. It is akin to determining the level of investor protection based on whether a transaction is recorded in a notebook or a software database. But it's the economic realities that should determine whether an asset is subject to the federal securities laws, not the type of record-keeping ledger. The bill's result would be weaker investor protection than currently exists for those assets that meet the *Howey* test.

Fourth, for those crypto investment contracts that would still fall under the SEC's remit the bill seeks to replace Roosevelt's investor protection framework with fewer protections than investors are afforded in every other type of investment. Doing so increases risk to the American public.

Fifth, the bill specifically excludes crypto asset trading systems from the definition of an exchange and thus removes, for investors on crypto asset trading platforms, the protections that benefit investors on registered exchanges. These crypto trading platforms would be able to legally comele their functions in a way that fosters conflicts of interest, may allow trading against their customers, and reduces custody protections for their customers.

Sixth, the legislation creates an exemption from regulation under this Act for any entity or organization that falls under a broadly defined category called "Decentralized Finance." Any number of firms would qualify for the exemption, regardless of potential conflicts of interest. This would include firms that intermediate crypto securities transactions.

Finally, the bill could be read to functionally eliminate the current Regulation A and Regulation D offering restrictions for crypto securities by creating a new exempt offering framework. Non-accredited investors would be allowed to purchase crypto assets worth up to 10 percent of their net worth or annual income before the issuer would be required to provide any disclosure. That's a lot of risk for ordinary investors to take on without disclosure.

RISKS TO THE BROADER CAPITAL MARKETS

The self-certification process contemplated by the bill risks investor protection not just in the crypto space; it could undermine the broader \$100 trillion capital markets by providing a path for those trying to escape robust disclosures, prohibitions preventing the loss and theft of customer funds, enforcement by the SEC, and private rights of action for investors in the federal courts. It

could encourage non-compliant entities to try to choose what regulatory regimes they wish to be subjected to—not based on economic realities, but potentially based on a label.

What if perpetrators of pump and dump schemes and penny stock pushers contend that they're outside of the securities laws by labeling themselves as crypto investment contracts or self-certifying that they are decentralized systems? The SEC would only have 60 days to contest their self-certification.

CONCLUSION

History has shown for 90 years that robust securities regulation both creates trust in markets and fosters innovation. There are countless examples of American companies across many industries that have made world-changing innovations while also registering their securities. It is through the securities laws that we get full, fair, and truthful disclosure that arms investors with the information they need to make investment decisions and enables regulators to guard against the types of fraud we've seen in the crypto field.

The crypto industry's record of failures, frauds, and bankruptcies is not because we don't have rules or because the rules are unclear. It's because many players in the crypto industry don't play by the rules. We should make the policy choice to protect the investing public over facilitating business models of noncompliant firms.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, DC, July 20, 2023.

Hon. MAXINE WATERS,
Ranking Member, Committee on Financial Services,
House of Representatives, Washington,
DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WATERS: Thank you for your June 23, 2023, letter requesting feedback on a legislative proposal to revise the market structure for digital assets.

As you know, in response to President Biden's March 9, 2022, Executive Order 14067 on Ensuring Responsible Development of Digital Assets, the U.S. Department of the Treasury ("Treasury") prepared reports covering a range of topics related to digital assets, including current use cases of digital assets and their effects on consumers, investors, and businesses. In addition, the Financial Stability Oversight Council ("FSOC") published a report on the potential financial stability risks posed by digital assets. Events that have occurred since publishing these reports—including the failures of large crypto firms, runs on stablecoins, and losses to investors and consumers—have confirmed and reinforced many of the risks and concerns identified in the reports.

These events have also reinforced the reports' recommendations for how to address these risks. First, the existing market regulatory framework is designed to address many of the risks posed by digital assets. For example, the protections and principles of the existing framework—including governance and risk management standards, and protections against commingling of customer assets—are directly responsive to the failures of large crypto platforms. Accordingly, where existing requirements apply, they must be enforced rigorously so that the same protections and principles that apply in markets for other financial assets apply in markets for digital assets.

At the same time, the FSOC report also identified discrete gaps in existing regulatory authority and recommended that Congress expand regulators' authorities to address these gaps. First, the FSOC recommended that Congress provide authority over the spot market for non-security digital

assets. Today, these markets are subject to limited direct federal regulation and, as a result, are not subject to the same protections that are designed to ensure orderly trading, prevent conflicts of interest, and protect investors. Second, the FSOC recommended that Congress ensure that regulators have visibility into the activities of affiliates and subsidiaries of federally regulated intermediaries. Today, digital asset platforms may have affiliates or subsidiaries operating under different regulatory frameworks, and no single regulator may have visibility into the risks across the entire business. Finally, and as we have discussed previously, FSOC recommended establishing a regulatory framework for stablecoins.

In developing these recommendations and when considering legislative proposals, we are guided by our and the FSOC's prior work on digital assets. More specifically,

Existing authorities should be preserved. As discussed above, the existing market regulatory framework is designed to address many of the risks of digital assets. Exceptions and limitations to the existing framework—whether on a provisional or ongoing basis—would leave investors without critical protections and undermine market integrity. For example, provisional or temporary exemptions should not exclude core protections that are critical to an effective market regulatory regime, such as requirements that ensure orderly trading and to protect against conflicts of interest. Immunizing issuers and platforms from enforcement of prior violations prevents redress of harms done to investors and undermines market integrity. On an ongoing basis, limiting market regulators' ability and discretion to act would undermine their ability to provide clarity to market participants.

Same risk, same activity, same regulatory outcome. Activities that bear the same risks should be subject to the same regulatory outcome. To that end, when creating new regulatory categories—e.g., new pathways to access capital markets, or distinguishing a type of trading platforms—policymakers must consider carefully how existing products or services may be affected, either disadvantaged relative to the new category or migrating to take advantage of more favorable treatment. Technological differences may be relevant to regulatory treatment, but only insofar as these distinctions inform the conduct of the activity and how risks manifest. The process for accessing capital markets, along with the conduct of secondary market activity within those markets, should reflect the underlying risks, not the technology used. Fraud, misstatements, and other misconduct in digital asset markets do not suggest that the underlying technology is associated with a reduction in or change to the underlying risks for investors. Moreover, regulatory distinctions based on technology alone are prone to arbitrage or obsolescence, in part because they do not always appropriately reflect the underlying risks. Finally, regulatory arbitrage also may have a wide range of financial stability and other risks if activities that bear the same risks are subject to different rules or if firms can operate in a manner that prevents regulators from assessing the totality of the organization's risks. Today, the operations and organizational structures of digital asset trading platforms may result in having different regulatory regimes for different affiliates or subsidiaries, such that no single regulator has a view into operations of the whole. By adding new regulatory distinctions without appropriately addressing the underlying risks of the activity or conduct, the proposal could amplify these risks.

Robust regulation of spot markets. Investors in non-security digital asset spot mar-

kets, which includes many retail investors, should have the same basic protections as are present in other trading markets. Accordingly, and consistent with the principles above, regulatory authority should cover a range of subjects, including conflicts of interest, abusive trading practices, margin, trade reporting, governance, capital, record-keeping, governance, custody, and settlement. Regulatory authority should be accompanied by resources sufficient to ensure that implementation is effective.

We appreciate your leadership on these issues and share your concerns that many digital assets present significant risks to consumers, investors, and businesses, and have the potential to pose significant risks to the broader financial system. We also appreciate your engagement with Treasury on these issues, and we look forward to working with you and your staff in the future. If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact the Office of Legislative Affairs.

Sincerely,

JONATHAN DAVIDSON,
NORTH AMERICAN SECURITIES ADMINISTRATORS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
May 21, 2024.

Re Vote NO on H.R. 4763, the Financial Innovation and Technology Act for the 21st Century Act, As Amended

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON AND DEMOCRATIC LEADER JEFFRIES: On behalf of the North American Securities Administrators Association, Inc. ("NASAA"), I write to express strong opposition to H.R. 4763, the Financial Innovation and Technology for the 21st Century Act, as amended ("H.R. 4763"). In short, H.R. 4763 would create a bespoke, light-touch regime under federal securities and commodities laws to benefit market participants that elect to use blockchain and other distributed ledger technologies ("DLTs") to raise capital, manage risk, and trade products. As explained below, over time, this bill could upend decades of industry, judicial, legislative, and regulatory work to build capital markets that are the gold standard. Near-term, the bill would nullify or otherwise severely complicate the ability of securities regulators to fulfill their missions.

To begin, H.R. 4763 would supplant longstanding and critical components of securities laws through the introduction of new defined terms into our federal market frameworks for products such as "digital assets," "investment contract assets," and "digital commodities." Indeed, the point of entry to access this regime would be the definition of a "digital asset." The bill would define such products as any fungible digital representation of value that (i) can be exclusively possessed and transferred, person to person, without necessary reliance on an intermediary, (ii) is recorded on a cryptographically secured public distributed ledger, and (iii) is not a product enumerated in H.R. 4763, which in short is a list of selected products treated as securities and commodities under federal law. With respect to "digital assets" that run on a DLT that is certified as "decentralized," meaning no one person or entity had "unilateral authority" during the lookback period to control the operation of or access to the system, H.R. 4763 would treat them as "digital commodities." This designation would place them and associated intermediaries under the Commodity Futures Trading Commission ("CFTC"). By contrast, for those "digital assets" that run

on a DLT that is not “decentralized” enough to qualify as a “digital commodity,” H.R. 4763 would treat them as “digital assets,” “restricted digital assets” or “securities,” depending on the facts. This designation would place or keep them and associated intermediaries under the Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”). Alarming, H.R. 4763 would define “investment contract assets” by carrying over the “digital assets” definition and then essentially carving the product out of federal securities laws, thereby creating a new gap, specifically the investment contracts assets gap with no federal market regulator in charge.

Staying on the bill’s impact on the SEC’s regulation of “digital assets,” the legislation would establish a new minimally transparent market for transactions “involving the offer or sale of units of a digital asset” that meet specified criteria. In short, H.R. 4763 would create an exemptive pathway for raising capital under the Securities Act of 1933 (“1933 Act”). Issuers relying on the exemption could raise as much as \$75 million within a 12-month period with certain limits on sales to non-accredited investors.

Importantly, while H.R. 4763 would prevent state governments from requiring issuers to register their digital asset offerings with the states, the legislation would preserve the ability of states to investigate and if appropriate bring enforcement actions for fraud and require notice filings and associated fees. Anti-fraud authority and notice filings are important tools that mirror existing state authority for certain other federal “covered securities.” However, they are insufficient regulatory tools when it comes to authority meant to stop potential harm before it is inflicted on retail investors. Unfortunately, fraud tied to the offer and sale of digital asset securities has been and continues to be a top investor threat.

Further, H.R. 4763 would introduce several new defined terms under federal securities law for intermediaries associated with “digital assets” such as a new category called a “digital asset broker.” Creating such bespoke new categories, particularly when they would or could be redundant of existing categories such as broker-dealer agents, would add complexity and costs to our federal market frameworks, with no net-benefit for investors. Indeed, years after the adoption of SEC Regulation Best Interest and Form CRS, many investors still struggle to distinguish between broker-dealer agents and investment adviser representatives. Injecting new, largely redundant digital asset intermediaries would only create more confusion and more conflicts for retail investors.

Undoubtedly, the deregulatory nature of this bill would prompt so-called traditional market participants to explore the use of DLTs if only to access a regime that has less transparency and less robust standards than the present one. We have seen time-and-again that market behaviors shift to more opaque areas of the markets, a move observable most recently in the now widespread use of the SEC Regulation D, Rule 506(b) exemption in lieu of public offerings. In addition to further reducing transparency in our markets, such a shift would create new competition concerns, particularly for small market participants who generally cannot afford to use the latest technology.

In sum, we believe this legislation began as a well-intentioned effort to fill what was described initially as a potential regulatory gap for so-called virtual currencies. Fast forward to today, the legislation that has emerged in the form of H.R. 4763 introduces anti-competitive, overly complicated, costly, and unwarranted changes to the laws that have protected investors and promoted robust capital markets for decades.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me or Kristen Hutchens, NASAA’s Director of Policy and Government Affairs, and Policy Counsel.

Respectfully,

JOSEPH BRADY,
NASAA Executive Director.

May 20, 2024.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON AND MINORITY LEADER JEFFRIES, We, the undersigned organizations and individuals, write to you today to express our opposition to H.R. 4763, the Financial Innovation and Technology for the 21st Century Act (The “FIT” Act). We urge you and Members of Congress to vote against this bill when it comes to floor this week. Many signatories of this letter also wrote to the House Financial Services and Agriculture Committees last year expressing their opposition to this bill when it was marked up in Committee. We see little in the new version of this bill (despite format and cosmetic changes) to assuage our concerns.

Consumers have lost trillions due to the 2022-2023 crypto collapse, in addition to the billions lost directly to widespread scams, fraud and theft found throughout the industry. Public opinion has largely soured on these speculative investments. Venture capital funding, which pumped crypto hype for years, often for their own firms’ benefit, plummeted during the crash, migrating to the next shiny object of discussion—AI. Most of the industry’s wounds are self-inflicted, and are a result of either failure to adhere to the most basic financial management principles, rampant fraud, or both. Even now, after the prosecutions of Sam Bankman-Fried, Changpeng Zhao, and other seminal crypto players, many industry players large and small are still facing civil and criminal enforcement actions at the state, national and international level, as well as class-action lawsuits from defrauded customers. After 15 years, crypto still struggles to demonstrate viable use cases outside of speculative investment. While other tech has proven its usefulness many times over, crypto’s big moment is always just over the horizon. The industry has superficially recovered this year, in part due to controversial approval of spot BTC ETPs by the Securities Exchange Commission. Yet, the scams, hacks, theft, instability, reckless promotional activities, and regulatory evasion that were present during the last crypto bull market remain endemic in the industry today.

In the midst of this new bubble, a concentrated lobbying effort by the crypto industry, backed primarily by wealthy venture capital investors seeking short-term returns on risky investments, has moved lawmakers to advance this proposal with potentially radical implications that would, in the name of “crypto innovation” and so-called “regulatory clarity,” complicate and weaken consumer and investor protections for both traditional and crypto investors. It would also broadly reshape financial regulatory agencies’ jurisdictions and weaken regulatory oversight of financial products and services writ large. All this could result in real harm to consumers and investors, whether they invest in crypto or not.

We have numerous concerns about the bill; we discuss a set of crucial problems below.

A potential backdoor path to undermine the Howey Test. For decades, the Howey Test—a legal framework outlined by a Supreme Court ruling that is used to determine whether certain transactions qualify as in-

vestment contracts, and thus must adhere to robust investor safeguards—has been a vetted and reliable formula used by the courts and regulators to determine whether certain investment activities, assets and actors should be subject to investor protection standards under securities law. The crypto industry’s efforts to contest the notion that crypto assets aren’t securities under Howey have had a rocky trajectory—a few wins, many more losses and settlements in court. As described further below, much of this bill seeks to circumvent these standards, in part by creating a fast-track, rubber stamp process to designate crypto assets as “commodities,” thus narrowing application of securities regulation to those assets and related actors.

But, leaving nothing to chance, Title II of the FIT Act also declares that, if enacted, all “investment contracts assets”—which are defined in the bill as digital assets—are not securities, full stop. This would likely not only undermine application of the Howey Test to crypto assets and activities writ large (even when evidently appropriate) but would also invite non-crypto actors to use this new terminology to evade coverage of the Howey Test for their investment products and activities as well. Instead of applying the principles of “same activities, same risks, same rules” which helps create consistent regulatory standards, this bill seeks to re-write large swathes of securities law to create special exceptions and lighter regulations for crypto. And it does so in ways that are likely to undermine consistent regulation and investor protection more broadly. That means even investors who never touch crypto may be harmed by this bill if enacted.

A blueprint for unregistered stock offerings. This bill creates a blueprint for crypto asset issuers to effectively issue “unregistered stock,” by enacting a static decentralized system definition that would allow crypto asset issuers and traders to qualify as decentralized when certain conditions are met, and therefore be exempt from most meaningful securities regulatory oversight. This approach effectively codifies existing crypto business models that are all too often used to exploit retail investors for the benefit of a smaller group of initial investors.

A roadmap for traditional financial firms to use “decentralized networks” to evade more rigorous oversight. Not only could the decentralization framework named above allow crypto firms to largely continue with dangerous business practices as usual; it could also enable traditional financial firms to evade more robust regulatory oversight by claiming their products and platforms meet this decentralization rubric (e.g. “slap a blockchain on it”), and thus are exempt from conventional regulatory requirements for securities issuers and actors. This would create huge potential risks for consumers, investors, and markets due to less rigorous oversight than they would otherwise see with traditional regulatory approaches.

A rubber-stamp certification scheme for crypto “commodities.” The bill’s self-certification process for crypto industry actors makes it very easy for anyone to declare they fall under CFTC jurisdiction (as crypto commodity issuers, brokers, etc.) The SEC is given nominal authority to intervene in these certifications, but the bill sets a 60-day time limit for such interventions, requires the agency to do extensive legal analysis, and allows the CFTC to intervene and applicants to file appeals. This process and unreasonable timeline stacks the deck against the appropriate securities regulation of crypto assets that should fall under the SEC’s jurisdiction, and all but guarantees many asset issuers and traders will flood the system seeking registration under the CFTC. This

also flies in the face of arguments that this bill is intended to address a targeted gap in crypto spot market regulation, when it's clear the scope of assets and actors that can and would likely seek registration with the CFTC is far greater.

A vague mandate for CFTC that lacks clarity or sufficient investor and consumer protections. The bill grants the CFTC new regulatory authority over crypto commodities and crypto commodity traders, but the language regarding consumer and investor protection provisions in the bill is vague, narrowly cast, or left up to rulemakings, and not fully commensurate with investor protection provisions found in the securities regulatory framework. If and when the agency sought to further define these elements—especially if they were to do so in a robust way—they would likely face significant litigation from crypto and non-crypto entities alike, as the bill's proposals are not fully supported by or consistent with its current statutory mandate, which is largely focused on anti-fraud and market manipulation measures meant to address activity by large, sophisticated trading firms, not retail crypto investors buying crypto from their phone on an app.

The legal wrangling that would likely ensue could take years, if not decades, to resolve—leaving crypto investors without adequate regulatory protections in the interim. Lastly, it's possible the regulatory authority given to the CFTC under this bill could undermine the authority of agencies such as the CFPB to regulate and oversee crypto consumer financial products and services as well. All told, instead of the so-called “regulatory clarity” the crypto industry claims it needs to be compliant with basic investor protection safeguards, this bill is more likely to introduce regulatory chaos for crypto and non-crypto actors alike.

Weaker regulatory requirements for many crypto securities. The bill's regulatory provisions for those crypto assets that are deemed ‘securities’ allow for major exemptions for crypto asset issuers whose sales are under \$75 million a year—a threshold that would exclude thousands of tokens currently on the market. This exemption would allow crypto securities issuers to issue what amount to private offerings to the broader investor public, without adequate regulatory oversight. Numerous crypto scams and pump and dump schemes have fleeced crypto consumers with sales volumes of far less.

An expansive temporary safe harbor that tacitly rewards non-compliance. Finally, this bill, via a “notice of intent to file” provision, creates an expansive safe harbor for crypto platforms and crypto asset issuers, whereby firms can offer nominal information about their business regulators and “provisionally” register with the SEC or CFTC while these agencies enact more formal rules. By giving such safe harbor (which given rulemaking timelines, could potentially last for years) crypto firms currently out of compliance with existing financial regulatory laws would be sheltered from current or future legal action, and would be free to continue with business as usual. We fear this would give such firms a patina of legitimacy which could draw unwary consumers back to crypto, exposing them to more risk and harm.

A lack of action to protect the right to private action for consumers and investors. The recent collapse or bankruptcy of multiple crypto firms—Terraform Labs, 3AC, Voyager Digital, Celsius Network, BlockFI, Genesis Global Capital, Gemini Trust, FTX, and many others—has illustrated how important it is to preserve investor rights that provide to access US courts, help hold bad actors accountable and enable investors to recover

their losses. Yet, this bill fails to create such protections within this framework, does nothing to preserve existing investor rights and does not include a savings clause to retain these rights under state law as well. The bill also fails to address the widespread use by crypto firms of forced arbitration clauses and other onerous limitations on consumers' and investors' rights.

All told, we believe this bill as written introduces a policy “cure” that would be far worse than the disease and create significant harm within and far beyond the crypto industry. Regulators already have extensive existing powers to regulate this industry, the same way other financial products and services are regulated. Those regulatory gaps that may exist require a targeted, narrow, and measured approach, but this bill is sweeping and broad in scope, and should it become law it would profoundly undermine the SEC's ability to support orderly markets and protect investors from harm.

Instead of pursuing this ill-advised proposal, the best immediate step Congress could take to protect consumers who choose to participate in crypto markets would be to support regulators' ongoing efforts to enforce existing regulatory standards that apply to crypto actors, assets and activities—the very basic elements of securities, banking and consumer finance regulation which provide the foundation for consumer and investor protections in the financial regulatory realm.

Thank you.

Signed,

ORGANIZATIONS

American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME); American Association for Justice; American Economic Liberties Project; AFL-CIO; Americans for Financial Reform; Center for American Progress; Center for Economic Integrity; Center for Responsible Lending; Clean Energy Action; Communication Workers of America; Consumer Federation of America; Consumer Reports; DC Consumer Rights Coalition; Demand Progress; Democracy for America Advocacy Fund; Economic Action Maryland; Empower Our Future.

Food and Water Watch; Groundwork Data; ISAAH (MN); Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy; Maine People's Alliance; National Community Reinvestment Coalition; National Consumer Law Center, on behalf of its low-income clients; P Street; Public Citizen; RAISE Texas; Revolving Door Project; Rise Economy; US PIRG; Take On Wall Street; Texas Applesseed; THIS! Is What We Did; Virginia Poverty Law Center; Woodstock Institute; 20/20 Vision; 350Hawaii.

INDIVIDUALS (TITLES AND INSTITUTIONS PROVIDED FOR IDENTIFICATION PURPOSES ONLY AND DO NOT CONSTITUTE INSTITUTIONAL ENDORSEMENTS)

Anat Admati, George G.C. Parker Professor of Finance and Economics, Graduate School of Business, Stanford University

Hilary J. Allen, Professor of Law, Associate Dean for Scholarship, American University Washington College of Law

Raúl Carrillo, Academic Fellow, Columbia Law School

Brian Flick, Ohio State Chair, National Association of Consumer Advocates

Richard W. Painter, S. Walter Richey Professor of Corporate Law, University of Minnesota Law School

Todd Phillips, Assistant Professor of Legal Studies, Robinson College of Business, Georgia State University

Lee Reiners, Lecturing Fellow, Duke Financial Economics Center and Duke Law

Jennifer Taub, Professor of Law, Wayne State University Law School (Fall 2024)

Urska Velikonja, Associate Dean For Academic Affairs, Professor of Law and Anne Fleming Research Professor, Georgetown Law School

Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr., Professor Emeritus of Law, George Washington University Law School

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I also include an excerpt from Coinbase's Form S-1 filing acknowledging the risk that Coinbase could be found to be illegally acting outside of securities laws, excerpts from the SEC's complaint against Coinbase alleging that Coinbase was illegally acting outside of securities laws; and a summary of, and key excerpt from, the decision in the case of SEC v. Coinbase, finding that Coinbase was indeed acting illegally by failing to comply with existing laws.

SEC V. COINBASE

EXCERPT FROM COINBASE S-1 FILING ON “RISK FACTORS”

As indicated in the above complaint, in its Form S-1 filing with the SEC Coinbase acknowledged the risks that the crypto assets it makes available on its platform could be deemed securities, and therefore Coinbase could be found to be engaging in unregistered brokerage, exchange, and/or clearing-agency activity:

“A particular crypto asset's status as a “security” in any relevant jurisdiction is subject to a high degree of uncertainty and if we are unable to properly characterize a crypto asset, we may be subject to regulatory scrutiny, investigations, fines, and other penalties, which may adversely affect our business, operating results, and financial condition. The SEC and its staff have taken the position that certain crypto assets fall within the definition of a “security” under the U.S. federal securities laws. The legal test for determining whether any given crypto asset is a security is a highly complex, fact-driven analysis that evolves over time, and the outcome is difficult to predict. The SEC generally does not provide advance guidance or confirmation on the status of any particular crypto asset as a security. Furthermore, the SEC's views in this area have evolved over time and it is difficult to predict the direction or timing of any continuing evolution. It is also possible that a change in the governing administration or the appointment of new SEC commissioners could substantially impact the views of the SEC and its staff . . . With respect to all other crypto assets, there is currently no certainty under the applicable legal test that such assets are not securities, notwithstanding the conclusions we may draw based on our risk-based assessment regarding the likelihood that a particular crypto asset could be deemed a “security” under applicable laws.

The classification of a crypto asset as a security under applicable law has wide-ranging implications for the regulatory obligations that flow from the offer, sale, trading, and clearing of such assets. Persons that effect transactions in crypto assets that are securities in the United States may be subject to registration with the SEC as a “broker” or “dealer.” Platforms that bring together purchasers and sellers to trade crypto assets that are securities in the United States are generally subject to registration as national securities exchanges, or must qualify for an exemption, such as by being operated by a registered broker-dealer as an alternative trading system, or ATS, in compliance with rules for ATSs. Persons facilitating clearing and settlement of securities may be subject to registration with the SEC as a clearing agency.

SUMMARY AND EXCERPT FROM OPINION OF THE JUDGE FROM THE US DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK, DENYING COINBASE'S MOTION TO DISMISS IN THE CASE OF SEC V. COINBASE

In March 2024, U.S. District Court Judge Katherine Polk Failla of the Southern District of New York made a preliminary ruling in the Coinbase case, holding that because at least some crypto trades on the Coinbase platform met the longstanding definition of an investment contract, the SEC can move ahead with claims that Coinbase improperly operated as a securities exchange, broker and clearing agency. She also said the SEC adequately alleged that Coinbase sold unregistered securities through its staking program. In an 84-page opinion, the judge asserted, among other things, that “the ‘crypto’ nomenclature may be of recent vintage, but the challenged transactions fall comfortably within the framework that courts have used to identify securities for nearly eighty years.”

EXCERPTS FROM THE SEC'S COMPLAINT FILED AGAINST COINBASE IN JUNE 2023

“In September 2019, Coinbase released a framework for analyzing crypto assets that assigned to the crypto asset a score ranging from 1 to 5, with a score of 1 indicating that an “asset has few or no characteristics consistent with treatment as an investment contract,” and a score of 5 meaning that an “asset has many characteristics strongly consistent with treatment as a security.” Meanwhile, between 2019 and 2020, Coinbase more than doubled the number of crypto assets available for trading on its platform, and it more than doubled that number again in 2021. During this period, Coinbase made available on its platform crypto assets with high “risk” scores under the CRC framework it had adopted. In other words, to realize exponential growth of the Coinbase Platform and boost its own trading profits, Coinbase made the strategic business decision to add crypto assets to the Coinbase Platform even where it recognized the crypto assets had the characteristics of securities.”

Coinbase generates most of its revenue from transaction fees collected on crypto asset trades made through the Coinbase Platform, Prime, and Wallet. For example, in 2021, Coinbase generated \$6.8 billion in “transaction revenue,” out of a total net revenue of \$7.4 billion. Likewise, in 2022, Coinbase generated over \$2.2 billion in transaction revenue out of a total net revenue of \$3.1 billion.

“Coinbase also worked closely with issuers of crypto assets who sought to have their crypto assets listed on Coinbase. Coinbase’s “Listings Team” engaged in a dialogue with issuers focused on identifying potential “roadblocks” under Howey. For example, on one occasion, Coinbase identified “problematic statements” by an issuer that described its crypto asset “with language traditionally associated with securities,” “implying that the asset is an investment or way to earn profit,” “emphasizing the profitability of a project and/or the historic or potential appreciation of the value of the assets,” and “using terms referring to the assets that are commonly associated with securities such as ‘dividend,’ ‘interest,’ ‘investment’ or ‘investors.’” As “possible mitigation,” Coinbase suggested that the issuer “remove any existing problematic statements, and refrain from making problematic statements in the future.” Coinbase was thus aware of the risk that it could be making available for trading on the Coinbase Platform crypto assets that were being offered and sold as securities. Indeed, Coinbase touted to the investing public its familiarity with the relevant legal analysis governing the offer and sale of securities.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MANN).

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chair, my home State of Kansas is a leader when it comes to agriculture innovation. A lesson that I have learned from Kansans is that we must be ready to respond to new technological developments as they come to life. Digital asset markets are no exception.

As these markets have grown, they have lacked congressional guidance over who has regulatory and enforcement authority over them. Currently, participants are at the mercy of regulators who continue to assert jurisdiction and extend their authority through enforcement actions, all without legislation and direction from Congress.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this bill to establish a framework consistent with existing financial market requirements while acknowledging the uniqueness of digital assets. We can and should give consumers, developers, and institutions a clear set of rules that provide certainty as they explore this new, innovative technology.

Digital assets and related blockchain technology have the potential to lead us to the next generation of internet technology. Everyone here should want America to be a place where this flourishes. That is what FIT21 does. It allows America to build on this potential. If we do not act now, we cede American leadership, talent, and innovation.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on FIT21.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FLOOD), a great legislator in the innovation space.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chair, I would like to focus on one particular aspect of this bill. It is exactly responsive to the problems in the digital assets market that we have seen over the last couple of years.

In the aftermath of the collapse of FTX in 2022, we need to ensure that there are investor protection rules that prevent anything from happening like that again in the United States.

Under the regulatory structure created by this bill, FTX would not have been able to register. FTX would not have been able to commingle customer funds that hurt so many of their investors.

Some of my friends on the other side of the aisle have spoken about protecting investors. The great irony is that they are opposing a bill that would do just that. If you believe in investor protection, if you believe we need to respond to the disaster of FTX, then we need to pass a bill that would prevent the next FTX.

The status quo will not work. It did not work in 2022, and it will not work today.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROSE), a great leader on the Agriculture and Financial Services Committees.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 4763, the Financial Innovation and Technology for the 21st Century Act, or the FIT21.

As a member of the House Financial Services and Agriculture Committees, I am proud to support this bill. This product is a joint effort between both committees. I commend both Chairman MCHENRY and Chairman THOMPSON for working on this bipartisan legislation.

This bill confronts the litigation-heavy approach toward digital assets of the Securities and Exchange Commission led by rogue regulator Gary Gensler. Chair Gensler has blown past the SEC’s statutory mandate and instead forced investors and companies to operate in the dark, thus risking the United States’ standing as a world leader in digital innovation.

The Financial Innovation and Technology for the 21st Century Act will allow the U.S. to reclaim our place as a world leader in innovation and provides clear rules of the road for cryptocurrencies.

Mr. Chair, I urge Members to join me in voting “yes.”

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina has 7 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California 4 has minutes remaining.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), a leader on the Agriculture Committee, a former chair of the Agriculture Committee, a great leader on the Financial Services Committee, and also the chair of the Science Committee, before I forget.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chair, the United States has no meaningful Federal regulation of the digital asset markets. The attempts by regulators to apply existing laws are arbitrary and unclear.

The fact is, the status quo does not work. Without a clear Federal framework, we fail to provide adequate consumer protections and forfeit our international competitiveness. This hurts U.S. consumers, investors, and the entire economy.

This is why this bill is so important. The legislation establishes a market structure framework that accounts for the unique characteristics of digital assets, adhering to the core principles of the Commodity Exchange Act.

U.S. consumers are actively participating in the digital asset market, and we should ensure they are protected from fraud and scams. This bill does that.

Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman MCHENRY and Chairman THOMPSON for

all of their work on this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), the chair of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee of the House Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chair, since the first cryptocurrency network was created nearly 15 years ago, the rules governing the digital asset ecosystem have remained unclear.

As I learned while serving as chairman of the Capital Markets Subcommittee, regulators have been using opaque guidelines and regulation by enforcement. Meanwhile, Congress has been working on a bipartisan path forward.

Digital assets have the potential to revolutionize payment systems in the United States by allowing financial systems to become more efficient and more accessible to consumers.

By passing a comprehensive market structure framework, responsible actors will now have greater certainty and consumers will have greater protection from bad actors.

Mr. Chair, our markets are the envy of the world. We must not cede any ground. American innovation is a critical element of job creation and economic opportunity here in the United States. Congress must look to preserve this competitive advantage and not let it leave our shores. FIT21 is a historic first step.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, does the gentlewoman have any additional speakers?

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, if the gentleman has no more speakers, I am prepared to close.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. KIM).

Mrs. KIM of California. Mr. Chair, millions of Americans from all backgrounds see digital assets as one of the many options to take wealth creation into their own hands. Unfortunately, the U.S. is falling behind compared to other countries, and we have yet to establish a viable regulatory framework for digital assets.

H.R. 4763 establishes a much-needed digital asset market structure framework that provides clear rules for digital asset firms while providing robust consumer protections. Thus, I believe this bill is very fit for the 21st century.

FIT21 would enable innovation to flourish and the United States to lead the world in the development of digital assets. The EU, the U.K., Hong Kong—and the list goes on—have established or are in the process of establishing a regulatory framework.

The development of technologies and new financial services tools should be

taking place here, not elsewhere. Mr. Chair, I urge a “yes” vote on H.R. 4763.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIL), the chair of the House Administration Committee and a great member of the Financial Services Committee on innovation policy.

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the Financial Innovation and Technology for the 21st Century Act.

Blockchain and digital assets are transforming finance and reshaping, in particular, the way the internet works, but responsible innovators are being held back by stubborn Washington bureaucrats. It is pushing jobs and opportunities overseas.

For the first time in generations, the U.S. is at risk of missing out on leading the next wave of technology. FIT21 provides clear rules for digital assets and related businesses. It protects consumers and strengthens transparency and accountability. It establishes the United States as a technology leader.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the bill and bring jobs, opportunities, and innovation in digital assets to the United States.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS).

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chair, I rise in favor of the Financial Innovation and Technology for the 21st Century Act, which establishes a much-needed regulatory framework for digital assets.

Currently, the lack of clear direction from Congress, combined with broad definitions of securities and commodities, has allowed the SEC to insert itself into the regulation of cryptocurrency. This has created uncertainty and hindered innovation.

Meanwhile, other countries like Singapore, UAE, and even China have capitalized on our unclear regulatory environment. They have developed their own framework, positioning themselves as hubs for the digital asset ecosystem.

I believe the United States, and particularly Utah's Silicon Slopes, which boasts a growing and thriving blockchain industry, should be the global center for digital assets.

This bill creates an appropriate framework for cryptocurrency regulation that fosters innovation and ensures U.S. leadership in blockchain technology while also protecting against bad actors like FTX.

The Financial Innovation and Technology for the 21st Century Act realigns the SEC with its appropriate regulatory role and designates the Commodity Futures Trading Commission as the primary regulator of cryptocurrency as a commodity. It also clarifies the SEC's role in regulating digital assets.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, as we have heard today, the entities that stand to benefit from this bill are not ordinary investors trying to build wealth but rather the crypto firms that have chosen not to register with the SEC or otherwise comply with the securities laws.

They have already made billions of dollars unlawfully issuing or facilitating the buying and selling of crypto securities, and Republicans are now proposing to reward these illegal activities by making these activities legal. This is truly preposterous.

Mr. LYNCH, when he spoke, said this was one of the worst pieces of legislation he has experienced during his entire career. I understood why when I examined this bill and I saw that the Republicans created this new definition. This new definition is known as the investment contract assets.

We have talked about this, but even in the Rules Committee, while they were talking about how this bill was going to protect consumers, they did not debate us about this investment contract asset because they know that it created a void. It created a no-man's-land. This was created basically so that the crypto companies could be in a space without regulation, but it goes further than that.

□ 1600

It also covers traditional securities so they can be in a space without regulations.

It is not enough to say this is a bad bill. This is not only a bad bill, this is a bill where the crypto companies decided they didn't like the SEC, they do not want to be regulated, and they were going to come to the Congress of the United States. They were going to use their power, they were going to use their influence to change the rules of the game, and they were going to now go to where the commodities are regulated, and they are going to take the securities over there.

I explained to you that the CFTC is a small agency. I explained to you that they don't have a lot of money. I explained to you how much smaller they are than the SEC.

The SEC are the experts. They have been developing regulations for this country for 90 years. The SEC is 90 years old, and it is respected all over the world. We are the envy of the world because we have an SEC.

When I talk about this void that has been created, there is no way that the Members of this Congress can allow that to happen, to allow this no-man's-land to exist where the same crypto companies are now refusing to register, who are unlawful, that you are going to exonerate and then you are going to further give them the opportunity to operate without regulation.

This is unbelievable. How can this happen in the Congress of the United States in the House of Representatives where we are supposed to represent the people?

We have an SEC that is a cop on the block. We have an SEC that is expert

in securities. The SEC goes into the courts, and they fight tough battles. These battles are long. These battles are hard because they are fought by the crypto companies. They don't give up because at least they have people who can begin to work on it. We try to give the SEC more money to do their work, but they are denied additional appropriations by the other side of the aisle.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. FULCHER). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me speak to this. The void is the lack of a definition of what is a digital asset in Federal law. We have none. This bill establishes it. We have no consumer protections for crypto today. This bill establishes it both at the CFTC with a robust oversight of this industry and the SEC with real clarity. That is what this bill does is provide clarity for investors and consumers and innovators.

We are falling behind Europe. This bill catches us up so that we do not lose out on innovation policy to the Europeans, to the folks in the U.K., to Singapore, to Japan, to Hong Kong that all have regimes similar to what we are doing in this bill.

This is an important bill. It is bipartisan work. Hundreds of hours have been put into developing this bill with Members and staff.

I thank the great partnership I have had with FRENCH HILL of the Financial Services Committee and Chairman GT THOMPSON on the Ag Committee and DUSTY JOHNSON on the Ag Committee. I also thank the great staff on the House Financial Services Committee, Allison Behuniak, who has shepherded this bill to this point and Paul Balzano on the Ag Committee. They have worked in great partnership and friendship and worked through major issues. I thank them for this important legislative product.

We can promote American innovation, consumer protection, and leadership with a clear regulatory framework for digital assets. The next generation of internet technology is being written. It should be written by American innovators here in the United States. We can allow that innovation to pass us by, or we can seize the opportunity and pass this bill to provide real clarity for innovation policy here in the United States.

Regulatory clarity and consumer protection, that is FIT21.

Let's vote "yes" on this bill and establish bipartisan support for crypto in America. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendments in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committees on Agriculture and Financial Services, printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-33, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 118-516, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 4763

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the “Financial Innovation and Technology for the 21st Century Act”.

(b) *TABLE OF CONTENTS.*—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—DEFINITIONS; RULEMAKING; NOTICE OF INTENT TO REGISTER

Sec. 101. Definitions under the Securities Act of 1933.

Sec. 102. Definitions under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

Sec. 103. Definitions under the Commodity Exchange Act.

Sec. 104. Definitions under this Act.

Sec. 105. Rulemakings.

Sec. 106. Notice of intent to register for digital commodity exchanges, brokers, and dealers.

Sec. 107. Notice of intent to register for digital asset brokers, dealers, and trading systems.

Sec. 108. Commodity Exchange Act savings provisions.

Sec. 109. Administrative requirements.

Sec. 110. International harmonization.

Sec. 111. Implementation.

TITLE II—CLARITY FOR ASSETS OFFERED AS PART OF AN INVESTMENT CONTRACT

Sec. 201. Short title.

Sec. 202. Treatment of investment contract assets.

TITLE III—OFFERS AND SALES OF DIGITAL ASSETS

Sec. 301. Exempted transactions in digital assets.

Sec. 302. Requirements for offers and sales of certain digital assets.

Sec. 303. Enhanced disclosure requirements.

Sec. 304. Certification of certain digital assets.

Sec. 305. Effective date.

TITLE IV—REGISTRATION FOR DIGITAL ASSET INTERMEDIARIES AT THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Sec. 401. Treatment of digital commodities and other digital assets.

Sec. 402. Authority over permitted payment stablecoins and restricted digital assets.

Sec. 403. Registration of digital asset trading systems.

Sec. 404. Requirements for digital asset trading systems.

Sec. 405. Registration of digital asset brokers and digital asset dealers.

Sec. 406. Requirements of digital asset brokers and digital asset dealers.

Sec. 407. Rules related to conflicts of interest.

Sec. 408. Treatment of certain digital assets in connection with federally regulated intermediaries.

Sec. 409. Exclusion for decentralized finance activities.

Sec. 410. Registration and requirements for notice-registered digital asset clearing agencies.

Sec. 411. Treatment of custody activities by banking institutions.

Sec. 412. Effective date; administration.

Sec. 413. Discretionary Surplus Fund.

TITLE V—REGISTRATION FOR DIGITAL ASSET INTERMEDIARIES AT THE COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

Sec. 501. Commission jurisdiction over digital commodity transactions.

Sec. 502. Requiring futures commission merchants to use qualified digital commodity custodians.

Sec. 503. Trading certification and approval for digital commodities.

Sec. 504. Registration of digital commodity exchanges.

Sec. 505. Qualified digital commodity custodians.

Sec. 506. Registration and regulation of digital commodity brokers and dealers.

Sec. 507. Registration of associated persons.

Sec. 508. Registration of commodity pool operators and commodity trading advisors.

Sec. 509. Exclusion for decentralized finance activities.

Sec. 510. Funding for implementation and enforcement.

Sec. 511. Effective date.

TITLE VI—INNOVATION AND TECHNOLOGY IMPROVEMENTS

Sec. 601. Findings; sense of Congress.

Sec. 602. Codification of the SEC Strategic Hub for Innovation and Financial Technology.

Sec. 603. Codification of LabCFTC.

Sec. 604. CFTC-SEC Joint Advisory Committee on Digital Assets.

Sec. 605. Study on decentralized finance.

Sec. 606. Study on non-fungible digital assets.

Sec. 607. Study on expanding financial literacy amongst digital asset holders.

Sec. 608. Study on financial market infrastructure improvements.

TITLE I—DEFINITIONS; RULEMAKING; NOTICE OF INTENT TO REGISTER

SEC. 101. DEFINITIONS UNDER THE SECURITIES ACT OF 1933.

Section 2(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77b(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(20) *AFFILIATED PERSON.*—

“(A) *IN GENERAL.*—The term ‘affiliated person’ means a person (including a related person) that—

“(i) with respect to a digital asset issuer—

“(I) directly, or indirectly through one or more intermediaries, controls, or is controlled by, or is under common control with, such digital asset issuer; or

“(II) was described under clause (i) at any point in the previous 3-month period; or

“(ii) with respect to any digital asset—

“(I) beneficially owns 5 percent or more of the units of such digital asset that are then outstanding; or

“(II) was described under clause (i) at any point in the previous 3-month period.

“(B) *BENEFICIAL OWNERSHIP DISCLOSURE.*—The Commission shall issue rules to require a person that beneficially owns 5 percent or more of the units of a digital asset that are then outstanding to file with the Commission a report at such time as the Commission determines appropriate.

“(21) *BLOCKCHAIN.*—The term ‘blockchain’ means any technology—

“(A) where data is—

“(i) shared across a network to create a public ledger of verified transactions or information among network participants;

“(ii) linked using cryptography to maintain the integrity of the public ledger and to execute other functions; and

“(iii) distributed among network participants in an automated fashion to concurrently update network participants on the state of the public ledger and any other functions; and

“(B) composed of source code that is publicly available.

“(22) BLOCKCHAIN PROTOCOL.—The term ‘blockchain protocol’ means any executable software deployed to a blockchain composed of source code that is publicly available and accessible, including a smart contract or any network of smart contracts.

“(23) BLOCKCHAIN SYSTEM.—The term ‘blockchain system’ means any blockchain or blockchain protocol.

“(24) DECENTRALIZED GOVERNANCE SYSTEM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘decentralized governance system’ means, with respect to a blockchain system, any rules-based system permitting persons using the blockchain system or the digital assets related to such blockchain system to form consensus or reach agreement in the development, provision, publication, management, or administration of such blockchain system.

“(B) RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONS TO DECENTRALIZED GOVERNANCE SYSTEMS.—Persons acting through a decentralized governance system shall be treated as separate persons unless such persons are under common control.

“(C) EXCLUSION.—The term ‘decentralized governance system’ does not include a system in which—

“(i) a person or group of persons under common control have the ability to—

“(I) unilaterally alter the rules of consensus or agreement for the blockchain system; or

“(II) determine the final outcome of decisions related to the development, provision, publication, management, or administration of such blockchain system;

“(ii) a person or group of persons is directly engaging in an activity that requires registration with the Commission or the Commodity Futures Trading Commission other than—

“(I) developing, providing, publishing, managing, or administering a blockchain system; or

“(II) an activity with respect to which the organization is exempt from such registration; or

“(iii) a person or group of persons seeking to knowingly evade the requirements imposed on a digital asset issuer, a related person, an affiliated person, or any other person registered (or required to be registered) under the securities laws, the Financial Innovation and Technology for the 21st Century Act, or the Commodity Exchange Act.

“(25) DECENTRALIZED SYSTEM.—With respect to a blockchain system to which a digital asset relates, the term ‘decentralized system’ means the following conditions are met:

“(A) During the previous 12-month period, no person—

“(i) had the unilateral authority, directly or indirectly, through any contract, arrangement, understanding, relationship, or otherwise, to control or materially alter the functionality or operation of the blockchain system; or

“(ii) had the unilateral authority to restrict or prohibit any person who is not a digital asset issuer, related person, or an affiliated person from—

“(I) using, earning, or transmitting the digital asset;

“(II) deploying software that uses or integrates with the blockchain system;

“(III) participating in a decentralized governance system with respect to the blockchain system; or

“(IV) operating a node, validator, or other form of computational infrastructure with respect to the blockchain system.

“(B) During the previous 12-month period—

“(i) no digital asset issuer or affiliated person beneficially owned, in the aggregate, 20 percent or more of the total amount of units of such digital asset that—

“(I) can be created, issued, or distributed in such blockchain system; and

“(II) were freely transferrable or otherwise used or available to be used for the purposes of such blockchain system;

“(ii) no digital asset issuer or affiliated person had the unilateral authority to direct the voting, in the aggregate, of 20 percent or more of the outstanding voting power of such digital asset or related decentralized governance system; or

“(iii) the digital asset did not include voting power with respect to any decentralized governance system of the blockchain system.

“(C) During the previous 3-month period, the digital asset issuer, any affiliated person, or any related person has not implemented or contributed any intellectual property to the source code of the blockchain system that materially alters the functionality or operation of the blockchain system, unless such implementation or contribution to the source code—

“(i) addressed vulnerabilities, errors, regular maintenance, cybersecurity risks, or other technical changes to the blockchain system; or

“(ii) were adopted through the consensus or agreement of a decentralized governance system.

“(D) During the previous 3-month period, neither any digital asset issuer nor any affiliated person described under paragraph (20)(A) has marketed to the public the digital assets as an investment.

“(E) During the previous 12-month period, all issuances of units of such digital asset through the programmatic functioning of the blockchain system were end user distributions. For purposes of the previous sentence, any units of such digital asset that are made available over time and were created in the initial block of the blockchain system shall be considered issued at the point in time of creation.

“(26) DIGITAL ASSET.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘digital asset’ means any fungible digital representation of value that can be exclusively possessed and transferred, person to person, without necessary reliance on an intermediary, and is recorded on a cryptographically secured public distributed ledger.

“(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term ‘digital asset’ does not include—

“(i) any note, stock, treasury stock, security future, security-based swap, bond, debenture, evidence of indebtedness, certificate of interest or participation in any profit-sharing agreement, collateral-trust certificate, preorganization certificate or subscription, transferable share, voting-trust certificate, certificate of deposit for a security, fractional undivided interest in oil, gas, or other mineral rights, any put, call, straddle, option, privilege on any security, certificate of deposit, or group or index of securities (including any interest therein or based on the value thereof); or

“(ii) any asset which, based on its terms and other characteristics, is, represents, or is functionally equivalent to an agreement, contract, or transaction that is—

“(I) a contract of sale of a commodity (as defined under section 1a of the Commodity Exchange Act) for future delivery or an option thereon;

“(II) a security futures product;

“(III) a swap;

“(IV) an agreement, contract, or transaction described in section 2(c)(2)(C)(i) or 2(c)(2)(D)(i) of the Commodity Exchange Act;

“(V) a commodity option authorized under section 4c of the Commodity Exchange Act; or

“(VI) a leverage transaction authorized under section 19 of the Commodity Exchange Act.

“(C) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to create a pre-

sumption that a digital asset is a representation of any type of security not excluded from the definition of digital asset.

“(D) RELATIONSHIP TO A BLOCKCHAIN SYSTEM.—A digital asset is considered to relate to a blockchain system if the digital asset is intrinsically linked to the blockchain system, including—

“(i) where the digital asset’s value is reasonably expected to be generated by the programmatic functioning of the blockchain system;

“(ii) where the digital asset has voting rights with respect to the decentralized governance system of the blockchain system; or

“(iii) where the digital asset is issued through the programmatic functioning of the blockchain system.

“(E) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DIGITAL ASSETS SOLD PURSUANT TO AN INVESTMENT CONTRACT.—A digital asset offered or sold or intended to be offered or sold pursuant to an investment contract is not and does not become a security as a result of being sold or otherwise transferred pursuant to that investment contract.

“(27) DIGITAL ASSET ISSUER.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to a digital asset, the term ‘digital asset issuer’ means any person that, in exchange for any consideration—

“(i) issues or causes to be issued a unit of such digital asset to a person; or

“(ii) offers or sells a right to a future issuance of a unit of such digital asset to a person.

“(B) EXCLUSION.—The term ‘digital asset issuer’ does not include any person solely because such person deploys source code that creates or issues units of a digital asset that are only distributed in end user distributions.

“(C) PROHIBITION ON EVASION.—It shall be unlawful for any person to knowingly evade classification as a ‘digital asset issuer’ and facilitate an arrangement for the primary purpose of effecting a sale, distribution, or other issuance of a digital asset.

“(28) DIGITAL ASSET MATURITY DATE.—The term ‘digital asset maturity date’ means, with respect to any digital asset, the first date on which 20 percent or more of the total units of such digital asset that are then outstanding as of such date are—

“(A) digital commodities; or

“(B) digital assets that have been registered with the Commission.

“(29) DIGITAL COMMODITY.—The term ‘digital commodity’ has the meaning given that term under section 1a of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1a).

“(30) END USER DISTRIBUTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘end user distribution’ means an issuance of a unit of a digital asset that—

“(i) does not involve an exchange of more than a nominal value of cash, property, or other assets; and

“(ii) is distributed in a broad, equitable, and non-discretionary manner based on conditions capable of being satisfied by any participant in the blockchain system, including, as incentive-based rewards—

“(I) to users of the digital asset or any blockchain system to which the digital asset relates;

“(II) for activities directly related to the operation of the blockchain system, such as mining, validating, staking, or other activity directly tied to the operation of the blockchain system; or

“(III) to the existing holders of another digital asset, in proportion to the total units of such other digital asset as are held by each person.

“(B) PROHIBITION ON EVASION.—It shall be unlawful for any person to facilitate an end user distribution to knowingly evade classification as a digital asset issuer, related person, or an affiliated person, or the requirements related to a digital asset issuance.

“(31) FUNCTIONAL SYSTEM.—With respect to a blockchain system to which a digital asset relates, the term ‘functional system’ means the

network allows network participants to use such digital asset for—

“(A) the transmission and storage of value on the blockchain system;

“(B) the participation in services provided by or an application running on the blockchain system; or

“(C) the participation in the decentralized governance system of the blockchain system.

“(32) PERMITTED PAYMENT STABLECOIN.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘permitted payment stablecoin’ means a digital asset—

“(i) that is or is designed to be used as a means of payment or settlement;

“(ii) the issuer of which—

“(I) is obligated to convert, redeem, or repurchase for a fixed amount of monetary value; or

“(II) represents will maintain or creates the reasonable expectation that it will maintain a stable value relative to the value of a fixed amount of monetary value;

“(iii) the issuer of which is subject to regulation by a Federal or State regulator with authority over entities that issue payment stablecoins; and

“(iv) that is not—

“(I) a national currency; or

“(II) a security issued by an investment company registered under section 8(a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a–8(a)).

“(B) MONETARY VALUE DEFINED.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term ‘monetary value’ means a national currency, deposit (as defined under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act), or an equivalent instrument that is denominated in a national currency.

“(33) RELATED PERSON.—With respect to a digital asset issuer, the term ‘related person’ means—

“(A) a founder, promoter, employee, consultant, advisor, or person serving in a similar capacity;

“(B) any person that is or was in the previous 6-month period an executive officer, director, trustee, general partner, advisory board member, or person serving in a similar capacity;

“(C) any equity holder or other security holder; or

“(D) any other person that received a unit of digital asset from such digital asset issuer through—

“(i) an exempt offering, other than an offering made in reliance on section 4(a)(8); or

“(ii) a distribution that is not an end user distribution described under section 42(d)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

“(34) RESTRICTED DIGITAL ASSET.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘restricted digital asset’ means—

“(i) prior to the first date on which each blockchain system to which a digital asset relates is a functional system and certified to be a decentralized system under section 44 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, any unit of the digital asset held by a person, other than the digital asset issuer, a related person, or an affiliated person, that was—

“(I) issued to such person through a distribution, other than an end user distribution described under section 42(d)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; or

“(II) acquired by such person in a transaction that was not executed on a digital commodity exchange;

“(ii) during any period when any blockchain system to which a digital asset relates is not a functional system or not certified to be a decentralized system under section 44 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, any digital asset held by a related person or an affiliated person; and

“(iii) any unit of a digital asset held by the digital asset issuer.

“(B) EXCLUSION.—The term ‘restricted digital asset’ does not include a permitted payment stablecoin.

“(35) SECURITIES LAWS.—The term ‘securities laws’ has the meaning given that term under section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)).

“(36) SOURCE CODE.—With respect to a blockchain system, the term ‘source code’ means a listing of commands to be compiled or assembled into an executable computer program.”.

SEC. 102. DEFINITIONS UNDER THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.

Section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)) is amended—

(8) by redesignating the second paragraph (80) (relating to funding portals) as paragraph (81); and

(9) by adding at the end the following:

“(82) BANK SECRECY ACT.—The term ‘Bank Secrecy Act’ means—

“(A) section 21 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1829b);

“(B) chapter 2 of title I of Public Law 91–508 (12 U.S.C. 1951 et seq.); and

“(C) subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code.

“(83) DIGITAL ASSET BROKER.—The term ‘digital asset broker’—

“(A) means any person engaged in the business of effecting transactions in restricted digital assets for the account of others; and

“(B) does not include—

“(i) a blockchain protocol or a person or group of persons solely because of their development of a blockchain protocol; or

“(ii) a bank engaging in certain banking activities with respect to a restricted digital asset in the same manner as a bank is excluded from the definition of a broker under paragraph (4).

“(84) DIGITAL ASSET CUSTODIAN.—The term ‘digital asset custodian’ means an entity in the business of providing custodial or safekeeping services for restricted digital assets for others.

“(85) DIGITAL ASSET DEALER.—The term ‘digital asset dealer’—

“(A) means any person engaged in the business of buying and selling restricted digital assets for such person’s own account through a broker or otherwise; and

“(B) does not include—

“(i) a person that buys or sells restricted digital assets for such person’s own account, either individually or in a fiduciary capacity, but not as a part of a regular business;

“(ii) a blockchain protocol or a person or group of persons solely because of their development of a blockchain protocol; or

“(iii) a bank engaging in certain banking activities with respect to a restricted digital asset in the same manner as a bank is excluded from the definition of a dealer under paragraph (5).

“(86) DIGITAL ASSET TRADING SYSTEM.—The term ‘digital asset trading system’—

“(A) means any organization, association, person, or group of persons, whether incorporated or unincorporated, that constitutes, maintains, or provides a market place or facilities for bringing together purchasers and sellers of restricted digital assets or for otherwise performing with respect to restricted digital assets the functions commonly performed by a stock exchange within the meaning of section 240.3b–16 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of enactment of this paragraph; and

“(B) does not include a blockchain protocol or a person or group of persons solely because of their development of a blockchain protocol.

“(87) NOTICE-REGISTERED DIGITAL ASSET CLEARING AGENCY.—The term ‘notice-registered digital asset clearing agency’ means a clearing agency that has registered with the Commission pursuant to section 17A(b)(9).

“(88) ADDITIONAL DIGITAL ASSET-RELATED TERMS.—

“(A) SECURITIES ACT OF 1933.—The terms ‘affiliated person’, ‘blockchain system’, ‘decentralized governance system’, ‘decentralized system’, ‘digital asset’, ‘digital asset issuer’, ‘digital asset maturity date’, ‘end user distribution’, ‘functional system’, ‘permitted payment stablecoin’, ‘related person’, ‘restricted digital asset’, and ‘source code’ have the meaning given those terms, respectively, under section 2(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77b(a)).

“(B) COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT.—The terms ‘digital commodity’, ‘digital commodity broker’, ‘digital commodity dealer’, and ‘digital commodity exchange’ have the meaning given those terms, respectively, under section 1A of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1a).”.

SEC. 103. DEFINITIONS UNDER THE COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT.

Section 1A of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1a) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (10)(A)—

(A) by redesignating clauses (iii) and (iv) as clauses (iv) and (v), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after clause (ii) the following: “(iii) digital commodity;”;

(2) in paragraph (11)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(i)—

(i) by redesignating subclauses (III) and (IV) as subclauses (IV) and (V), respectively; and

(ii) by inserting after subclause (II) the following:

“(III) digital commodity;”;

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C) and inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) EXCLUSION.—The term ‘commodity pool operator’ does not include—

“(i) a decentralized governance system; or

“(ii) any excluded activity, as described in section 4v.”;

(3) in paragraph (12)(A)(i)—

(A) in subclause (II), by adding at the end a semicolon;

(B) by redesignating subclauses (III) and (IV) as subclauses (IV) and (V), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after subclause (II) the following:

“(III) a digital commodity;”;

(4) in paragraph (40)—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (E);

(B) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (F) and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) a digital commodity exchange registered under section 5i.”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(52) ASSOCIATED PERSON OF A DIGITAL COMMODITY BROKER.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term ‘associated person of a digital commodity broker’ means a person who is associated with a digital commodity broker as a partner, officer, employee, or agent (or any person occupying a similar status or performing similar functions) in any capacity that involves—

“(i) the solicitation or acceptance of an order for the purchase or sale of a digital commodity; or

“(ii) the supervision of any person engaged in the solicitation or acceptance of an order for the purchase or sale of a digital commodity.

“(B) EXCLUSION.—The term ‘associated person of a digital commodity broker’ does not include any person associated with a digital commodity broker the functions of which are solely clerical or ministerial.

“(53) ASSOCIATED PERSON OF A DIGITAL COMMODITY DEALER.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term ‘associated person of a digital commodity dealer’ means a person who is associated with a digital commodity dealer as a partner, officer, employee, or agent (or any person occupying a similar status or performing similar functions) in any capacity that involves—

“(i) the solicitation or acceptance of an order for the purchase or sale of a digital commodity; or

“(ii) the supervision of any person engaged in the solicitation or acceptance of an order for the purchase or sale of a digital commodity.

“(B) EXCLUSION.—The term ‘associated person of a digital commodity dealer’ does not include any person associated with a digital commodity dealer the functions of which are solely clerical or ministerial.

“(54) **BANK SECRECY ACT.**—The term ‘Bank Secrecy Act’ means—

“(A) section 21 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1829b);

“(B) chapter 2 of title I of Public Law 91–508 (12 U.S.C. 1951 et seq.); and

“(C) subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code.

“(55) **DIGITAL COMMODITY.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘digital commodity’ means—

“(i) any unit of a digital asset held by a person, other than the digital asset issuer, a related person, or an affiliated person, before the first date on which each blockchain system to which the digital asset relates is a functional system and certified to be a decentralized system under section 44 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, that was—

“(I) issued to the person through an end user distribution described under section 42(d)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; or

“(II) acquired by such person in a transaction that was executed on a digital commodity exchange;

“(ii) any unit of a digital asset held by a person, other than the digital asset issuer, a related person, or an affiliated person, after the first date on which each blockchain system to which the digital asset relates is a functional system and certified to be a decentralized system under section 44 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; and

“(iii) any unit of a digital asset held by a related person or an affiliated person during any period when any blockchain system to which the digital asset relates is a functional system and certified to be a decentralized system under section 44 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

“(B) **EXCLUSION.**—The term ‘digital commodity’ does not include a permitted payment stablecoin.

“(C) **TREATMENT OF ADJUDICATED NON-SECURITIES.**—If, before enactment of this paragraph, a Federal court in a Securities and Exchange Commission enforcement action determines that a digital asset transaction is not an offer or sale of a security, any unit of a digital asset transferred pursuant to the transaction shall be considered a digital commodity, unless the determination is overturned.

“(56) **DIGITAL COMMODITY BROKER.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘digital commodity broker’ means any person who, in a digital commodity cash or spot market, is—

“(i) engaged in soliciting or accepting orders for the purchase or sale of a unit of a digital commodity from a person that is not an eligible contract participant;

“(ii) engaged in soliciting or accepting orders for the purchase or sale of a unit of a digital commodity from a person on or subject to the rules of a registered entity; or

“(iii) registered with the Commission as a digital commodity broker.

“(B) **EXCEPTIONS.**—The term ‘digital commodity broker’ does not include a person solely because the person—

“(i) enters into a digital commodity transaction the primary purpose of which is to make, send, receive, or facilitate payments, whether involving a payment service provider or on a peer-to-peer basis;

“(ii) validates a digital commodity transaction, operates a node, or engages in similar activity to participate in facilitating, operating, or securing a blockchain system; or

“(iii) is a bank (as defined under section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934) engaging in certain banking activities with respect to a digital commodity in the same manner as a bank is excluded from the definition of a broker under section 3(a)(4) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

“(57) **DIGITAL COMMODITY CUSTODIAN.**—The term ‘digital commodity custodian’ means an entity in the business of holding, maintaining, or safeguarding digital commodities for others.

“(58) **DIGITAL COMMODITY DEALER.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘digital commodity dealer’ means any person who—

“(i) in digital commodity cash or spot markets—

“(I) holds itself out as a dealer in a digital commodity;

“(II) makes a market in a digital commodity;

“(III) has an identifiable business of dealing in a digital commodity as principal for its own account; or

“(IV) engages in any activity causing the person to be commonly known in the trade as a dealer or market maker in a digital commodity;

“(ii) has an identifiable business of entering into any agreement, contract, or transaction described in subsection (c)(2)(D)(i) involving a digital commodity; or

“(iii) is registered with the Commission as a digital commodity dealer.

“(B) **EXCEPTION.**—The term ‘digital commodity dealer’ does not include a person solely because the person—

“(i) enters into a digital commodity transaction with an eligible contract participant;

“(ii) enters into a digital commodity transaction on or through a registered digital commodity exchange;

“(iii) enters into a digital commodity transaction for the person’s own account, either individually or in a fiduciary capacity, but not as a part of a regular business;

“(iv) enters into a digital commodity transaction the primary purpose of which is to make, send, receive, or facilitate payments, whether involving a payment service provider or on a peer-to-peer basis;

“(v) validates a digital commodity transaction, operates a node, or engages in similar activity to participate in facilitating, operating, or securing a blockchain system; or

“(vi) is a bank (as defined under section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934) engaging in certain banking activities with respect to a digital commodity in the same manner as a bank is excluded from the definition of a dealer under section 3(a)(5) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

“(59) **DIGITAL COMMODITY EXCHANGE.**—The term ‘digital commodity exchange’ means a trading facility that offers or seeks to offer a cash or spot market in at least 1 digital commodity.

“(60) **DIGITAL ASSET-RELATED DEFINITIONS.**—

“(A) **SECURITIES ACT OF 1933.**—The terms ‘affiliated person’, ‘blockchain system’, ‘decentralized governance system’, ‘decentralized system’, ‘digital asset’, ‘digital asset issuer’, ‘end user distribution’, ‘functional system’, ‘permitted payment stablecoin’, ‘related person’, and ‘restricted digital asset’ have the meaning given the terms, respectively, under section 2(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77b(a)).

“(B) **SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.**—The terms ‘digital asset broker’ and ‘digital asset dealer’ have the meaning given those terms, respectively, under section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)).

“(C) **MIXED DIGITAL ASSET TRANSACTION.**—The term ‘mixed digital asset transaction’ means an agreement, contract, or transaction involving a digital commodity and—

“(A) a security; or

“(B) a restricted digital asset.”

SEC. 104. DEFINITIONS UNDER THIS ACT.

In this Act:

(1) **DEFINITIONS UNDER THE COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT.**—The terms “digital commodity”, “digital commodity broker”, “digital commodity dealer”, “digital commodity exchange”, and “mixed digital asset transaction” have the meaning given those terms, respectively, under section 1a of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1a).

(2) **DEFINITIONS UNDER THE SECURITIES ACT OF 1933.**—The terms “affiliated person”, “blockchain”, “blockchain system”, “blockchain protocol”, “decentralized system”,

“digital asset”, “digital asset issuer”, “digital asset maturity date”, “digital asset trading system”, “end user distribution”, “functional system”, “permitted payment stablecoin”, “restricted digital asset”, “securities laws”, and “source code” have the meaning given those terms, respectively, under section 2(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77b(a)).

(3) **DEFINITIONS UNDER THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.**—The terms “Bank Secrecy Act”, “digital asset broker”, “digital asset dealer”, “digital asset trading system”, and “self-regulatory organization” have the meaning given those terms, respectively, under section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)).

SEC. 105. RULEMAKINGS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—The Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission shall jointly issue rules to further define the following terms:

(1) The terms “affiliated person”, “blockchain”, “blockchain system”, “blockchain protocol”, “decentralized system”, “decentralized governance system”, “digital asset”, “digital asset issuer”, “digital asset maturity date”, “end user distribution”, “functional system”, “related person”, “restricted digital asset”, and “source code”, as defined under section 2(a) of the Securities Act of 1933.

(2) The term “digital commodity”, as defined under section 1a of the Commodity Exchange Act.

(b) **JOINT RULEMAKING FOR EXCHANGES AND INTERMEDIARIES.**—The Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission shall jointly issue rules to exempt persons dually registered with the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission from duplicative, conflicting, or unduly burdensome provisions of this Act, the securities laws, and the Commodity Exchange Act and the rules thereunder, to the extent such exemption would foster the development of fair and orderly markets in digital assets, be necessary or appropriate in the public interest, and be consistent with the protection of investors.

(c) **JOINT RULEMAKING FOR MIXED DIGITAL ASSET TRANSACTIONS.**—The Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission shall jointly issue rules applicable to mixed digital asset transactions under this Act and the amendments made by this Act, including by further defining such term.

(d) **PROTECTION OF SELF-CUSTODY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Financial Crimes Enforcement Network may not issue any rule or order that would prohibit a U.S. individual from—

(A) maintaining a hardware wallet, software wallet, or other means to facilitate such individual’s own custody of digital assets; or

(B) conducting transactions with and self-custody of digital assets for any lawful purpose.

(2) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Paragraph (1) may not be construed to limit the ability of Financial Crimes Enforcement Network to carry out any enforcement action.

(e) **JOINT RULEMAKING, PROCEDURES, OR GUIDANCE FOR DELISTING.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission shall jointly issue rules, procedures, or guidance (as determined appropriate by the Commissions) regarding the process to delist an asset for trading under sections 106 and 107 of this Act if the Commissions determine that the listing is inconsistent with the Commodity Exchange Act, the securities laws (including regulations under those laws), or this Act.

(f) **JOINT RULEMAKING FOR CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS.**—The Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission shall jointly issue rules to require a person with multiple registrations with the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, or both such agencies to maintain sufficient capital to comply with the stricter of any applicable capital requirements to which such person is subject to by reason of such registrations.

SEC. 106. NOTICE OF INTENT TO REGISTER FOR DIGITAL COMMODITY EXCHANGES, BROKERS, AND DEALERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—

(1) **NOTICE OF INTENT TO REGISTER.**—Any person may file a notice of intent to register with the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (in this subsection referred to as the “Commission”) as a—

(A) digital commodity exchange, for a person intending to register as a digital commodity exchange under section 5i of the Commodity Exchange Act;

(B) digital commodity broker, for a person intending to register as a digital commodity broker under section 4u of such Act; or

(C) digital commodity dealer, for a person intending to register as a digital commodity dealer under section 4u of such Act.

(2) **CONDITIONS.**—A person filing a notice of intent to register under paragraph (1) shall be in compliance with this section if the person—

(A) submits to the Commission and continues to materially update a statement of the nature of the registrations the filer intends to pursue;

(B) submits to the Commission and continues to materially update the information required by subsections (b) and (c);

(C) complies with subsection (d);

(D) is a member of a futures association registered under section 17 of the Commodity Exchange Act, and complies with the rules of the association, including the rules of the association pertaining to customer disclosures and protection of customer assets; and

(E) pays all fees and penalties imposed on the person under section 510 of this Act.

(b) **DISCLOSURE OF GENERAL INFORMATION.**—A person filing a notice of intent to register under subsection (a) shall disclose to the Commission the following:

(1) Information concerning the management of the person, including information describing—

(A) the ownership and management of the person;

(B) the financial condition of the person;

(C) affiliated entities;

(D) potential conflicts of interest;

(E) the address of the person, including—

(i) the place of incorporation;

(ii) principal place of business; and

(iii) an address for service of process; and

(F) a list of the States in which the person has operations.

(2) Information concerning the operations of the person, including—

(A) a general description of the person’s business and the terms of service for United States customers;

(B) a description of the person’s account approval process;

(C) any rulebook or other customer order fulfillment rules;

(D) risk management procedures;

(E) a description of the product listing process; and

(F) anti-money laundering policies and procedures.

(c) **LISTING INFORMATION.**—A person filing a notice of intent to register under subsection (a) shall provide to the Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission a detailed description of—

(1) the specific characteristics of each digital asset listed or offered by the person, including information regarding the digital asset’s market activity, distribution, and functional use; and

(2) the product listing determination made by the person for each asset listed or offered for trading by the person.

(d) **REQUIREMENTS.**—A person filing a notice of intent to register under subsection (a) shall comply with the following requirements:

(1) **STATUTORY DISQUALIFICATIONS.**—Except to the extent otherwise specifically provided by Commission or registered futures association rule, regulation, or order, the person shall not permit an individual who is subject to a statutory disqualification under paragraph (2) or (3) of section 8a of the Commodity Exchange Act to effect or be involved in effecting transactions on behalf of the person, if the person knew, or in the exercise of reasonable care should have known, of the statutory disqualification.

(2) **BOOKS AND RECORDS.**—The person shall keep their books and records open to inspection and examination by the Commission and by any registered futures association of which the person is a member.

(3) **CUSTOMER DISCLOSURES.**—The person shall disclose to customers—

(A) information about the material risks and characteristics of the assets listed for trading on the person;

(B) information about the material risks and characteristics of the transactions facilitated by the person;

(C) information about the location and manner in which the digital assets of the customer will be and are custodied;

(D) information concerning the policies and procedures of the person that are related to the protection of the data of customers of the person; and

(E) in their disclosure documents, offering documents, and promotional material—

(i) in a prominent manner, that they are not registered with or regulated by the Commission; and

(ii) the contact information for the whistleblower, complaint, and reparation programs of the Commission.

(4) **CUSTOMER ASSETS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The person shall—

(i) hold customer money, assets, and property in a manner to minimize the risk of loss to the customer or unreasonable delay in customer access to money, assets, and property of the customer;

(ii) treat and deal with all money, assets, and property, including any rights associated with any such money, assets, or property, of any customer received as belonging to the customer;

(iii) calculate the total digital asset obligations of the person, and at all times hold money, assets, or property equal to or in excess of the total digital asset obligations; and

(iv) not commingle such money, assets and property held to meet the total commodity obligation with the funds of the person or use the money, assets, or property to margin, secure, or guarantee any trade or contract, or to secure or extend the credit, of any customer or person other than the one for whom the same are held, except that—

(I) the money, assets, and property of any customer may be commingled with that of any other customer, if separately accounted for; and

(II) the share of the money, assets, and property, as in the normal course of business are necessary to margin, guarantee, secure, transfer, adjust, or settle a contract of sale of a commodity asset, may be withdrawn and applied to do so, including the payment of commissions, brokerage, interest, taxes, storage, and other charges lawfully accruing in connection with the contract of sale of a digital commodity.

(B) **ADDITIONAL RESOURCES.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—This section shall not prevent or be construed to prevent the person from adding to the customer money, assets, and property required to be segregated under subparagraph (A), additional amounts of money, assets, or property from the account of the person as the person determines necessary to hold money,

assets, or property equal to or in excess of the total digital asset obligations of the person.

(ii) **TREATMENT AS CUSTOMER FUNDS.**—Any money, assets, or property deposited pursuant to clause (i) shall be considered customer property within the meaning of this subsection.

(e) **COMPLIANCE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A person who has filed a notice of intent to register under this section and is in compliance with this section shall be exempt from Securities and Exchange Commission rules and regulations pertaining to registering as a national securities exchange, broker, dealer, or clearing agency, for activities related to a digital asset.

(2) **NONCOMPLIANCE.**—Paragraph (1) shall not apply if, after notice from the Commission and a reasonable opportunity to correct the deficiency, a person who has submitted a notice of intent to register is not in compliance with this section.

(3) **ANTI-FRAUD AND ANTI-MANIPULATION.**—Paragraph (1) shall not be construed to limit any anti-fraud, anti-manipulation, or false reporting enforcement authority of the Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, a registered futures association, or a national securities association.

(4) **DELISTING.**—Paragraph (1) shall not be construed to limit the authority of the Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission to jointly require a person to delist an asset for trading if the Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission determines that the listing is inconsistent with the Commodity Exchange Act, the securities laws (including regulations under those laws), or this Act.

(f) **REGISTRATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A person may not file a notice of intent to register with the Commission after the Commission has finalized its rules for the registration of digital commodity exchanges, digital commodity brokers, or digital commodity dealers, as appropriate.

(2) **TRANSITION TO REGISTRATION.**—Subsection (e)(1) shall not apply to a person who has submitted a notice of intent to register if—

(A) the Commission—

(i) determines that the person has failed to comply with the requirements of this section; or

(ii) denies the application of the person to register; or

(B) the digital commodity exchange, digital commodity broker, or digital commodity dealer that filed a notice of intent to register failed to apply for registration as such with the Commission within 180 days after the effective date of the final rules of the Commission for the registration of digital commodity exchanges, digital commodity brokers, or digital commodity dealers, as appropriate.

(g) **RULEMAKING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, a registered futures association shall adopt and enforce rules applicable to persons required by subsection (a)(3) to be members of the association.

(2) **FEES.**—The rules adopted under paragraph (1) may provide for dues in accordance with section 17(b)(6) of the Commodity Exchange Act.

(3) **EFFECT.**—A registered futures association shall submit to the Commission any rule adopted under paragraph (1), which shall take effect pursuant to the requirements of section 17(j) of the Commodity Exchange Act.

(h) **LIABILITY OF THE FILER.**—It shall be unlawful for any person to provide false information in support of a filing under this section if the person knew or reasonably should have known that the information was false.

(i) **WHISTLEBLOWER ENFORCEMENT.**—For purposes of section 23 of the Commodity Exchange Act, the term “this Act” includes this section.

SEC. 107. NOTICE OF INTENT TO REGISTER FOR DIGITAL ASSET BROKERS, DEALERS, AND TRADING SYSTEMS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—

(1) **NOTICE OF INTENT TO REGISTER.**—Any person may file a notice of intent to register with

the Securities and Exchange Commission (in this section referred to as the “Commission”) as—

(A) a digital asset trading system, for a person intending to register as a digital asset trading system under section 6(m) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934;

(B) a digital asset broker, for a person intending to register as a digital asset broker under section 15H of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; or

(C) a digital asset dealer, for a person intending to register as a digital asset dealer under section 15H of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

(2) **CONDITIONS.**—A person filing a notice of intent to register under paragraph (1) shall be in compliance with this section if the person—

(A) submits to the Commission and continues to materially update a statement of the nature of the registrations the filer intends to pursue;

(B) submits to the Commission and continues to materially update the information required by subsections (b) and (c);

(C) complies with the requirements of subsection (d); and

(D) is a member of a national securities association registered under section 15A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a-3) and complies with the rules of the association, including the rules of the association pertaining to customer disclosures and protection of customer assets.

(b) **DISCLOSURE OF GENERAL INFORMATION.**—A person filing a notice of intent to register under subsection (a) shall disclose to the Commission the following:

(1) Information concerning the management of the person, including information describing—

(A) the ownership and management of the person;

(B) the financial condition of the person;

(C) affiliated entities;

(D) potential conflicts of interest;

(E) the address of the person, including—

(i) the place of incorporation;

(ii) the principal place of business; and

(iii) an address for service of process; and

(F) a list of the States in which the person has operations.

(2) Information concerning the operations of the person, including—

(A) a general description of the person’s business and the terms of service for United States customers;

(B) a description of the person’s account approval process;

(C) any rulebook or other customer order fulfillment rules;

(D) risk management procedures;

(E) a description of the product listing process; and

(F) anti-money laundering policies and procedures.

(c) **LISTING INFORMATION.**—A person filing a notice of intent to register under subsection (a) shall provide to the Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission a detailed description of—

(1) the specific characteristics of each digital asset listed or offered for trading by the person, including information regarding the digital asset’s market activity, distribution, and functional use; and

(2) the product listing determination made by the person for each asset listed or offered for trading by the person.

(d) **REQUIREMENTS.**—A person filing a notice of intent to register under subsection (a) shall comply with the following requirements:

(1) **STATUTORY DISQUALIFICATION.**—Except to the extent otherwise specifically provided by Commission or a national securities association rule, regulation, or order, the person may not permit an individual who is subject to a statutory disqualification (as defined under section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934) to effect or be involved in effecting transactions on behalf of the person if the person knows, or in

the exercise of reasonable discretion should know, the individual is subject to a statutory disqualification.

(2) **BOOKS AND RECORDS.**—The person shall keep their books and records open to inspection and examination by the Commission and any national securities association of which they are a member.

(3) **CUSTOMER DISCLOSURES.**—The person shall disclose to customers—

(A) information about the material risks and characteristics of the assets listed for trading on the person;

(B) information about the material risks and characteristics of the transactions facilitated by the person;

(C) information about the location and manner in which the digital assets of the customer will be and are custodied;

(D) information concerning the person’s policies and procedures related to the protection of customers’ data; and

(E) in their disclosure documents, offering documents, and promotional material—

(i) in a prominent manner, that they are not registered with or regulated by the Commission; and

(ii) the contact information for the whistleblower, complaint, and reparation programs of the Commission.

(4) **CUSTOMER ASSETS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The person shall—

(i) hold customer money, assets, and property in a manner to minimize the risk of loss to the customer or unreasonable delay in customer access to money, assets, and property of the customer;

(ii) treat and deal with all money, assets, and property, including any rights associated with any such money, assets, or property, of any customer received as belonging to the customer;

(iii) segregate all money, assets, and property received from any customer of the person from the funds of the person, except that—

(I) the money, assets, and property of any customer may be commingled with that of any other customer, if separately accounted for; and

(II) the share of the money, assets, and property, as in the normal course of business are necessary to margin, guarantee, secure, transfer, adjust, or settle a contract of sale of a digital asset, may be withdrawn and applied to do so, including the payment of commissions, brokerage, interest, taxes, storage, and other charges lawfully accruing in connection with the contract of sale of a digital asset.

(B) **ADDITIONAL RESOURCES.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—This section shall not prevent or be construed to prevent the person from adding to the customer money, assets, and property required to be segregated under subparagraph (A) additional amounts of money, assets, or property from the account of the person as the person determines necessary to hold money, assets, or property equal to or in excess of the total digital asset obligation of the person.

(ii) **TREATMENT AS CUSTOMER FUNDS.**—Any money, assets, or property deposited pursuant to clause (i) shall be considered customer property within the meaning of this subsection.

(e) **COMPLIANCE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A person who has filed a notice of intent to register under this section and is in compliance with this section shall be exempt from Commission rules and regulations pertaining to registering as a national securities exchange, broker, dealer, or clearing agency, for activities related to a digital asset.

(2) **NONCOMPLIANCE.**—Paragraph (1) shall not apply if, after notice from the Commission and a reasonable opportunity to correct the deficiency, a person who has submitted a notice of intent to register is not in compliance with this section.

(3) **ANTI-FRAUD AND ANTI-MANIPULATION.**—Paragraph (1) shall not be construed to limit any fraud, anti-manipulation, or false reporting enforcement authority of the Commission, the

Commodity Futures Trading Commission, a registered futures association, or a national securities association.

(4) **DELISTING.**—Paragraph (1) shall not be construed to limit the authority of the Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to jointly require a person to delist an asset for trading if the Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission determines that the listing is inconsistent with the Commodity Exchange Act, the securities laws (including regulations under those laws), or this Act.

(f) **REGISTRATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A person may not file a notice of intent to register with the Commission after the Commission has finalized its rules for the registration of digital asset brokers, digital asset dealers, digital asset trading systems, and notice-registered clearing agencies, as appropriate.

(2) **TRANSITION TO REGISTRATION.**—Subsection (e)(1) shall not apply to a person who has submitted a notice of intent to register if—

(A) the Commission—

(i) determines that the person has failed to comply with the requirements of this section; or

(ii) denies the application of the person to register; or

(B) the digital asset broker, digital asset dealer, or digital asset trading system that filed a notice of intent to register failed to apply for registration as such with the Commission within 180 days after the effective date of the Commission’s final rules for the registration of digital asset brokers, digital asset dealers, and digital asset trading systems, as appropriate.

(g) **LIABILITY OF THE FILER.**—It shall be unlawful for any person to provide false information in support of a filing under this section if the person knew or reasonably should have known that the information was false.

(h) **NATIONAL SECURITIES ASSOCIATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A national securities association may adopt and enforce rules written specifically for persons filing a notice of intent to register under subsection (a), including rules that prescribe reasonable fees and charges to defray the costs of the national securities association related to overseeing such persons.

(2) **APPROVAL BY THE COMMISSION.**—With respect to a provisional rule described under paragraph (1) filed with the Commission, the Commission shall—

(A) not later than 90 days following the date of such filing, approve the rule if the Commission determines that the rule effectuates the purposes of this section; and

(B) make such approval on a summary basis pursuant to section 19(b)(3)(B) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

(i) **WHISTLEBLOWER ENFORCEMENT.**—For purposes of section 21F of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78u-6), the term “securities laws” includes this section.

SEC. 108. COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT SAVINGS PROVISIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Nothing in this Act shall affect or apply to, or be interpreted to affect or apply to—

(1) any agreement, contract, or transaction that is subject to the Commodity Exchange Act as—

(A) a contract of sale of a commodity for future delivery or an option on such a contract;

(B) a swap;

(C) a security futures product;

(D) an option authorized under section 4c of such Act;

(E) an agreement, contract, or transaction described in section 2(c)(2)(C)(i) of such Act; or

(F) a leverage transaction authorized under section 19 of such Act; or

(2) the activities of any person with respect to any such agreement, contract, or transaction.

(b) **PROHIBITIONS ON SPOT DIGITAL COMMODITY ENTITIES.**—Nothing in this Act authorizes, or shall be interpreted to authorize, a digital commodity exchange, digital commodity

broker, or digital commodity dealer to engage in any activities involving any transaction, contract, or agreement described in subsection (a)(1), solely by virtue of being registered or filing notice of intent to register as a digital commodity exchange, digital commodity broker, or digital commodity dealer.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, each term shall have the meaning provided in the Commodity Exchange Act or the regulations prescribed under such Act.

SEC. 109. ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.**—Section 21A of the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78u-1) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(j) **DUTY OF MEMBERS AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEES RELATED TO DIGITAL ASSETS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Solely for purposes of the insider trading prohibitions arising under this Act, including section 10 and Rule 10b-5 thereunder, each individual who is a Member of Congress, an employee of Congress, or an employee or agent of any department or agency of the Federal Government owes a duty arising from a relationship of trust and confidence to the Congress, the United States Government, and the citizens of the United States with respect to material, nonpublic information related to a restricted digital asset that is derived from such individual’s position as a Member of Congress, employee of Congress, or as an employee or agent of a department or agency of the Federal Government or gained from the performance of such individual’s official responsibilities.

“(2) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection, the terms ‘Member of Congress’ and ‘employee of Congress’ have the meaning given those terms, respectively, under subsection (g)(2).”

(b) **COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT.**—Section 4c(a) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 6c(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) a contract of sale of a digital commodity.”;

(2) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in clause (ii), by striking “or” at the end;

(ii) in clause (iii), by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) a contract of sale of a digital commodity.”;

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in clause (ii), by striking “or” at the end;

(ii) in clause (iii), by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) a contract of sale of a digital commodity.”; and

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) in clause (ii), by striking “or” at the end;

(ii) by striking “(iii) a swap, provided however,” and inserting the following:

“(iii) a swap; or

“(iv) a contract of sale of a digital commodity, provided, however,”; and

(iii) by striking “clauses (i), (ii), or (iii)” and insert “any of clauses (i) through (iv)”.

SEC. 110. INTERNATIONAL HARMONIZATION.

In order to promote effective and consistent global regulation of digital assets, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission, as appropriate—

(1) shall consult and coordinate with foreign regulatory authorities on the establishment of consistent international standards with respect to the regulation of digital assets, restricted digital assets, and digital commodities; and

(2) may agree to such information-sharing arrangements as may be deemed to be necessary or

appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors, customers, and users of digital assets.

SEC. 111. IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) **GLOBAL RULEMAKING TIMEFRAME.**—Unless otherwise provided in this Act or an amendment made by this Act, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission, or both, shall individually, and jointly where required, promulgate rules and regulations required of each Commission under this Act or an amendment made by this Act not later than 360 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) **RULES AND REGISTRATION BEFORE FINAL EFFECTIVE DATES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In order to prepare for the implementation of this Act, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission may, before any effective date provided in this Act—

(A) promulgate rules, regulations, or orders permitted or required by this Act;

(B) conduct studies and prepare reports and recommendations required by this Act;

(C) register persons under this Act; and

(D) exempt persons, agreements, contracts, or transactions from provisions of this Act, under the terms contained in this Act.

(2) **LIMITATION ON EFFECTIVENESS.**—An action by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission or the Securities and Exchange Commission under paragraph (1) shall not become effective before the effective date otherwise applicable to the action under this Act.

TITLE II—CLARITY FOR ASSETS OFFERED AS PART OF AN INVESTMENT CONTRACT

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be referred to as the “Securities Clarity Act of 2024”.

SEC. 202. TREATMENT OF INVESTMENT CONTRACT ASSETS.

(a) **SECURITIES ACT OF 1933.**—Section 2(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77b(a)), as amended by section 101, is further amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following: “The term ‘security’ does not include an investment contract asset.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(37) The term ‘investment contract asset’ means a fungible digital representation of value—

“(A) that can be exclusively possessed and transferred, person to person, without necessary reliance on an intermediary, and is recorded on a cryptographically secured public distributed ledger;

“(B) sold or otherwise transferred, or intended to be sold or otherwise transferred, pursuant to an investment contract; and

“(C) that is not otherwise a security pursuant to the first sentence of paragraph (1).”.

(b) **INVESTMENT ADVISERS ACT OF 1940.**—Section 202(a)(18) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-2(a)(18)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “The term ‘security’ does not include an investment contract asset (as such term is defined under section 2(a) of the Securities Act of 1933).”.

(c) **INVESTMENT COMPANY ACT OF 1940.**—Section 2(a)(36) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-2(a)(36)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “The term ‘security’ does not include an investment contract asset (as such term is defined under section 2(a) of the Securities Act of 1933).”.

(d) **SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.**—Section 3(a)(10) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(10)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “The term ‘security’ does not include an investment contract asset (as such term is defined under section 2(a) of the Securities Act of 1933).”.

(e) **SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION ACT OF 1970.**—Section 16(14) of the Securities Investor Protection Act of 1970 (15 U.S.C. 78ll(14)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“The term ‘security’ does not include an investment contract asset (as such term is defined under section 2(a) of the Securities Act of 1933).”.

TITLE III—OFFERS AND SALES OF DIGITAL ASSETS

SEC. 301. EXEMPTED TRANSACTIONS IN DIGITAL ASSETS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77a et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 4(a), by adding at the end the following:

“(B) transactions involving the offer or sale of units of a digital asset by a digital asset issuer, if—

“(A) the aggregate amount of units of the digital asset sold by the digital asset issuer in reliance on the exemption provided under this paragraph, during the 12-month period preceding the date of such transaction, including the amount sold in such transaction, is not more than \$75,000,000 (as such amount is annually adjusted by the Commission to reflect the change in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor);

“(B) with respect to a transaction involving the purchase of units of a digital asset by a person who is not an accredited investor, the aggregate amount of all units of digital assets purchased by such person during the 12-month period preceding the date of such transaction, including the unit of a digital asset purchased in such transaction, does not exceed the greater of—

“(i) 10 percent of the person’s annual income or joint income with that person’s spouse or spousal equivalent; or

“(ii) 10 percent of the person’s net worth or joint net worth with the person’s spouse or spousal equivalent;

“(C) after the completion of the transaction, the purchaser does not own more than 10 percent of the total amount of the units of the digital asset sold in reliance on the exemption under this paragraph;

“(D) the transaction does not involve the offer or sale of any digital asset not offered as part of an investment contract;

“(E) the transaction does not involve the offer or sale of a unit of a digital asset by a digital asset issuer that—

“(i) is not organized under the laws of a State, a territory of the United States, or the District of Columbia;

“(ii) is a development stage company that either—

“(I) has no specific business plan or purpose; or

“(II) has indicated that the business plan of the company is to merge with or acquire an unidentified company;

“(iii) is an investment company, as defined in section 3 of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-3), or is excluded from the definition of investment company by section 3(b) or section 3(c) of that Act (15 U.S.C. 80a-3(b) or 80a-3(c));

“(iv) is issuing fractional undivided interests in oil or gas rights, or a similar interest in other mineral rights;

“(v) is, or has been, subject to any order of the Commission entered pursuant to section 12(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 during the 5-year period before the filing of the offering statement; or

“(vi) is disqualified pursuant to section 230.262 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations; and

“(F) the issuer meets the requirements of section 4B(a).”; and

(2) by inserting after section 4A the following:

“SEC. 4B. REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN DIGITAL ASSET TRANSACTIONS.

“(a) **REQUIREMENTS FOR DIGITAL ASSET ISSUERS.**—

“(1) INFORMATION REQUIRED IN STATEMENT.—A digital asset issuer offering or selling a unit of digital asset in reliance on section 4(a)(8) shall file with the Commission a statement containing the following information:

“(A) The name, legal status (including the jurisdiction in which the issuer is organized and the date of organization), and website of the digital asset issuer.

“(B) The address and telephone number of the issuer or a legal representative of the issuer.

“(C) A certification that the digital asset issuer meets the relevant requirements described under section 4(a)(8).

“(D) An overview of the material aspects of the offering.

“(E) A description of the purpose and intended use of the offering proceeds.

“(F) A description of the plan of distribution of any unit of a digital asset that is to be offered.

“(G) A description of the material risks surrounding ownership of a unit of a digital asset.

“(H) A description of the material aspects of the digital asset issuer’s business.

“(I) A description of exempt offerings conducted within the past three years by the digital asset issuer.

“(J) A description of the digital asset issuer and the current number of employees of the digital asset issuer.

“(K) A description of any material transactions or relationships between the digital asset issuer and affiliated persons.

“(L) A description of exempt offerings conducted within the past three years.

“(2) INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR PURCHASERS.—A digital asset issuer that has filed a statement under paragraph (1) to offer and sell a unit of a digital asset in reliance on section 4(a)(8) shall disclose the information described under section 43 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 on a freely accessible public website.

“(3) ONGOING DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.—A digital asset issuer that has filed a statement under paragraph (1) to offer and sell a unit of a digital asset in reliance on section 4(a)(8) shall file the following with the Commission:

“(A) ANNUAL REPORTS.—An annual report that includes any material changes to the information described under paragraph (2) for the current fiscal year and for any fiscal year thereafter, unless the issuer is no longer obligated to file such annual report pursuant to paragraph (4).

“(B) SEMIANNUAL REPORTS.—Along with each annual report required under subparagraph (A), and separately six months thereafter, a report containing—

“(i) an updated description of the current state and timeline for the development of the blockchain system to which the digital asset relates, showing how and when the blockchain system intends or intended to be considered a functional system and a decentralized system;

“(ii) the amount of money raised by the digital asset issuer in reliance on section 4(a)(8), how much of that money has been spent, and the general categories and amounts on which that money has been spent; and

“(iii) any material changes to the information in the most recent annual report.

“(C) CURRENT REPORTS.—A current report shall be filed with the Commission reflecting any material changes to the information previously reported to the Commission by the digital asset issuer.

“(4) TERMINATION OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The ongoing reporting requirements under paragraph (3) shall not apply to a digital asset issuer 180 days after the end of the covered fiscal year.

“(B) COVERED FISCAL YEAR DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term ‘covered fiscal year’ means the first fiscal year of an issuer in which the blockchain system to which the digital asset relates is a functional system and certified to be a

decentralized system under section 44 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

“(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR INTERMEDIARIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A person acting as an intermediary in a transaction involving the offer or sale of a unit of a digital asset in reliance on section 4(a)(8) shall—

“(A) register with the Commission as a digital asset broker; and

“(B) be a member of a national securities association registered under section 15A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o-3).

“(2) PURCHASER QUALIFICATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each time, before accepting any commitment (including any additional commitment from the same person), an intermediary or digital asset issuer shall have a reasonable basis for believing that the purchaser satisfies the requirements of section 4(a)(8).

“(B) RELIANCE ON PURCHASER’S REPRESENTATIONS.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), an intermediary or digital asset issuer may rely on a purchaser’s representations concerning the purchaser’s annual income and net worth and the amount of the purchaser’s other investments made, unless the intermediary or digital asset issuer has reason to question the reliability of the representation.

“(C) RELIANCE ON ISSUER.—For purposes of determining whether a transaction meets the requirements described under subparagraph (A) through (C) of section 4(a)(8), an intermediary may rely on the efforts of a digital asset issuer.

“(c) ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS.—

“(1) ACCEPTANCE OF WRITTEN OFFERS; SALES.—After an issuer files a statement under paragraph (1) to offer and sell a digital asset in reliance on section 4(a)(8)—

“(A) written offers of the digital asset may be made; and

“(B) the issuer may sell the digital assets in reliance on section 4(a)(8), if such sales meet all other requirements.

“(2) SOLICITATION OF INTEREST.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—At any time before the filing of a statement under paragraph (1), a digital asset issuer may communicate orally or in writing to determine whether there is any interest in a contemplated offering. Such communications are deemed to be an offer of a unit of a digital asset for sale for purposes of the anti-fraud provisions of the Federal securities laws. No solicitation or acceptance of money or other consideration, nor of any commitment, binding or otherwise, from any person is permitted until the statement is filed.

“(B) CONDITIONS.—In any communication described under subparagraph (A), the digital asset issuer shall—

“(i) state that no money or other consideration is being solicited, and if sent in response, will not be accepted;

“(ii) state that no offer to buy a unit of a digital asset can be accepted and no part of the purchase price can be received until the statement is filed and then only through an intermediary; and

“(iii) state that a person’s indication of interest involves no obligation or commitment of any kind.

“(C) INDICATIONS OF INTEREST.—Any written communication described under subparagraph (A) may include a means by which a person may indicate to the digital asset issuer that such person is interested in a potential offering. A digital asset issuer may require a name, address, telephone number, or email address in any response form included with a communication described under subparagraph (A).

“(3) DISQUALIFICATION PROVISIONS.—The Commission shall issue rules to apply the disqualification provisions under section 230.262 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to the exemption provided under section 4(a)(8).”

(b) ADDITIONAL EXEMPTIONS.—

(1) CERTAIN REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 12(g)(6) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78l(g)(6)) is amended by strik-

ing “under section 4(6)” and inserting “under section 4(a)(6) or 4(a)(8)”.

(2) EXEMPTION FROM STATE REGULATION.—Section 18(b)(4) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77r(b)(4)) is amended—

(A) in section (B), by striking “section 4(4)” and inserting “section 4(a)(4)”; and

(B) in section (C), by striking “section 4(6)” and inserting “section 4(a)(6)”; and

(C) in subparagraph (F)—

(i) by striking “section 4(2)” each place such term appears and inserting “section 4(a)(2)”; and

(ii) by striking “or” at the end;

(D) in subparagraph (G), by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

“(H) section 4(a)(8).”

SEC. 302. REQUIREMENTS FOR OFFERS AND SALES OF CERTAIN DIGITAL ASSETS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title I of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 42. REQUIREMENTS FOR OFFERS AND SALES OF CERTAIN DIGITAL ASSETS.

“(a) OFFERS AND SALES OF CERTAIN RESTRICTED DIGITAL ASSETS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, subject to paragraph (2), a restricted digital asset may be offered and sold on a digital asset trading system by any person other than a digital asset issuer if, at the time of such offer or sale, any blockchain system to which the restricted digital asset relates is a functional system and the information described in section 43 has been certified and made publicly available for any blockchain system to which the restricted digital asset relates.

“(2) ADDITIONAL RULES FOR RELATED PERSONS AND AFFILIATED PERSONS.—Except as provided under subsection (c), a restricted digital asset owned by a related person or an affiliated person may only be offered or sold after 12 months after the later of—

“(A) the date on which such restricted digital asset was acquired; or

“(B) the digital asset maturity date.

“(b) OFFERS AND SALES OF CERTAIN DIGITAL COMMODITIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), a digital commodity may be offered and sold by any person.

“(2) RULES FOR RELATED AND AFFILIATED PERSONS.—Except as provided under subsection (c), a digital commodity may only be offered or sold by a related person or an affiliated person if—

“(A) the holder of the digital commodity originally acquired the digital asset while it was a restricted digital asset not less than 12 months after the later of—

“(i) the date on which such restricted digital asset was acquired; or

“(ii) the digital asset maturity date;

“(B) any blockchain system to which the digital commodity relates is certified to be a decentralized system under section 44; and

“(C) the digital commodity is offered or sold on or subject to the rules of a digital commodity exchange registered under section 5i of the Commodity Exchange Act.

“(3) NOT AN INVESTMENT CONTRACT.—For purposes of the securities laws, an offer or sale of a digital commodity that does not violate paragraph (2) shall not be a transaction in an investment contract.

“(c) SALES RESTRICTIONS FOR AFFILIATED PERSONS.—A digital asset may be offered and sold by an affiliated person under subsection (a) or (b) if—

“(1) the aggregate amount of such digital assets sold in any 3-month period by the affiliated person is not greater than one percent of the digital assets then outstanding; or

“(2) the affiliated person promptly, following the placement of an order to sell one percent or more of the digital assets then outstanding during any 3-month period, reports the sale to—

“(A) the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, in the case of an order to sell a digital

commodity on or subject to the rules of a digital commodity exchange; or

“(B) the Securities and Exchange Commission, in the case of a sell order for a restricted digital asset placed with a digital asset trading system.

“(d) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN END USER DISTRIBUTIONS UNDER THE SECURITIES LAWS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to a digital asset, an end user distribution is described under this paragraph if—

“(A) each blockchain system to which such digital asset relates is a functional system; and

“(B) with respect to the digital asset and each blockchain system to which such digital asset relates, the information described in section 43 has been certified and made publicly available.

“(2) NOT AN INVESTMENT CONTRACT.—For purposes of the securities laws, an end user distribution described under paragraph (1) shall not be a transaction in an investment contract.

“(3) EXEMPTION.—Section 5 of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77e) shall not apply to an end user distribution described under paragraph (1) or a transaction in a unit of digital asset issued in such a distribution.”.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act may be construed to restrict the use of a digital asset, except as expressly provided in connection with—

(1) the offer or sale of a restricted digital asset or digital commodity; or

(2) an intermediary's custody of a restricted digital asset or digital commodity.

SEC. 303. ENHANCED DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.

Title I of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.), as amended by section 302, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 43. ENHANCED DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO DIGITAL ASSETS.

“(a) DISCLOSURE INFORMATION.—With respect to a digital asset and any blockchain system to which the digital asset relates, the information described under this section is as follows:

“(1) SOURCE CODE.—The source code for any blockchain system to which the digital asset relates.

“(2) TRANSACTION HISTORY.—A description of the steps necessary to independently access, search, and verify the transaction history of any blockchain system to which the digital asset relates.

“(3) DIGITAL ASSET ECONOMICS.—A description of the purpose of any blockchain system to which the digital asset relates and the operation of any such blockchain system, including—

“(A) information explaining the launch and supply process, including the number of digital assets to be issued in an initial allocation, the total number of digital assets to be created, the release schedule for the digital assets, and the total number of digital assets then outstanding;

“(B) information on any applicable consensus mechanism or process for validating transactions, method of generating or mining digital assets, and any process for burning or destroying digital assets on the blockchain system;

“(C) an explanation of governance mechanisms for implementing changes to the blockchain system or forming consensus among holders of such digital assets; and

“(D) sufficient information for a third party to create a tool for verifying the transaction history of the digital asset.

“(4) PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT.—The current state and timeline for the development of any blockchain system to which the digital asset relates, showing how and when the blockchain system intends or intended to be considered a functional system and decentralized system.

“(5) DEVELOPMENT DISCLOSURES.—A list of all persons who are related persons or affiliated persons who have been issued a unit of a digital asset by a digital asset issuer or have a right to a unit of a digital asset from a digital asset issuer.

“(6) RISK FACTOR DISCLOSURES.—A description of the material risks surrounding ownership of a unit of a digital asset.

“(b) CERTIFICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to a digital asset and any blockchain system to which the digital asset relates, the information described under this section has been certified if the digital asset issuer, an affiliated person, a decentralized governance system, or a digital commodity exchange certifies on a quarterly basis to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission that the information is true and correct.

“(2) PRIOR DISCLOSURES.—Information described under this section which was made available to the public prior to the date of enactment of this section may be certified as true and correct on the date such information was published in final form.

“(3) RULEMAKING.—The Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission may jointly issue rules regarding the certification process described under paragraph (1).”.

SEC. 304. CERTIFICATION OF CERTAIN DIGITAL ASSETS.

Title I of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.), as amended by section 303, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 44. CERTIFICATION OF CERTAIN DIGITAL ASSETS.

“(a) CERTIFICATION.—Any person may certify to the Securities and Exchange Commission that the blockchain system to which a digital asset relates is a decentralized system.

“(b) FILING REQUIREMENTS.—A certification described under subsection (a) shall be filed with the Commission, and include—

“(1) information regarding the person making the certification;

“(2) a description of the blockchain system and the digital asset which relates to such blockchain system, including—

“(A) the operation of the blockchain system;

“(B) the functionality of the related digital asset;

“(C) any decentralized governance system which relates to the blockchain system; and

“(D) the process to develop consensus or agreement within such decentralized governance system;

“(3) a description of the development of the blockchain system and the digital asset which relates to the blockchain system, including—

“(A) a history of the development of the blockchain system and the digital asset which relates to such blockchain system;

“(B) a description of the issuance process for the digital asset which relates to the blockchain system;

“(C) information identifying the digital asset issuer of the digital asset which relates to the blockchain system; and

“(D) a list of any affiliated person related to the digital asset issuer;

“(4) an analysis of the factors on which such person based the certification that the blockchain system is a decentralized system, including—

“(A) an explanation of the protections and prohibitions available during the previous 12 months against any one person being able to—

“(i) control or materially alter the blockchain system;

“(ii) exclude any other person from using or participating on the blockchain system; and

“(iii) exclude any other person from participating in a decentralized governance system;

“(B) information regarding the beneficial ownership of the digital asset which relates to such blockchain system and the distribution of voting power in any decentralized governance system during the previous 12 months;

“(C) information regarding the history of upgrades to the source code for such blockchain system during the previous 3 months, including—

“(i) a description of any consensus or agreement process utilized to process or approve changes to the source code;

“(ii) a list of any material changes to the source code, the purpose and effect of the changes, and the contributor of the changes, if known; and

“(iii) any changes to the source code made by the digital asset issuer, a related person, or an affiliated person;

“(D) information regarding any activities conducted to market the digital asset which relates to the blockchain system during the previous 3 months by the digital asset issuer or an affiliated person of the digital asset issuer; and

“(E) information regarding any issuance of a unit of the digital asset which relates to such blockchain system during the previous 12 months; and

“(5) with respect to a blockchain system for which a certification has previously been rebutted under this section or withdrawn under section 5i(m) of the Commodity Exchange Act, specific information relating to the analysis provided in subsection (f)(2) in connection with such rebuttal or such section 5i(m)(1)(C) in connection with such withdrawal.

“(c) REBUTTABLE PRESUMPTION.—The Commission may rebut a certification described under subsection (a) with respect to a blockchain system if the Commission, within 60 days of receiving such certification, determines that the blockchain system is not a decentralized system.

“(d) CERTIFICATION REVIEW.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any blockchain system that relates to a digital asset for which a certification has been made under subsection (a) shall be considered a decentralized system 60 days after the date on which the Commission receives a certification under subsection (a), unless the Commission notifies the person who made the certification within such time that the Commission is staying the certification due to—

“(A) an inadequate explanation by the person making the certification; or

“(B) any novel or complex issues which require additional time to consider.

“(2) PUBLIC NOTICE.—The Commission shall make the following available to the public and provide a copy to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission:

“(A) Each certification received under subsection (a).

“(B) Each stay of the Commission under this section, and the reasons therefore.

“(C) Any response from a person making a certification under subsection (a) to a stay of the certification by the Commission.

“(3) CONSOLIDATION.—The Commission may consolidate and treat as one submission multiple certifications made under subsection (a) for the same blockchain system which relates to a digital asset which are received during the review period provided under this subsection.

“(e) STAY OF CERTIFICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A notification by the Commission pursuant to subsection (d)(1) shall stay the certification once for up to an additional 120 days from the date of the notification.

“(2) PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.—Before the end of the 60-day period described under subsection (d)(1), the Commission may begin a public comment period of at least 30 days in conjunction with a stay under this section.

“(f) DISPOSITION OF CERTIFICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A certification made under subsection (a) shall—

“(A) become effective—

“(i) upon the publication of a notification from the Commission to the person who made the certification that the Commission does not object to the certification; or

“(ii) at the expiration of the certification review period; and

“(B) not become effective upon the publication of a notification from the Commission to the person who made the certification that the Commission has rebutted the certification.

“(2) DETAILED ANALYSIS INCLUDED WITH REBUTTAL.—The Commission shall include, with each publication of a notification of rebuttal described under paragraph (1)(B), a detailed analysis of the factors on which the decision was based.

“(g) RECERTIFICATION.—With respect to a blockchain system for which a certification has been rebutted under this section, no person may make a certification under subsection (a) with respect to such blockchain system during the 90-day period beginning on the date of such rebuttal.

“(h) APPEAL OF REBUTTAL.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If a certification is rebutted under this section, the person making such certification may appeal the decision to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, not later than 60 days after the notice of rebuttal is made.

“(2) REVIEW.—In an appeal under paragraph (1), the court shall have de novo review of the determination to rebut the certification.”.

SEC. 305. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Unless otherwise provided in this title, this title and the amendments made by this title shall take effect 360 days after the date of enactment of this Act, except that, to the extent a provision of this title requires a rulemaking, the provision shall take effect on the later of—

(1) 360 days after the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) 60 days after the publication in the Federal Register of the final rule implementing the provision.

TITLE IV—REGISTRATION FOR DIGITAL ASSET INTERMEDIARIES AT THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SEC. 401. TREATMENT OF DIGITAL COMMODITIES AND OTHER DIGITAL ASSETS.

(a) SECURITIES ACT OF 1933.—Section 2(a)(1) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77b(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “The term does not include a digital commodity or permitted payment stablecoin.”.

(b) SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.—Section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following: “The term ‘exchange’ does not include a digital asset trading system or a blockchain protocol offering digital assets, or any person or group of persons solely because of their development of such a blockchain protocol.”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following: “A digital asset trading system is not a ‘facility’ of an exchange.”;

(3) in paragraph (4)(A), by inserting “, other than restricted digital assets,” after “securities”;

(4) in paragraph (5)(A), by inserting “restricted digital assets or” after “not including”;

(5) in paragraph (26) by inserting “(other than a notice-registered digital asset clearing agency)” after “or registered clearing agency”;

(6) in paragraph (28) by inserting “(other than a notice-registered digital asset clearing agency)” after “registered clearing agency”; and

(7) in paragraph (10), by adding at the end the following: “The term does not include a digital commodity or permitted payment stablecoin.”.

(c) INVESTMENT ADVISERS ACT OF 1940.—Section 202(a) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-2) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (18), by adding at the end the following: “The term does not include a digital commodity or permitted payment stablecoin.”;

(2) by redesignating the second paragraph (29) relating to commodity pools as paragraph (31);

(3) by adding at the end, the following:

“(32) DIGITAL ASSET-RELATED TERMS.—The terms ‘digital commodity’ and ‘permitted payment stablecoin’ have the meaning given those

terms, respectively, under section 2(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77b(a)).”.

(d) INVESTMENT COMPANY ACT OF 1940.—Section 2(a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-2) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (36), by adding at the end the following: “The term does not include a digital commodity or permitted payment stablecoin.”; and

(2) by adding at the end, the following:

“(55) DIGITAL ASSET-RELATED TERMS.—The terms ‘digital commodity’ and ‘permitted payment stablecoin’ have the meaning given those terms, respectively, under section 2(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77b(a)).”.

SEC. 402. AUTHORITY OVER PERMITTED PAYMENT STABLECOINS AND RESTRICTED DIGITAL ASSETS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 10 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78j) is amended—

(1) by moving subsection (c) so as to appear after subsection (b);

(2) by designating the undesignated matter at the end of that section as subsection (d); and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(e)(1) Rules promulgated under subsection (b) that prohibit fraud, manipulation, or insider trading (but not rules imposing or specifying reporting or recordkeeping requirements, procedures, or standards as prophylactic measures against fraud, manipulation, or insider trading), and judicial precedents decided under subsection (b) and rules promulgated thereunder that prohibit fraud, manipulation, or insider trading, shall apply with respect to permitted payment stablecoin transactions and restricted digital assets transactions engaged in by a broker, dealer, digital asset broker, or digital asset dealer or through an alternative trading system or digital asset trading system to the same extent as they apply to securities transactions.

“(2) Judicial precedents decided under section 17(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 and sections 9, 15, 16, 20, and 21A of this title, and judicial precedents decided under applicable rules promulgated under such sections, shall apply to permitted payment stablecoins and restricted digital assets with respect to those circumstances in which the permitted payment stablecoins or restricted digital assets are brokered, traded, or custodied by a broker, dealer, digital asset broker, digital asset dealer, or through an alternative trading system or digital asset trading system to the same extent as they apply to securities.

“(3) Nothing in this subsection may be construed to provide the Commission authority to make any rule, regulation, or requirement or impose any obligation or limitation on a permitted payment stablecoin issuer or a digital asset issuer regarding any aspect of the operations of a permitted payment stablecoin issuer, a digital asset issuer, a permitted payment stablecoin, or a restricted digital asset.”.

(b) TREATMENT OF PERMITTED PAYMENT STABLECOINS.—Title I of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.), as amended by section 404, is amended by inserting after section 6B the following

“SEC. 6C. TREATMENT OF TRANSACTIONS IN PERMITTED PAYMENT STABLECOINS.

“(a) AUTHORITY TO BROKER, TRADE, AND CUSTODY PERMITTED PAYMENT STABLECOINS.—Permitted payment stablecoins may be brokered, traded, or custodied by a broker, dealer, digital asset broker, or digital asset dealer or through an alternative trading system or digital asset trading system.

“(b) COMMISSION JURISDICTION.—The Commission shall only have jurisdiction over a transaction in a permitted payment stablecoin with respect to those circumstances in which a permitted payment stablecoin is brokered, traded, or custodied—

“(1) by a broker, dealer, digital asset broker, or digital asset dealer; or

“(2) through an alternative trading system or digital asset trading system.

“(c) LIMITATION.—Subsection (b) shall only apply to a transaction described in subsection (b) for the purposes of regulating the offer, execution, solicitation, or acceptance of a permitted payment stablecoin in those circumstances in which the permitted payment stablecoin is brokered, traded, or custodied—

“(1) by a broker, dealer, digital asset broker, or digital asset dealer; or

“(2) through an alternative trading system or digital asset trading system.”.

SEC. 403. REGISTRATION OF DIGITAL ASSET TRADING SYSTEMS.

Section 6 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78f) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(m) DIGITAL ASSET TRADING SYSTEM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for any digital asset trading system to make use of the mails or any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce within or subject to the jurisdiction of the United States to effect any transaction in a restricted digital asset, unless such digital asset trading system is registered with the Commission.

“(2) APPLICATION.—A person desiring to register as a digital asset trading system shall submit to the Commission an application in such form and containing such information as the Commission may require for the purpose of making the determinations required for approval.

“(3) EXEMPTIONS.—A digital asset trading system that offers or seeks to offer at least one restricted digital asset shall not be required to register under this section (and paragraph (1) shall not apply to such digital asset trading system) if the trading system satisfies any exemption contained on a list of exemptions prepared by the Commission to be as close as practicable to those exemptions set forth in section 240.3b-16(b) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, applicable to the definition of an exchange.

“(4) ADDITIONAL REGISTRATIONS.—

“(A) WITH THE COMMISSION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A registered digital asset trading system shall be permitted to maintain any other registration with the Commission relating to the other activities of the registered digital asset trading system, including as a—

“(I) national securities exchange;

“(II) broker;

“(III) dealer;

“(IV) alternative trading system, pursuant to part 242 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of enactment of this subsection;

“(V) digital asset broker; or

“(VI) digital asset dealer.

“(ii) RULEMAKING.—The Commission shall prescribe rules for an entity with multiple registrations described under clause (i) to exempt the entity from duplicative, conflicting, or unduly burdensome provisions of this Act and the rules under this Act, to the extent such an exemption would protect investors, maintain fair, orderly, and efficient markets, and facilitate capital formation.

“(B) WITH THE COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION.—A registered digital asset trading system shall be permitted to maintain a registration with the Commodity Futures Trading Commission as a digital commodity exchange to offer contracts of sale for digital commodities.”.

SEC. 404. REQUIREMENTS FOR DIGITAL ASSET TRADING SYSTEMS.

Title I of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 6 the following:

“SEC. 6A. REQUIREMENTS FOR DIGITAL ASSET TRADING SYSTEMS.

“(a) HOLDING OF CUSTOMER ASSETS.—

“(1) QUALIFIED DIGITAL ASSET CUSTODIAN REQUIRED.—A digital asset trading system shall hold customer restricted digital assets with a qualified digital asset custodian described under section 6B.

“(2) **CUSTODY PROHIBITED.**—A digital asset trading system, in its capacity as such, may not hold custody of customer money, assets, or property.

“(3) **CUSTODY IN OTHER CAPACITY.**—Nothing in this Act may be construed to prohibit a person registered as a digital asset trading system from holding custody of customer money, assets, or property in any other permitted capacity, including as a digital asset broker, digital asset dealer, or qualified digital asset custodian in compliance with the requirements of this Act.

“(b) **RULEMAKING.**—The Commission shall prescribe rules for digital asset trading systems relating to the following:

“(1) **NOTICE.**—Notice to the Commission of the initial operation of a digital asset trading system or any material change to the operation of the digital asset trading system.

“(2) **ORDER DISPLAY.**—The thresholds at which a digital asset trading system is required to display the orders of the digital asset trading system, and the manner of such display.

“(3) **FAIR ACCESS.**—The thresholds at which a digital asset trading system is required to have policies regarding providing fair access to the digital asset trading system.

“(4) **CAPACITY, INTEGRITY, AND SECURITY OF AUTOMATED SYSTEMS.**—Policies and procedures reasonably designed to ensure the capacity, integrity, and security of the digital asset trading system, taking into account the particular nature of digital asset trading systems.

“(5) **EXAMINATIONS, INSPECTIONS, AND INVESTIGATIONS.**—The examination and inspection of the premises, systems, and records of the digital asset trading system by the Commission or by a self-regulatory organization of which such digital asset trading system is a member.

“(6) **RECORDKEEPING.**—The making, keeping current, and preservation of records related to trading activity on the digital asset trading system.

“(7) **REPORTING.**—The reporting of transactions in digital assets that occur through the digital asset trading system.

“(8) **PROCEDURES.**—The establishment of adequate written safeguards and written procedures to protect confidential trading information.

“(c) **NAME REQUIREMENT.**—A digital asset trading system may not use the word ‘exchange’ in the name of the digital asset trading system, unless the digital asset trading system—

“(1) is operated by a registered national securities exchange; and

“(2) is clearly indicated as being provided outside of the system’s capacity as a national securities exchange.

“(d) **TREATMENT UNDER THE BANK SECRECY ACT.**—A digital asset trading system shall be treated as a financial institution for purposes of the Bank Secrecy Act.

“SEC. 6B. REQUIREMENTS FOR QUALIFIED DIGITAL ASSET CUSTODIANS.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—A digital asset custodian is a qualified digital asset custodian if the digital asset custodian complies with the requirements of this section.

“(b) **SUPERVISION REQUIREMENT.**—A digital asset custodian that is not subject to supervision and examination by an appropriate Federal banking agency, the National Credit Union Administration, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, or the Securities and Exchange Commission shall be subject to adequate supervision and appropriate regulation by—

“(1) a State bank supervisor (within the meaning of section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act);

“(2) a State credit union supervisor, as defined under section 6003 of the Anti-Money Laundering Act of 2020; or

“(3) an appropriate foreign governmental authority in the home country of the digital asset custodian.

“(c) **OTHER REQUIREMENTS.**—

“(1) **NOT OTHERWISE PROHIBITED.**—The digital asset custodian has not been prohibited by a su-

pervisor of the digital asset custodian from engaging in an activity with respect to the custody and safekeeping of digital assets.

“(2) **INFORMATION SHARING.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A digital asset custodian shall share information with the Commission on request and comply with such requirements for periodic sharing of information regarding customer accounts that the digital asset custodian holds on behalf of an entity registered with the Commission as the Commission determines by rule are reasonably necessary to effectuate any of the provisions, or to accomplish any of the purposes, of this Act.

“(B) **PROVISION OF INFORMATION.**—Any entity that is subject to regulation and examination by an appropriate Federal banking agency may satisfy any information request described in subparagraph (A) by providing the Commission with a detailed listing, in writing, of the restricted digital assets of a customer within the custody or use of the entity.

“(d) **ADEQUATE SUPERVISION AND APPROPRIATE REGULATION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of subsection (b), the terms ‘adequate supervision’ and ‘appropriate regulation’ mean such minimum standards for supervision and regulation as are reasonably necessary to protect the digital assets of customers of an entity registered with the Commission, including standards relating to the licensing, examination, and supervisory processes that require the digital asset custodian to, at a minimum—

“(A) receive a review and evaluation of ownership, character and fitness, conflicts of interest, business model, financial statements, funding resources, and policies and procedures of the digital asset custodian;

“(B) hold capital sufficient for the financial integrity of the digital asset custodian;

“(C) protect customer assets;

“(D) establish and maintain books and records regarding the business of the digital asset custodian;

“(E) submit financial statements and audited financial statements to the applicable supervisor described in subsection (b);

“(F) provide disclosures to the applicable supervisor described in subsection (b) regarding actions, proceedings, and other items as determined by such supervisor;

“(G) maintain and enforce policies and procedures for compliance with applicable State and Federal laws, including those related to anti-money laundering and cybersecurity;

“(H) establish a business continuity plan to ensure functionality in cases of disruption; and

“(I) establish policies and procedures to resolve complaints.

“(2) **RULEMAKING WITH RESPECT TO DEFINITIONS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of this section, the Commission may, by rule, further define the terms ‘adequate supervision’ and ‘appropriate regulation’ as necessary in the public interest, as appropriate for the protection of investors, and consistent with the purposes of this Act.

“(B) **CONDITIONAL TREATMENT OF CERTAIN CUSTODIANS BEFORE RULEMAKING.**—Before the effective date of a rulemaking under subparagraph (A), a trust company is deemed subject to adequate supervision and appropriate regulation if—

“(i) the trust company is expressly permitted by a State bank supervisor to engage in the custody and safekeeping of digital assets;

“(ii) the State bank supervisor has established licensing, examination, and supervisory processes that require the trust company to, at a minimum, meet the conditions described in subparagraphs (A) through (I) of paragraph (1); and

“(iii) the trust company is in good standing with its State bank supervisor.

“(C) **TRANSITION PERIOD FOR CERTAIN CUSTODIANS.**—In implementing the rulemaking

under subparagraph (A), the Commission shall provide a transition period of not less than two years for any trust company which is deemed subject to adequate supervision and appropriate regulation under subparagraph (B) on the effective date of the rulemaking.”

SEC. 405. REGISTRATION OF DIGITAL ASSET BROKERS AND DIGITAL ASSET DEALERS.

The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 15G the following:

“SEC. 15H. REGISTRATION OF DIGITAL ASSET BROKERS AND DIGITAL ASSET DEALERS.

“(a) **REGISTRATION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—It shall be unlawful for any digital asset broker or digital asset dealer (other than a natural person associated with a registered digital asset broker or registered digital asset dealer, and other than such a digital asset broker or digital asset dealer whose business is exclusively intrastate and who does not make use of a digital asset trading system) to make use of the mails or any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce to effect any transactions in, or to induce or attempt to induce the purchase or sale of, any restricted digital asset unless such digital asset broker or digital asset dealer is registered in accordance with this section.

“(2) **APPLICATION.**—A person desiring to register as a digital asset broker or digital asset dealer shall submit to the Commission an application in such form and containing such information as the Commission may require for the purpose of making the determinations required for approval.

“(b) **NATIONAL SECURITIES ASSOCIATION MEMBERSHIP.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A digital asset broker or digital asset dealer may not register or maintain registration under this section unless such digital asset broker or digital asset dealer is a member of a national securities association registered under section 15A.

“(2) **TREATMENT UNDER SECTION 15A.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of section 15A—

“(i) the term ‘broker’ includes a digital asset broker and the term ‘registered broker’ includes a registered digital asset broker;

“(ii) the term ‘dealer’ includes a digital asset dealer and the term ‘registered dealer’ includes a registered digital asset dealer; and

“(iii) the term ‘security’ includes a restricted digital asset.

“(B) **CLARIFICATION.**—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), a national securities association shall, with respect to the restricted digital asset activities of a digital asset broker or a digital asset dealer, only examine for and enforce against such digital asset broker or digital asset dealer—

“(i) rules of such national securities association written specifically for digital asset brokers or digital asset dealers;

“(ii) the provisions of the Financial Innovation and Technology for the 21st Century Act and rules issued thereunder applicable to digital asset brokers and digital asset dealers; and

“(iii) the provisions of the securities laws and the rules thereunder applicable to digital asset brokers and digital asset dealers.

“(c) **ADDITIONAL REGISTRATIONS WITH THE COMMISSION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A registered digital asset broker or registered digital asset dealer shall be permitted to maintain any other registration with the Commission relating to the other activities of the registered digital asset broker or registered digital asset dealer, including as—

“(A) a national securities exchange;

“(B) a broker;

“(C) a dealer;

“(D) an alternative trading system, pursuant to part 242 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of enactment of this section; or

“(E) a digital asset trading system.

“(2) **RULEMAKING.**—The Commission shall prescribe rules for an entity with multiple registrations described under paragraph (1) to exempt the entity from duplicative, conflicting, or unduly burdensome provisions of this Act and the rules under this Act, to the extent such an exemption would protect investors, maintain fair, orderly, and efficient markets, and facilitate capital formation.

“(3) **SELF-REGULATORY ORGANIZATIONS.**—The Commission shall require any self-regulatory organization with a registered digital asset broker or registered digital asset dealer as a member to provide such rules as may be necessary to further compliance with this section, protect investors, maintain fair, orderly, and efficient markets, and facilitate capital formation.

“(d) **ADDITIONAL REGISTRATIONS WITH THE COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION.**—A registered digital asset broker or registered digital asset dealer shall be permitted to maintain a registration with the Commodity Futures Trading Commission as a digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer, to list or trade contracts of sale for digital commodities.”.

SEC. 406. REQUIREMENTS OF DIGITAL ASSET BROKERS AND DIGITAL ASSET DEALERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 15H of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as added by section 405, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) **ANTI-FRAUD.**—No digital asset broker or digital asset dealer shall make use of the mails or any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce to effect any transaction in, or to induce or attempt to induce the purchase or sale of, any restricted digital asset by means of any manipulative, deceptive, or other fraudulent device or contrivance.

“(f) **HOLDING OF CUSTOMER ASSETS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A digital asset broker or digital asset dealer shall hold customer money, assets, and property in a manner to minimize the risk of loss to the customer or unreasonable delay in the access to the money, assets, and property of the customer.

“(2) **QUALIFIED DIGITAL ASSET CUSTODIAN REQUIRED.**—A digital asset broker or digital asset dealer shall hold customer restricted digital assets described in paragraph (1) with a qualified digital asset custodian described under section 6B.

“(3) **SEGREGATION OF FUNDS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A digital asset broker or digital asset dealer shall treat and deal with all money, assets, and property held for a customer of the digital asset broker or digital asset dealer, or that accrues to a customer as a result of trading in restricted digital assets, as belonging to the customer.

“(B) **COMMINGLING PROHIBITED.**—Money, assets, and property of a customer described in subparagraph (A) shall be separately accounted for and shall not be commingled with the funds of the digital asset broker or digital asset dealer or be used to margin, secure, or guarantee any trades of any person other than the customer of the digital asset broker or digital asset dealer for whom the same are held.

“(4) **EXCEPTIONS.**—

“(A) **USE OF FUNDS.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding paragraph (4), money, assets, and property of customers of a digital asset broker or digital asset dealer described in paragraph (4) may be maintained and deposited in the same account or accounts with any bank, trust company, or qualified digital asset custodian described under section 6B, if the money, assets, and property remain segregated from the money, assets, and property of the digital asset broker or digital asset dealer.

“(ii) **WITHDRAWAL.**—Notwithstanding paragraph (4), such share of the money, assets, and property described in paragraph (4) as in the normal course of business shall be necessary to transfer, adjust, or settle a restricted digital asset transaction pursuant to a customer’s in-

struction (standing or otherwise) may be withdrawn and applied to such purposes, including the withdrawal and payment of commissions, brokerage, interest, taxes, storage, and other charges lawfully accruing in connection with a restricted digital asset transaction.

“(iii) **COMMISSION ACTION.**—In accordance with such terms and conditions as the Commission may prescribe by rule, regulation, or order, any money, assets, or property of a customer of a digital asset broker or digital asset dealer described in paragraph (4) may be commingled and deposited as provided in this section with any other money, assets, or property received by the digital asset broker or digital asset dealer and required by the Commission to be separately accounted for and treated and dealt with as belonging to the customer of the digital asset broker or digital asset dealer.

“(B) **PARTICIPATION IN BLOCKCHAIN SERVICES.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—A customer shall have the right to waive the restrictions in paragraph (4) for any unit of a digital asset to be used under clause (ii), by affirmatively electing, in writing to the digital asset broker or digital asset dealer, to waive the restrictions.

“(ii) **USE OF FUNDS.**—Customer digital assets removed from segregation under clause (i) may be pooled and used by the digital asset broker or digital asset dealer or its designee to provide a blockchain service for a blockchain system to which the unit of the digital asset removed from segregation under clause (i) relates.

“(iii) **LIMITATIONS.**—

“(I) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission may, by rule, establish notice and disclosure requirements, and any other limitations and rules related to the waiving of any restrictions under this subparagraph that are reasonably necessary to protect customers.

“(II) **CUSTOMER CHOICE.**—A digital asset broker or digital asset dealer may not require a waiver from a customer described in clause (i) as a condition of doing business with the digital asset broker or digital asset dealer.

“(iv) **BLOCKCHAIN SERVICE DEFINED.**—In this subparagraph, the term ‘blockchain service’ means any activity relating to validating transactions on a blockchain system, providing security for a blockchain system, or other similar activity required for the ongoing operation of a blockchain system.

“(5) **FURTHER LIMITATIONS.**—No person shall treat or deal with a restricted digital asset held on behalf of any customer pursuant to paragraph (4) by utilizing any unit of such restricted digital asset to participate in a blockchain service (as defined in paragraph (5)(B)(iv)) or a decentralized governance system associated with the restricted digital asset or the blockchain system to which the restricted digital asset relates in any manner other than that which is expressly directed by the customer from which such unit of a restricted digital asset was received.

“(g) **CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Each registered digital asset broker and registered digital asset dealer shall meet such minimum capital requirements as the Commission may prescribe to ensure that the digital asset broker or digital asset dealer is able to—

“(A) conduct an orderly wind-down of the activities of the digital asset broker or digital asset dealer; and

“(B) fulfill the customer obligations of the digital asset broker or digital asset dealer.

“(2) **CALCULATION.**—For purposes of any Commission rule or order adopted under this section or any interpretation thereof regulating a digital asset broker or digital asset dealer’s financial responsibility obligations and capital requirements, a registered digital asset broker or digital asset dealer that maintains control of customer digital assets in a manner that satisfies the rules issued by the Commission under subsection (f)(2) shall not be required to include

the custodial obligation with respect to such digital assets as liabilities or such digital assets as assets of the digital asset broker or digital asset dealer.

“(h) **REPORTING AND RECORDKEEPING.**—Each registered digital asset broker and digital asset dealer—

“(1) shall make such reports as are required by the Commission by rule or regulation regarding the transactions, positions, and financial condition of the digital asset broker or digital asset dealer;

“(2) shall keep books and records in such form and manner and for such period as may be prescribed by the Commission by rule or regulation; and

“(3) shall keep the books and records open to inspection and examination by any representative of the Commission.

“(i) **TREATMENT UNDER THE BANK SECRECY ACT.**—A digital asset broker and a digital asset dealer shall be treated as a financial institution for purposes of the Bank Secrecy Act.”.

(b) **DEFINITION OF CLEARING AGENCY.**—Section 3(a)(23)(B) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(23)(B)) is amended by inserting “digital asset broker, digital asset dealer,” after “broker, dealer,” each place such term appears.

SEC. 407. RULES RELATED TO CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.

The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 10D the following:

“SEC. 10E. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST RELATED TO DIGITAL ASSETS.

“Each registered digital asset trading system, registered digital asset broker, registered digital asset dealer, and notice-registered digital asset clearing agency shall establish, maintain, and enforce written policies and procedures reasonably designed, taking into consideration the nature of such person’s business, to mitigate any conflicts of interest and transactions or arrangements with affiliates.”.

SEC. 408. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DIGITAL ASSETS IN CONNECTION WITH FEDERALLY REGULATED INTERMEDIARIES.

Section 18(b) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77r(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) **EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN DIGITAL ASSETS IN CONNECTION WITH FEDERALLY REGULATED INTERMEDIARIES.**—A restricted digital asset is treated as a covered security with respect to a transaction that is exempt from registration under this Act when it is—

“(A) brokered, traded, custodied, or cleared by a digital asset broker or digital asset dealer registered under section 15H of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; or

“(B) traded through a digital asset trading system.”.

SEC. 409. EXCLUSION FOR DECENTRALIZED FINANCE ACTIVITIES.

The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.), as amended by section 405, is further amended by inserting after section 15H the following:

“SEC. 15I. DECENTRALIZED FINANCE ACTIVITIES NOT SUBJECT TO THIS ACT.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, a person shall not be subject to this Act and the regulations thereunder based on the person directly or indirectly engaging in any of the following activities, whether singly or in combination thereof, in relation to the operation of a blockchain system or in relation to decentralized finance (as defined in section 605(d) of the Financial Innovation and Technology for the 21st Century Act):

“(1) Compiling network transactions, operating or participating in a liquidity pool, relaying, searching, sequencing, validating, or acting in a similar capacity with respect to a digital asset.

“(2) Providing computational work, operating a node, or procuring, offering, or utilizing network bandwidth, or other similar incidental services with respect to a digital asset.

“(3) Providing a user-interface that enables a user to read and access data about a blockchain system, send messages, or otherwise interact with a blockchain system.

“(4) Developing, publishing, constituting, administering, maintaining, or otherwise distributing a blockchain system.

“(5) Developing, publishing, constituting, administering, maintaining, or otherwise distributing software or systems that create or deploy a hardware or software wallet or other system facilitating an individual user’s own personal ability to keep, safeguard, or custody such user’s digital assets or related private keys.

“(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Subsection (a) shall not be construed to apply to the anti-fraud and anti-manipulation authorities of the Commission.”.

SEC. 410. REGISTRATION AND REQUIREMENTS FOR NOTICE-REGISTERED DIGITAL ASSET CLEARING AGENCIES.

Section 17A(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78q-1(b)) is amended—

(1) in subsection (1), by inserting after the first sentence the following: “The previous sentence shall not apply to a notice-registered digital asset clearing agency with respect to a restricted digital asset.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(9) REGISTRATION AND REQUIREMENTS FOR NOTICE-REGISTERED DIGITAL ASSET CLEARING AGENCY.—

“(A) ELIGIBILITY.—A person may register with the Commission as a notice-registered digital asset clearing agency if the person—

“(i) is otherwise registered as a digital asset broker or digital asset dealer with the Commission and is engaging in a business involving restricted digital assets, in compliance with Commission rules pursuant to section 15H(f);

“(ii) is a bank; or

“(iii) is a clearing agency already registered with the Commission pursuant to this section.

“(B) REGISTRATION.—A person may register with the Commission as a notice-registered digital asset clearing agency by filing with the Commission a notice of the activities of the person or planned activities in such form as the Commission determines appropriate.

“(C) EFFECTIVENESS OF REGISTRATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The registration of a person filing a notice described under subparagraph (B) as a notice-registered digital asset clearing agency shall be effective upon publication by the Commission of such notice, which shall occur no later than 14 days after the date of such filing.

“(ii) INITIAL REGISTRATIONS.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—A person registered as a notice-registered digital asset clearing agency before the date on which the Commission adopts rules under subparagraph (D) shall, after such rules are adopted, renew the person’s registration pursuant to such rules.

“(II) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subclause (I), a person registered as a notice-registered digital asset clearing agency before the end of the 2-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this section shall have such registration remain in effect until the end of such 2-year period.

“(D) RULEMAKING.—The Commission may adopt rules, which may not take effect until at least 360 days following the date of enactment of this paragraph, with regard to the activities of notice-registered digital asset clearing agencies, taking into account the nature of restricted digital assets.”.

SEC. 411. TREATMENT OF CUSTODY ACTIVITIES BY BANKING INSTITUTIONS.

(a) TREATMENT OF CUSTODY ACTIVITIES.—The appropriate Federal banking agency (as defined under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813)), the National Credit Union Administration (in the case of a credit

union), and the Securities and Exchange Commission may not require, or take supervisory action that would cause, a depository institution, national bank, Federal credit union, State credit union, or trust company, or any affiliate (as such term is defined under section 2 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956) thereof—

(1) to include assets held in custody or safekeeping, or the assets associated with a cryptographic key held in custody or safekeeping, as a liability on such institution’s financial statement or balance sheet, except that cash held for a third party by such institution that is commingled with the general assets of such institution may be reflected as a liability on a financial statement or balance sheet;

(2) to hold additional regulatory capital against assets in custody or safekeeping, or the assets associated with a cryptographic key held in custody or safekeeping, except as necessary to mitigate against operational risks inherent with the custody or safekeeping services, as determined by—

(A) the appropriate Federal banking agency;

(B) the National Credit Union Administration (in the case of a credit union);

(C) a State bank supervisor (as defined under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813)); or

(D) a State credit union supervisor (as defined under section 6003 of the Anti-Money Laundering Act of 2020);

(3) to recognize a liability for any obligations related to activities or services performed for digital assets with respect to which such institution does not have beneficial ownership if that liability would exceed the expense recognized in the income statement as a result of the corresponding obligation.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.—The term “depository institution” has the meaning given that term under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act.

(2) CREDIT UNION TERMS.—The terms “Federal credit union” and “State credit union” have the meaning given those terms, respectively, under section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act.

SEC. 412. EFFECTIVE DATE; ADMINISTRATION.

Except as otherwise provided under this title, this title and the amendments made by this title shall take effect 360 days after the date of enactment of this Act, except that, to the extent a provision of this title requires a rulemaking, the provision shall take effect on the later of—

(1) 360 days after the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) 60 days after the publication in the Federal Register of the final rule implementing the provision.

SEC. 413. DISCRETIONARY SURPLUS FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The dollar amount specified under section 7(a)(3)(A) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 289(a)(3)(A)) is reduced by \$15,000,000.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on September 30, 2034.

TITLE V—REGISTRATION FOR DIGITAL ASSET INTERMEDIARIES AT THE COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

SEC. 501. COMMISSION JURISDICTION OVER DIGITAL COMMODITY TRANSACTIONS.

(a) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Section 2(a)(1) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 2(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(J) Except as expressly provided in this Act, nothing in the Financial Innovation and Technology for the 21st Century Act shall affect or apply to, or be interpreted to affect or apply to—

“(i) any agreement, contract, or transaction that is subject to this Act as—

“(I) a contract of sale of a commodity for future delivery or an option on such a contract;

“(II) a swap;

“(III) a security futures product;

“(IV) an option authorized under section 4c of this Act;

“(V) an agreement, contract, or transaction described in subparagraph (C)(i) or (D)(i) of subsection (c)(2) of this section; or

“(VI) a leverage transaction authorized under section 19 of this Act; or

“(ii) the activities of any person with respect to any such an agreement, contract, or transaction.”.

(b) LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY OVER PERMITTED PAYMENT STABLECOINS.—Section 2(c)(1) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 2(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (F), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (G), by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(H) permitted payment stablecoins.”.

(c) COMMISSION JURISDICTION OVER DIGITAL ASSET TRANSACTIONS.—Section 2(c)(2) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 2(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D)—

(A) in clause (ii)—

(i) in subclause (I) by inserting “(other than an agreement, contract, or transaction in a permitted payment stablecoin)” after “paragraph (1)”; and

(ii) in subclause (III)—

(I) in the matter that precedes item (aa), by inserting “of a commodity, other than a digital commodity or a permitted payment stablecoin,” before “that”; and

(II) in item (bb), by striking “or” at the end; and

(iii) by redesignating subclauses (IV) and (V) as subclauses (VI) and (VII) and inserting after subclause (III) the following:

“(IV) a contract of sale of a digital commodity or a permitted payment stablecoin that results in actual delivery, as the Commission shall by rule determine, within 2 days or such other period as the Commission may determine by rule or regulation based upon the typical commercial practice in cash or spot markets for the digital commodity involved;

“(V) a contract of sale of a digital commodity or a permitted payment stablecoin that—

“(aa) is executed with a registered digital commodity dealer—

“(AA) directly;

“(BB) through a registered digital commodity broker; or

“(CC) on or subject to the rules of a registered digital commodity exchange; and

“(bb) is not a contract of sale of—

“(AA) a digital commodity or a permitted payment stablecoin that references, represents an interest in, or is functionally equivalent to an agricultural commodity, an excluded commodity, or an exempt commodity, other than the digital commodity itself, as shall be further defined by the Commission; or

“(BB) a digital commodity or a permitted payment stablecoin to which the Commission determines, by rule or regulation, it is not in the public interest for this section to apply;”;

(B) by redesignating clause (iv) as clause (v) and inserting after clause (iii) the following:

“(iv) The Commission shall adopt rules and regulations applicable to digital commodity dealers and digital commodity brokers in connection with the agreements, contracts or transactions in digital commodities or permitted payment stablecoins described in clause (ii)(V) of this subparagraph, which shall set forth minimum requirements related to disclosure, record-keeping, margin and financing arrangements, capital, reporting, business conduct, documentation, and supervision of employees and agents. Except as prohibited in subparagraph (G)(iii), the Commission may also make, promulgate, and enforce such rules and regulations as, in the judgment of the Commission, are reasonably necessary to effectuate any of the provisions of,

or to accomplish any of the purposes of, this Act in connection with agreements, contracts, or transactions described in such clause (ii)(V), which may include, without limitation, requirements regarding registration with the Commission and membership in a registered futures association.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) COMMISSION JURISDICTION WITH RESPECT TO DIGITAL COMMODITY TRANSACTIONS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to sections 6d and 12(e), the Commission shall have exclusive jurisdiction with respect to any account, agreement, contract, or transaction involving a contract of sale of a digital commodity in interstate commerce, including in a digital commodity cash or spot market, that is offered, solicited, traded, facilitated, executed, cleared, reported, or otherwise dealt in—

“(I) on or subject to the rules of a registered entity or an entity that is required to be registered as a registered entity; or

“(II) by any other entity registered, or required to be registered, with the Commission.

“(ii) LIMITATIONS.—Clause (i) shall not apply with respect to custodial or depository activities for a digital commodity, or custodial or depository activities for any promise or right to a future digital commodity, of an entity regulated by an appropriate Federal banking agency or a State bank supervisor (within the meaning of section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act).

“(iii) MIXED DIGITAL ASSET TRANSACTIONS.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Clause (i) shall not apply to a mixed digital asset transaction.

“(II) REPORTS ON MIXED DIGITAL ASSET TRANSACTIONS.—A digital asset issuer, related person, affiliated person, or other person registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission that engages in a mixed digital asset transaction, shall, on request, open to inspection and examination by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission all books and records relating to the mixed digital asset transaction, subject to the confidentiality and disclosure requirements of section 8.

“(G) AGREEMENTS, CONTRACTS, AND TRANSACTIONS IN STABLECOINS.—

“(i) TREATMENT OF PERMITTED PAYMENT STABLECOINS ON COMMISSION-REGISTERED ENTITIES.—Subject to clauses (ii) and (iii), the Commission shall have jurisdiction over a cash or spot agreement, contract, or transaction in a permitted payment stablecoin that is offered, offered to enter into, entered into, executed, confirmed the execution of, solicited, or accepted—

“(I) on or subject to the rules of a registered entity; or

“(II) by any other entity registered with the Commission.

“(ii) PERMITTED PAYMENT STABLECOIN TRANSACTION RULES.—This Act shall apply to a transaction described in clause (i) only for the purpose of regulating the offer, execution, solicitation, or acceptance of a cash or spot permitted payment stablecoin transaction on a registered entity or by any other entity registered with the Commission, as if the permitted payment stablecoin were a digital commodity.

“(iii) NO AUTHORITY OVER PERMITTED PAYMENT STABLECOINS.—Notwithstanding clauses (i) and (ii), the Commission shall not make a rule or regulation, impose a requirement or obligation on a registered entity or other entity registered with the Commission, or impose a requirement or obligation on a permitted payment stablecoin issuer, regarding the operation of a permitted payment stablecoin issuer or a permitted payment stablecoin.”.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 2(a)(1)(A) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 2(a)(1)(A)) is amended in the 1st sentence by inserting “subparagraphs (F) and (G) of subsection (c)(2) of this section or” before “section 19”.

SEC. 502. REQUIRING FUTURES COMMISSION MERCHANTS TO USE QUALIFIED DIGITAL COMMODITY CUSTODIANS.

Section 4d of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 6d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) in the 1st proviso, by striking “any bank or trust company” and inserting “any bank, trust company, or qualified digital commodity custodian”; and

(B) by inserting “: Provided further, That any such property that is a digital commodity shall be held in a qualified digital commodity custodian” before the period at the end; and

(2) in subsection (f)(3)(A)(i), by striking “any bank or trust company” and inserting “any bank, trust company, or qualified digital commodity custodian”.

SEC. 503. TRADING CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL FOR DIGITAL COMMODITIES.

Section 5c of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 7a–2) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “5(d) and 5b(c)(2)” and inserting “5(d), 5b(c)(2), and 5i(c)”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in each of paragraphs (1) and (2), by inserting “digital commodity exchange,” before “derivatives”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting “digital commodity exchange,” before “derivatives” each place it appears;

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by inserting “or participants” before “(in)”;

(B) in paragraph (4)(B), by striking “1a(10)” and inserting “1a(9)”;

(C) in paragraph (5), by adding at the end the following:

“(D) SPECIAL RULES FOR DIGITAL COMMODITY CONTRACTS.—In certifying any new rule or rule amendment, or listing any new contract or instrument, in connection with a contract of sale of a commodity for future delivery, option, swap, or other agreement, contract, or transaction, that is based on or references a digital commodity, a registered entity shall make or rely on a certification under subsection (d) for the digital commodity.”; and

(4) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) CERTIFICATIONS FOR DIGITAL COMMODITY TRADING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (c), for the purposes of listing or offering a digital commodity for trading in a digital commodity cash or spot market, an eligible entity shall issue a written certification that the digital commodity meets the requirements of this Act (including the regulations prescribed under this Act).

“(2) CONTENTS OF THE CERTIFICATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In making a written certification under this paragraph, the eligible entity shall furnish to the Commission—

“(i) an analysis of how the digital commodity meets the requirements of section 5i(c)(3);

“(ii) information about the digital commodity regarding—

“(I) its purpose and use;

“(II) its unit creation or release process;

“(III) its consensus mechanism;

“(IV) its governance structure;

“(V) its participation and distribution; and

“(VI) its current and proposed functionality; and

“(iii) any other information, analysis, or documentation the Commission may, by rule, require.

“(B) RELIANCE ON PRIOR DISCLOSURES.—In making a certification under this subsection, an eligible entity may rely on the records and disclosures of any relevant person registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission or other State or Federal agency.

“(3) MODIFICATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity shall modify a certification made under paragraph (1) to—

“(i) account for significant changes in any information provided to the Commission under paragraph (2)(A)(ii); or

“(ii) permit or restrict trading in units of a digital commodity held by a related person or an affiliated person.

“(B) RECERTIFICATION.—Modifications required by this subsection shall be subject to the same disapproval and review process as a new certification under paragraphs (4) and (5).

“(4) DISAPPROVAL.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The written certification described in paragraph (1) shall become effective unless the Commission finds that the digital asset does not meet the requirements of this Act or the rules and regulations thereunder.

“(B) ANALYSIS REQUIRED.—The Commission shall include, with any findings referred to in subparagraph (A), a detailed analysis of the factors on which the decision was based.

“(C) PUBLIC FINDINGS.—The Commission shall make public any disapproval decision, and any related findings and analysis, made under this paragraph.

“(5) REVIEW.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Unless the Commission makes a disapproval decision under paragraph (4), the written certification described in paragraph (1) shall become effective, pursuant to the certification by the eligible entity and notice of the certification to the public (in a manner determined by the Commission) on the date that is—

“(i) 20 business days after the date the Commission receives the certification (or such shorter period as determined by the Commission by rule or regulation), in the case of a digital commodity that has not been certified under this section or for which a certification is being modified under paragraph (3); or

“(ii) 2 business days after the date the Commission receives the certification (or such shorter period as determined by the Commission by rule or regulation) for any digital commodity that has been certified under this section.

“(B) EXTENSIONS.—The time for consideration under subparagraph (A) may be extended through notice to the eligible entity that there are novel or complex issues that require additional time to analyze, that the explanation by the submitting eligible entity is inadequate, or of a potential inconsistency with this Act—

“(i) once, for 30 business days, through written notice to the eligible entity by the Chairman; and

“(ii) once, for an additional 30 business days, through written notice to the digital commodity exchange from the Commission that includes a description of any deficiencies with the certification, including any—

“(I) novel or complex issues which require additional time to analyze;

“(II) missing information or inadequate explanations; or

“(III) potential inconsistencies with this Act.

“(6) CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, a registered entity or other entity registered with the Commission shall not list for trading, accept for clearing, offer to enter into, enter into, execute, confirm the execution of, or conduct any office or business anywhere in the United States, its territories or possessions, for the purpose of soliciting, or accepting any order for, or otherwise dealing in, any transaction in, or in connection with, a digital commodity, unless a certification has been made under this section for the digital commodity.

“(7) PRIOR APPROVAL BEFORE REGISTRATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A person applying for registration with the Commission for the purposes of listing or offering a digital commodity for trading in a digital commodity cash or spot market may request that the Commission grant prior approval for the person to list or offer the digital commodity on being registered with the Commission.

“(B) REQUEST FOR PRIOR APPROVAL.—A person seeking prior approval under subparagraph (A) shall furnish the Commission with a written certification that the digital commodity meets

the requirements of this Act (including the regulations prescribed under this Act) and the information described in paragraph (2).

“(C) DEADLINE.—The Commission shall take final action on a request for prior approval not later than 90 business days after submission of the request, unless the person submitting the request agrees to an extension of the time limitation established under this subparagraph.

“(D) DISAPPROVAL.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall approve a new contract or other instrument unless the Commission finds that the new contract or other instrument would violate this Act (including a regulations prescribed under this Act).

“(ii) ANALYSIS REQUIRED.—The Commission shall include, with any findings made under clause (i), a detailed analysis of the factors on which the decision is based.

“(iii) PUBLIC FINDINGS.—The Commission shall make public any disapproval decision, and any related findings and analysis, made under this paragraph.

“(B) ELIGIBLE ENTITY DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘eligible entity’ means a registered entity or group of registered entities acting jointly.”

SEC. 504. REGISTRATION OF DIGITAL COMMODITY EXCHANGES.

The Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 5h the following:

“SEC. 5i. REGISTRATION OF DIGITAL COMMODITY EXCHANGES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—

“(1) REGISTRATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A trading facility that offers or seeks to offer a cash or spot market in at least 1 digital commodity shall register with the Commission as a digital commodity exchange.

“(B) APPLICATION.—A person desiring to register as a digital commodity exchange shall submit to the Commission an application in such form and containing such information as the Commission may require for the purpose of making the determinations required for approval.

“(C) EXEMPTIONS.—A trading facility that offers or seeks to offer a cash or spot market in at least 1 digital commodity shall not be required to register under this section if the trading facility—

“(i) permits no more than a de minimis amount of trading activity in a digital commodity; or

“(ii) serves only customers in a single State or territory.

“(2) ADDITIONAL REGISTRATIONS.—

“(A) WITH THE COMMISSION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A registered digital commodity exchange may also register as—

“(I) a designated contract market; or

“(II) a swap execution facility.

“(ii) RULES.—For an entity with multiple registrations under clause (i), the Commission—

“(I) shall prescribe rules to exempt the entity from duplicative, conflicting, or unduly burdensome provisions of this Act and the rules under this Act, to the extent such an exemption would foster the development of fair and orderly cash or spot markets in digital commodities, be necessary or appropriate in the public interest, and be consistent with the protection of customers; and

“(II) may, after an analysis of the risks and benefits, prescribe rules to provide for portfolio margining, as may be necessary to protect market participants, promote fair and equitable trading in digital commodity markets, and promote responsible economic or financial innovation.

“(B) WITH THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION.—A registered digital commodity exchange may register with the Securities and Exchange Commission as a digital asset trading system to list or trade contracts of sale for restricted digital assets.

“(C) WITH A REGISTERED FUTURES ASSOCIATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A registered digital commodity exchange shall also be a member of a registered futures association and comply with rules related to such activity, if the registered digital commodity exchange accepts customer funds required to be segregated under subsection (d).

“(ii) RULEMAKING REQUIRED.—The Commission shall require any registered futures association with a digital commodity exchange as a member to provide such rules as may be necessary to further compliance with subsection (d), protect customers, and promote the public interest.

“(D) REGISTRATION REQUIRED.—A person required to be registered as a digital commodity exchange under this section shall register with the Commission as such regardless of whether the person is registered with another State or Federal regulator.

“(b) TRADING.—

“(1) PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN TRADING PRACTICES.—

“(A) Section 4b shall apply to any agreement, contract, or transaction in a digital commodity as if the agreement, contract, or transaction were a contract of sale of a commodity for future delivery.

“(B) Section 4c shall apply to any agreement, contract, or transaction in a digital commodity as if the agreement, contract, or transaction were a transaction involving the purchase or sale of a commodity for future delivery.

“(C) Section 4b-1 shall apply to any agreement, contract, or transaction in a digital commodity as if the agreement, contract, or transaction were a contract of sale of a commodity for future delivery.

“(2) PROHIBITION ON ACTING AS A COUNTERPARTY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A digital commodity exchange or any affiliate of such an exchange shall not trade on or subject to the rules of the digital commodity exchange for its own account.

“(B) EXCEPTIONS.—The Commission shall, by rule, permit a digital commodity exchange or any affiliate of a digital commodity exchange to engage in trading on an affiliated exchange so long as the trading is not solely for the purpose of the profit of the exchange, including the following:

“(i) CUSTOMER DIRECTION.—A transaction for, or entered into at the direction of, or for the benefit of, an unaffiliated customer.

“(ii) RISK MANAGEMENT.—A transaction to manage the risks associated with the digital commodity business of the exchange.

“(iii) FUNCTIONAL USE.—A transaction related to the functional operation of a blockchain network.

“(C) NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—In order for a digital commodity exchange or any affiliate of a digital commodity exchange to engage in trading on the affiliated exchange pursuant to subsection (B), notice must be given to the Commission that shall enumerate how any proposed activity is consistent with the exceptions in subsection (B) and the principles of the Act.

“(D) DELEGATION.—The Commission may, by rule, delegate authority to the Director of the Division of Market Oversight, or such other employee or employees as the Director of the Division of Market Oversight may designate from time to time, to carry out these provisions.

“(3) TRADING SECURITIES.—A registered digital commodity exchange that is also registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission may offer a contract of sale of a restricted digital asset.

“(4) RULES FOR CERTAIN DIGITAL ASSET SALES.—The digital commodity exchange shall have in place such rules as may be necessary to reasonably ensure the orderly sale of any unit of a digital commodity sold by a related person or an affiliated person.

“(c) CORE PRINCIPLES FOR DIGITAL COMMODITY EXCHANGES.—

“(1) COMPLIANCE WITH CORE PRINCIPLES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—To be registered, and maintain registration, as a digital commodity exchange, a digital commodity exchange shall comply with—

“(i) the core principles described in this subsection; and

“(ii) any requirement that the Commission may impose by rule or regulation pursuant to section 8a(5).

“(B) REASONABLE DISCRETION OF A DIGITAL COMMODITY EXCHANGE.—Unless otherwise determined by the Commission by rule or regulation, a digital commodity exchange described in subparagraph (A) shall have reasonable discretion in establishing the manner in which the digital commodity exchange complies with the core principles described in this subsection.

“(2) COMPLIANCE WITH RULES.—A digital commodity exchange shall—

“(A) establish and enforce compliance with any rule of the digital commodity exchange, including—

“(i) the terms and conditions of the trades traded or processed on or through the digital commodity exchange; and

“(ii) any limitation on access to the digital commodity exchange;

“(B) establish and enforce trading, trade processing, and participation rules that will deter abuses and have the capacity to detect, investigate, and enforce those rules, including means—

“(i) to provide market participants with impartial access to the market; and

“(ii) to capture information that may be used in establishing whether rule violations have occurred; and

“(C) establish rules governing the operation of the exchange, including rules specifying trading procedures to be used in entering and executing orders traded or posted on the facility.

“(3) LISTING STANDARDS FOR DIGITAL COMMODITIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A digital commodity exchange shall permit trading only in a digital commodity that is not readily susceptible to manipulation.

“(B) PUBLIC INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A digital commodity exchange shall permit trading only in a digital commodity if the information required in clause (ii) is correct, current, and available to the public.

“(ii) REQUIRED INFORMATION.—With respect to a digital commodity and each blockchain system to which the digital commodity relates for which the digital commodity exchange will make the digital commodity available to the customers of the digital commodity exchange, the information required in this clause is as follows:

“(I) SOURCE CODE.—The source code for any blockchain system to which the digital commodity relates.

“(II) TRANSACTION HISTORY.—A narrative description of the steps necessary to independently access, search, and verify the transaction history of any blockchain system to which the digital commodity relates.

“(III) DIGITAL ASSET ECONOMICS.—A narrative description of the purpose of any blockchain system to which the digital asset relates and the operation of any such blockchain system, including—

“(aa) information explaining the launch and supply process, including the number of digital assets to be issued in an initial allocation, the total number of digital assets to be created, the release schedule for the digital assets, and the total number of digital assets then outstanding;

“(bb) information detailing any applicable consensus mechanism or process for validating transactions, method of generating or mining digital assets, and any process for burning or destroying digital assets on the blockchain system;

“(cc) an explanation of governance mechanisms for implementing changes to the blockchain system or forming consensus among holders of the digital assets; and

“(dd) sufficient information for a third party to create a tool for verifying the transaction history of the digital asset.

“(IV) TRADING VOLUME AND VOLATILITY.—The trading volume and volatility of the digital commodity.

“(V) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—Such additional information as the Commission may, by rule, determine to be necessary for a customer to understand the financial and operational risks of a digital commodity, and to be in the public interest or in furtherance of the requirements of this Act.

“(iii) FORMAT.—The Commission shall prescribe rules and regulations for the standardization and simplification of disclosures under clause (ii), including requiring that disclosures—

“(I) be conspicuous;

“(II) use plain language comprehensible to customers; and

“(III) succinctly explain the information that is required to be communicated to the customer.

“(C) ADDITIONAL LISTING CONSIDERATIONS.—In addition to the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B), a digital commodity exchange shall consider—

“(i) if a sufficient percentage of the units of the digital asset are units of a digital commodity to permit robust price discovery;

“(ii) if it is reasonably unlikely that the transaction history can be fraudulently altered by any person or group of persons acting collectively;

“(iii) if the operating structure and system of the digital commodity is secure from cybersecurity threats;

“(iv) if the functionality of the digital commodity will protect holders from operational failures;

“(v) if sufficient public information about the operation, functionality, and use of the digital commodity is available; and

“(vi) any other factor which the Commission has, by rule, determined to be in the public interest or in furtherance of the requirements of this Act.

“(D) RESTRICTED DIGITAL ASSETS.—A digital commodity exchange shall not permit the trading of a unit of a digital asset that is a restricted digital asset.

“(4) TREATMENT OF CUSTOMER ASSETS.—A digital commodity exchange shall establish standards and procedures that are designed to protect and ensure the safety of customer money, assets, and property.

“(5) MONITORING OF TRADING AND TRADE PROCESSING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A digital commodity exchange shall provide a competitive, open, and efficient market and mechanism for executing transactions that protects the price discovery process of trading on the exchange.

“(B) PROTECTION OF MARKETS AND MARKET PARTICIPANTS.—A digital commodity exchange shall establish and enforce rules—

“(i) to protect markets and market participants from abusive practices committed by any party, including abusive practices committed by a party acting as an agent for a participant; and

“(ii) to promote fair and equitable trading on the exchange.

“(C) TRADING PROCEDURES.—A digital commodity exchange shall—

“(i) establish and enforce rules or terms and conditions defining, or specifications detailing—

“(I) trading procedures to be used in entering and executing orders traded on or through the facilities of the digital commodity exchange; and

“(II) procedures for trade processing of digital commodities on or through the facilities of the digital commodity exchange; and

“(ii) monitor trading in digital commodities to prevent manipulation, price distortion, and disruptions of the delivery or cash settlement process through surveillance, compliance, and disciplinary practices and procedures, including

methods for conducting real-time monitoring of trading and comprehensive and accurate trade reconstructions.

“(6) ABILITY TO OBTAIN INFORMATION.—A digital commodity exchange shall—

“(A) establish and enforce rules that will allow the facility to obtain any necessary information to perform any of the functions described in this section;

“(B) provide the information to the Commission on request; and

“(C) have the capacity to carry out such international information-sharing agreements as the Commission may require.

“(7) EMERGENCY AUTHORITY.—A digital commodity exchange shall adopt rules to provide for the exercise of emergency authority, in consultation or cooperation with the Commission or a registered entity, as is necessary and appropriate, including the authority to facilitate the liquidation or transfer of open positions in any digital commodity or to suspend or curtail trading in a digital commodity.

“(8) TIMELY PUBLICATION OF TRADING INFORMATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A digital commodity exchange shall make public timely information on price, trading volume, and other trading data on digital commodities to the extent prescribed by the Commission.

“(B) CAPACITY OF DIGITAL COMMODITY EXCHANGE.—A digital commodity exchange shall have the capacity to electronically capture and transmit trade information with respect to transactions executed on the exchange.

“(9) RECORDKEEPING AND REPORTING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A digital commodity exchange shall—

“(i) maintain records of all activities relating to the business of the facility, including a complete audit trail, in a form and manner acceptable to the Commission for a period of 5 years;

“(ii) report to the Commission, in a form and manner acceptable to the Commission, such information as the Commission determines to be necessary or appropriate for the Commission to perform the duties of the Commission under this Act; and

“(iii) keep any such records of digital commodities which relate to a security open to inspection and examination by the Securities and Exchange Commission.

“(B) INFORMATION-SHARING.—Subject to section 8, and on request, the Commission shall share information collected under subparagraph (A) with—

“(i) the Board;

“(ii) the Securities and Exchange Commission;

“(iii) each appropriate Federal banking agency;

“(iv) each appropriate State bank supervisor (within the meaning of section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act);

“(v) the Financial Stability Oversight Council;

“(vi) the Department of Justice; and

“(vii) any other person that the Commission determines to be appropriate, including—

“(I) foreign financial supervisors (including foreign futures authorities);

“(II) foreign central banks; and

“(III) foreign ministries.

“(C) CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT.—Before the Commission may share information with any entity described in subparagraph (B), the Commission shall receive a written agreement from the entity stating that the entity shall abide by the confidentiality requirements described in section 8 relating to the information on digital commodities that is provided.

“(D) PROVIDING INFORMATION.—A digital commodity exchange shall provide to the Commission (including any designee of the Commission) information under subparagraph (A) in such form and at such frequency as is required by the Commission.

“(10) ANTITRUST CONSIDERATIONS.—Unless necessary or appropriate to achieve the purposes

of this Act, a digital commodity exchange shall not—

“(A) adopt any rules or take any actions that result in any unreasonable restraint of trade; or

“(B) impose any material anticompetitive burden on trading.

“(11) CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—A registered digital commodity exchange shall implement conflict-of-interest systems and procedures that—

“(A) establish structural and institutional safeguards—

“(i) to minimize conflicts of interest that might potentially bias the judgment or supervision of the digital commodity exchange and contravene the principles of fair and equitable trading and the business conduct standards described in this Act, including conflicts arising out of transactions or arrangements with affiliates (including affiliates engaging in digital commodity activities) or between self-regulatory obligations and commercial interests, which may include information partitions, restrictions on employees and directors, and the legal separation of different persons or entities involved in digital commodity activities; and

“(ii) to ensure that the activities of any person within the digital commodity exchange or any affiliated entity relating to research or analysis of the price or market for any digital commodity or acting in a role of providing dealing, brokering, or advising activities are separated by appropriate informational partitions within the digital commodity exchange or any affiliated entity from the review, pressure, or oversight of persons whose involvement in pricing, trading, exchange, or clearing activities might potentially bias their judgment or supervision and contravene the core principles of open access and the business conduct standards described in this Act; and

“(B) address such other issues as the Commission determines to be appropriate.

“(12) FINANCIAL RESOURCES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A digital commodity exchange shall have adequate financial, operational, and managerial resources, as determined by the Commission, to discharge each responsibility of the digital commodity exchange.

“(B) MINIMUM AMOUNT OF FINANCIAL RESOURCES.—A digital commodity exchange shall possess financial resources that, at a minimum, exceed the greater of—

“(i) the total amount that would enable the digital commodity exchange to conduct an orderly wind-down of its activities or

“(ii) the total amount that would enable the digital commodity exchange to cover the operating costs of the digital commodity exchange for a 1-year period, as calculated on a rolling basis.

“(13) DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURES.—A digital commodity exchange shall establish and enforce disciplinary procedures that authorize the digital commodity exchange to discipline, suspend, or expel members or market participants that violate the rules of the digital commodity exchange, or similar methods for performing the same functions, including delegation of the functions to third parties.

“(14) GOVERNANCE FITNESS STANDARDS.—

“(A) GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS.—A digital commodity exchange shall establish governance arrangements that are transparent to fulfill public interest requirements.

“(B) FITNESS STANDARDS.—A digital commodity exchange shall establish and enforce appropriate fitness standards for—

“(i) directors; and

“(ii) any individual or entity with direct access to, or control of, customer assets.

“(15) SYSTEM SAFEGUARDS.—A digital commodity exchange shall—

“(A) establish and maintain a program of risk analysis and oversight to identify and minimize sources of operational and security risks, through the development of appropriate controls and procedures, and automated systems, that—

“(i) are reliable and secure; and

“(ii) have adequate scalable capacity;

“(B) establish and maintain emergency procedures, backup facilities, and a plan for disaster recovery that allow for—

“(i) the timely recovery and resumption of operations; and

“(ii) the fulfillment of the responsibilities and obligations of the digital commodity exchange; and

“(C) periodically conduct tests to verify that the backup resources of the digital commodity exchange are sufficient to ensure continued—

“(i) order processing and trade matching;

“(ii) price reporting;

“(iii) market surveillance; and

“(iv) maintenance of a comprehensive and accurate audit trail.

“(d) HOLDING OF CUSTOMER ASSETS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A digital commodity exchange shall hold customer money, assets, and property in a manner to minimize the risk of loss to the customer or unreasonable delay in the access to the money, assets, and property of the customer.

“(A) SEGREGATION OF FUNDS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A digital commodity exchange shall treat and deal with all money, assets, and property that is received by the digital commodity exchange, or accrues to a customer as the result of trading in digital commodities, as belonging to the customer.

“(ii) COMMINGLING PROHIBITED.—Money, assets, and property of a customer described in clause (i) shall be separately accounted for and shall not be commingled with the funds of the digital commodity exchange or be used to margin, secure, or guarantee any trades or accounts of any customer or person other than the person for whom the same are held.

“(B) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(i) USE OF FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), money, assets, and property of customers of a digital commodity exchange described in subparagraph (A) may, for convenience, be commingled and deposited in the same account or accounts with any bank, trust company, derivatives clearing organization, or qualified digital commodity custodian.

“(II) WITHDRAWAL.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), such share of the money, assets, and property described in item (aa) as in the normal course of business shall be necessary to margin, guarantee, secure, transfer, adjust, or settle a contract of sale of a digital commodity with a registered entity may be withdrawn and applied to such purposes, including the payment of commissions, brokerage, interest, taxes, storage, and other charges, lawfully accruing in connection with the contract of sale of a digital commodity.

“(ii) COMMISSION ACTION.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), in accordance with such terms and conditions as the Commission may prescribe by rule, regulation, or order, any money, assets, or property of the customers of a digital commodity exchange described in subparagraph (A) may be commingled and deposited in customer accounts with any other money, assets, or property received by the digital commodity exchange and required by the Commission to be separately accounted for and treated and dealt with as belonging to the customer of the digital commodity exchange.

“(2) PERMITTED INVESTMENTS.—Money described in subparagraph (A) may be invested in obligations of the United States, in general obligations of any State or of any political subdivision of a State, and in obligations fully guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States, or in any other investment that the Commission may by rule or regulation prescribe, and such investments shall be made in accordance with such rules and regulations and subject to such conditions as the Commission may prescribe.

“(3) CUSTOMER PROTECTION DURING BANKRUPTCY.—

“(A) CUSTOMER PROPERTY.—All assets held on behalf of a customer by a digital commodity exchange, and all money, assets, and property of any customer received by a digital commodity exchange for trading or custody, or to facilitate, margin, guarantee, or secure contracts of sale of a digital commodity (including money, assets, or property accruing to the customer as the result of the transactions), shall be considered customer property for purposes of section 761 of title 11, United States Code.

“(B) TRANSACTIONS.—A transaction involving a unit of a digital commodity occurring on or subject to the rules of a digital commodity exchange shall be considered a ‘contract for the purchase or sale of a commodity for future delivery, on or subject to the rules of, a contract market or board of trade’ for the purposes of the definition of a ‘commodity contract’ in section 761 of title 11, United States Code.

“(C) EXCHANGES.—A digital commodity exchange shall be considered a futures commission merchant for purposes of section 761 of title 11, United States Code.

“(D) ASSETS REMOVED FROM SEGREGATION.—Assets removed from segregation due to a customer election under paragraph (5) shall not be considered customer property for purposes of section 761 of title 11, United States Code.

“(4) MISUSE OF CUSTOMER PROPERTY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful—

“(i) for any digital commodity exchange that has received any customer money, assets, or property for custody to dispose of, or use any such money, assets, or property as belonging to the digital commodity exchange or any person other than a customer of the digital commodity exchange; or

“(ii) for any other person, including any depository, other digital commodity exchange, or digital commodity custodian that has received any customer money, assets, or property for deposit, to hold, dispose of, or use any such money, assets, or property, or property, as belonging to the depositing digital commodity exchange or any person other than the customers of the digital commodity exchange.

“(B) USE FURTHER DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, ‘use’ of a digital commodity includes utilizing any unit of a digital asset to participate in a blockchain service defined in paragraph (5) or a decentralized governance system associated with the digital commodity or the blockchain system to which the digital commodity relates in any manner other than that expressly directed by the customer from whom the unit of a digital commodity was received.

“(5) PARTICIPATION IN BLOCKCHAIN SERVICES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A customer shall have the right to waive the restrictions in paragraph (1) for any unit of a digital commodity to be used under subparagraph (B), by affirmatively electing, in writing to the digital commodity exchange, to waive the restrictions.

“(B) USE OF FUNDS.—Customer digital commodities removed from segregation under subparagraph (A) may be pooled and used by the digital commodity exchange or its designee to provide a blockchain service for a blockchain system to which the unit of the digital asset removed from segregation in subparagraph (A) relates.

“(C) LIMITATIONS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may, by rule, establish notice and disclosure requirements, and any other limitations and rules related to the waiving of any restrictions under this paragraph that are reasonably necessary to protect customers, including eligible contract participants, non-eligible contract participants, or any other class of customers.

“(ii) CUSTOMER CHOICE.—A digital commodity exchange may not require a waiver from a customer described in subparagraph (A) as a condition of doing business on the exchange.

“(D) BLOCKCHAIN SERVICE DEFINED.—In this subparagraph, the term ‘blockchain service’

means any activity relating to validating transactions on a blockchain system, providing security for a blockchain system, or other similar activity required for the ongoing operation of a blockchain system.

“(e) MARKET ACCESS REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A digital commodity exchange shall require any person who is not an eligible contract participant to access trading on the exchange through a digital commodity broker.

“(2) AFFILIATED COMMODITY BROKERS.—A registered digital commodity exchange may permit an affiliated digital commodity broker to facilitate access to the digital commodity exchange.

“(3) DIRECT ACCESS FOR ELIGIBLE CONTRACT PARTICIPANTS.—Nothing in this section shall prohibit a digital commodity exchange in compliance with this section from permitting direct access for eligible contract participants.

“(4) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—The Commission may, by rule, impose any additional requirements related to the operations and activities of the digital commodity exchange and an affiliated digital commodity broker necessary to protect market participants, promote fair and equitable trading on the digital commodity exchange, and promote responsible economic or financial innovation.

“(f) DESIGNATION OF CHIEF COMPLIANCE OFFICER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A digital commodity exchange shall designate an individual to serve as a chief compliance officer.

“(2) DUTIES.—The chief compliance officer shall—

“(A) report directly to the board or to the senior officer of the exchange;

“(B) review compliance with the core principles in this subsection;

“(C) in consultation with the board of the exchange, a body performing a function similar to that of a board, or the senior officer of the exchange, resolve any conflicts of interest that may arise;

“(D) establish and administer the policies and procedures required to be established pursuant to this section;

“(E) ensure compliance with this Act and the rules and regulations issued under this Act, including rules prescribed by the Commission pursuant to this section; and

“(F) establish procedures for the remediation of noncompliance issues found during compliance office reviews, look backs, internal or external audit findings, self-reported errors, or through validated complaints.

“(3) REQUIREMENTS FOR PROCEDURES.—In establishing procedures under paragraph (2)(F), the chief compliance officer shall design the procedures to establish the handling, management response, remediation, retesting, and closing of noncompliance issues.

“(4) ANNUAL REPORTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with rules prescribed by the Commission, the chief compliance officer shall annually prepare and sign a report that contains a description of—

“(i) the compliance of the digital commodity exchange with this Act; and

“(ii) the policies and procedures, including the code of ethics and conflict of interest policies, of the digital commodity exchange.

“(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The chief compliance officer shall—

“(i) submit each report described in subparagraph (A) with the appropriate financial report of the digital commodity exchange that is required to be submitted to the Commission pursuant to this section; and

“(ii) include in the report a certification that, under penalty of law, the report is accurate and complete.

“(g) APPOINTMENT OF TRUSTEE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If a proceeding under section 5e results in the suspension or revocation of the registration of a digital commodity exchange, or if a digital commodity exchange

withdraws from registration, the Commission, on notice to the digital commodity exchange, may apply to the appropriate United States district court where the digital commodity exchange is located for the appointment of a trustee.

“(2) ASSUMPTION OF JURISDICTION.—If the Commission applies for appointment of a trustee under paragraph (1)—

“(A) the court may take exclusive jurisdiction over the digital commodity exchange and the records and assets of the digital commodity exchange, wherever located; and

“(B) if the court takes jurisdiction under subparagraph (A), the court shall appoint the Commission, or a person designated by the Commission, as trustee with power to take possession and continue to operate or terminate the operations of the digital commodity exchange in an orderly manner for the protection of customers subject to such terms and conditions as the court may prescribe.

“(h) QUALIFIED DIGITAL COMMODITY CUSTODIAN.—A digital commodity exchange shall hold in a qualified digital commodity custodian each unit of a digital commodity that is—

“(1) the property of a customer of the digital commodity exchange;

“(2) required to be held by the digital commodity exchange under subsection (c)(12) of this section; or

“(3) otherwise so required by the Commission to reasonably protect customers or promote the public interest.

“(i) EXEMPTIONS.—

“(1) In order to promote responsible economic or financial innovation and fair competition, or protect customers, the Commission may (on its own initiative or on application of the registered digital commodity exchange) exempt, either unconditionally or on stated terms or conditions or for stated periods and either retroactively or prospectively, or both, a registered digital commodity exchange from the requirements of this section, if the Commission determines that—

“(A) the exemption would be consistent with the public interest and the purposes of this Act; and

“(B) the exemption will not have a material adverse effect on the ability of the Commission or the digital commodity exchange to discharge regulatory or self-regulatory duties under this Act.

“(2) The Commission may exempt, conditionally or unconditionally, a digital commodity exchange from registration under this section if the Commission finds that the digital commodity exchange is subject to comparable, comprehensive supervision and regulation on a consolidated basis by the appropriate governmental authorities in the home country of the facility.

“(j) CUSTOMER DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘customer’ means any person that maintains an account for the trading of digital commodities directly with a digital commodity exchange (other than a person that is owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by the digital commodity exchange) for its own behalf or on behalf of any other person.

“(k) FEDERAL PREEMPTION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commission shall have exclusive jurisdiction over any digital commodity exchange registered under this section.

“(l) TREATMENT UNDER THE BANK SECRECY ACT.—A digital commodity exchange shall be treated as a financial institution for purposes of the Bank Secrecy Act.

“(m) WITHDRAWAL OF CERTIFICATION OF A BLOCKCHAIN SYSTEM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) DETERMINATION BY A DIGITAL COMMODITY EXCHANGE.—With respect to a certification of a blockchain system that becomes effective pursuant to section 44(f) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, if a digital commodity exchange determines that the blockchain system may not be a decentralized system, the digital commodity exchange shall notify the Commission of such determination.

“(B) WITHDRAWAL PROCESS.—With respect to each notification received under subparagraph (A), the Commission shall initiate a withdrawal process under which the Commission shall—

“(i) publish a notice announcing the proposed withdrawal;

“(ii) provide a 30 day comment period with respect to the proposed withdrawal; and

“(iii) after the end of the 30-day comment required under clause (ii), publish either—

“(I) a notification of withdrawal of the applicable certification; or

“(II) a notice that the Commission is not withdrawing the certification.

“(C) DETAILED ANALYSIS REQUIRED.—The Commission shall include, with each publication of a notification of withdrawal described under subparagraph (B)(iii)(I), a detailed analysis of the factors on which the decision was based.

“(2) RECERTIFICATION.—With respect to a blockchain system for which a certification has been withdrawn under this subsection, no person may make a certification under section 44(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 with respect to such blockchain system during the 90-day period beginning on the date of such withdrawal.

“(3) APPEAL OF WITHDRAWAL.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If a certification is withdrawn under this subsection, a person making may appeal the decision to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, not later than 60 days after the notice of withdrawal is made.

“(B) REVIEW.—In an appeal under subparagraph (A), the court shall have de novo review of the determination to withdraw the certification.”

SEC. 505. QUALIFIED DIGITAL COMMODITY CUSTODIANS.

The Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), as amended by the preceding provisions of this Act, is amended by inserting after section 5i the following:

“SEC. 5j. QUALIFIED DIGITAL COMMODITY CUSTODIANS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—A digital commodity custodian is a qualified digital commodity custodian if the digital commodity custodian complies with the requirements of this section.

“(b) SUPERVISION REQUIREMENT.—A digital commodity custodian that is not subject to supervision and examination by an appropriate Federal banking agency, the National Credit Union Administration, the Commission, or the Securities and Exchange Commission shall be subject to adequate supervision and appropriate regulation by—

“(1) a State bank supervisor (within the meaning of section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act);

“(2) a State credit union supervisor, as defined under section 6003 of the Anti-Money Laundering Act of 2020; or

“(3) an appropriate foreign governmental authority in the home country of the digital commodity custodian.

“(c) OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) NOT OTHERWISE PROHIBITED.—The digital commodity custodian has not been prohibited by a supervisor of the digital commodity custodian from engaging in an activity with respect to the custody and safekeeping of digital commodities.

“(2) INFORMATION SHARING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A digital commodity custodian shall share information with the Commission on request and comply with such requirements for periodic sharing of information regarding customer accounts that the digital commodity custodian holds on behalf of an entity registered with the Commission as the Commission determines by rule are reasonably necessary to effectuate any of the provisions, or to accomplish any of the purposes, of this Act.

“(B) PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—Any entity that is subject to regulation and examination by an appropriate Federal banking agency may

satisfy any information request described in subparagraph (A) by providing the Commission with a detailed listing, in writing, of the digital commodities of a customer within the custody or use of the entity.

“(d) ADEQUATE SUPERVISION AND APPROPRIATE REGULATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (b), the terms ‘adequate supervision’ and ‘appropriate regulation’ mean such minimum standards for supervision and regulation as are reasonably necessary to protect the digital commodities of customers of an entity registered with the Commission, including standards relating to the licensing, examination, and supervisory processes that require the digital commodity custodian to, at a minimum—

“(A) receive a review and evaluation of ownership, character and fitness, conflicts of interest, business model, financial statements, funding resources, and policies and procedures of the digital commodity custodian;

“(B) hold capital sufficient for the financial integrity of the digital commodity custodian;

“(C) protect customer assets;

“(D) establish and maintain books and records regarding the business of the digital commodity custodian;

“(E) submit financial statements and audited financial statements to the applicable supervisor described in subsection (b);

“(F) provide disclosures to the applicable supervisor described in subsection (b) regarding actions, proceedings, and other items as determined by the supervisor;

“(G) maintain and enforce policies and procedures for compliance with applicable State and Federal laws, including those related to anti-money laundering and cybersecurity;

“(H) establish a business continuity plan to ensure functionality in cases of disruption; and

“(I) establish policies and procedures to resolve complaints.

“(2) RULEMAKING WITH RESPECT TO DEFINITIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the Commission may, by rule, further define the terms ‘adequate supervision’ and ‘appropriate regulation’ as necessary in the public interest, as appropriate for the protection of investors, and consistent with the purposes of this Act.

“(B) CONDITIONAL TREATMENT OF CERTAIN CUSTODIANS BEFORE RULEMAKING.—Before the effective date of a rulemaking under subparagraph (A), a trust company is deemed subject to adequate supervision and appropriate regulation if—

“(i) the trust company is expressly permitted by a State bank supervisor to engage in the custody and safekeeping of digital commodities;

“(ii) the State bank supervisor has established licensing, examination, and supervisory processes that require the trust company to, at a minimum, meet the conditions described in subparagraphs (A) through (I) of paragraph (1); and

“(iii) the trust company is in good standing with its State bank supervisor.

“(C) TRANSITION PERIOD FOR CERTAIN CUSTODIANS.—In implementing the rulemaking under subparagraph (A), the Commission shall provide a transition period of not less than 2 years for any trust company that is deemed subject to adequate supervision and appropriate regulation under subparagraph (B) on the effective date of the rulemaking.

“(e) AUTHORITY TO TEMPORARILY SUSPEND STANDARDS.—The Commission may, by rule or order, temporarily suspend, in whole or in part, any requirement imposed under, or any standard referred to in, this section if the Commission determines that the suspension would be consistent with the public interest and the purposes of this Act.”

SEC. 506. REGISTRATION AND REGULATION OF DIGITAL COMMODITY BROKERS AND DEALERS.

The Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), as amended by the preceding provisions of

this Act, is amended by inserting after section 4t the following:

“SEC. 4u. REGISTRATION AND REGULATION OF DIGITAL COMMODITY BROKERS AND DEALERS.

“(a) **REGISTRATION.**—It shall be unlawful for any person to act as a digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer unless the person is registered as such with the Commission.

“(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A person shall register as a digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer by filing a registration application with the Commission.

“(2) **CONTENTS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The application shall be made in such form and manner as is prescribed by the Commission, and shall contain such information as the Commission considers necessary concerning the business in which the applicant is or will be engaged.

“(B) **CONTINUAL REPORTING.**—A person that is registered as a digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer shall continue to submit to the Commission reports that contain such information pertaining to the business of the person as the Commission may require.

“(3) **STATUTORY DISQUALIFICATION.**—Except to the extent otherwise specifically provided by rule, regulation, or order, it shall be unlawful for a digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer to permit any person who is associated with a digital commodity broker or a digital commodity dealer and who is subject to a statutory disqualification to effect or be involved in effecting a contract of sale of a digital commodity on behalf of the digital commodity broker or the digital commodity dealer, respectively, if the digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer, respectively, knew, or in the exercise of reasonable care should have known, of the statutory disqualification.

“(4) **LIMITATIONS ON CERTAIN ASSETS.**—A digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer shall not offer, offer to enter into, enter into, or facilitate any contract of sale of a digital commodity that has not been certified under section 5c(d).

“(c) **ADDITIONAL REGISTRATIONS.**—

“(1) **WITH THE COMMISSION.**—Any person required to be registered as a digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer may also be registered as a futures commission merchant, introducing broker, or swap dealer.

“(2) **WITH THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION.**—Any person required to be registered as a digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer under this section may register with the Securities and Exchange Commission as a digital asset broker or digital asset dealer, pursuant to section 15(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

“(3) **WITH MEMBERSHIP IN A REGISTERED FUTURES ASSOCIATION.**—Any person required to be registered as a digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer under this section shall be a member of a registered futures association.

“(4) **REGISTRATION REQUIRED.**—Any person required to be registered as a digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer under this section shall register with the Commission as such regardless of whether the person is registered with another State or Federal regulator.

“(d) **RULEMAKING.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission shall prescribe such rules applicable to registered digital commodity brokers and registered digital commodity dealers as are appropriate to carry out this section, including rules in the public interest that limit the activities of digital commodity brokers and digital commodity dealers.

“(2) **MULTIPLE REGISTRANTS.**—The Commission shall prescribe rules or regulations permitting, or may otherwise authorize, exemptions or additional requirements applicable to persons with multiple registrations under this Act, including as futures commission merchants, introducing brokers, digital commodity brokers, dig-

ital commodity dealers, or swap dealers, as may be in the public interest to reduce compliance costs and promote customer protection.

“(e) **CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Each digital commodity broker and digital commodity dealer shall meet such minimum capital requirements as the Commission may prescribe to address the risks associated with digital commodity trading and to ensure that the digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer, respectively, is able to—

“(A) meet, and continue to meet, at all times, the obligations of such a registrant; and

“(B) in the case of a digital commodity dealer, fulfill the counterparty obligations of the digital commodity dealer for any margined, leveraged, or financed transactions.

“(2) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall limit, or be construed to limit, the authority of the Securities and Exchange Commission to set financial responsibility rules for a broker or dealer registered pursuant to section 15(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o(b)) (except for section 15(b)(11) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 78o(b)(11)) in accordance with section 15(c)(3) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 78o(c)(3)).

“(3) **FUTURES COMMISSION MERCHANTS AND OTHER DEALERS.**—Each futures commission merchant, introducing broker, digital commodity broker, digital commodity dealer, broker, and dealer shall maintain sufficient capital to comply with the stricter of any applicable capital requirements to which the futures commission merchant, introducing broker, digital commodity broker, digital commodity dealer, broker, or dealer, respectively, is subject under this Act or the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.).

“(f) **REPORTING AND RECORDKEEPING.**—Each digital commodity broker and digital commodity dealer—

“(1) shall make such reports as are required by the Commission by rule or regulation regarding the transactions, positions, and financial condition of the digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer, respectively;

“(2) shall keep books and records in such form and manner and for such period as may be prescribed by the Commission by rule or regulation; and

“(3) shall keep the books and records open to inspection and examination by any representative of the Commission.

“(g) **DAILY TRADING RECORDS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Each digital commodity broker and digital commodity dealer shall maintain daily trading records of the transactions of the digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer, respectively, and all related records (including related forward or derivatives transactions) and recorded communications, including electronic mail, instant messages, and recordings of telephone calls, for such period as the Commission may require by rule or regulation.

“(2) **INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS.**—The daily trading records shall include such information as the Commission shall require by rule or regulation.

“(3) **COUNTERPARTY RECORDS.**—Each digital commodity broker and digital commodity dealer shall maintain daily trading records for each customer or counterparty in a manner and form that is identifiable with each digital commodity transaction.

“(4) **AUDIT TRAIL.**—Each digital commodity broker and digital commodity dealer shall maintain a complete audit trail for conducting comprehensive and accurate trade reconstructions.

“(h) **BUSINESS CONDUCT STANDARDS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Each digital commodity broker and digital commodity dealer shall conform with such business conduct standards as the Commission, by rule or regulation, prescribes related to—

“(A) fraud, manipulation, and other abusive practices involving spot or margined, leveraged,

or financed digital commodity transactions (including transactions that are offered but not entered into);

“(B) diligent supervision of the business of the registered digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer, respectively; and

“(C) such other matters as the Commission deems appropriate.

“(2) **BUSINESS CONDUCT REQUIREMENTS.**—The Commission shall, by rule, prescribe business conduct requirements which—

“(A) require disclosure by a registered digital commodity broker and registered digital commodity dealer to any counterparty to the transaction (other than an eligible contract participant) of—

“(i) information about the material risks and characteristics of the digital commodity;

“(ii) information about the material risks and characteristics of the transaction;

“(B) establish a duty for such a digital commodity broker and such a digital commodity dealer to communicate in a fair and balanced manner based on principles of fair dealing and good faith;

“(C) establish standards governing digital commodity broker and digital commodity dealer marketing and advertising, including testimonials and endorsements; and

“(D) establish such other standards and requirements as the Commission may determine are—

“(i) in the public interest;

“(ii) appropriate for the protection of customers; or

“(iii) otherwise in furtherance of the purposes of this Act.

“(3) **PROHIBITION ON FRAUDULENT PRACTICES.**—It shall be unlawful for a digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer to—

“(A) employ any device, scheme, or artifice to defraud any customer or counterparty;

“(B) engage in any transaction, practice, or course of business that operates as a fraud or deceit on any customer or counterparty; or

“(C) engage in any act, practice, or course of business that is fraudulent, deceptive, or manipulative.

“(i) **DUTIES.**—

“(1) **RISK MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES.**—Each digital commodity broker and digital commodity dealer shall establish robust and professional risk management systems adequate for managing the day-to-day business of the digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer, respectively.

“(2) **DISCLOSURE OF GENERAL INFORMATION.**—Each digital commodity broker and digital commodity dealer shall disclose to the Commission information concerning—

“(A) the terms and conditions of the transactions of the digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer, respectively;

“(B) the trading operations, mechanisms, and practices of the digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer, respectively;

“(C) financial integrity protections relating to the activities of the digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer, respectively; and

“(D) other information relevant to trading in digital commodities by the digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer, respectively.

“(3) **ABILITY TO OBTAIN INFORMATION.**—Each digital commodity broker and digital commodity dealer shall—

“(A) establish and enforce internal systems and procedures to obtain any necessary information to perform any of the functions described in this section; and

“(B) provide the information to the Commission, on request.

“(4) **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.**—Each digital commodity broker and digital commodity dealer shall implement conflict-of-interest systems and procedures that—

“(A) establish structural and institutional safeguards—

“(i) to minimize conflicts of interest that might potentially bias the judgment or supervision of the digital commodity broker or digital

commodity dealer, respectively, and contravene the principles of fair and equitable trading and the business conduct standards described in this Act, including conflicts arising out of transactions or arrangements with affiliates (including affiliates acting as digital asset issuers, digital commodity dealers, or qualified digital commodity custodians), which may include informational partitions and the legal separation of different persons involved in digital commodity activities; and

“(ii) to ensure that the activities of any person within the digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer relating to research or analysis of the price or market for any digital commodity or acting in a role of providing exchange activities or making determinations as to accepting exchange customers are separated by appropriate informational partitions within the digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer from the review, pressure, or oversight of persons whose involvement in pricing, trading, exchange, or clearing activities might potentially bias their judgment or supervision and contravene the core principles of open access and the business conduct standards described in this Act; and

“(B) address such other issues as the Commission determines to be appropriate.

“(5) ANTITRUST CONSIDERATIONS.—Unless necessary or appropriate to achieve the purposes of this Act, a digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer shall not—

“(A) adopt any process or take any action that results in any unreasonable restraint of trade; or

“(B) impose any material anticompetitive burden on trading or clearing.

“(j) DESIGNATION OF CHIEF COMPLIANCE OFFICER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each digital commodity broker and digital commodity dealer shall designate an individual to serve as a chief compliance officer.

“(2) DUTIES.—The chief compliance officer shall—

“(A) report directly to the board or to the senior officer of the registered digital commodity broker or registered digital commodity dealer;

“(B) review the compliance of the registered digital commodity broker or registered digital commodity dealer with respect to the registered digital commodity broker and registered digital commodity dealer requirements described in this section;

“(C) in consultation with the board of directors, a body performing a function similar to the board, or the senior officer of the organization, resolve any conflicts of interest that may arise;

“(D) be responsible for administering each policy and procedure that is required to be established pursuant to this section;

“(E) ensure compliance with this Act (including regulations), including each rule prescribed by the Commission under this section;

“(F) establish procedures for the remediation of noncompliance issues identified by the chief compliance officer through any—

“(i) compliance office review;

“(ii) look-back;

“(iii) internal or external audit finding;

“(iv) self-reported error; or

“(v) validated complaint; and

“(G) establish and follow appropriate procedures for the handling, management response, remediation, retesting, and closing of noncompliance issues.

“(3) ANNUAL REPORTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with rules prescribed by the Commission, the chief compliance officer shall annually prepare and sign a report that contains a description of—

“(i) the compliance of the registered digital commodity broker or registered digital commodity dealer with respect to this Act (including regulations); and

“(ii) each policy and procedure of the registered digital commodity broker or registered

digital commodity dealer of the chief compliance officer (including the code of ethics and conflict of interest policies).

“(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The chief compliance officer shall ensure that a compliance report under subparagraph (A)—

“(i) accompanies each appropriate financial report of the registered digital commodity broker or registered digital commodity dealer that is required to be furnished to the Commission pursuant to this section; and

“(ii) includes a certification that, under penalty of law, the compliance report is accurate and complete.

“(k) SEGREGATION OF DIGITAL COMMODITIES.—

“(1) HOLDING OF CUSTOMER ASSETS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each digital commodity broker and digital commodity dealer shall hold customer money, assets, and property in a manner to minimize the risk of loss to the customer or unreasonable delay in customer access to the money, assets, and property of the customer.

“(B) QUALIFIED DIGITAL COMMODITY CUSTODIAN.—Each digital commodity broker and digital commodity dealer shall hold in a qualified digital commodity custodian each unit of a digital commodity that is—

“(i) the property of a customer or counterparty of the digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer, respectively;

“(ii) required to be held by the digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer under subsection (e); or

“(iii) otherwise so required by the Commission to reasonably protect customers or promote the public interest.

“(2) SEGREGATION OF FUNDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each digital commodity broker and digital commodity dealer shall treat and deal with all money, assets, and property that is received by the digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer, or accrues to a customer as the result of trading in digital commodities, as belonging to the customer.

“(B) COMMINGLING PROHIBITED.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), each digital commodity broker and digital commodity dealer shall separately account for money, assets, and property of a digital commodity customer, and shall not commingle any such money, assets, or property with the funds of the digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer, respectively, or use any such money, assets, or property to margin, secure, or guarantee any trades or accounts of any customer or person other than the person for whom the money, assets, or property are held.

“(ii) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(1) USE OF FUNDS.—

“(aa) IN GENERAL.—A digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer may, for convenience, commingle and deposit in the same account or accounts with any bank, trust company, derivatives clearing organization, or qualified digital commodity custodian money, assets, and property of customers.

“(bb) WITHDRAWAL.—The share of the money, assets, and property described in item (aa) as in the normal course of business shall be necessary to margin, guarantee, secure, transfer, adjust, or settle a contract of sale of a digital commodity with a registered entity may be withdrawn and applied to such purposes, including the payment of commissions, brokerage, interest, taxes, storage, and other charges, lawfully accruing in connection with the contract.

“(II) COMMISSION ACTION.—In accordance with such terms and conditions as the Commission may prescribe by rule, regulation, or order, any money, assets, or property of the customers of a digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer may be commingled and deposited in customer accounts with any other money, assets, or property received by the digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer, respectively, and required by the Commission to be

separately accounted for and treated and dealt with as belonging to the customer of the digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer, respectively.

“(3) PERMITTED INVESTMENTS.—Money described in paragraph (2) may be invested in obligations of the United States, in general obligations of any State or of any political subdivision of a State, in obligations fully guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States, or in any other investment that the Commission may by rule or regulation allow.

“(4) CUSTOMER PROTECTION DURING BANKRUPTCY.—

“(A) CUSTOMER PROPERTY.—All money, assets, or property described in paragraph (2) shall be considered customer property for purposes of section 761 of title 11, United States Code.

“(B) TRANSACTIONS.—A transaction involving a unit of a digital commodity occurring with a digital commodity dealer shall be considered a ‘contract for the purchase or sale of a commodity for future delivery, on or subject to the rules of, a contract market or board of trade’ for purposes of the definition of a ‘commodity contract’ in section 761 of title 11, United States Code.

“(C) BROKERS AND DEALERS.—A digital commodity dealer and a digital commodity broker shall be considered a futures commission merchant for purposes of section 761 of title 11, United States Code.

“(D) ASSETS REMOVED FROM SEGREGATION.—Assets removed from segregation due to a customer election under paragraph (6) shall not be considered customer property for purposes of section 761 of title 11, United States Code.

“(5) MISUSE OF CUSTOMER PROPERTY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful—

“(i) for any digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer that has received any customer money, assets, or property for custody to dispose of, or use any such money, assets, or property as belonging to the digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer, respectively, or any person other than a customer of the digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer, respectively; or

“(ii) for any other person, including any depository, digital commodity exchange, other digital commodity broker, other digital commodity dealer, or digital commodity custodian that has received any customer money, assets, or property for deposit, to hold, dispose of, or use any such money, assets, or property, as belonging to the depositing digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer or any person other than the customers of the digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer, respectively.

“(B) USE FURTHER DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, ‘use’ of a digital commodity includes utilizing any unit of a digital asset to participate in a blockchain service defined in paragraph (6) or a decentralized governance system associated with the digital commodity or the blockchain system to which the digital commodity relates in any manner other than that expressly directed by the customer from whom the unit of a digital commodity was received.

“(6) PARTICIPATION IN BLOCKCHAIN SERVICES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A customer shall have the right to waive the restrictions in paragraph (1) for any unit of a digital commodity to be used under subparagraph (B), by affirmatively electing, in writing to the digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer, to waive the restrictions.

“(B) USE OF FUNDS.—Customer digital commodities removed from segregation under subparagraph (A) may be pooled and used by the digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer, or one of their designees, to provide a blockchain service for a blockchain system to which the unit of the digital asset removed from segregation in subparagraph (A) relates.

“(C) LIMITATIONS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may, by rule, establish notice and disclosure requirements, and any other limitations and rules related to the waiving of any restrictions under this paragraph that are reasonably necessary to protect customers, including eligible contract participants, non-eligible contract participants, or any other class of customers.

“(ii) CUSTOMER CHOICE.—A digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer may not require a waiver from a customer described in subparagraph (A) as a condition of doing business with the broker or dealer.

“(D) BLOCKCHAIN SERVICE DEFINED.—In this subparagraph, the term ‘blockchain service’ means any activity relating to validating transactions on a blockchain system, providing security for a blockchain system, or other similar activity required for the ongoing operation of a blockchain system.

“(I) FEDERAL PREEMPTION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commission shall have exclusive jurisdiction over any digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer registered under this section.

“(m) EXEMPTIONS.—In order to promote responsible economic or financial innovation and fair competition, or protect customers, the Commission may (on its own initiative or on application of the registered digital commodity broker or registered digital commodity dealer) exempt, unconditionally or on stated terms or conditions, or for stated periods, and retroactively or prospectively, or both, a registered digital commodity broker or registered digital commodity dealer from the requirements of this section, if the Commission determines that—

“(1)(A) the exemption would be consistent with the public interest and the purposes of this Act; and

“(B) the exemption will not have a material adverse effect on the ability of the Commission to discharge regulatory duties under this Act; or

“(2) the registered digital commodity broker or registered digital commodity dealer is subject to comparable, comprehensive supervision and regulation by the appropriate government authorities in the home country of the registered digital commodity broker or registered digital commodity dealer, respectively.

“(n) TREATMENT UNDER THE BANK SECRECY ACT.—A digital commodity broker and a digital commodity dealer shall be treated as a financial institution for purposes of the Bank Secrecy Act.”

SEC. 507. REGISTRATION OF ASSOCIATED PERSONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4k of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 6k) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (4) through (6) as subsections (5) through (7), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (3) the following:

“(4) It shall be unlawful for any person to act as an associated person of a digital commodity broker or an associated person of a digital commodity dealer unless the person is registered with the Commission under this Act and such registration shall not have expired, been suspended (and the period of suspension has not expired), or been revoked. It shall be unlawful for a digital commodity broker or a digital commodity dealer to permit such a person to become or remain associated with the digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer if the digital commodity broker or digital commodity dealer knew or should have known that the person was not so registered or that the registration had expired, been suspended (and the period of suspension has not expired), or been revoked.”; and

(3) in subsection (5) (as so redesignated), by striking “or of a commodity trading advisor” and inserting “of a commodity trading advisor, of a digital commodity broker, or of a digital commodity dealer”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1a et seq.) is

amended by striking “section 4k(6)” each place it appears and inserting “section 4k(7)”.

SEC. 508. REGISTRATION OF COMMODITY POOL OPERATORS AND COMMODITY TRADING ADVISORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4m(3) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 6m(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking “any commodity trading advisor” and inserting “a commodity pool operator or commodity trading advisor”; and

(B) by striking “acting as a commodity trading advisor” and inserting “acting as a commodity pool operator or commodity trading advisor”; and

(2) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “digital commodities,” after “physical commodities.”

(b) EXEMPTIVE AUTHORITY.—Section 4m of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6m) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) EXEMPTIVE AUTHORITY.—The Commission shall promulgate rules to provide appropriate exemptions for commodity pool operators and commodity trading advisors, to provide relief from duplicative, conflicting, or unduly burdensome requirements or to promote responsible innovation, to the extent the exemptions foster the development of fair and orderly cash or spot digital commodity markets, are necessary or appropriate in the public interest, and are consistent with the protection of customers.”

SEC. 509. EXCLUSION FOR DECENTRALIZED FINANCE ACTIVITIES.

The Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), as amended by the preceding provisions of this Act, is amended by inserting after section 4u the following:

“SEC. 4u. DECENTRALIZED FINANCE ACTIVITIES NOT SUBJECT TO THIS ACT.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, a person shall not be subject to this Act and the regulations promulgated under this Act based on the person directly or indirectly engaging in any of the following activities, whether singly or in combination, in relation to the operation of a blockchain system or in relation to decentralized finance (as defined in section 605(d) of the Financial Innovation and Technology for the 21st Century Act):

“(1) Compiling network transactions, operating or participating in a liquidity pool, relaying, searching, sequencing, validating, or acting in a similar capacity with respect to contract of sale of a digital asset.

“(2) Providing computational work, operating a node, or procuring, offering, or utilizing network bandwidth, or other similar incidental services with respect to a contract of sale of a digital asset.

“(3) Providing a user-interface that enables a user to read, and access data about a blockchain system, send messages, or otherwise interact with a blockchain system.

“(4) Developing, publishing, constituting, administering, maintaining, or otherwise distributing a blockchain system.

“(5) Developing, publishing, constituting, administering, maintaining, or otherwise distributing software or systems that create or deploy hardware or software, including wallets or other systems, facilitating an individual user’s own personal ability to keep, safeguard, or custody the user’s digital commodities or related private keys.

“(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Subsection (a) shall not be interpreted to apply to the anti-fraud, anti-manipulation, or false reporting enforcement authorities of the Commission.”

SEC. 510. FUNDING FOR IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT.

(a) COLLECTION OF FEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commodity Futures Trading Commission (in this section referred to as the “Commission”) shall charge and collect a filing fee from each person who files with the Commission a notice of intent to register as a

digital commodity exchange, digital commodity broker, or digital commodity dealer pursuant to section 106.

(2) AMOUNT.—The fees authorized under paragraph (1) may be collected and available for obligation only in the amounts provided in advance in an appropriation Act.

(2) AUTHORITY TO ADJUST FEES.—Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this subsection, to promote fair competition or innovation, the Commission, in its sole discretion, may reduce or eliminate any fee otherwise required to be paid by a small or medium filer under this subsection.

(b) FEE SCHEDULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall publish in the Federal Register a schedule of the fees to be charged and collected under this section.

(2) CONTENT.—The fee schedule for a fiscal year shall include a written analysis of the estimate of the Commission of the total costs of carrying out the functions of the Commission under this Act during the fiscal year.

(3) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Before publishing the fee schedule for a fiscal year, the Commission shall submit a copy of the fee schedule to the Congress.

(4) TIMING.—

(A) 1ST FISCAL YEAR.—The Commission shall publish the fee schedule for the fiscal year in which this Act is enacted, within 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS.—The Commission shall publish the fee schedule for each subsequent fiscal year, not less than 90 days before the due date prescribed by the Commission for payment of the annual fee for the fiscal year.

(c) LATE PAYMENT PENALTY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may impose a penalty against a person that fails to pay an annual fee charged under this section, within 30 days after the due date prescribed by the Commission for payment of the fee.

(2) AMOUNT.—The amount of the penalty shall be—

(A) 5 percent of the amount of the fee due; multiplied by

(B) the whole number of consecutive 30-day periods that have elapsed since the due date.

(d) REIMBURSEMENT OF EXCESS FEES.—To the extent that the total amount of fees collected under this section during a fiscal year that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act exceeds the amount provided under subsection (a)(2) with respect to the fiscal year, the Commission shall reimburse the excess amount to the persons who have timely paid their annual fees, on a pro-rata basis that excludes penalties, and shall do so within 60 days after the end of the fiscal year.

(e) DEPOSIT OF FEES INTO THE TREASURY.—All amounts collected under this section shall be credited to the currently applicable appropriation, account, or fund of the Commission as discretionary offsetting collections, and shall be available for the purposes authorized in subsection (f) only to the extent and in the amounts provided in advance in appropriation Acts.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated to the Commission, there is authorized to be appropriated to the Commission amounts collected under this section to cover the costs of carrying out the functions of the Commission under this Act.

(g) SUNSET.—The authority to charge and collect fees under this section shall expire at the end of the 4th fiscal year that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 511. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Unless otherwise provided in this title, this title and the amendments made by this title shall take effect 360 days after the date of enactment of this Act, except that, to the extent a provision of this title requires a rulemaking, the provision shall take effect on the later of—

(1) 360 days after the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) 60 days after the publication in the Federal Register of the final rule implementing the provision.

TITLE VI—INNOVATION AND TECHNOLOGY IMPROVEMENTS

SEC. 601. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Entrepreneurs and innovators are building and deploying this next generation of the internet.

(2) Digital asset networks represent a new way for people to join together and cooperate with one another to undertake certain activities.

(3) Digital assets have the potential to be the foundational building blocks of these networks, aligning the economic incentive for individuals to cooperate with one another to achieve a common purpose.

(4) The digital asset ecosystem has the potential to grow our economy and improve everyday lives of Americans by facilitating collaboration through the use of technology to manage activities, allocate resources, and facilitate decision making.

(5) Blockchain networks and the digital assets they empower provide creator control, enhance transparency, reduce transaction costs, and increase efficiency if proper protections are put in place for investors, consumers, our financial system, and our national security.

(6) Blockchain technology facilitates new types of network participation which businesses in the United States may utilize in innovative ways.

(7) Other digital asset companies are setting up their operations outside of the United States, where countries are establishing frameworks to embrace the potential of blockchain technology and digital assets and provide safeguards for consumers.

(8) Digital assets, despite the purported anonymity, provide law enforcement with an exceptional tracing tool to identify illicit activity and bring criminals to justice.

(9) The Financial Services Committee of the House of Representatives has held multiple hearings highlighting various risks that digital assets can pose to the financial markets, consumers, and investors that must be addressed as we seek to harness the benefits of these innovations.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States should seek to prioritize understanding the potential opportunities of the next generation of the internet;

(2) the United States should seek to foster advances in technology that have robust evidence indicating they can improve our financial system and create more fair and equitable access to financial services for everyday Americans while protecting our financial system, investors, and consumers;

(3) the United States must support the responsible development of digital assets and the underlying technology in the United States or risk the shifting of the development of such assets and technology outside of the United States, to less regulated countries;

(4) Congress should consult with public and private sector stakeholders to understand how to enact a functional framework tailored to the specific risks and unique benefits of different digital asset-related activities, distributed ledger technology, distributed networks, and decentralized systems; and

(5) Congress should enact a functional framework tailored to the specific risks of different digital asset-related activities and unique benefits of distributed ledger technology, distributed networks, and decentralized systems; and

(6) consumers and market participants will benefit from a framework for digital assets consistent with longstanding investor protections in securities and commodities markets, yet tailored

to the unique benefits and risks of the digital asset ecosystem.

SEC. 602. CODIFICATION OF THE SEC STRATEGIC HUB FOR INNOVATION AND FINANCIAL TECHNOLOGY.

Section 4 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78d) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(1) STRATEGIC HUB FOR INNOVATION AND FINANCIAL TECHNOLOGY.—

“(1) OFFICE ESTABLISHED.—There is established within the Commission the Strategic Hub for Innovation and Financial Technology (referred to in this section as the ‘FinHub’).

“(2) PURPOSES.—The purposes of FinHub are as follows:

“(A) To assist in shaping the approach of the Commission to technological advancements.

“(B) To examine financial technology innovations among market participants.

“(C) To coordinate the response of the Commission to emerging technologies in financial, regulatory, and supervisory systems.

“(3) DIRECTOR OF FINHUB.—FinHub shall have a Director who shall be appointed by the Commission, from among individuals having experience in both emerging technologies and Federal securities laws and serve at the pleasure of the Commission. The Director shall report directly to the Commission and perform such functions and duties as the Commission may prescribe.

“(4) RESPONSIBILITIES.—FinHub shall—

“(A) foster responsible technological innovation and fair competition within the Commission, including around financial technology, regulatory technology, and supervisory technology;

“(B) provide internal education and training to the Commission regarding financial technology;

“(C) advise the Commission regarding financial technology that would serve the Commission’s functions;

“(D) analyze technological advancements and the impact of regulatory requirements on financial technology companies;

“(E) advise the Commission with respect to rulemakings or other agency or staff action regarding financial technology;

“(F) provide businesses working in emerging financial technology fields with information on the Commission, its rules and regulations; and

“(G) encourage firms working in emerging technology fields to engage with the Commission and obtain feedback from the Commission on potential regulatory issues.

“(5) ACCESS TO DOCUMENTS.—The Commission shall ensure that FinHub has full access to the documents and information of the Commission and any self-regulatory organization, as necessary to carry out the functions of FinHub.

“(6) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than October 31 of each year after 2024, FinHub shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report on the activities of FinHub during the immediately preceding fiscal year.

“(B) CONTENTS.—Each report required under subparagraph (A) shall include—

“(i) the total number of persons that met with FinHub;

“(ii) the total number of market participants FinHub met with, including the classification of those participants;

“(iii) a summary of general issues discussed during meetings with persons;

“(iv) information on steps FinHub has taken to improve Commission services, including responsiveness to the concerns of persons;

“(v) recommendations—

“(I) with respect to the regulations of the Commission and the guidance and orders of the Commission; and

“(II) for such legislative actions as FinHub determines appropriate; and

“(vi) any other information, as determined appropriate by the Director of FinHub.

“(C) CONFIDENTIALITY.—A report under subparagraph (A) may not contain confidential information.

“(7) SYSTEMS OF RECORDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall establish a detailed system of records (as defined under section 552a of title 5, United States Code) to assist FinHub in communicating with interested parties.

“(B) ENTITIES COVERED BY THE SYSTEM.—Entities covered by the system required under subparagraph (A) include entities or persons submitting requests or inquiries and other information to Commission through FinHub.

“(C) SECURITY AND STORAGE OF RECORDS.—FinHub shall store—

“(i) electronic records—

“(I) in the system required under subparagraph (A); or

“(II) on the secure network or other electronic medium, such as encrypted hard drives or backup media, of the Commission; and

“(ii) paper records in secure facilities.

“(8) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection.”.

SEC. 603. CODIFICATION OF LABCFCTC.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 18 of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 22) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) LABCFCTC.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Commission LabCFCTC.

“(2) PURPOSE.—The purposes of LabCFCTC are to—

“(A) promote responsible financial technology innovation and fair competition for the benefit of the American public;

“(B) serve as an information platform to inform the Commission about new financial technology innovation; and

“(C) provide outreach to financial technology innovators to discuss their innovations and the regulatory framework established by this Act and the regulations promulgated thereunder.

“(3) DIRECTOR.—LabCFCTC shall have a Director, who shall be appointed by the Commission and serve at the pleasure of the Commission. Notwithstanding section 2(a)(6)(A), the Director shall report directly to the Commission and perform such functions and duties as the Commission may prescribe.

“(4) DUTIES.—LabCFCTC shall—

“(A) advise the Commission with respect to rulemakings or other agency or staff action regarding financial technology;

“(B) provide internal education and training to the Commission regarding financial technology;

“(C) advise the Commission regarding financial technology that would bolster the Commission’s oversight functions;

“(D) engage with academia, students, and professionals on financial technology issues, ideas, and technology relevant to activities under this Act;

“(E) provide persons working in emerging technology fields with information on the Commission, its rules and regulations, and the role of a registered futures association; and

“(F) encourage persons working in emerging technology fields to engage with the Commission and obtain feedback from the Commission on potential regulatory issues.

“(5) ACCESS TO DOCUMENTS.—The Commission shall ensure that LabCFCTC has full access to the documents and information of the Commission and any self-regulatory organization or registered futures association, as necessary to carry out the functions of LabCFCTC.

“(6) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than October 31 of each year after 2024, LabCFCTC shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report on its activities.

“(B) CONTENTS.—Each report required under paragraph (1) shall include—

“(i) the total number of persons that met with LabCFTC;

“(ii) a summary of general issues discussed during meetings with the person;

“(iii) information on steps LabCFTC has taken to improve Commission services, including responsiveness to the concerns of persons;

“(iv) recommendations made to the Commission with respect to the regulations, guidance, and orders of the Commission and such legislative actions as may be appropriate; and

“(v) any other information determined appropriate by the Director of LabCFTC.

“(C) CONFIDENTIALITY.—A report under paragraph (A) shall abide by the confidentiality requirements in section 8.

“(7) SYSTEMS OF RECORDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall establish a detailed system of records (as defined in section 552a of title 5, United States Code) to assist LabCFTC in communicating with interested parties.

“(B) PERSONS COVERED BY THE SYSTEM.—The persons covered by the system of records shall include persons submitting requests or inquiries and other information to the Commission through LabCFTC.

“(C) SECURITY AND STORAGE OF RECORDS.—The system of records shall store records electronically or on paper in secure facilities, and shall store electronic records on the secure network of the Commission and on other electronic media, such as encrypted hard drives and backup media, as needed.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 2(a)(6)(A) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 2(a)(6)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking “paragraph and in” and inserting “paragraph,”; and

(2) by inserting “and section 18(c)(3),” before “the executive”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The Commodity Futures Trading Commission shall implement the amendments made by this section (including complying with section 18(c)(7) of the Commodity Exchange Act) within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 604. CFTC-SEC JOINT ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON DIGITAL ASSETS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission (in this section referred to as the “Commissions”) shall jointly establish the Joint Advisory Committee on Digital Assets (in this section referred to as the “Committee”).

(b) PURPOSE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall—

(A) provide the Commissions with advice on the rules, regulations, and policies of the Commissions related to digital assets;

(B) further the regulatory harmonization of digital asset policy between the Commissions;

(C) examine and disseminate methods for describing, measuring, and quantifying digital asset—

(i) decentralization;

(ii) functionality;

(iii) information asymmetries; and

(iv) transaction and network security;

(D) examine the potential for digital assets, blockchain systems, and distributed ledger technology to improve efficiency in the operation of financial market infrastructure and better protect financial market participants, including services and systems which provide—

(i) improved customer protections;

(ii) public availability of information;

(iii) greater transparency regarding customer funds;

(iv) reduced transaction cost; and

(v) increased access to financial market services; and

(E) discuss the implementation by the Commissions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(2) REVIEW BY AGENCIES.—Each Commission shall—

(A) review the findings and recommendations of the Committee;

(B) promptly issue a public statement each time the Committee submits a finding or recommendation to a Commission—

(i) assessing the finding or recommendation of the Committee;

(ii) disclosing the action or decision not to take action made by the Commission in response to a finding or recommendation; and

(iii) explaining the reasons for the action or decision not to take action; and

(C) each time the Committee submits a finding or recommendation to a Commission, provide the Committee with a formal response to the finding or recommendation not later than 3 months after the date of the submission of the finding or recommendation.

(c) MEMBERSHIP AND LEADERSHIP.—

(1) NON-FEDERAL MEMBERS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commissions shall appoint at least 20 nongovernmental stakeholders who represent a broad spectrum of interests, equally divided between the Commissions, to serve as members of the Committee. The appointees shall include—

(i) digital asset issuers;

(ii) persons registered with the Commissions and engaged in digital asset related activities;

(iii) individuals engaged in academic research relating to digital assets; and

(iv) digital asset users.

(B) MEMBERS NOT COMMISSION EMPLOYEES.—Members appointed under subparagraph (A) shall not be deemed to be employees or agents of a Commission solely by reason of membership on the Committee.

(2) CO-DESIGNATED FEDERAL OFFICERS.—

(A) NUMBER; APPOINTMENT.—There shall be 2 co-designated Federal officers of the Committee, as follows:

(i) The Director of LabCFTC of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

(ii) The Director of the Strategic Hub for Innovation and Financial Technology of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

(B) DUTIES.—The duties required by chapter 10 of title 5, United States Code, to be carried out by a designated Federal officer with respect to the Committee shall be shared by the co-designated Federal officers of the Committee.

(3) COMMITTEE LEADERSHIP.—

(A) COMPOSITION; ELECTION.—The Committee members shall elect, from among the Committee members—

(i) a chair;

(ii) a vice chair;

(iii) a secretary; and

(iv) an assistant secretary.

(B) TERM OF OFFICE.—Each member elected under subparagraph (A) in a 2-year period referred to in section 1013(b)(2) of title 5, United States Code, shall serve in the capacity for which the member was so elected, until the end of the 2-year period.

(d) NO COMPENSATION FOR COMMITTEE MEMBERS.—

(1) NON-FEDERAL MEMBERS.—All Committee members appointed under subsection (c)(1) shall—

(A) serve without compensation; and

(B) while away from the home or regular place of business of the member in the performance of services for the Committee, be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in the Government service are allowed expenses under section 5703(b) of title 5, United States Code.

(2) NO COMPENSATION FOR CO-DESIGNATED FEDERAL OFFICERS.—The co-designated Federal officers shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as officers or employees of the United States.

(e) FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS.—The Committee shall meet—

(1) not less frequently than twice annually; and

(2) at such other times as either Commission may request.

(f) DURATION.—Section 1013(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, shall not apply to the Committee.

(g) TIME LIMITS.—The Commissions shall—

(1) adopt a joint charter for the Committee within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this section;

(2) appoint members to the Committee within 120 days after such date of enactment; and

(3) hold the initial meeting of the Committee within 180 days after such date of enactment.

(h) FUNDING.—Subject to the availability of funds, the Commissions shall jointly fund the Committee.

SEC. 605. STUDY ON DECENTRALIZED FINANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission shall jointly carry out a study on decentralized finance that analyzes—

(1) the nature, size, role, and use of decentralized finance blockchain protocols;

(2) the operation of blockchain protocols that comprise decentralized finance;

(3) the interoperability of blockchain protocols and blockchain systems;

(4) the interoperability of blockchain protocols and software-based systems, including websites and wallets;

(5) the decentralized governance systems through which blockchain protocols may be developed, published, constituted, administered, maintained, or otherwise distributed, including—

(A) whether the systems enhance or detract from—

(i) the decentralization of the decentralized finance; and

(ii) the inherent benefits and risks of the decentralized governance system; and

(B) any procedures, requirements, or best practices that would mitigate the risks identified in subparagraph (A)(ii);

(6) the benefits of decentralized finance, including—

(A) operational resilience and availability of blockchain systems;

(B) interoperability of blockchain systems;

(C) market competition and innovation;

(D) transaction efficiency;

(E) transparency and traceability of transactions; and

(F) disintermediation;

(7) the risks of decentralized finance, including—

(A) pseudonymity of users and transactions;

(B) disintermediation; and

(C) cybersecurity vulnerabilities;

(8) the extent to which decentralized finance has integrated with the traditional financial markets and any potential risks or improvements to the stability of the markets;

(9) how the levels of illicit activity in decentralized finance compare with the levels of illicit activity in traditional financial markets;

(10) methods for addressing illicit activity in decentralized finance and traditional markets that are tailored to the unique attributes of each;

(11) how decentralized finance may increase the accessibility of cross-border transactions; and

(12) the feasibility of embedding self-executing compliance and risk controls into decentralized finance.

(b) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out the study required under subsection (a), the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission shall consult with the Secretary of the Treasury on the factors described under paragraphs (7) through (10) of subsection (a).

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission shall jointly submit

to the relevant congressional committees a report that includes the results of the study required by subsection (a).

(d) GAO STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) carry out a study on decentralized finance that analyzes the information described under paragraphs (1) through (12) of subsection (a); and

(2) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, submit to the relevant congressional committees a report that includes the results of the study required by paragraph (1).

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) DECENTRALIZED FINANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “decentralized finance” means blockchain protocols that allow users to engage in financial transactions in a self-directed manner so that a third-party intermediary does not effectuate the transactions or take custody of digital assets of a user during any part of the transactions.

(B) RELATIONSHIP TO EXCLUDED ACTIVITIES.—The term “decentralized finance” shall not be interpreted to limit or exclude any activity from the activities described in section 151(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 or section 4v(a) of the Commodity Exchange Act.

(2) RELEVANT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “relevant congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committees on Financial Services and Agriculture of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committees on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

SEC. 606. STUDY ON NON-FUNGIBLE DIGITAL ASSETS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall carry out a study of non-fungible digital assets that analyzes—

(1) the nature, size, role, purpose, and use of non-fungible digital assets;

(2) the similarities and differences between non-fungible digital assets and other digital assets, including digital commodities and payment stablecoins, and how the markets for those digital assets intersect with each other;

(3) how non-fungible digital assets are minted by issuers and subsequently administered to purchasers;

(4) how non-fungible digital assets are stored after being purchased by a consumer;

(5) the interoperability of non-fungible digital assets between different blockchain systems;

(6) the scalability of different non-fungible digital asset marketplaces;

(7) the benefits of non-fungible digital assets, including verifiable digital ownership;

(8) the risks of non-fungible tokens, including—

(A) intellectual property rights;

(B) cybersecurity risks; and

(C) market risks;

(9) whether and how non-fungible digital assets have integrated with traditional marketplaces, including those for music, real estate, gaming, events, and travel;

(10) whether non-fungible tokens can be used to facilitate commerce or other activities through the representation of documents, identification, contracts, licenses, and other commercial, government, or personal records;

(11) any potential risks to traditional markets from such integration; and

(12) the levels and types of illicit activity in non-fungible digital asset markets.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General, shall make publicly available a report that includes the results of the study required by subsection (a).

SEC. 607. STUDY ON EXPANDING FINANCIAL LITERACY AMONGST DIGITAL ASSET HOLDERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commodity Futures Trading Commission with the Securities and Ex-

change Commission shall jointly conduct a study to identify—

(1) the existing level of financial literacy among retail digital asset holders, including subgroups of investors identified by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission with the Securities and Exchange Commission;

(2) methods to improve the timing, content, and format of financial literacy materials regarding digital assets provided by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission;

(3) methods to improve coordination between the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission with other agencies, including the Financial Literacy and Education Commission as well as nonprofit organizations and State and local jurisdictions, to better disseminate financial literacy materials;

(4) the efficacy of current financial literacy efforts with a focus on rural communities and communities with majority minority populations;

(5) the most useful and understandable relevant information that retail digital asset holders need to make informed financial decisions before engaging with or purchasing a digital asset or service that is typically sold to retail investors of digital assets;

(6) the most effective public-private partnerships in providing financial literacy regarding digital assets to consumers;

(7) the most relevant metrics to measure successful improvement of the financial literacy of an individual after engaging with financial literacy efforts; and

(8) in consultation with the Financial Literacy and Education Commission, a strategy (including to the extent practicable, measurable goals and objectives) to increase financial literacy of investors regarding digital assets.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission shall jointly submit a written report on the study required by subsection (a) to the Committees on Financial Services and on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

SEC. 608. STUDY ON FINANCIAL MARKET INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission shall jointly conduct a study to assess whether additional guidance or rules are necessary to facilitate the development of tokenized securities and derivatives products, and to the extent such guidance or rules would foster the development of fair and orderly financial markets, be necessary or appropriate in the public interest, and be consistent with the protection of investors and customers.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) TIME LIMIT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission shall jointly submit to the relevant congressional committees a report that includes the results of the study required by subsection (a).

(2) RELEVANT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “relevant congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committees on Financial Services and on Agriculture of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committees on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

The Acting CHAIR: No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 118–516. Each such further amendment may be of-

ferred only in the order printed in the report, by a member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. CASAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 118–516.

Mr. CASAR. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 68, line 11, strike “\$75,000,000” and insert “\$5,000,000”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1243, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CASAR. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, from 2017 to 2022, Americans who invested in the SSP Index received about a 61 percent return on their investment, but Americans who invested in one of the top 12 cryptocurrencies that existed during that 5-year period did not make money. In fact, on average, they lost about half of their money. Three out of every four bitcoin traders during that time period also lost money. From FTX to Celsius to Blockchain ATMs, the industry has repeatedly lost everyday Americans their money.

Whether you are a crypto booster or a crypto sceptic, we can all agree based on the facts that crypto investment is a risk.

Since it is a risk, we should want more oversight to protect Americans. This bill before us today doesn't provide us more regulation. It doesn't even provide many Americans the same level of regulation as traditional finance.

Instead, it creates a light-touch regulatory regime that can be manipulated by bad actors in both crypto and traditional finance, putting Americans and our 90-year-old securities laws at risk.

My amendment focuses on one key area where everyday people who would invest in crypto under this bill will, in fact, receive less protection than Americans invested in traditional finance.

The current flawed bill before us creates a crowdfunding registration exemption for crypto that is 15 times weaker than the crowdfunding exemption that exists in traditional finance.

In the existing bill before us, someone could crowdfund up to \$75 million from everyday Americans, and those Americans would receive just the most minimal of protections. We would never allow that in the non-crypto finance world.

My amendment changes the exemption cap to \$5 million, putting that cap

in line with other current laws, so at the very least Americans making investments in crypto can get the same level of protection as crowdfunding investors in traditional finance.

I hope that whether you are for the underlying bill or against the underlying bill like me, we can agree that this commonsense amendment will help protect everyday people, and I urge everyone to support it.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I am opposed to this amendment. Today, digital asset issuers rely on exemptions under the current securities regime. Each exemption includes its own requirements under traditional securities law. What we provide in this act is purpose built for digital assets. What this does today is if you are raising money for a digital asset offering, the exemption is built for those other types of securities in the space.

The SEC's disclosure regime is supposed to give investors the information they need to make informed decisions, but it is not built for digital assets.

What we do in this act is provide certain disclosures for investors in digital assets, such as source code, token supply, government mechanisms, and other aspects unique to crypto. That is what this bill does.

What the gentleman from Texas is proposing to do is limit that aperture from \$75 million to \$5 million of those folks that can invest in these early-stage innovations. What he is doing is restricting the opportunity for average, everyday investors to get options like high-wealth investors get today under securities law.

The original exemption for regulation crowdfunding was something we put in law with bipartisan support. MAXINE WATERS was my cosponsor on the regulation crowdfunding, this very exemption.

I have enhanced this. I put additional requirements here to make sure there are more disclosures, and we open up the aperture to \$75 million so more folks can participate and so those blockchains can develop. When you make it \$5 million, it makes it impossible for you to actually scale up, especially with these inflationary times that our people are facing.

What I would urge is the House reject this amendment. The gentleman's arguments against this exemption have nothing to do with the exemption but have everything to do with opposition to the bill.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASAR. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Texas for attempting

this amendment. As a matter of fact, there have been any number of Members from this side of the aisle who have been attempting to amend this bill to try and make it better. While I have great respect for all of those attempts, if my friends had listened, if they had accepted, perhaps they could have made this a better bill. Unfortunately, at this point in time, no, with all the work that this gentleman has done, Mr. CASAR and others, my friends will not accept any amendments. They are not going to accept his amendment. They don't think that the bill can be made better, and unfortunately, the bill is so bad, I don't think it can be made better either.

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

Mr. CASAR. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Our securities laws were created after the Great Depression when this country understood that strong regulation protects Americans and is necessary for innovation and for our economy to thrive. We cannot hold cryptocurrency to a lower standard than traditional finance.

My amendment ensures that when it comes to crowdfunding, cryptocurrency is held to the same standard.

Mr. Chair, I urge all Members to support my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, may I inquire of the Chair how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time. Let me close with this, Mr. Chairman. We have this push and pull on the Financial Services Committee. Generally speaking, we have elected officials that say the American people's hard-earned savings are their hard-earned savings. Then we have paternalistic amendments like the one before us today that say: No, you are not smart enough to invest your own money. We have to put in these safeguards to protect you from yourself.

Well, I think that goes way too far.

What we have done with securities laws is take average, everyday investors and disintermediate them from the greater economy so average, everyday Americans don't get the benefit of economic growth, of Wall Street doing great, and earnings going up in corporate America. We have separated it because we have made it harder for average, everyday folks to invest in companies and have ownership of companies.

What we are trying to do is open that up a little bit from \$5 million of an exemption when you are raising money to \$75 million. In the scope of our economy, in the scope of our capital markets, in the scope of economic opportunity and innovation, which is a very

small aperture we are opening here. We have done that. We have constructed this provision with a lot of Democratic input and Republican input, and that is how we came to the number of \$75 million.

It is already a compromise.

What the gentleman offers with this amendment is nothing more than saying: I am paternalistic, and I am, therefore, going to restrict your opportunity to invest your money as you see fit.

Reject the amendment. Vote "no" on this amendment, and vote "yes" on final passage.

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

□ 1615

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASAR).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CASAR. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. PETERSEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 118-516.

Ms. PETERSEN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In title I, add at the end the following:

SEC. 112. APPLICATION OF THE BANK SECRECY ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5312 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)(G), by striking "or dealer" and inserting "dealer, digital asset broker, digital asset dealer, or digital asset trading system"; and

(2) in subsection (c)(1)(A)—

(A) by inserting "digital commodity broker, digital commodity dealer," after "futures commission merchant,"; and

(B) by inserting before the period the following: "and any digital commodity exchange registered, or required to register, under the Commodity Exchange Act which permits direct customer access".

(b) GAO STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall conduct a study to—

(A) assess the risks posed by centralized intermediaries that are primarily located in foreign jurisdictions that provide services to U.S. persons without regulatory requirements that are substantially similar to the requirements of the Bank Secrecy Act; and

(B) provide any regulatory or legislative recommendations to address these risks under subparagraph (A).

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall issue a report to Congress containing all findings and determinations made in carrying out the study required under paragraph (1).

Page 105, strike lines 1 through 4.

Page 121, strike line 7 and all that follows through "Bank Secrecy Act." on line 10.

Page 183, strike lines 14 through 17.

Page 215, strike line 6 and all that follows through "Bank Secrecy Act." on line 9.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1243, the gentleman from Colorado (Ms. PETERSEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Ms. PETERSEN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, more than 20 percent of Americans have owned or traded cryptocurrency.

Despite this, the U.S. still lacks a clear regulatory structure for digital assets which is hurting American competitiveness and incentivizing some companies, unfortunately, to move overseas.

While there may be disagreement about how to best establish the appropriate market regulatory structure, there is broad bipartisan agreement for preventing criminals from using cryptocurrencies for illicit purposes, such as money laundering, terrorist financing, and sanctioned evasion.

My amendment would provide clarity and conformity to how the Bank Secrecy Act and regulations safeguarding our financial system from criminals are applied to digital assets.

The base bill already calls for the Bank Secrecy Act to apply to digital assets; however, by amending the BSA directly and explicitly expanding the definition of financial institution in the BSA to cover digital asset entities, we are providing certainty to the regulators and the Department of Treasury in their authorities to protect our financial system.

Additionally, the amendment would also require a study to assess the risk posed by centralized intermediaries based in jurisdictions that lack robust anti-money laundering enforcement.

While in most cases, American digital asset companies are already complying with the applicable requirements under the Bank Secrecy Act, we also have to be thinking about the threat of foreign companies with U.S. touchpoints that are not complying with equivalent controls or reporting standards.

I thank Chairman MCHENRY and Representative HILL for working with me on this issue, and their commitment to strengthening the anti-money laundering provisions in this bill.

This amendment, combined with the underlying bill, will help provide more oversight into the digital asset market and support regulators' work to protect consumers and investors. While there is more work to be done to ensure the integrity of our digital assets market, this amendment is an important step forward and I urge my colleagues to support the adoption of the amendment and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time

in opposition, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to accept this amendment.

I think it is important that as we establish a new comprehensive regulatory framework for the digital asset markets, we also have to ensure that we have a consistent application of the Bank Secrecy Act and anti-money laundering provisions in existing law. These requirements on the digital asset intermediaries and exchanges are necessary so that bad actors don't exploit these markets for nefarious purposes.

Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for her work on this amendment. She has been focused on AML/BSA-related issues in the build up to us writing FIT21 during the markup process in the Financial Services Committee and then the process through the Rules Committee. I appreciate her sincere engagement on this matter and for coming up with a very good amendment.

Mr. Chair, I urge support of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PETERSEN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, I, again, thank the chairman from North Carolina for working with me and others to bring a bipartisan bill with broad support to the House. This has been years in the making, and I congratulate him for getting it to this point. I appreciate his willingness to work with me. I also thank my team for helping me address an issue that I had concerns about.

Mr. Chair, I ask for the support of my colleagues, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL), the chair of the Digital Assets, Financial Technology and Inclusion Subcommittee on the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman MCHENRY for the time.

Mr. Chair, I congratulate the gentleman from Colorado on this very effective amendment because she shares that passion that we have all had through this entire process, which is to recognize that we need to have vigorous anti-money laundering/Bank Secrecy Act and Know Your Customer protections around digital finance just like we do in the analog financial services system. Her bill will strengthen that.

I was just reviewing the Treasury Department's 2024 national security for combating terrorists and other illicit financing, and it brings to mind what a better regime it is to have blockchain.

Because a blockchain, Mr. Chair, has the identity connected with the transaction. It leaves an indelible mark

cryptographically of those transactions that makes illicit finance easier to identify, not less. The Treasury Department points out that the top abusers, the top concern about illicit finance, are misuse of cash, including bulk cash, misuse of financial products and services like money orders; easy formation and limited information required to create a legal entity. An example is the use of casinos.

That is what the Treasury Department says are the toughest, most-challenging aspects of terror finance, and that is why this study will help us make sure that using blockchain is a more effective way to counter illicit finance in the world.

Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for her support and for being such a constructive source of dynamic support for crafting FIT21.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, again, I will echo what Congressman HILL just stated for the RECORD.

The gentleman from Colorado has been a sterling advocate for enhanced BSA-AML protections, ensuring that we work against illicit finance. I thank her for the efforts, and I am willing to accept the amendment and urge its adoption.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Ms. PETERSEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 118-516.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:
SEC. 414. STUDIES ON FOREIGN ADVERSARY PARTICIPATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission, shall, not later than 1 year after date of the enactment of this section, conduct a study and submit a report to the relevant congressional committees that—

(1) identifies any digital asset registrants which are owned by governments of foreign adversaries;

(2) determines whether any governments of foreign adversaries are collecting personal data or trading data about United States persons in the digital asset markets; and

(3) evaluates whether any proprietary intellectual property of digital asset registrants is being misused or stolen by any governments of foreign adversaries.

(b) GAO STUDY AND REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General shall, not later than 1 year after date of the enactment of this section, conduct a study and submit a report to the relevant congressional committees that—

(A) identifies any digital asset registrants which are owned by governments of foreign adversaries;

(B) determines whether any governments of foreign adversaries are collecting personal

data or trading data about United States persons in the digital asset markets; and

(C) evaluates whether any proprietary intellectual property of digital asset registrants is being misused or stolen by any governments of foreign adversaries.

(C) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) DIGITAL ASSET REGISTRANT.—The term “digital asset registrant” means any person required to register as a digital asset trading system, digital asset broker, digital asset dealer, digital commodity exchange, digital commodity broker, or digital commodity dealer under this Act.

(2) FOREIGN ADVERSARIES.—The term “foreign adversaries” means the foreign governments and foreign non-government persons determined by the Secretary of Commerce to be foreign adversaries under section 7.4(a) of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations.

(3) RELEVANT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “relevant congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committees on Financial Services and Agriculture of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committees on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1243, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, my amendment is pretty simple. It requires the Treasury Secretary in consultation with the CFTC and the SEC to complete a study and submit a report to Congress that identifies any digital asset registrants that are owned by governments of foreign adversaries.

The report will determine whether foreign adversary governments are collecting or trading personal data about American citizens in the digital asset markets and evaluate whether foreign adversary governments are misusing or stealing any proprietary intellectual property of digital asset registrants.

The GAO is required to complete a study and submit a report to Congress on the very same issues.

This amendment would promote transparency regarding how our Nation’s strategic enemies may be exploiting the digital asset marketplace to invade the privacy of Americans and steal valuable intellectual property.

In June 2023, the Financial Services hearings that focused on the very bill that we are considering today, Aaron Kaplan, the CEO of, Prometheus, the first and only SEC/FINRA approved Special Purpose Broker-Dealer for digital assets, stated that Prometheus and its CCP partners entered into a joint agreement in December 2018 to develop a blockchain trading system where the Chinese partner took a 20 percent stake in Prometheus.

In case anyone has any doubts about the CCP ties, Prometheus’s Chinese partner company was founded in 1969 by a former senior CCP official. In 2021, the party’s central committee posthumously named him a “National Excellent Communist Party member.”

In July 2023, several of my colleagues and I sent a letter to the SEC and the

DOJ expressing our concerns with inconsistencies in Prometheus’s public filings and the CCP’s ownership of an entity that had the blessing of the SEC and FINRA to operate in the United States.

I followed up on this letter in a September 2023 hearing with the SEC Chair Gary Gensler, where he dodged my question and did not take my concerns of the 20 percent CCP ownership of Prometheus seriously.

The fact of the matter is that because Chinese companies are generally required by Chinese law to share data with the Chinese Government, these companies present substantial risks to United States individual privacy and our national security. Chinese-owned broker-dealers like Prometheus, Webull, and MooMoo operate as registered entities here in the United States, and the Biden administration and Chair Gensler do not seem to care, yet they attack American businesses operating in good faith with no regulatory clarity.

This is simply how the CCP and other foreign adversaries operate. They infiltrate our markets while the Biden administration looks the other way and punishes American companies who are only trying to operate in the United States but face endless regulation by enforcement of the Biden administration.

We need to pass FIT21 into law because the SEC’s current regulation by enforcement is putting the United States at a disadvantage and allowing foreign adversaries to gain an advantage in our U.S. crypto markets, all while Gary Gensler attacks American public companies who have tried to work with the SEC and come in and register.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment to protect Americans from having their personal data shared with the CCP and other foreign adversaries.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, but I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, while I do not oppose this amendment, I will emphasize that the broad deregulatory nature of the not fit for purpose act is such that it would severely weaken our capital markets and make us more vulnerable to bad actors, both domestic and foreign.

This amendment and the underlying bill do not protect consumers and investors. This amendment only requires a study on whether or not foreign adversaries are operating as digital asset registrants under the bill and collecting data on the U.S. consumer or investors.

We should not just be studying this issue; we should be legislating strong

data privacy protections that apply all across the board.

Moreover, if TikTok was the inspiration for this bill, I will note that TikTok is not directly owned by the Chinese Government. The concern was that it was vulnerable to being unduly influenced by the Chinese Communist Party. If a China-based company was operating as a digital asset registrant under this bill, it would not fall within this study unless it was directly owned by the Chinese Communist Party. It would be easy for our adversaries to simply stand up proxy companies that appear to have no direct affiliation with them to evade the scrutiny of the study in the bill.

While I plan to support this amendment, I don’t think it provides any meaningful safeguards on consumer privacy and it certainly does nothing to fix the underlying problems of the not fit for purpose act.

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

□ 1630

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina has 45 seconds remaining.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding to me to speak in support of this amendment. It allows me to illustrate two things.

First is that Prometheus, while it was approved as a special purpose broker-dealer for digital assets, has not accomplished anything. It has no business, yet it also has this partnership with the CCP, so there is an illustration that FIT21 would allow us to have the guidance on how to register a broker-dealer.

Secondly, I fully support Mr. NORMAN and his concerns about the influence of foreign adversaries on people registered in the United States. It is a clear issue, and we have an investigation going on, on why the SEC has not pursued this itself.

I rise in support of Mr. NORMAN’s effort. It is a good amendment. Let’s add it to the bill and pass FIT21.

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

The bill’s supporters have claimed that this bill is necessary to provide legal clarity as to when a digital asset is considered a security and when it is considered a commodity, but this bill is anything but clear. It is 253 pages of highly convoluted and poorly defined language.

At the Rules Committee hearing yesterday, the Republicans testifying on the panel in defense of the bill could not answer a simple question from a fellow Republican as to whether dogecoin would qualify as a security or a commodity under this bill.

They pointed to their five-part decentralization test in the bill, which is, again, anything but clear. The current test for determining whether something is a security is called the Howey Test. It has stood the test of time, with guidance from the SEC clarifying its application, in addition to decades of case law expounding on how it applies to a variety of different assets. Even the courts have agreed with SEC's interpretation of the Howey Test, classifying digital assets as securities in a strikingly consistent manner.

The five-part decentralization test in this bill has not been tested, and it would create a slew of new litigation trying to decipher how it applies. Instead of a study, we should remember the fact that Members of Congress and legal experts struggling to agree on basic facts about what this bill would do foreshadows the mountains of litigation that this bill would result in to figure that out.

This bill provides the opposite of legal clarity, as the bill supporters claim. Instead, it provides several more convoluted and untested definitions to replace the time-tested Howey Test in place today.

The only thing clear about this 253-page bill is that it results in the substantial deregulation of crypto, just as the crypto industry has asked for.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chair, this amendment gives the illusion that it prevents the bill from being useful to our foreign adversaries when, in fact, we see Iran using crypto to avoid sanctions, North Korea profiting from crypto, and Hamas raising huge amounts of money and being able to sneak around our efforts by using crypto. Finally, we see the crypto advocates viewing this bill as their ticket to move crypto into a competitor with the U.S. dollar. With tomorrow's bill, they try to hobble the dollar by saying it can't be digital and we can't have a better payment system involving the dollar, and that is their system for having crypto outcompete the dollar.

The administration opposes this bill. Even if you looked at it a few weeks ago, it has gotten much, much worse. I want to reemphasize that they added a new title that allows crypto to be completely unregulated and would allow for nonregulation of our stocks and bonds, so even if you liked this bill when you saw it 3 weeks ago, vote "no."

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further pro-

ceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 118-516.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. ____ SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.

It is the sense of the Congress that nothing in this Act or any amendment made by this Act should be interpreted to authorize any entity to regulate any commodity, other than a digital commodity, on any spot market.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1243, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a simple but important amendment.

While the underlying legislation allows the Commodity Futures Trading Commission the authority to regulate digital asset spot markets, nothing in the bill should be construed as giving the CFTC power beyond digital assets.

We all have seen good intentions around here, and nothing is punished like good intentions, so let's make clear what the strike zone is for everybody. We are trying to define that strike zone.

This amendment adds a sense of Congress that nothing in this act or any amendment made by this act should be interpreted to authorize any entity to regulate any commodity other than a digital commodity on any spot market. That is it. That is the whole thing.

Again, this amendment simply aims to combat mission creep, if you want to call it that, somewhere outside the strike zone and makes clear that Congress' intent is to only address digital asset spot markets in this bill and no more. With this amendment, the courts won't have any questions, and Mr. Gensler can't say, "Well, I am not sure they did this," or "They surely must have meant that."

No. We cannot allow these agencies to take more and more power in the absence of express congressional approval. We have already seen Mr. Gensler aggressively pursue litigation against the crypto industry, people trying to do it the right way.

While trying to rein him in, we ought to ensure the CFTC knows exactly what they can and cannot do because he is not going to be there forever. There is going to be some next person that comes along and says that Congress wasn't really sure.

We are sure, and that is what this amendment does.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. BICE). The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, under H.R. 4763, crypto that is deemed to be a digital commodity would come under the CFTC's purview, which would include a new explicit authority for the CFTC to regulate crypto spot markets. However, this amendment would ensure that this new authority for the CFTC to regulate crypto spot markets does not include traditional commodity spot markets.

It is already bad enough that this bill would result in mass deregulation of crypto and even some traditional securities, too. This amendment takes the bill to the next level by trying to preemptively block the CFTC to oversee non-crypto spot markets.

The bill's supporters continue to insist that this bill is only about crypto, but it has serious implications for traditional securities. With this amendment, it would now appear to have serious implications for traditional commodities also.

It is wholly unclear why Republicans, who have placed so much faith in the CFTC to police the spot markets of digital commodities, think that this agency is unable to oversee the spot markets of everyday commodities they currently regulate, like oil, wheat, and livestock. Excessive speculation in spot markets of tangible commodities is a real problem that can harm working families' budgets.

For this reason, Democratic CFTC Commissioner Christy Goldsmith Romero has called on the CFTC to study excessive and harmful speculations in the commodities markets. Specifically, she has stated: "The CFTC has an impressive surveillance program and an equally impressive cadre of commodity markets experts to rely upon as it seeks to understand these pressures of working families, farmers, and producers. We should use them more, and more publicly." I agree with her.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to stand up for working families and farmers by leaving the CFTC's existing authority to protect them from speculation in the traditional securities market fully intact.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam Chair, I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his thoughtful and forward-looking amendment.

I think it is important that we set the record straight. This amendment would not, as some have alleged, strip the CFTC of all of its spot market regulatory authority. All of the antifraud and antimanipulation powers that they currently hold would remain in place.

This sense of Congress simply makes it clear that, within FIT21, it does not provide the CFTC with grand new authorities over non-digital asset spot markets.

I think it is important we do that. There are clear and important differences between the traditional spot markets for commodities. Think about people buying and selling barrels of oil. That is not something everyday Americans are doing, but we do have everyday Americans engaged in the spot market for digital assets.

Also, with regard to digital asset commodities, we also have a number of intermediaries that would be interacting with these retail consumers. Some of those intermediaries would certainly hold the cash of consumers, either pending or after a trade. That is an important situation that we need to protect for that is not exactly like that in the traditional commodity markets—different marketplace, different threats, different set of tools.

As chair of the Commodity Markets, Digital Assets, and Rural Development Subcommittee, I want to make it clear that I support the gentleman's amendment. I do not want any part of FIT21 to change the CFTC's authority over non-digital asset commodities.

Madam Chair, I commend the gentleman for his work, and I urge a "yes" vote on the amendment.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, at the Rules Committee hearing, Republicans revealed their true intentions with this bill. My friend, Mr. NORMAN, stated, regarding the investors who were defrauded by FTX:

I blame the investor. I mean, would I get on an airplane with two wheels missing and one wing? They should have done their homework.

Representative AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia on the Rules Committee doubled down on this kind of victim blaming, saying that he believed we should use a buyer-beware approach.

This is entirely offensive to consumers to simply say that they should have known better than to get defrauded. The very definition of fraud implies that the consumer could not have been expected to know or understand some facet of a contract.

I would venture to say that this bill is even worse than just a buyer-beware approach. This bill creates a facade of regulation that is designed to make ordinary investors and consumers think they are protected and that the investments are safe. In reality, this bill would facilitate and legitimize fraud rather than warning consumers to beware of the risk.

In addition to blaming millions of defrauded investors, Republicans continue to move forward with a bill that exempts the same crypto firms that were unlawfully issuing or facilitating crypto securities, giving them a get-out-of-jail-free card.

This is what Republicans love to do. They blame consumers and investors who have been defrauded while also ad-

vancing bills to protect those same firms that are ripping off consumers and investors.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time of my time to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his constructive amendment. I think it is the absolute right approach. I want to associate myself with the comments from the chairman of the Commodity Markets, Digital Assets, and Rural Development Subcommittee from the House Ag Committee, Mr. JOHNSON, on that.

Madam Chair, FIT21 does exactly the opposite of what has been argued by the minority today. It gives a clear regulatory framework. It prevents fraud. It does require registration, custody, capital requirements. It gives clarity for the first time in American history to how we do securities and commodity oversight for digital assets.

The minority has also charged time and time again that somehow a great securities loophole is being opened in this bill.

□ 1645

It is just not true. It is not a factual statement. The term "investment contract" is a fungible, digital representation. It is not all these other items.

In fact, the bill specifically says the term "digital asset" does not include notes, stock, Treasury stock, securities, security-based swaps, and a whole list. It does not open the loophole that the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee charges.

I urge a "yes" vote on the bill and a "yes" vote for Mr. PERRY's amendment. Let's have regulatory credibility and clarity for a competitive United States in the 21st century.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment illustrates the problem. A commodity other than a digital commodity, but any commodity can become a digital commodity, or you can have a contract or a derivative tied to the physical commodity that now becomes a digital coin.

We are told that the bill does not allow stocks and bonds to be digital assets, but it does allow them to be defined as investment contracts. If you get defined as an investment contract, you are without regulation.

As to the underlying bill, keep in mind, the administration opposes it, and three-quarters of Democrats voted against it before it got much worse.

The bill got much worse a few weeks ago. If you studied it before then, and I know the bill has been out there since July of last year, your analysis won't show you how this bill now allows digital crypto to go without regulation and opens the door to taking our tradi-

tional stocks and bonds out from the SEC.

Vote "no" on the amendment, but especially vote "no" on the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 118-516 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. CASAR of Texas.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. NORMAN of South Carolina.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. PERRY of Pennsylvania.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. CASAR

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 1, printed in B of House Report 118-516, offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASAR), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 204, noes 209, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 223]

AYES—204

Adams	Case	Deluzio
Aguilar	Casten	DeSaulnier
Allred	Castor (FL)	Dingell
Amo	Castro (TX)	Doggett
Auchincloss	Cherfilus-	Escobar
Balint	McCormick	Eshoo
Barragan	Chu	Espaillet
Beatty	Clark (MA)	Fletcher
Bera	Clarke (NY)	Foster
Beyer	Cleaver	Foushee
Bishop (GA)	Clyburn	Frankel, Lois
Blunt Rochester	Cohen	Frost
Bonamici	Connolly	Gallego
Bowman	Correa	Garamendi
Boyle (PA)	Courtney	Garcia (IL)
Brown	Craig	Garcia (TX)
Brownley	Crockett	Garcia, Robert
Budzinski	Crow	Golden (ME)
Bush	Cuellar	Goldman (NY)
Caraveo	Dauids (KS)	Gomez
Carbajal	Davis (IL)	Gonzalez,
Cárdenas	Davis (NC)	Vicente
Carson	Dean (PA)	Gottheimer
Carter (LA)	DeGette	Green, Al (TX)
Cartwright	DeLauro	Harder (CA)
Casar	DelBene	Hayes

Himes Meng Schiff Rodgers (WA) Smith (NJ) Van Orden
 Horsford Mfume Schneider Rogers (AL) Stucker Wagner
 Houlihan Morelle Scholten Rogers (KY) Stauber Walberg
 Hoyer Moskowitz Schrier Rose Steel Waltz
 Hoyle (OR) Moulton Scott (VA) Rosendale Weber (TX)
 Huffman Mrvan Scott, David Rouzer Steil Webster (FL)
 Ivey Mullin Sewell Roy Stube Wenstrup
 Jackson (IL) Nadler Sherman Rutherford Strong Westernman
 Jackson (NC) Napolitano Sherrill Salazar Tenney Westerman
 Jacobs Neal Slotkin Schweikert Thompson (PA) Williams (NY)
 Jayapal Neguse Smith (WA) Scott, Austin Tiffany Williams (TX)
 Jeffries Nickel Sorensen Self Timmons Wilson (SC)
 Johnson (GA) Norcross Soto Sessions Turner Wittman
 Kamlager-Dove Norton Spanberger Simpson Valadao Womack
 Kaptur Ocasio-Cortez Stanton Smith (MO) Van Drew Yakym
 Keating Omar Stevens Strickland Smith (NE) Van Duyn Zinke
 Kelly (IL) Pallone Suozzi
 Kennedy Pappas Swallow
 Khanna Pappas Swallow Blumenauer LaMalfa Radewagen
 Kildee Pascrell Sykes Costa Landsman Sablan
 Kilmer Pelosi Takano Davidson Loudermilk Scalise
 Kim (NJ) Peltola Thanedar Evans Magaziner Spartz
 Krishnamoorthi Perez Thompson (CA) González-Colón Massie Stansbury
 Kuster Peters Thompson (MS) Grijalva Moore (WI) Velázquez
 Larsen (WA) Pettersen Titus Hunt Murphy Wilson (FL)
 Larson (CT) Phillips Tlaib Jackson Lee Nunn (IA)
 Lee (CA) Pingree Tokuda
 Lee (NV) Plaskett Tonko
 Lee (PA) Pocan Torres (CA)
 Leger Fernandez Porter Torres (NY)
 Levin Pressley Trahan
 Lieu Quigley Trone
 Lofgren Ramirez Underwood
 Lynch Raskin Vargas
 Manning Ross Vasquez
 Matsui Ruiz Veasey
 McBath Ruppertsberger Wasserman
 McClellan Ryan Schultz
 McCollum Salinas Waters
 McGarvey Sánchez Watson Coleman
 McGovern Sarbanes Wexton
 Meeks Scanlon Wild
 Menendez Schakowsky Williams (GA)

NOT VOTING—23

□ 1721

Messrs. ZINKE, WILLIAMS of Texas, ROGERS of Kentucky, BUCSHON, GRAVES of Missouri, Ms. VAN DUYN, Messrs. OBERNOLTE, DUNN of Florida, ROSE, and Ms. GREENE of Georgia changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. TLAIB, and Mr. CUELLAR changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

Ms. GRANGER changed her vote from “present” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3, printed in part B of House Report 118–516, offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 411, noes 0, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 224]

AYES—411

NOES—209
 Aderholt Ellzey Kelly (PA)
 Alford Emmer Kiggans (VA)
 Allen Estes Kiley
 Amodei Ezell Kim (CA)
 Armstrong Fallon Kustoff
 Arrington Feenstra LaHood
 Babin Ferguson LaLota
 Bacon Finstad Lamborn
 Baird Fischbach Langworthy
 Balderson Fitzgerald Latta
 Banks Fitzpatrick LaTurner
 Barr Fleischmann Lawler
 Bean (FL) Flood Lee (FL)
 Bentz Foxx Lesko
 Bergman Franklin, Scott Letlow
 Bice Fry Lucas
 Biggs Fulcher Luetkemeyer
 Bilirakis Gaetz Luna
 Bishop (NC) Garbarino Luttrell
 Boebert Garcia, Mike Mace
 Bost Gimenez Malliotakis
 Brecheen Gonzales, Tony Maloy
 Buchanan Good (VA) Mann
 Bucshon Gooden (TX) Mast
 Burchett Gosar McCaul
 Burgess Granger McClain
 Burlison Graves (LA) McClintock
 Calvert Graves (MO) McCormick
 Cammack Green (TN) McHenry
 Carey Greene (GA) Meuser
 Carl Griffith Miller (IL)
 Carter (GA) Grothman Miller (OH)
 Carter (TX) Guest Miller (WV)
 Chavez-DeRemer Guthrie Miller-Meeks
 Ciscomani Hageman Mills
 Cline Harris Molinaro
 Cloud Harshbarger Moolenaar
 Clyde Hern Mooney
 Cole Higgins (LA) Moore (AL)
 Collins Hill Moore (UT)
 Comer Hinson Moran
 Crane Houchin Moylan
 Crawford Hudson Nehls
 Crenshaw Huizenga Newhouse
 Curtis Issa Norman
 D’Esposito Jackson (TX) Obernolte
 De La Cruz James Ogles
 DesJarlais Johnson (LA) Owens
 Diaz-Balart Johnson (SD) Palmer
 Donalds Jordan Pence
 Duarte Joyce (OH) Perry
 Duncan Joyce (PA) Pfluger
 Dunn (FL) Kean (NJ) Posey
 Edwards Kelly (MS) Reschenthaler

Adams Bean (FL) Brownley
 Aderholt Beatty Buchanan
 Aguilar Bentz Buchanon
 Alford Bera Budzinski
 Allen Bergman Burchett
 Allred Beyer Burgess
 Amo Bice Burlison
 Amodei Biggs Bush
 Bilirakis Bilirakis Cammack
 Arrington Bishop (GA) Caraveo
 Auchincloss Bishop (NC) Carbajal
 Babin Blunt Rochester Cárdenas
 Bacon Boebert Carey
 Baird Bonamici Carson
 Balderson Bost Carter (GA)
 Balint Bowman Carter (LA)
 Banks Boyle (PA) Carter (TX)
 Barr Brecheen Cartwright
 Barragán Brown Casar

Case Griffith Meng
 Casten Grothman Meuser
 Castor (FL) Guest Mfume
 Castro (TX) Guthrie Miller (IL)
 Chavez-DeRemer Hageman Miller (OH)
 Cherfilus-Harder (CA) Miller (WV)
 McCormick Harris Miller-Meeks
 Chu Harshbarger Mills
 Ciscomani Hayes Molinaro
 Clark (MA) Hern Moolenaar
 Clarke (NY) Higgins (LA) Mooney
 Cleaver Hill Moore (AL)
 Cline Himes Moore (UT)
 Cloud Hinson Moran
 Clyburn Horsford Morelle
 Clyde Houchin Moskowitz
 Cohen Houlihan Moulton
 Cole Hoyer Moylan
 Collins Hoyle (OR) Mrvan
 Comer Hudson Mullin
 Connolly Huffman Nadler
 Correa Huizenga Napolitano
 Courtney Issa Neal
 Crane Ivey Neguse
 Crawford Jackson (IL) Jackson (IL)
 Crenshaw Jackson (NC) Jackson (NC)
 Crockett Jackson (TX) Jackson (TX)
 Crow Jacobs Norcross
 Cuellar James Norman
 Curtis Jayapal Norton
 D’Esposito Jeffries Obernolte
 Davids (KS) Johnson (GA) Ocasio-Cortez
 Davis (IL) Johnson (LA) Johnson (LA)
 Davis (NC) Johnson (SD) Johnson (SD)
 De La Cruz Jordan Omar
 Dean (PA) Joyce (OH) Owens
 DeGette Joyce (PA) Pallone
 DeLauro Kamlager-Dove Palmer
 DeBene Kean (NJ) Pascrell
 Deluzio Keating Pelosi
 DeSaulnier DesJarlais Kelly (IL)
 Diaz-Balart Kelly (MS) Peltola
 Dingell Kelly (PA) Pence
 Doggett Kennedy Perez
 Donalds Khanna Perry
 Duarte Kiggans (VA) Peters
 Duncan Kildee Pettersen
 Dunn (FL) Kiley Pfluger
 Edwards Kilmer Phillips
 Ellzey Kim (CA) Pingree
 Emmer Kim (NJ) Plaskett
 Escobar Kim (NJ) Pocan
 Eshoo Krishnamoorthi Porter
 Espaillet Kuster Posey
 Estes Kustoff Pressley
 Ezell LaHood Quigley
 Fallon LaLota Ramirez
 Feenstra LaMalfa Raskin
 Ferguson Lamborn Reschenthaler
 Finstad Langworthy Rodgers (WA)
 Fischbach Larsen (WA) Rogers (AL)
 Fitzgerald Larson (CT) Rogers (KY)
 Fitzpatrick Latta Rose
 Fletcher LaTurner Rosendale
 Flood Lawler Ross
 Foster Lee (CA) Rouzer
 Foushee Lee (FL) Roy
 Foyx Lee (NV) Ruiz
 Frankel, Lois Lee (PA) Ruppertsberger
 Franklin, Scott Letlow Rutherford
 Frost Levin Ryan
 Fry Lieu Salazar
 Fulcher Lofgren Sánchez
 Gaetz Lucas Sarbanes
 Garamendi Luetkemeyer Scanlon
 Garbarino Luna Schakowsky
 Garcia (IL) Luttrell Schiff
 Garcia (TX) Lynch Schneider
 Garcia, Mike Mace Scholten
 Garcia, Robert Malliotakis Schrier
 Gimenez Maloy Schweikert
 Golden (ME) Mann Scott (VA)
 Goldman (NY) Manning Scott, Austin
 Gomez Mast Self
 Gonzales, Tony Matsui Sessions
 Gonzalez, Vicente McBath Sewell
 Good (VA) McCaul Sherman
 Gooden (TX) McClain Sherrill
 Gosar McClellan Simpson
 Gottheimer Gosar Slotkin
 Granger McCormick Smith (MO)
 Graves (LA) McGovern Smith (NJ)
 Graves (MO) McHenry Smith (WA)
 Green (TN) Meeks Smucker
 Greene (GA) Menendez Sorensen
 Soto
 Spanberger

Spartz	Timmons	Waltz	Geatz	Latta	Rogers (KY)	Pressley	Scott, David	Tokuda
Stanton	Titus	Wasserman	Garbarino	LaTurner	Rose	Quigley	Sewell	Tonko
Stauber	Tlaib	Schultz	Garcia, Mike	Lawler	Rosendale	Ramirez	Sherman	Torres (CA)
Steel	Tokuda	Waters	Gimenez	Lee (FL)	Rouzer	Raskin	Slotkin	Torres (NY)
Stefanik	Tonko	Watson Coleman	Golden (ME)	Lesko	Roy	Ross	Smith (WA)	Trahan
Steil	Torres (CA)	Weber (TX)	Gonzales, Tony	Letlow	Rutherford	Ruiz	Soto	Trone
Steube	Torres (NY)	Webster (FL)	Good (VA)	Lofgren	Salazar	Ruppersberger	Spanberger	Underwood
Stevens	Trahan	Wenstrup	Gooden (TX)	Lucas	Schweikert	Ryan	Stevens	Vargas
Strickland	Trone	Westerman	Gosar	Luetkemeyer	Scott, Austin	Salinas	Strickland	Vasquez
Strong	Turner	Wexton	Granger	Luna	Self	Sánchez	Suoizzi	Wasserman
Suoizzi	Underwood	Wild	Graves (LA)	Luttrell	Sessions	Sarbanes	Swalwell	Wasserman
Swalwell	Valadao	Williams (GA)	Graves (MO)	Mace	Sherrill	Scanlon	Sykes	Schultz
Sykes	Van Drew	Williams (NY)	Green (TN)	Malliotakis	Simpson	Schakowsky	Takano	Waters
Takano	Van Duyne	Williams (TX)	Greene (GA)	Maloy	Smith (MO)	Schiff	Thanedar	Watson Coleman
Tenney	Van Orden	Wilson (FL)	Griffith	Mann	Smith (NE)	Schneider	Thompson (CA)	Wexton
Thanedar	Vargas	Wilson (SC)	Grothman	Mast	Smith (NJ)	Scholten	Thompson (MS)	Wild
Thompson (CA)	Vasquez	Wittman	Guest	McCauley	Smucker	Schrier	Titus	Williams (GA)
Thompson (MS)	Veasey	Womack	Guthrie	McClain	Sorensen	Scott (VA)	Tlaib	Wilson (FL)
Thompson (PA)	Wagner	Yakym	Hageman	McClintock	Spartz			
Tiffany	Walberg	Zinke	Harder (CA)	McCormick	Stanton			

NOT VOTING—25

Blumenauer	Grijalva	Nunn (IA)
Calvert	Hunt	Radewagen
Carl	Jackson Lee	Sablan
Costa	Landsman	Scalise
Craig	Loudermilk	Smith (NE)
Davidson	Magaziner	Stansbury
Evans	Massie	Velázquez
Gallego	Moore (WI)	
González-Colón	Murphy	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1726

So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 4, printed in part B of House Report 118-516, offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 225, noes 191, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 225]

AYES—225

Aderholt	Burchett	De La Cruz
Alford	Burgess	DesJarlais
Allen	Burlison	Diaz-Balart
Amodei	Calvert	Donalds
Armstrong	Cammack	Duarte
Arrington	Caraveo	Duncan
Babin	Carey	Dunn (FL)
Bacon	Carl	Edwards
Baird	Carter (GA)	Ellzey
Balderson	Carter (TX)	Emmer
Banks	Chavez-DeRemer	Estes
Barr	Ciscomani	Ezell
Bean (FL)	Cline	Fallon
Bentz	Cloud	Feenstra
Bergman	Clyde	Ferguson
Bice	Core	Finstad
Biggs	Collins	Fischbach
Bilirakis	Comer	Fitzgerald
Bishop (NC)	Craig	Fitzpatrick
Boebert	Crane	Fleischmann
Bost	Crawford	Flood
Brecheen	Crenshaw	Foxx
Buchanan	Curtis	Franklin, Scott
Bueshon	D'Esposito	Fry
Budzinski	Davidson	Fulcher

Harris	Hern	Higgins (LA)
Harshbarger	Hill	Hinson
Hern	Houchin	Hudson
Higgins (LA)	Houchin	Huizenga
Hill	Hudson	Issa
Hinson	Houchin	Jackson (TX)
Houchin	Hudson	James
Hudson	Huizenga	Johnson (LA)
Huizenga	Issa	Johnson (SD)
Issa	Jackson (TX)	Jordan
Jackson (TX)	James	Joyce (OH)
James	Johnson (LA)	Joyce (PA)
Johnson (LA)	Johnson (SD)	Kean (NJ)
Johnson (SD)	Jordan	Kelly (MS)
Jordan	Joyce (OH)	Kelly (PA)
Joyce (OH)	Joyce (PA)	Kiggans (VA)
Joyce (PA)	Kean (NJ)	Kiley
Kean (NJ)	Kelly (MS)	Kim (CA)
Kelly (MS)	Kelly (PA)	Kuster
Kelly (PA)	Kiggans (VA)	Kustoff
Kiley	Kim (CA)	LaHood
Kim (CA)	Kuster	LaLota
Kuster	Kustoff	LaMalfa
Kustoff	LaHood	Lamborn
LaHood	LaLota	Langworthy
LaLota	LaMalfa	
LaMalfa	Lamborn	
Lamborn	Langworthy	

NOES—191

Adams	DeLauro	Krishnamoorthi
Aguliar	DelBene	Larsen (WA)
Allred	Deluzio	Larson (CT)
Amo	DeSaulnier	Lee (CA)
Auchincloss	Dingell	Lee (NV)
Balint	Doggett	Lee (PA)
Barragán	Escobar	Leger Fernandez
Beatty	Eshoo	Levin
Bera	Españillat	Lieu
Beyer	Fletcher	Lynch
Bishop (GA)	Foster	Manning
Blunt Rochester	Foushee	Matsui
Bonamici	Frankel, Lois	McBath
Bowman	Frost	McClellan
Boyle (PA)	Garamendi	McCollum
Brown	Garcia (IL)	McGarvey
Brownley	Garcia (TX)	McGovern
Bush	Garcia, Robert	Meeks
Carbajal	Goldman (NY)	Menendez
Cárdenas	Gomez	Meng
Carson	Gonzalez, Vicente	Mfume
Carter (LA)	Gottheimer	Morelle
Cartwright	Green, Al (TX)	Moskowitz
Casar	Hayes	Moulton
Case	Himes	Mrvan
Casten	Horsford	Mullin
Castor (FL)	Houlahan	Nadler
Castro (TX)	Hoyer	Napolitano
Cherfilus-	Hoyle (OR)	Neal
McCormick	Huffman	Neguse
Chu	Ivey	Nickel
Clark (MA)	Jackson (IL)	Norcross
Clarke (NY)	Jackson (NC)	Norton
Cleaver	Jacobs	Ocasio-Cortez
Clyburn	Jayapal	Omar
Cohen	Jeffries	Pallone
Connolly	Johnson (GA)	Panetta
Correa	Kamllager-Dove	Pappas
Courtney	Keating	Pascrell
Crockett	Kelly (IL)	Pelosi
Crow	Kennedy	Peters
Cuellar	Khanna	Pettersen
Davids (KS)	Kildee	Phillips
Davis (IL)	Kilmer	Pingree
Davis (NC)	Kim (NJ)	Plaskett
Dean (PA)		Pocan
DeGette		Porter

NOT VOTING—20

Blumenauer	Jackson Lee	Nunn (IA)
Costa	Landsman	Radewagen
Evans	Loudermilk	Sablan
Gallego	Magaziner	Scalise
González-Colón	Massie	Stansbury
Grijalva	Moore (WI)	Velázquez
Hunt	Murphy	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1730

So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendment, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BICE) having assumed the chair, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4763) to provide for a system of regulation of digital assets by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 1243, she reported the bill back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any further amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 279, noes 136, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 226]

AYES—279

Aderholt
 Aguiar
 Alford
 Allen
 Allred
 Amodi
 Armstrong
 Arrington
 Auchincloss
 Babin
 Bacon
 Baird
 Balderson
 Banks
 Barr
 Bean (FL)
 Bentz
 Bera
 Bergman
 Beyer
 Bice
 Billirakis
 Bishop (NC)
 Boebert
 Bost
 Boyle (PA)
 Brecheen
 Buchanan
 Bucshon
 Budzinski
 Burchett
 Burgess
 Burlison
 Calvert
 Cammack
 Caraveo
 Carey
 Carl
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Chavez-DeRemer
 Ciscomani
 Clark (MA)
 Cline
 Cloud
 Clyde
 Cole
 Collins
 Comer
 Costa
 Craig
 Crane
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Crockett
 Cuellar
 Curtis
 D'Esposito
 Davidson
 Davis (NC)
 De La Cruz
 DelBene
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Donalds
 Duarte
 Duncan
 Dunn (FL)
 Edwards
 Ellzey
 Emmer
 Eshoo
 Estes
 Ezell
 Fallon
 Feenstra
 Ferguson
 Finstad
 Fischbach
 Fitzgerald
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Flood
 Foxx
 Franklin, Scott
 Fry
 Fulcher
 Gaetz
 Gallego
 Garbarino
 Garcia, Mike
 Garcia, Robert
 Gimenez
 Goldman (NY)

Gomez
 Gonzales, Tony
 Gonzalez, Vicente
 Good (VA)
 Gooden (TX)
 Gosar
 Gottheimer
 Granger
 Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO)
 Green (TN)
 Greene (GA)
 Griffith
 Grothman
 Guest
 Guthrie
 Hageman
 Harder (CA)
 Harris
 Harshbarger
 Hern
 Higgins (LA)
 Hill
 Himes
 Hinson
 Horsford
 Houchin
 Houlihan
 Hudson
 Huizenga
 Issa
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson (NC)
 Jackson (TX)
 James
 Johnson (LA)
 Johnson (SD)
 Jordan
 Joyce (OH)
 Joyce (PA)
 Kamlager-Dove
 Kean (NJ)
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)
 Kennedy
 Khanna
 Kiggans (VA)
 Kiley
 Kim (CA)
 Kim (NJ)
 Krishnamoorthi
 Kuster
 Kustoff
 LaHood
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Langworthy
 Latta
 LaTurner
 Lawler
 Lee (FL)
 Lee (NV)
 Lesko
 Letlow
 Levin
 Lieu
 Lofgren
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Luna
 Luttrell
 Mace
 Malliotakis
 Maloy
 Mann
 Mast
 Van Orden
 McBath
 McCaul
 McClain
 McClintock
 McCormick
 McHenry
 Menendez
 Meuser
 Miller (IL)
 Miller (OH)
 Miller (WV)
 Miller-Meeks
 Mills
 Molinaro
 Moolenaar
 Mooney
 Moore (AL)

Moore (UT)
 Moran
 Moskowitz
 Moulton
 Mullin
 Nehls
 Newhouse
 Nickel
 Norman
 Obernolte
 Ogles
 Owens
 Palmer
 Panetta
 Pelosi
 Peltola
 Pence
 Perry
 Peters
 Pettersen
 Pfluger
 Phillips
 Posey
 Quigley
 Reschenthaler
 Rodgers (WA)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rose
 Rouzer
 Roy
 Rutherford
 Ryan
 Salazar
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Scholten
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Self
 Sessions
 Sherrill
 Simpson
 Slotkin
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smucker
 Sorensen
 Soto
 Spanberger
 Spartz
 Stanton
 Stauber
 Steel
 Stefanik
 Steil
 Steube
 Stevens
 Strickland
 Strong
 Suozzi
 Swalwell
 Tenney
 Thaneadar
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (PA)
 Tiffany
 Timmons
 Titus
 Torres (NY)
 Turner
 Valadao
 Van Drew
 Van Duyne
 Veasey
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Waltz
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Wild
 Williams (NY)
 Williams (TX)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Yakym
 Zinke

NOES—136

Adams
 Amo
 Balint
 Barragan
 Beatty
 Biggs
 Bishop (GA)
 Blunt Rochester
 Bonamici
 Bowman
 Brown
 Brownley
 Bush
 Carabajal
 Cardenas
 Carson
 Carter (LA)
 Cartwright
 Casar
 Case
 Casten
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Cherfilus-McCormick
 Chu
 Clarke (NY)
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly
 Correa
 Courtney
 Crow
 Davids (KS)
 Davis (IL)
 Dean (PA)
 DeGette
 DeLauro
 Deluzio
 DeSaulnier
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Escobar
 Espallat
 Fletcher

Foster
 Foushee
 Frankel, Lois
 Frost
 Garamendi
 Garcia (IL)
 Garcia (TX)
 Golden (ME)
 Green, Al (TX)
 Hayes
 Hoyer
 Hoyle (OR)
 Huffman
 Ivey
 Jacobs
 Jayapal
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 LaLota
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lee (CA)
 Lee (PA)
 Leger Fernandez
 Lynch
 Manning
 Matsui
 McClellan
 McCollum
 McGarvey
 McGovern
 Meeke
 Meng
 Mfume
 Morelle
 Mrvan
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Neguse
 Norcross

Ocasio-Cortez
 Omar
 Pallone
 Pappas
 Pascrell
 Perez
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Porter
 Pressley
 Ramirez
 Raskin
 Rosendale
 Ross
 Ruiz
 Ruppersberger
 Salinas
 Sanchez
 Sarbanes
 Scanlon
 Schakowsky
 Schrier
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Sewell
 Sherman
 Smith (WA)
 Sykes
 Takano
 Thompson (MS)
 Tlaib
 Tokuda
 Tonko
 Torres (CA)
 Trahan
 Trone
 Underwood
 Vargas
 Vasquez
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson Coleman
 Weston
 Williams (GA)
 Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—15

Blumenauer
 Evans
 Grijalva
 Hunt
 Jackson Lee
 Landsman
 Loudermilk
 Magaziner
 Massie
 Moore (WI)
 Murphy
 Nunn (IA)
 Scalise
 Stansbury
 Velazquez

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1738

So the bill was passed.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, had I been present for the vote today on Roll Call No. 221, Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 1243, I would have voted NAY.

Had I been present for the vote on Roll Call No. 222, H. Res. 1243, I would have voted "no."

Had I been present for the vote on Roll Call No. 223, Casar Amendment No. 1, I would have voted "aye."

Had I been present for the vote on Roll Call No. 224, Norman Amendment No. 3, I would have voted "aye."

Had I been present for the vote on Roll Call No. 225, Perry Amendment No. 4, I would have voted "no."

Had I been present for the vote on Roll Call No. 226, H.R. 4763, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LANDSMAN. Madam Speaker, for personal reasons, I was unable to make votes. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 221, NAY on Roll Call No.

222, YEA on Roll Call No. 223, YEA on Roll Call No. 224, NAY on Roll Call No. 225, and YEA on Roll Call No. 226.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NUNN of Iowa. Madam Speaker, due to a natural disaster event in my district, I made an emergency trip back to Iowa to provide assistance to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 223, Casar Amendment No. 1 to H.R. 4763, YEA on Roll Call No. 224, Norman Amendment No. 3 to H.R. 4763, YEA on Roll Call No. 225, Perry Amendment No. 4 to H.R. 4763, and YEA on Roll Call No. 226, H.R. 4763.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SELF). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

HONORING THE LIFE OF TIFFANY FERDON

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor the life of a dedicated first responder from Okanogan, Washington, Tiffany Ferdon, who we tragically lost last month.

Tiffany was a volunteer firefighter, an EMT for the Tonasket Fire Department and Aeneas Valley Fire Department, as well as a member of the Samaritan Riders, a group of motorcycle enthusiasts who serve the medically challenged and socially disadvantaged children throughout our region. Her passion was making the world a better place, a quality which was clear in the work that she did.

Tiffany's death is a loss for the whole community, but her legacy will never be forgotten. May her family and community continue to be blessed with her memory, and may she rest in peace.

HONORING ROBERT L. FERRIS, JR.

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

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, with the American flag hanging, a white hearse traveled down the highway, returning the remains of Staff Sergeant Robert L. Ferris, Jr., home.

More than 80 years after his bomber crashed, Sergeant Ferris joined his family, and he was finally laid to rest.

He was a young gunner, 20 years old, during World War II when his B-17 was shot down.

This past week he was transported from Raleigh-Durham International Airport to New Bern, a journey that took him through Wilson.

Our local fire department and others came to show respect and pay special tribute to this incredible hero.

There are thousands of stories like Sergeant Ferris'. As we approach Memorial Day, let us honor our fallen soldiers, POWs, MIAs, and those killed in action.

BIDEN BORDER CRISIS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Biden border crisis rages on, and American families are affected, including in their pocketbooks.

At the start of 2023, the cost of illegal aliens crossing with Biden was over \$150 billion. The burden of illegal aliens costs each American taxpayer nearly \$1,200 annually.

Corrupt Judge Merchan continues promoting the reelection of Donald Trump by relentlessly being bigoted and objectionable, earning an invitation as my guest to the Trump inauguration. The invitation was hand-delivered to New York to Merchan's office Monday by South Carolina Attorney General Alan Wilson.

The shameful bias and bigotry of Judge Merchan has been exposed this week by esteemed Harvard law professor Alan Dershowitz as "unethical, unlawful, and petty."

In conclusion, God bless our troops who successfully protected America for 20 years as the global war on terrorism moves from the Afghanistan safe haven to America. We do not need new border laws. We need to enforce the existing laws. Biden shamefully opens borders for dictators, as more 9/11 attacks across America are imminent, as repeatedly warned by the FBI.

NEW HAVEN PIZZA

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a specially crafted food that draws people from across the country to my hometown of New Haven, Connecticut. It is called pizza—after the original way "la pizza" was pronounced in southern Italy.

For more than a century, New Haven has been home to some of the most famous pizzerias in the country, known for everything from a plain sauce to white clam to mashed potato. I proudly rise today to claim New Haven as the pizza capital of the United States.

While there are other States that have their own pizza traditions, Connecticut has the most pizzerias of any State per capita and the most family-owned pizzerias of any State in the country.

There is something special about New Haven pizza. Some say it is coal

fire, some say brick ovens, some say it is char, some say it is the water used to make the dough. Personally, I believe it is the generation after generation of dedication to the craft.

Historic pizzerias in the New Haven area that continue this legacy include: Frank Pepe Pizzeria Napoletana, Modern Apizza, Zuppardi's Apizza, Sally's Apizza, Ernie's Apizza, Yorkside, BAR, Grand Apizza, and Zeneli Pizza, and Abate's Apizza just to name a few. They have helped to establish a uniquely American culinary and cultural experience, making New Haven one of the most respected and recognized pizza destinations in the country.

New Haven pizza is more than just a delicious meal—it is a part of who we are as New Haveners and Nutmeggers. Earlier today, I joined Connecticut pizza makers, legislators, veterans, and community leaders to celebrate New Haven and recognize it as the pizza capital of the United States.

RECOGNIZING FREDERICA ACADEMY GIRLS' SOCCER TEAM

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the achievement of the girls soccer team at Frederica Academy with their back-to-back State title wins.

The team defended their State title with a final score of 1-0 against the Westminster Schools of Augusta. The goal was scored by freshman Sophia Gregg who outmaneuvered her defenders in the first half of the game. Gregg's goal was made possible by an assist from Mary Ford Fitzjurls.

Frederica's strong defense was also able to hold off every shot attempt made at their goal. This allowed them to go undefeated in the Georgia Independent Athletic Association AAA District 2 Region, making them the number one ranked team in the region.

Congratulations to the young women of the Frederica Academy soccer team. I know I speak for the whole First District when I say we are very proud of you.

PROJECT DIAMOND

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

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight an extraordinary initiative in the heart of Michigan's 11th district, Project DIAMOND, a groundbreaking program spearheaded by Troy's Automation Alley and the Oakland County Economic Development Office.

This project encapsulates not just the spirit of innovation but also the determination of our local communities and our industrious small to mid-sized manufacturers.

Project DIAMOND is revolutionizing additive manufacturing with 3D printing, positioning Michigan as a global leader and delivering 250 3D printers to empower manufacturers in the automotive, aerospace, and defense sectors.

This technology allows rapid prototyping, reduces lead times, and integrates seamlessly into existing supply chains, advancing our national manufacturing agenda.

Mr. Speaker, as we look to future-proof our industries, let us support and expand initiatives like Project DIAMOND.

CONGRATULATING ST. XAVIER HIGH SCHOOL SWIMMING AND DIVING TEAM

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the incredible success of the St. Xavier High School swimming and diving team and to congratulate them on winning their 44th State championship. The dedication and hard work of these talented athletes is second to none, as they have claimed 24 of the last 26 State championships, 4 of the last 5, and 44 out of the last 54.

The St. Xavier High School swimming and diving team, the Bombers, or Aqua Bombers as they are also known, won their most recent championship with a score of 302 points, beating out the runners-up by 73 points.

The Bombers were led by Ohio Second District native Max Ward, who brought home first place finishes in the 100-meter butterfly and the 200-meter freestyle.

As a member of the St. Xavier "Long Blue Line" and a swimmer alum, I want to congratulate the talented swimmers, divers, and coaches on this incredible feat.

If they made it look easy, it was because it wasn't. Go Bombers.

THE INSPIRING STORY OF ANTRONE WILLIAMS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the inspiring story of Antrone "Juice" Williams, a remarkable individual from Lucas County, Ohio.

I had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Williams 2 years ago, and since then, his journey has been nothing short of extraordinary.

Antrone is not just a dedicated athlete with the Special Olympics Lucas County Lightning, but also a relentless advocate for his community.

As the former president of the Central Resident Advisory Board, he tirelessly represented over 11,000 residents in Lucas Metropolitan Housing.

His entrepreneurial spirit led him to Ivy Entrepreneurs business school where he rose to new heights, becoming the CEO and founder of the H.O.W. Inc. Foundation, Helping Others Win.

Antrone's achievements are vast, but perhaps most notable is his pioneering accomplishment as the first physically challenged man to become an independent provider.

Antrone's story is a beacon of hope for those living with physical challenges. His story is a powerful reminder that our circumstances do not define us, our spirit and determination do. To Antrone I say: Onward. We are so proud of you.

REMEMBERING MARK WOODS

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

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of a true American hero, Mark Woods, who dedicated his life to public service in the military, in law enforcement, and in his local community.

A two-term U.S. Army combat veteran and a retired NYPD detective who served on the Joint Terrorism Task Force, Mark lived a life of service from the start.

His passion for supporting fellow veterans through his role as director of the Joseph P. Dwyer peer-to-peer veteran service program at BRIDGES and as a veteran service officer in Rockland County was revered by all in our region.

Mark was rightly recognized as Rockland County's 2024 Veteran of the Year thanks to his unparalleled efforts advocating for veterans and getting them the support and services they need and deserve.

Beyond his work for the veteran community, Mark was a councilman in the town of Clarkstown and a dedicated family man. We extend our deepest sympathies to his family, especially his wife, Jeanne, his son and daughter, who should know that Mark's legacy will continue to inspire and guide all of us.

On a more personal note, Mark was great friend, who I was honored to swear in as councilman in January, and I will miss him dearly. He was a humble and decent man whose work was rooted in service to the people of Rockland County.

May God rest his soul on behalf of a grateful Nation.

PAY THEM BACK

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

Ms. SALINAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the daughter of a Vietnam veteran and the Representative for Oregon's Sixth District, home to nearly 40,000 veterans.

These brave Oregonians served our country, and now I have the great honor of serving them in Congress. They are hardworking people, some of whom carry with them scars both visible and invisible of their service.

Returning to civilian life can be challenging. Mental health problems are all too common, and many veterans struggle to find stable jobs in housing. They put country first and their own comfort second.

As Members of Congress, the least we can do is to show them we care.

That is why I was shocked to see House Republicans proposing \$30 billion in cuts to SNAP in their farm bill proposal.

Cutting SNAP was never on the table for Democrats, yet my Republican colleagues have chosen to move forward with this reckless plan and take away up to 2 days' worth of food every month from hungry veterans, kids, and seniors.

Why must my Republican colleagues deprive veterans of food when they fall on hard times? Why the unnecessary cruelty?

Instead, we need to protect SNAP and ensure that those who have sacrificed so much for our freedom will have healthy, nutritious food on the table. It is our job—no, our duty and responsibility to pay them back.

RECOGNIZING ROY SPRINGFIELD

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

Mrs. SPARTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sergeant Roy Springfield of Anderson, Indiana, who served in the U.S. Army for 3 years as a member of the elite Special Forces. Roy enlisted in the Army in 1961, where he completed his tour of duty in Vietnam and Laos.

While evacuating a Special Forces base in Laos under intense enemy attack, Sergeant Springfield managed to grab an American flag and keep it from falling into enemy hands. He has retained and treasured this flag for more than six decades.

After his time in the Army, Roy went on to serve his community for 27 years as a police officer with the Anderson Police Department. In 1973, he also started the Police Athletic League in Anderson for disadvantaged youth.

In recognition of his brave service to our Nation, it was my honor to present Sergeant Roy Springfield with a National Defense Service Medal and the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal on January 26, 2024. I am extremely grateful for Roy's bravery and am humbled to express our appreciation on behalf of the American people in Indiana's Fifth Congressional District.

□ 1800

SNAP BENEFITS ARE NEEDED BY 42 MILLION AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. HAYES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to submit extraneous material in the RECORD on the topic of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues who have joined me for this extremely special SNAP Special Order hour.

Hunger continues to be a pervasive issue in America. According to the USDA, in 2023, over 42 million people rely on the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, also known as SNAP, and 41 percent of those households have children.

SNAP benefits are modest, averaging only about \$6.20 per person per day or about \$2 per person per meal.

The benefits of SNAP are highly targeted to focus on those with the greatest needs. Ninety-two percent of SNAP benefits go to households with income below the poverty line and 54 percent go to households at or below half of the poverty line.

Additionally, every dollar spent on SNAP benefits generates as much as \$1.54 to the local economy. House Republicans are putting forward a farm bill which would end the USDA's authority to increase the Thrifty Food Plan. The Thrifty Food Plan is used to determine the amount of benefits a SNAP recipient receives.

USDA calculates the Thrifty Food Plan using a mathematical model based on the cost of food, the nutrients in the food, nutrition guidance, and what Americans are actually eating. The Thrifty Food Plan goes further than a simple adjustment for inflation to better ensure that people have access to food.

The 2018 bipartisan farm bill directed USDA to regularly reevaluate the Thrifty Food Plan and SNAP benefit adjustments as food prices, dietary guidance, and other scientific standards shifted over time. The farm bill put forth by House Republicans will result in roughly \$30 billion in benefit cuts, according to the Congressional Budget Office. That would impact every SNAP household in future years, including children, older adults, and people with disabilities.

It would mean that the cost of the Thrifty Food Plan would be frozen no matter what the science says about the cost of a healthy, normal diet.

In the last 50 years, the Thrifty Food Plan has only been updated three times: in 1983, 1989, and 2006, but these updates did not increase SNAP benefits.

As a result of the 2021 update, the benefit amounts were increased and the purchasing power of the plan to 21 percent. This led to a \$1.40 per person per day increase in SNAP's average benefits, or about 70 cents per meal.

This is not a lot of money to begin with; however, this update lifted over 2 million SNAP participants out of poverty or above the poverty line, including over 1 million children.

According to the Urban Institute, the 2021 Thrifty Food Plan reduced poverty for Black and Hispanic people, suggesting that reevaluation was addressing longstanding systemic racial issues. Additionally, a 2023 Data for Progress poll found that 66 percent have a favorable view of SNAP, including 83 percent of Democrats, 62 percent of Independents, and 52 percent of Republicans. All Americans benefit from this anti-hunger program. A majority of Americans support increasing funding for SNAP, not cutting it.

The total cut to SNAP and related nutrition programs under the House Republican proposal is roughly \$30 billion. The average per person SNAP benefit would be roughly \$7 less per month between 2027 and 2031 and jump to \$15 less per month in 2032 and 2033.

According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, this cut would affect nearly 6 million older adults, 4 million people with disabilities, and nearly 17 million children, including 5 million children under the age of 5.

Hunger is a policy choice and SNAP is our most effective anti-hunger program, and we must protect the Thrifty Food Plan in the farm bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD four letters in opposition to the House Republican farm bill from the American Federation of Teachers, the National Education Association, AFL-CIO, and ASFCME. All letters disapprove of the nearly \$30 billion cut to SNAP.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS,
May 22, 2024.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.7 million members of the AFT, I write in opposition to the Farm, Food, and National Security Act of 2024 (Farm Bill).

Simply put, this bill will only increase hunger and food insecurity for many Americans by cutting \$30 billion in Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits over 10 years. This will have a devastating effect on the children, families, older Americans, college students and individuals with disabilities who rely on the program. SNAP is the nutritional safety net that families and individuals depend on to thrive. The AFT represents school food service workers and educators who know firsthand that SNAP is the guardrail, along with school meals, that ensures our most vulnerable students are receiving the food assistance needed to learn and excel in school. This proposal will be the largest cut to SNAP in 30 years. According to the Center

on Budget and Policy Priorities, the Summer EBT (electronic benefit transfer) program, which provides families with school-age children a grocery benefit over the summer when students cannot receive their school meals, will also receive a cut of \$500 million in this bill.

SNAP benefits are already limited, with the average benefit totaling approximately \$6.20 per person, per day. And this is after the 2021 re-evaluation (the first adjustment in nearly 50 years), which provided SNAP recipients with an additional \$1.40 per person, per day. According to the Urban Institute, this increase helped reduce poverty by 4.7 percent, impacting approximately 2.3 million Americans. Yet, in addition to the cuts, this is the adjustment the House Farm Bill wants to prevent from occurring again.

The Farm Bill is also proposing to eliminate the federal protections for merit staffing and privatize the workforce that conducts the essential work for the SNAP program. Merit staff are government workers who ensure the program is working effectively with transparency by providing eligibility screenings, application assistance and verification guidance. As a union of public employees, including those who process SNAP applications, the AFF opposes the proposal to outsource jobs and strip merit staffing that has protected public investment for more than 75 years. Not only will this eliminate public accountability for public investment, but it will also set the precedent to remove the merit staffing provisions in other critical federal programs.

Although the Farm Bill includes programs for rural communities that have bipartisan support, the funding for those programs is paid for with funding taken from SNAP. If a child is hungry, any positive gains of having additional funding for schools, broadband and other services in rural communities are nullified. This is not a time to borrow from Peter to pay Paul.

Many individuals and families are struggling to buy sufficient, healthy meals. Instead of focusing on real bipartisan solutions for families, children, workers and rural communities, the House Farm Bill is attempting to roll back nutrition and labor protections. I urge you to oppose the Farm, Food, and National Security Act of 2024 in committee.

Sincerely,

RANDI WEINGARTEN,
President, AFT.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, May 20, 2024.
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 3 million members of the National Education Association, who teach and support nearly 50 million students in public schools across America, we urge you to vote NO on the Farm, Food, and National Security Act 2024, the reauthorization legislation for the farm bill. Votes related to this issue may be included in the NEA Report Card for the 118th Congress.

We oppose the bill because of proposed changes to the Thrifty Food Plan (TFP)—that will weaken the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) and erode benefits for participants.

NEA members are teachers and education support professionals in 14,000 communities throughout urban, suburban, and rural America. These educators know firsthand that hungry students cannot focus on learning. We urge you to strengthen SNAP so that it will improve low-income families' health and well-being and help prepare students for learning.

Approximately two-thirds of SNAP households include a child, an older person, or an individual with a disability, according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (CBPP). Many working-age SNAP recipients hold multiple low-paying jobs with unreliable hours and paltry benefits, or no benefits at all. For them, any unexpected expense, health crisis, or other emergency could mean choosing between buying groceries and paying a bill. Among these recipients are approximately 10 percent of education support professionals and approximately 16 percent of school food service professionals—workers who are dedicated to nurturing students and providing them with healthy meals, but struggle to feed their own families. Like these hardworking education support professionals, 70 percent of adult SNAP recipients hold at least one job, according to a Government Accountability Office report.

Because SNAP is the first line of defense against childhood hunger, the NEA strongly opposes the bill's proposal to cut the program by approximately \$30 billion over 10 years, through limiting the U.S. Department of Agriculture's authority to adjust the TFP. This proposal—which would impact as many as 17 million children in a typical month, according to the CBPP—would undercut the TFP's ability to accurately reflect the cost of a healthy diet, eroding benefits and narrowing families' access to fresh fruits and vegetables amid rising prices.

This change would further impact programs that are tied to the Thrifty Food Plan. NEA is particularly concerned about the impact on the new Summer EBT Program, which provides grocery benefits to children in low-income families during the summer when schools are closed. The summer program would be cut by more than \$500 million over the 2027–2033 period due to the TFP change, the CBPP estimates.

While the bill contains some provisions that NEA supports, such as lifting the drug felony ban, improvements to the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations, and extending the Secure Rural Schools program, these are insufficient to make up for such a large and long-term cut to SNAP.

Instead of undermining SNAP, we ask you to be guided by NEA's priorities for reauthorization, which include strengthening the program by removing the shelter deduction cap and time limits on eligibility, enacting a standard deduction for medical expenses, and aligning SNAP's eligibility standards with the Affordable Care Act to allow lawfully present immigrants and permanent residents to participate in SNAP.

NEA also supports efforts to ensure that the work to cultivate, process, and secure the food supply chain is respected. NEA seeks a farm bill that ensures workers are paid a living wage, employers maintain safe working conditions, and employers support workers' right to organize in order to have a say in the conditions of their employment. This bill ignores these needs. In fact, the bill undermines labor. NEA further opposes the bill's privatization provision because it would permit the outsourcing of SNAP eligibility determinations, affecting the merit staff employees who administer SNAP.

SNAP is our nation's largest anti-hunger program. For many families, it means the difference between eating and going without. All students deserve important nutritional support to learn. Robust SNAP benefits not only provide struggling families with a crucial safety net; they are also instrumental in creating the conditions for academic engagement and achievement.

We must urge you to vote NO on the Farm, Food, and National Security Act 2024 as currently written. We also ask that you support amendments that would strengthen the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and

oppose all amendments that would weaken the program.

Sincerely,

MARC EGAN,
*Director of Government Relations,
National Education Association.*

AFL-CIO
May 20, 2024.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 12.5 million workers and 60 affiliate unions represented by the AFL-CIO, I urge you to oppose the Farm, Food, and National Security Act of 2024 when it comes to a vote in the House Agriculture Committee, and to reject any amendments that further harm our nation's food programs.

This partisan bill proposes changes to the Thrifty Food Program, resulting in close to \$30 billion in cuts to SNAP and other food benefits over the next decade, worsening food insecurity and hunger for over 42 million Americans. According to the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, these cuts will affect 17 million children, 5 million children under age five, 6 million seniors, and 4 million people with disabilities. Among other things, according to this analysis, the bill will result in \$500 million less funding for the Summer EBT program, depriving families of food benefits during the summer recess when school lunches are unavailable. Enacting this bill without dramatic changes would push more people below the poverty line and increase child hunger.

Additionally, we strongly oppose provisions like those in H.R. 5094, which strip the USDA of its oversight authority and eliminate federal protections for merit staffing within SNAP, potentially setting a dangerous precedent for other federal programs. Merit staff are essential for conducting SNAP eligibility screenings and maintaining program integrity. Privatization, as evident in failed experiments in Texas and Indiana, wastes taxpayer dollars and harms program beneficiaries.

Our unions represent workers across the entire food supply chain—from meat-cutting floors and school cafeterias to grocery store checkouts and agricultural fields. These workers are essential to our economy and community well-being. It is imperative that the Farm Bill supports good jobs and includes the voices of food workers in agricultural policy decisions.

We urge Congress to back agricultural policies that foster well-paying jobs, including the bipartisan Senate Farm Bill, the Rural Prosperity and Food Security Act of 2024, which seeks to protect and expand SNAP benefits, improving access for marginalized groups and offering a more effective approach to combating hunger and supporting workers.

Food safety, nutrition, and agricultural policies are vital to all Americans, especially our union members. We urge you to vote against this partisan Farm Bill and any further damaging amendments, and instead, work towards a more inclusive and effective solution.

Sincerely,

JODY CALEMINE,
Director, Government Affairs.

AFSCME,
May 21, 2024.

Hon. GLENN "GT" THOMPSON,
Chair

Hon. DAVID SCOTT,
Ranking Member,

Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIR THOMPSON AND RANKING MEMBER SCOTT: On behalf of the 1.4 million members of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees

(AFSCME), we strongly oppose the Farm, Food, and National Security Act of 2024 pending before the committee because it would deeply cut future SNAP benefits by nearly \$30 billion over the next decade, take away good union jobs and harm program integrity.

Tens of thousands of AFSCME members under merit-based personnel systems are proud to administer SNAP benefits because SNAP is the cornerstone of the nation's nutrition and food security safety net, helping to put food on the table for 41.2 million low-income participants each month. Cuts to SNAP would harm families, young children, college students, seniors, veterans, active-duty military families and people with disabilities in all U.S. states and territories. SNAP is a lifeline for low-wage workers, child care providers and school employees, including school food service workers and classroom assistants.

AFSCME strongly opposes Sections 4105 and 4111, and any other SNAP provisions which undermine, erode or eliminate the current federal requirements for SNAP to be administered by workers under a merit-based personnel system.

Merit-based personnel systems at the federal, state and local levels require hiring, advancement, demotion and discipline be based on merit and competence.

Federal law requires that merit staff public employees conduct the essential work of SNAP to screen for eligibility and determine benefit levels, including providing application assistance, answering client questions about missing information, pursuing missing information, providing verification guidance and to thoroughly explore and certify whether an individual meets the state's criteria for participation in Employment and Training (E&T).

Merit staffing ensures that all important SNAP determinations are unbiased, high quality, free from political influence and without fear of arbitrary management action or retaliation.

Merit staffing protects program integrity and ensures that SNAP beneficiaries receive the help they need from a professional workforce, that recipient data remains private, and determinations are based on qualifications rather than profit or other motives.

Section 4111 is based upon H.R. 5094, which we oppose, and despite its misleading title, this provision would not provide "flexibility" but would dismantle longstanding federal merit-staffing requirements that protect program integrity. States and counties currently have significant flexibility to administer SNAP. Experiments with the outsourcing of merit-staffed work in Texas and Indiana, in particular, have proven to be a waste of taxpayer dollars and a programmatic nightmare, as well as a drain on good, local jobs that pay better than private for-profit companies who rarely provide essential benefits, including health care and retirement.

Outsourcing has resulted in none of the promises of improved performance, efficiency or cost savings. In fact, it has harmed struggling families, seniors and the disabled, and compromised the integrity of the program itself.

Section 4105 is an additional attack on merit staffing, unwarranted by current merit staff performance, and inefficient. This provision would allow a state to hire for profit contractors to screen SNAP beneficiaries for E&T referral after merit staff have already reviewed an applicant for benefit determination. Merit staff responsibilities are designed to be "one stop," designating one staff point of contact to screen and refer potential beneficiaries to needed programs. Dividing screening and referral responsibilities cre-

ates duplicative work for the multiple screeners and additional points of contact and likely duplicative document submissions for people in need of assistance who are already navigating a complex system. This duplication would likely delay referrals for employment and training, create needless backlogs, and compromise the quality of services.

Both proposed privatization provisions (Sections 4105 and 4111) do not allow the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) to stop states from privatizing important work, nor would USDA have authority to oversee the actions of for-profit contractors. This lack of oversight and accountability would threaten access to essential SNAP benefits as a direct result of the actions of private companies whose past performance has been proven to result in increased backlogs, costs and error rates. Furthermore, the reference to collective bargaining agreements (CBAs) in Section 4111 is misleading and ineffective, providing no real protection to union workforces, and absolutely no protection to workers in states where there are no public sector CBAs.

AFSCME is relying on you to vote "no" on this partisan farm bill and any harmful amendments that compromise the SNAP program. We are counting on you to protect SNAP from deep benefit cuts and maintain current SNAP public sector merit-staffed employment requirements, which allow the program to continue to serve our nation's most vulnerable individuals and families.

Sincerely,

EDWIN S. JAYNE,
Director of Federal Government Affairs.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative HAYES for organizing this Special Order hour on SNAP.

Today, I rise because tomorrow the House Agriculture Committee will vote on the GOP's partisan farm bill. If passed, it will force severe cuts to the SNAP program that would risk benefits for years to come.

SNAP, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, formerly known as the Food Stamp program, is a vital resource to families and individuals who have fallen on hard times. In Ohio's 11th Congressional District, almost one in four households rely on SNAP benefits to put food on the table.

These are our friends, our family, neighbors, and my constituents. It shouldn't be controversial to want members of your community fed.

On the House Agriculture Committee, I am committed to making that known, but this farm bill will see the largest cut to SNAP benefits in over 30 years, taking nearly \$30 billion in food out of the mouths of people who really need it.

Being poor isn't a condemnation of morals, but Republicans have shown they want to treat it that way, which is why I urge my Republican colleagues to reconsider their extreme proposal and to join Democrats as we continue to put people over politics.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. WILD).

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the gentlewoman from Connecticut for convening us this evening

to discuss an issue that affects every corner of our Nation: food insecurity.

In blue, red, and purple districts alike, too many families struggle to afford the food that they need to keep themselves and their families healthy and fed. Throughout my time in Congress, I have used my voice and my vote to support nutrition programs because I am determined to ensure that in our Nation, the richest in the history of the world, no one goes hungry.

As part of this effort, I have prioritized key nutrition programs. In 2018, my very first vote was to reauthorize the farm bill, which funds many critical nutrition assistance programs that people in our community rely on. These programs include the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, known as SNAP; Meals on Wheels; The Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children; nutrition assistance, school breakfast programs, and summer meal programs.

Now, extreme Members of the House have put forward a farm bill that includes devastating cuts for SNAP participants that so many in our community rely on to feed their families. Their proposed bill would cut nearly \$30 billion in SNAP benefits that families rely on to put food on the table every night.

In 2023, one in eight households, roughly 44.2 million Americans, experienced food insecurity or lack of access to an affordable, nutritious diet. In my district, Pennsylvania's Seventh, the Greater Lehigh Valley area, nearly 40,000 households, or 13 percent of the households in our community, rely on SNAP to feed themselves and their families.

In the richest Nation in the world, no one should go to bed hungry because they can't afford to eat, and no one should have to worry about having enough food for their kids because politicians decided to play games with the necessary benefits that they rely on every single day.

This is a moral imperative of the highest priority. Children's physical and cognitive development depends on proper nutrition. Quite simply, adequate food sets them up for success in school and throughout life.

We cannot, we must not abandon families in our communities that struggle with food insecurity. This should not be a partisan issue and it is deeply disappointing to me that Members on the other side of the aisle would put forth a bill that so severely cuts SNAP benefits.

I will always stand up to efforts to strip benefits away from the most vulnerable members of our society, children. I hope to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle on a bipartisan path forward that protects critical nutrition programs, including SNAP, in the upcoming farm bill reauthorization.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. WILD for those powerful words.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my colleague, Congresswoman HAYES, for bringing us together today to talk about something so important.

We do live in the richest country in the world at the richest moment in history, and the very idea that we would tolerate and even think about adding to hunger in America is beyond belief.

It is a moral issue, but how could we even think about cutting the opportunity for our children, for our families, for older Americans, for people with disabilities, for people who simply can't afford to put food on the table. This is not because we have a shortage of the food that is available. It is not because there is not the funding to make sure that we take care of those in need.

This is the beginning, pretty soon, of the hunger season because many schools that have provided school lunch programs and school breakfast programs may not be available in the summer months, and yet these children and families need to eat.

How can anyone think about cutting the SNAP program, 60 million people in the United States, half of whom are children? No. It is just not tolerable.

I beg that we are going to make sure that everyone in the United States of America who is hungry will have food on the table.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. VARGAS).

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut for bringing us together tonight to defend the SNAP program.

In America, no child should go to bed hungry. No family should have to worry about where their next meal is coming from. SNAP is the most important and effective tool we have to stave off hunger in our country. It is our first line of defense, and yet House Republicans have proposed the largest cut to the program in decades. This is cruel, plain and simple.

These proposed cuts stand to harm more than 40,000 families in my district in California and over 40 million families nationwide who benefit from this program. Almost 80 percent of the people who benefit from SNAP are children, seniors, people with disabilities, and veterans.

SNAP also boosts our local economies. Every dollar spent on SNAP benefits generates roughly \$1.50 in economic activity. For too many people in our country, making ends meet is a daily battle. Programs like SNAP are vital tools for ending hunger and helping those who are most in need. They provide Americans with the help they need to find the footing in tough times and to make life better for themselves and their children. We should be expanding these programs, not cutting them.

□ 1815

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I would add that \$18 billion of the cuts would affect households with children, which, in a typical month, would include nearly 17 million children.

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

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans are coming after the food benefits of disabled veterans who receive food assistance or SNAP, part-time college students and single moms on SNAP. House Republicans' farm bill would make the largest cuts to SNAP and food assistance programs in 30 years.

Many American families are on the brink. They rely on SNAP to put food on the table. Eighty-six percent of all SNAP benefits go to households that have children or households with older Americans or individuals with disabilities.

As chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, I am also concerned about the harm SNAP cuts will bring to communities of color, including Latinos. Forty percent of Latino adults report not having enough food to eat, more than any other ethnic or racial group. Over 5 million Latinos in the United States receive SNAP to put food on the table.

Right now, a single person will receive at most \$9 in SNAP assistance for food per day. To those in need, \$9 can determine whether they can eat that day.

Three square meals a day should not be a partisan debate. Without SNAP, hungry Americans will be forced to choose between food to eat and necessities like electricity, running water, or medication. It is a cruel and inhumane choice we should not force on the American people.

House Democrats will continue to fight to preserve and expand access to SNAP so that no family goes hungry.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Republican colleagues to put people over politics and join House Democrats to protect SNAP. We must stand together for compassion, dignity, and the well-being of all Americans.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I would add for the record that \$9 billion of the cuts would affect households with preschool-aged children or children under 5, which, in a typical month, would include about 5 million young children.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I thank my wonderful, amazing, dedicated, committed colleague from Connecticut, who is today, as we say in Detroit, speaking truth to power when it comes to our most vulnerable in the United States.

We have heard over and over again that we are the richest country in the world. Even though we live in the richest country, millions of children live in poverty, lacking access to necessities like food, housing, and healthcare. It is shameful.

More than 44 million people in our country face hunger, including over 15 percent in one of the largest counties in my district, Wayne County. SNAP is an essential food assistance program that has been a key tool in combating hunger in our most vulnerable communities.

Now, my Republican colleagues want to cut this essential program that so many of our families rely on to feed their children. It is shameful. The GOP farm bill would make the largest cut to SNAP in nearly 30 years. The bill threatens \$27 billion in SNAP benefits for low-income families. It is utterly shameful.

We must stand together strongly in support of expanding the social safety net and increasing funding programs for SNAP and other child nutrition programs. They are essential in creating healthy, thriving communities.

It is time to protect programs to combat hunger, not make extremist cuts. Working families in our country should not have to worry about where their next meal is coming from.

In this body, we see over and over again that we seem to find money for endless wars like this, but we can't seem to find the same resources to end child hunger in our country.

The first African-American woman ever to serve in our Congress was Shirley Chisholm. She used to say children can't learn if they are hungry.

Children should and must have access to SNAP benefits to experience long-term positive outcomes like better health, improved learning, and higher success as adults.

I don't think people realize the trauma of what the most vulnerable people among us go through in going to sleep hungry. Access to nutritious meals is essential for every child's health and development. We know this.

Why make these extremist cuts? We must continue to invest in universal school meals and so much more.

I am proud to cosponsor the Universal School Meals Program Act and proud to say to all my folks in the 12th Congressional District that I am not going to back down. I am not going to back down until we fully fund SNAP benefits.

Mr. Speaker, it is the least we can do in this Congress. It is not just our children. It is our disabled neighbors, our seasoned residents, our veterans, and working-class folks who are working hours and hours a day but still can't put food on the table. We must do better.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank my colleague from Connecticut for bringing us together today to discuss the importance of protecting SNAP.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, \$5 billion of the cuts will affect households with older adults, which, in a typical month, would include more than 6 million individuals age 60 or older whose benefits would be cut.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON).

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise because it is imperative that this body move with all deliberate speed to pass a farm bill that is both responsible and enriching for the American people.

The farm bill is one of the most fundamental pieces of legislation that we enact as a government, not simply because of the dollars we dedicate, but more so because of the number of people who are supported by the passing of this indispensable law.

Unlike most of the bills we pass, the farm bill is not a dry and depersonalized legislative act. There are names and faces attached to food. There are real people in dire situations associated and connected to the success of this bill.

Unlike most of the appropriations we allocate in this body, the farm bill is a moral document that reminds us that we owe each other as human beings.

It brings us back to the fundamental things. It reminds us that the politics of the future mean nothing in the stomach of a child who is hungry.

To be sure, this bill compels us to move forward. This bill moves us beyond politics of blame so that we might embrace a more excellent way. In fact, I would go so far as to say that the farm bill is one of the few manifestations of the social contract this government makes with the American people. The SNAP program alone is a moral accomplishment that we have to reach for.

Over 300,000 people make up my district in Illinois. Almost 73,000 of those households receive SNAP benefits. Almost 40 percent of these households have a child in them, and almost 45 percent of those children have some sort of disability.

In fact, I would go so far as to say that the bill is one of the few manifestations of the social contract of this government that the American people deserve. The SNAP program alone is our moral achievement, and I say this because all of us know that 86 percent of the SNAP benefits go to the households of women and children.

Mr. Speaker, we have to move with speed. Ask not what you can do for your country but what your country can do for you. Let me tell you, there is a mutuality in this contract. We also have to understand that the state has to support the people, not simply the people supporting the state. The farm bill helps those who are in need when their backs are against the wall.

Does this bill achieve that? No, Mr. Speaker. Taking food off of children's plates is not the best of the American ideal. We say our prayers, and we pray for the food we are about to receive. We do not pray for the food that has now been removed from our table by our government.

We must, indeed, fight for the rights of all those women and children and disabled families that need our help.

This is important because the time when we ignore cities and emerging

farming centers is over. In the district that I represent, we celebrate community gardens and urban farms because inasmuch as I believe that access to healthy food is a right that all human beings should enjoy, it is also a responsibility that each of us must take into our own hands. Each of us must do whatever we can to ensure that our families have the sustenance and nutrition they require for flourishing and the possibility of a great life.

We need a farm bill that is responsible. Taking food out of the mouths of the most desperate and those of the least, the lost, and the left behind cannot stand. I will be opposing this farm bill until it is more responsive and we leave SNAP alone and ensure that every family is well fed in America.

I thank Mrs. HAYES for picking up this fight.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate everything Representative JACKSON said, and I thank him for his words.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), the chairman of the Task Force on Agriculture and Nutrition in the 21st Century.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I am one of those Members who represent a significant agricultural district which actually has its economy based on agriculture. I also represent the district that former Congressman Jamie Whitten represented. Ultimately, he framed the farm bill such that it did not pit rural America against urban America.

This bill pits rural America against urban America, and that is not the purpose of a farm bill. Let's talk a little bit about it.

Mr. Speaker, you can't penalize the needy for the greedy. What I am saying in that respect is, so many people in this country are in need of nutrition benefits. That is why we have a farm bill. A substantial majority of the farm bill is devoted to nutrition, and rightfully so.

Let's talk a little bit about where I am with it. This is my fourth farm bill. I have gone through all of it. I have seen everything that has been had with it, but the important part is that I serve as the chair of the Task Force on Agriculture and Nutrition in the 21st Century, appointed by Leader Jeffries.

We went all over the country. We heard from people saying, look, there are important things for the farm bill, but it is all about compromise and working together.

What did we hear people say? The first thing they said: Food is medicine. If you are worried about healthcare in this country, if people don't have nutrition, that is a problem.

Today, the cost of food is steadily rising, which means Americans cannot afford to purchase healthy and nutritious meals.

In going around the country, there were a number of things that we heard from east, west, north, and south. People said that we must eliminate the hot

food ban for SNAP recipients. SNAP recipients should have the benefit of hot meals. We must address the hunger among college students. We should protect SNAP against harmful cuts to eligibility requirements.

Talking about eligibility requirements, most people don't know that if you are on Social Security and Medicare, that counts against seniors' eligibility for SNAP benefits. By doing that, veterans are also penalized in the qualification for SNAP benefits.

We also have those individuals who have made a mistake. They have come out, but they are ineligible for SNAP benefits. We always talk about second-chance people, so why shouldn't formerly incarcerated people be eligible for food stamps?

Those are the things that we heard.

More importantly, this \$30 billion cut is totally unreasonable. It makes no sense, and again, it penalizes people by putting politics over people. I hope when this issue is taken up tomorrow, Democrats will stand firm in their opposition against it.

If Republicans are genuinely interested in making this work, we can do that, but from the nutritional standpoint, don't penalize people who need help. The demonstration of their help is already here.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to, after this issue is defeated, coming back together, pulling people together, working through all the logistics, and not being cute about how we fund certain programs and defund other programs.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I want to amplify the point that we have to have a farm bill that works for everyone. I often hear people say that we need a farm bill that represents farmers. I would challenge that. We need a farm bill that represents everyone.

Members often ask me whether I represent a farming community. My response is that we all represent communities where people eat, and that has to be a part of the conversation, as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY).

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, before we began this Special Order hour, I approached Congresswoman HAYES to thank her for her leadership in pulling this together. She said: You are welcome, but I am so sorry we have to do this at all.

I am also sorry, as are we all. It is such a shame.

I thank Congresswoman HAYES for her leadership and partnership in our fight to eradicate hunger and for convening us this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in solidarity with the over 50,000 SNAP beneficiaries in Massachusetts' Seventh Congressional District, as well as the 41-plus million across our country.

□ 1830

Parents who choose to go hungry because there isn't enough to feed both themselves and their children, they

would rather make that sacrifice than threaten the cognitive development and nutrition that their children need to thrive and, certainly, to support their readiness to learn.

I rise in solidarity with those families who, given the high cost of housing and food, are struggling because incomes are not keeping pace.

Mr. Speaker, food insecurity is on the rise, but it doesn't have to be. Congress should not advance a farm bill that cuts \$30 billion in SNAP funding.

Now, to be clear, we are not here due to a deficit of resources for SNAP. We are here due to a deficit of empathy, a deficit of empathy for those who are food insecure, a lack of empathy for our most vulnerable and marginalized neighbors.

This Republican cut to our Nation's largest nutrition program will disproportionately harm our seniors, veterans, children, adults with disabilities, and working families.

In my home State of Massachusetts, this cut will impact one in six residents, over 1 million people, people who depend on SNAP to put healthy food on the table.

That alarming statistic is worse for Black and Latino families who are twice as likely to face food insecurity.

For decades, SNAP has been a critical tool in reducing hunger for low-income people, lifting millions out of poverty, and improving health and well-being.

To make it plain, food is medicine. Food is life. We should not tolerate the suffering of our neighbors as they live in anxiety and fear, wondering where their next meal will come from.

Republicans need to stop playing with people's lives. Hunger is a humanitarian crisis, a moral failing, and a policy choice.

I urge my colleagues to choose compassion and care over cruelty and callousness and support full funding of SNAP.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative PRESSLEY for her remarks. I add that children in some of our most vulnerable communities don't have lobbyists, but they do have Members of Congress, and it is our job to make sure that we are actively working to improve their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR).

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative HAYES for her tireless efforts, and, yes, she is right. Children, the poor, the elderly, and the down-trodden do not have lobbyists, but they have us.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to Chairman THOMPSON's partisan farm bill. Hunger is rising at an alarming rate among U.S. households. In Minnesota alone, over 500,000 people are facing hunger, including over 180,000 children.

SNAP serves as the first line of defense against hunger for children, for the elderly, for veterans, and for those who have disabilities.

Yet, last week, Republicans unveiled the largest cuts to SNAP in nearly 30 years. This extreme proposal would slash SNAP funding, which provides food benefits for low-income families by approximately \$30 billion over the next decade, impacting every participant.

Instead of proposing this unacceptable policy, we should be passing my universal school meals program. We should be fully funding SNAP. We should be fully funding WIC.

Enacting this bill without dramatic changes would push more people below the poverty line and exacerbate hunger. I urge my colleagues to reject this proposal and prioritize our constituents over making political points.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I would add that in 2023, 1.2 million veterans participated in the SNAP program. I really don't understand why in this Congress whenever we have to make tough policy choices, these are the people that are always targeted.

Last year during the debt ceiling negotiations, the program that was targeted and cut was SNAP and nutrition programs.

In September when we went back for the appropriations budget, the program and the hard lines that were targeted were, once again, feeding and nutrition programs. When will this end?

I yield to the gentlewoman from Vermont (Ms. BALINT).

Ms. BALINT. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut, has been a champion on this issue, and I am so glad she has convened us here tonight.

Over 41 million Americans depend on nutrition assistance to feed themselves and their families, and SNAP benefits reach millions of rural Americans every day.

No State, no community, and no Congressional District in our Nation is immune to hunger and food insecurity.

Paradoxically, in rural areas that grow most of our Nation's food, many households face real struggles with hunger. It is not just in metropolitan areas.

We know poverty is the root cause of hunger, and it is often acute in rural communities, like in my home State of Vermont, with 15 percent of households in rural areas facing food insecurity.

Millions of working families, veterans, people with disabilities, seniors, and children in rural communities cannot always afford enough food to keep themselves and their families healthy.

Simply put, too many Americans are going hungry every day, but we have a vital program that actually helps to address this problem, the SNAP program. It provides monthly benefits to low-income families and individuals to help them to buy food.

The Republicans' attack, and it is just the latest attack on this essential program, would slash the program by \$30 billion over the next decade.

If enacted, the bill would make the largest cuts to SNAP benefits in 30

years at a time when we have gross wealth inequality in this country. Slashing anti-hunger programs that we know work is stupid, it is inhumane, and it is also shortsighted.

Even if you don't think we have a moral responsibility to feed the children of this Nation and make sure they don't go hungry every night, even if you don't think it is a moral imperative, which I do, but if you don't, there are real consequences for individual Americans and for our healthcare system.

When Americans don't have enough food, this greatly impacts the health of those who go hungry. Food insecurity can lead to Type 2 diabetes, high blood pressure, heart disease, and obesity.

The gentlewoman from Connecticut and I are both former teachers. We know children who go hungry struggle in school. They have health problems. Americans who are food insecure are more likely to struggle with psychological and behavioral health issues.

This year's farm bill should be providing more benefits to Americans. We should be expanding and protecting SNAP benefits.

Instead, what are we doing? Once again, demonizing the poor. It is time that House Republicans drop their partisan extremism and work alongside Democrats to pass a truly bipartisan farm bill and actually help feed the American people.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative BALINT for her remarks. As my colleague stated, she and I are both former educators, and I really wish that before Members of Congress cast their vote on these cuts to programs like SNAP that they were forced to sit in a classroom on a Tuesday morning after a long weekend and count the number of kids who have their heads down on their desk.

I wish that Members were forced to sit in a classroom on any given day as a kid said they had a headache third period, and you realize it is because they haven't had breakfast.

I wish that Members of Congress were forced to stand with you at the after-school program when a kid hung behind and asked if they could take something home for their little brother who has been home all day, and they know they haven't eaten.

I wish every Member of Congress and everyone in this Chamber were forced to do that before these proposals were put into a bill like the farm bill and before Members voted on these things.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS).

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut, for yielding time, and I reflect on this farm bill from the standpoint that at this period in time, Americans are paying more of their earned income for food than they have in the last 30 years.

Our President's FTC chair has notified us that grocery stores, big grocers, some food manufacturers, but mostly the grocers are price gouging.

If you are middle class, if you are poor, if you are trying to save for college for your kid, or if you are trying to save up for an unexpected occurrence, food is squeezing the middle class and working families of this country.

We have a responsibility to pass a farm bill that addresses the needs of the hungry and addresses the needs of our middle class.

We have to get real because what we do is we say, oh, you know what? We are going to cap you at this income level. If you are a single mom, and you are raising your kid, and you are \$500 over that income level, you don't get the SNAP benefits.

I am sick of this type of governance. I am sick of this type of means testing. We did this in the pandemic. It wasn't hard.

Steve Mnuchin was able to give everybody a capped unemployment level, but when it comes to food, you have a Democratic Caucus over here fighting over and over and over again.

We have free and reduced lunch in our schools. Thanks to the Governor of Michigan for actually getting that done. We would like to see that in the United States of America.

This is real stuff, and kids are going to school hungry, and kids are ashamed when they are carrying in those meal cards, and parents are worried.

Do you know what we have? We have over a trillion dollars of credit card debt because people can't go to the grocery store.

They can't take their kids out to eat because it costs \$50 for a family of four. You can't get lunch for under \$15.

What are we litigating here? We are just filling the pockets of the grocers and the big business and the this and the that when we don't actually have a real North Star here in this Chamber.

Just one last fact: The maximum benefits of SNAP right now fell 19 percent short of covering basic meal costs.

One study revealed that in 98 percent of counties, SNAP benefits did not cover the cost of a modestly priced meal, so we are not even meeting the bare minimum, my friends. We are not even doing the bare minimum.

The House Democrats are going to continue to stand up to this wrong-minded package that will not be serving the American people.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I can't help but reflect on the irony of us hearing every day about inflation and the rising cost of food and basic things that people need while also proposing cuts to the most vulnerable people on an anti-hunger, antipoverty program.

I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KENNEDY), the newest member of our Democratic Caucus.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I will start by thanking Congresswoman HAYES for leading this effort.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 62,000 households in New York's 26th Congressional District that rely on the SNAP program, I rise to urge my col-

leagues to oppose the changes in the Thrifty Food Plan in the farm bill.

In New York State alone, these cuts would result in the loss of \$2 billion in SNAP benefits over 10 years and the loss of over \$3.5 billion in total local economic activity.

□ 1845

At a time when overall food insecurity in New York State has increased from 11.4 percent to 13.5 percent and child food insecurity increased from 15.4 percent to 18.8 percent, the absolute last thing we should be doing is cutting SNAP benefits.

These changes to the Thrifty Food Program will negatively impact benefit levels for Summer EBT and funding for food banks. This is simply unacceptable.

Instead, Congress should pass legislation to expand access to SNAP. That is why I cosponsored the Enhanced Access to SNAP Act, which would eliminate work-for-food requirements and expand benefits for millions of college students.

In my district, our primary food bank, FeedMore Western New York, has seen the need for food assistance in the community triple since the pandemic. The number of people served today has already exceeded 10-year growth projections.

As a Nation, we have an obligation to eradicate hunger. This bill will do just the opposite. I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation as written.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), a leader on the Rules Committee.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative HAYES so very much for organizing and for giving me this time, because I am here on behalf of my good friend and the ranking member of the Rules Committee, JIM MCGOVERN, who Republicans silenced today for simply telling the truth about a criminal trial.

Imagine that, on this House floor, we cannot state a fact about a trial. Here is another fact about the former President that represents a policy choice Democrats oppose. President Trump supported cutting SNAP by nearly 30 percent within 10 years.

Mr. MCGOVERN stands for the opposite. He stands up every week on this House floor with his poster "end hunger now." If Republicans hadn't silenced him, he would have spoken tonight against the farm bill because of its impact on farmers. If Republicans hadn't silenced him, he would have spoken up for families who do not have enough food to eat.

Similar to me, Mr. MCGOVERN represents a district that includes thousands of farms and farmers who benefit from SNAP because they sell their produce to the program, but also farmers need to use SNAP because they don't make enough money. We are starving the people who are raising the food for us.

In my district, one in five New Mexicans receive SNAP benefits, the highest of any State. This Republican majority silenced him, so I am here to read the remarks that the Republican majority might not want to hear from Mr. MCGOVERN. These are his remarks:

Mr. Speaker, Republicans are advancing a bill that cuts SNAP, our Nation's first line of defense against hunger, by an astounding \$30 billion.

He would have probably raised his hands and said: You can't make this up.

MAGA Republicans included a provision in their extremely partisan farm bill that will prevent SNAP benefits from ever being increased, even if a scientific review says they should be.

The last reevaluation, in 2021, which was the first update in 50 years, gave families an extra—wait for it—\$1.40 per person per day to purchase food. That extra help has meant families can access more nutritious food. It has meant fewer skipped meals. It has meant better food security.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to oppose this MAGA Republican farm bill which would cut future benefits and increase hunger for kids, seniors, people with disabilities, and other vulnerable adults.

Those are JIM MCGOVERN's remarks. While House Republicans silenced him today, they will never silence the truth that he speaks. We must end hunger now. We must answer the call: "When I was hungry you gave me to eat; when I was thirsty you gave me to drink."

I thank Representative JAHANA HAYES for her advocacy in bringing us together to heed this call.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GOLDMAN).

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Connecticut very much for yielding.

I rise today, alongside so many of my colleagues, to make one thing very clear. Republicans' proposed funding cuts to SNAP are unconscionable and will send millions into poverty and food insecurity.

SNAP is an essential lifeline that working families across America rely on to put food on the table. In New York City alone, where I come from, more than 1.7 million people rely on SNAP benefits to help them feed their families. Nationwide, there are more than 41 million SNAP recipients.

According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 92 percent of SNAP benefits go to households with income below the poverty line and a shocking 54 percent go to households at or below half of the poverty line.

It begs the question: What do my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have against working families doing their best to succeed? Do you not care if our children go without food?

It is just simply unacceptable. Food is a basic necessity. In the wealthiest country in the world, it should not even be a question whether our govern-

ment is going to make sure that everyone, especially innocent children, have basic necessities.

Our budgets show where our priorities lie. Let's reverse these draconian cuts to SNAP, let's not cut taxes on the wealthy, and let's put our families and our children first.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to thank all of my colleagues who participated in tonight's SNAP Special Order.

I will close by saying that these cuts will affect Summer EBT, which is how most families feed their children over the summer, by \$500 million in this farm bill.

I am not really sure if there is a full appreciation of who is affected by these cuts. I have been very transparent about my story and the fact that I grew up in a household that received food stamps. As a young college student and a single mom, I was working two jobs, attending community college, and still qualified for benefits.

I promise you that my story is the same as a constituent in the district of every single Member of Congress who just wants a shot, who just wants a chance at raising their children with dignity, who just wants a chance at moving their family from poverty into being contributors to society.

Every single one of you has someone in your district just like me, hundreds of families going through the same thing, working families that will be affected by the \$11 billion in cuts that would affect their households and their earnings.

I urge my Republican colleagues to rethink these proposals, to come back to the table and let us work on a bipartisan farm bill that helps everybody in America. Of all the things that we can say that we have done, I don't want taking food out of the mouths of children to be one of them.

Tomorrow, we will go into a markup on this farm bill, and we will review it title by title. There are 12 titles. The Thrifty Food Plan, which is what many of us have spoken about tonight, which is a mathematical system by which benefits are evaluated and based upon, was moved from title IV, which is the nutrition title, to title XII, miscellaneous and others.

Nutrition is not miscellaneous. It is something that should be a priority in this country. It is something that we have the ability to do. Once again, it is a policy choice.

I held out until I saw the text because I prayed about it and I hoped and I wished that the cuts were not as bad as I had read about in the papers and heard talk about, but they are. Mr. Speaker, \$30 billion in cuts are devastating to a program that is the most effective antihunger program that we have.

I urge my colleagues to really consider their votes on this farm bill and the impact that it will have on children and families.

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

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I know what it is like to grow up hungry.

I know the feeling, as a young girl, opening the refrigerator, only to see the water jug.

I know what it's like growing up on government-provided commodity food—cheese, peanut butter, oatmeal.

This Farm Bill proposal cuts more than \$30 Billion from SNAP for what?

I want my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to explain why.

I want them to explain to the single mom at the grocery store whose hours are being cut because the store isn't making enough revenue or to the farmer trying to keep the farm afloat for the next generation, who relies on the grocery store to make payments.

Most importantly, I want them to be able to explain this to the children in my district.

Texas ranks second worst in the nation for hunger, and if these cuts do become a reality, Texas will receive \$2.3 billion less in SNAP benefits.

Let me repeat that: \$2.3 billion.

In my district, SNAP serves over 57,000 households.

These cuts would have a devastating impact on children, seniors, and individuals with disabilities.

It's a shame that House Republicans are weakening our ability to feed the most vulnerable members of our communities.

Instead of attacking SNAP, we must improve and protect it.

I know that the dysfunction of this Congress can mess with our sense of reality. So let me remind you:

The Farm Bill has long been a way to connect Republicans and Democrats, rural and urban, to serve all Americans. It reminds us that small places can do big things.

So, it is very sad that Republicans are holding out on farmers, families, and our neighbors. I mean, why are we balancing budgets on the bellies of hungry children?

We must put people over politics. We must put kids over cruelty. We must feed our kids and our communities.

I oppose any cuts to SNAP. I oppose these harmful choices made by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

FINANCIAL FREEDOM IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MOORE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, today and this week, House Republicans are advocating for the American people and protecting them from bureaucratic overreach. We are pushing legislation that will protect Americans' right to financial privacy and

create a regulatory framework for digital asset markets so American industries can thrive.

I am grateful to the Financial Services and Agriculture Committees for prioritizing this important issue, and I am grateful to have my friend and colleague from Arkansas here to share more about his work on this.

I think one interesting element to this is we had a very strong approach and bill on this regulatory framework regarding these various digital assets. We garnered an incredibly strong bipartisan vote today.

I think it is important to recognize this is not a messaging bill in any way, shape, or form. We are trying to make sure we do the thing that we are elected to do, and that is take care of this type of very important work legislatively and not cede this power to the bureaucratic state and the regulators.

That is something that we accomplished here, and we are accomplishing this week. It is incredibly important to recognize that we are doing this through legislation and not just through an administrative state.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL), an authority on this topic.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Utah for sharing some of the time tonight to talk to the American people about some of the important priorities that House Republicans have put on the floor for consideration in the House this week.

House Republicans believe strongly that capital formation, jobs, careers, and opportunities are essential to economic growth in our Nation.

America's economic growth leads the world right now. We are so blessed to have relatively low unemployment and ample work, but we are also leading in technology. That is at the heart of what House Republicans have had on the floor today.

First, let's talk about the internet. What has been more forceful in our lives, all of our lives, for the past three decades? The internet.

Back in 1996, in this Chamber, in this House, former Congressman Chris Cox of southern California, later an SEC chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission chairman, was on this floor and he said: We should not try to regulate or tax the internet. The internet is just a computer program; it is a computer platform. Let's tax and regulate the kinds of activity that take place on the internet.

This House made the decision, and the Senate joined, to leave the internet as an open platform for collaboration. Think about that and the effect on the last three decades.

If we had not had the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and that resolution to not overregulate and hamstring the internet by Federal intervention, you wouldn't have the smartphone technology in your pocket. You would not be shopping and having your dog food delivered to your house every month.

It has been amazing to see how the protocols written on the internet as open-source technology benefited our country.

After email, it allowed us to set up our own marketing platforms on the internet, so-called Web2, where we set up websites, we had interactivity with our customers, we sold products, we serviced products, and we took payments.

Now, it is time for people to have an opportunity to write applications on a blockchain, what we call Web3. We want to own our own data. We don't want our data to be owned by Google or by Facebook or by Big Tech. Ideally, we would like to own our own data, have our own data privacy, and all of that is made easier and more effective by writing applications on a blockchain.

Today, in the House, we had a big vote. We have 435 Members here in the House, and 279 Members voted in favor of the Republicans' proposal for a regulatory framework for digital asset technology. This is setting up the regulatory framework so that if you want to write an application on blockchain and you want to raise money around that, do venture capital effectively, right now there are no rules of the road for that, zero.

□ 1900

There is a regulatory gap, and that regulatory gap is in the purview of the Securities and Exchange Commission. Right now, we have people who want to do Web3 applications. They want to write programs for blockchain, they want to raise money for that and have that technology expand, but they are stymied by the existing laws and regulations of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Our fit for purpose act that we passed today by an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote sets up that framework. It directs the SEC and it directs the Commodity Futures Trading Commission what to do and how to have the right laws and the right regulations so that people can trade digital assets. Like bitcoin is a digital commodity, it is a cryptocurrency, but this affects, as I say, the future of technology in developing new forms of financial services that will lower costs for consumers, give people more choice, let people own their own data and have greater privacy and have less intrusion from Big Tech, own more of what they create, and get paid for sharing what they create.

All of that, in my judgment, is at the heart of Web3 internet development. The bill today, supported overwhelmingly by the Republicans and 71 Democrats who joined us for a total vote of 279 votes on the House floor means that, once again, there is a bipartisan consensus that we want America to lead in technology.

It is just like that bipartisan consensus back in the 1990s led by Chris Cox so long ago that gave us the abil-

ity to have competitive new technology for cellular telephones and for an open internet so that we could creatively use it to build our businesses.

I want to thank some people who have helped make this a success over the past 1½ years working on this: G.T. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, and PATRICK MCHENRY, the chairman of the House Financial Services Committee. If we didn't have PATRICK's and G.T.'s leadership then this wouldn't have been a priority in this House. Working with Majority Leader STEVE SCALISE and Speaker MIKE JOHNSON, it became a priority for this House.

My hat is off to Chair MCHENRY and Chair THOMPSON for their leadership.

It may sound like a small thing when you don't work here, Mr. Speaker, but to see two large authorizing committees of the U.S. House of Representatives, Agriculture and Financial Services, working seamlessly together, it is a big deal. They produced this bill. I was proud to work on it with them with my colleague on the Agriculture Committee who does digital assets on the Agriculture Committee, DUSTY JOHNSON of South Dakota.

The four of us led this effort, but we had help from our whip, TOM EMMER of Minnesota, and WARREN DAVIDSON who have been leaders in decentralized finance, Fintech, and blockchain for years, long before this bill came to the floor. They were essential to that effort.

Now for my friends on the other side of the aisle, JIM HIMES of Connecticut, RITCHIE TORRES of New York, JOSH GOTTHEIMER of New Jersey, BRITTANY PETERSEN of Colorado, and Ms. CARAVEO of Colorado, these were outstanding leaders on the Democratic side of the aisle who worked tirelessly with Republicans to draft this law to convince the American people that we do work together on this House floor, we do put America first, and we do put American leadership in technology first. A vote of 279, as I say, is a big vote in the House on a bipartisan priority to set the right course for a regulatory framework for digital assets.

Who benefits?

Consumers, investors, inventors, and people who want to create new ways for you and me to do financial services and do healthcare together on a blockchain benefit. I think this is an exciting prospect. I think it was an important step for the House.

The second bill that we will be debating tomorrow is also led by Republicans. It, again, says that the private sector should lead, not the public sector, not Big Government when it comes to digital payments.

Many in the Democratic Party support something called a central bank digital currency where you would actually end up banking at the Federal Reserve bank, and your lack of privacy and your private information could be compromised because you would be embedded in this large digital payment

system called a central bank digital currency.

Republicans are opposed to that. We prefer the private sector innovate in payments, as you see today in your own life, Mr. Speaker, Venmo, Zelle, and peer-to-peer payments, those are products of the private sector. Writing a check is part of the private sector. Making a debit card payment or a credit card payment is a product of the private sector.

We believe that is also the case when it comes to a tokenized payment stablecoin. We believe that should be a product of the private sector and not of the Federal Reserve or the central government.

Tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, you will see House Republicans come to this floor and say that we do not want this administration, or any administration, to move forward with a central bank digital currency without a direct authorization of the Congress because we believe, as I say, so strongly in the private sector leading the way in payments and in the innovation for blockchain technology.

We will probably come to this House floor later in the year with a private-sector driven payment stablecoin bill led by Mr. MCHENRY of North Carolina.

To my friend from Utah, I say that those are some of the highlights today that I think show that on a bipartisan basis, the Republicans are leading in technology in this House.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I will echo the comments on much of the financial services packages that we are putting on the floor this week. The gentleman's comment that this is a big deal, I would hope that folks could recognize that we are at a time where it is unknown. There are no rules in place for this innovation that is taking place in the financial market, and there has to be. It is good for every American, it is good for our economy, and it is good for our industries to be able to have that structure, and we are putting that forward today.

The big deal about this is that this is something that should pass as soon it goes over to the Senate. It has strong bipartisan support, and folks can recognize the importance of this moment. House Republicans are leading to make that happen and to make that possible. We are not just engaging in messaging bills on this type of stuff. This is legitimate, and it had a really, really strong vote today. It was not as strong, I might mention, from my Committee on Ways and Means with the tax package, but this is not a competition. It is not a competition.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Utah for yielding.

I think that is an important comment that this vote of 279 sends a strong message to the Senate that this House has done their homework and that this House is prepared to advance technology that protects consumers,

offers opportunities for investors, lets America lead, and brings capital back to the United States that has left the U.S. due to the uncertainty and lack of leadership from the Securities and Exchange Commission and the lack of authority in the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

I hope this is a sign we can work together with our friends in the Senate and that we can make law in this financial technology advance and, as you say, not just have a messaging bill.

RECOGNIZING JULIE'S SWEET SHOPPE IN
CONWAY, ARKANSAS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, small businesses are the heart of each of our communities.

I rise today to recognize the efforts of a good friend, a great entrepreneur, and one of my constituents, Julie Goodnight, and her bakery, Julie's Sweet Shoppe in Conway, Arkansas.

Julie began her career in the bakery industry at the age of 17 as she worked for her father's bakery, Ed's.

As the granddaughter of two World War II veterans, Julie loved how her father's shop provided a place for local veterans to meet and share their stories over a cup of coffee and a doughnut.

Beginning at Ed's in the 1990s, Julie worked to honor these local heroes by celebrating them with an annual Veterans Day event, and when Julie finally got that amazing opportunity that every American entrepreneur dreams of, opening her own shop on Veterans Day in 2013, she continued this amazing family tradition.

Since its founding, Julie's Sweet Shoppe has honored over 1,000 local veterans at its annual Veterans Day celebration.

I have had the honor of attending every Veterans Day event at Julie's, and I have seen firsthand the impact she makes on our community.

I thank Julie's Sweet Shoppe for their outstanding service to our veterans in central Arkansas and to wish them continued success in all of their endeavors.

SYRIAN EMERGENCY TASK FORCE, 2024
COMMUNITY PARTNER OF THE YEAR AWARD

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Syrian Emergency Task Force, a nonprofit based in central Arkansas.

In May, the University of Central Arkansas awarded SETF with the 2024 Community Partner of the Year Award for their work to relieve the suffering of those in Syria from Bashar al-Assad's deadly regime.

In 2011, the Syrian Emergency Task Force was created in response to the Syrian Government's war on its own citizens, many of the targets of which were innocent kids. It was called the Syrian Emergency Task Force because they thought it would be a short-term emergency in 2011. Here we are a decade later, and they are still hard at work on behalf of ordinary people in Syria.

Last summer, I was honored to visit the beautiful children at SETF's spon-

sored school for orphans, the Wisdom House, in northwest Syria. While there, I heard devastating stories from these children who endured continuous bombardment by the Assad regime and their Russian or Iranian coconspirators resulting in more orphans on the street and more families displaced.

Under UCA graduate and SETF executive director Mouaz Moustafa's leadership, SETF works with those in the region and beyond to bring the voices of the Syrian people to the international stage. They are determined to create a safe and free Syria, away from the Assad dictatorship.

I thank President Davis and many other leaders at the University of Central Arkansas for their support of SETF and their support of the organization's efforts to make a difference in the lives of the Syrian people who are suffering at the hand of the Assad regime's barbarism.

The SETF is more than deserving of this award. I am proud to continue to work alongside of them in Congress in combating the Assad regime and helping them to be a strong advocate for helping the innocent people regain their freedom and regain their country.

BSA 2024 SILVER BUFFALO AND ANTELOPE
AWARDS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize these Scouters from the Natural State Council who have been awarded national recognition in 2024.

The Silver Antelope, created in 1942, honors Scouters who have demonstrated exceptional character and provided distinguished service within one of Scouting America's 16 territories across the country.

The Natural State Council is delighted to see the recognition of Ray Dillon of Little Rock and Anthony Sitz of Conway as the 2024 winners of the Silver Antelope Award.

The Boy Scouts of America would not exist without the foundational help of their volunteers. They make scouting successful. The responsibility for ensuring that our youth receive mentorship and guidance that they need to develop as strong leaders rests with volunteers like Ray and Tony. I congratulate them both on this national recognition of their decades of service.

NATIONAL GUARD PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION
CENTER'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the National Guard Professional Education Center in North Little Rock, Arkansas.

In 1974, then-Governor Dale Bumpers recognized the need for a place to train National Guardsmen and -women from across the country, and he knew Arkansas would make the perfect home for such a facility.

□ 1915

Beginning with an inaugural class of 30 soldiers from 12 States, the PEC now serves over 20,000 National Guard members from around the country every year at their base in North Little Rock, Arkansas.

For 50 years, the Professional Education Center has been committed to the important work of ensuring the readiness of our National Guardsman to respond to the challenges of today and the unknown challenges of tomorrow.

The PEC at Camp Robinson is a credit to Arkansas and the Nation, and I thank them for their service and dedication. I know the next 50 years of our Professional Education Center on Camp Robinson will be absolutely just as productive and successful.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and colleague from the great State of Arkansas for his words, more so for being able to encapsulate what you all have accomplished with the Financial Services packages we are putting on this week. They are a very big deal, as was mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to sharing just a few thoughts of my own as we wrap up here.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his tireless work. These are meaty issues. They are hard for folks to truly understand, and it takes the real work of Congress to do stuff like this, so I thank the gentleman for his leadership there.

As I mentioned earlier, House Republicans are pushing legislation to protect consumers' and Americans' rights to financial privacy, values that I believe everyone can support. We witnessed that today with the strong bipartisan vote on this issue.

The Financial Innovation and Technology for the 21st Century Act, also known as FIT21, will protect consumers and encourage innovation by creating a regulatory framework for digital asset markets through legislation, not through regulators.

One of the most common frustrations that I hear back in the First District of Utah is this concept of why does the administrative state have so much influence? Why is there so much executive overreach?

This isn't just geared toward one administration. They are very frustrated with pretty much all of President Biden's policies and his executive actions, whether it be the student loan repayment stuff that he is doing or the inability to implement solid policy at the border and all the protections that he removed there.

They are so frustrated at executive overreach in general, and I think you see that play out in why Congress, oftentimes, has such low approval ratings.

Today was a day that we are pushing back against that. We can always blame the administration, but part of it is that we have to look at ourselves and say what we are doing to find a path forward and to find a way to get something accomplished.

We have actually had several of these moments in this House majority, in

this Republican majority, in this 118th Congress. Today was definitely one of those days.

We are making it so the executive branch is going to work the way they are supposed to. This legislation should go to the Senate. It should get a vote that will garner the same type of bipartisan support that it got here in the House today, and it should be signed into law.

As digital assets and blockchain technologies continue to develop, FIT21 takes a critical step toward market certainty for consumers and innovators. Rather than regulation by enforcement, FIT21 will establish clear regulatory lines between the SEC and CFTC, as well as ensure digital asset providers have a pathway to raise funds.

FIT21 would also protect consumers and the broader ecosystem through measures that establish transparent disclosure requirements, including requiring digital asset developers to provide information about a digital asset project's ownership and operational structure; creating a comprehensive registration system for digital asset institutions to serve customers in the market; and, three, ensuring that customer-facing digital asset exchanges and brokers provide disclosures to their customers and take steps to reduce those conflicts of interests, Mr. Speaker.

We have seen what regulatory certainty and pro-growth policies can do to help American industry thrive. I commend Chairman THOMPSON of the Agriculture Committee, Chairman MCHENRY of the Financial Services Committee, and members of both of those committees for their hard work on this important legislation. As we heard earlier from Mr. HILL, this is hard work. Actually finding consensus to move something forward is the tough work of Congress.

House Republicans are also leading efforts this week legislatively in supporting the CBDC Anti-Surveillance State Act, which is critical to blocking Federal bureaucrats from creating a central bank digital currency. A CBDC could allow a China-like reality in which our financial system could be used against Americans as the government monitors transactions and tracks customer behaviors.

As I shared earlier today, implementing a central bank digital currency is simply un-American. There are few things that could totally infringe on our freedoms and autonomy more than currency. There are only a few things that could totally infringe on that more than a currency that can be closely tracked, withheld, and weaponized based on our behaviors, causes, and political leanings.

This bill ensures Congress maintains its authority over CBDCs so that if a CBDC were authorized, it will receive robust attention and vetting by elected officials.

Mr. Speaker, I can't stress enough that with the way that this digital cur-

rency is trending—and we see it from other nations—the ability to closely and quickly track directly offends our American right to privacy on this important aspect of our financial freedom.

Again, we are taking the steps today with the House Republican majority to find a path forward and do this the way that the Constitution envisioned we would actually work here, to find a way to make this into law and to actually address these issues.

It is a world that is, again, difficult to understand, and that is why this is such tough work. Again, I commend the members on the Financial Services and Agriculture Committees to get this right, put forth the legislation, receive the bipartisan support, send it over to the Senate, and, hopefully, get it passed into law soon.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues who participated in this and for the successful week that we are having back here in our legislative session, the last one in the month of May. We look forward to advancing more key legislation tomorrow.

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

ISRAEL UNDER ATTACK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, anybody who is watching the world events unfolding today is well aware that our dear friends in Israel are under attack, but they are not just under attack by Hamas. They are, in fact, under attack from the anti-Western civilization radical progressives across the globe and, in particular, at the International Criminal Court.

In all ways, with respect to this attack on Israel, on Western civilization, on our own values, on the abuse of an international organization with no real legitimacy, the international court, the United States should have Israel's back.

Let's look back for a second at October 7. Let's look at what Israel is dealing with in addition to a long history of being under attack, of facing foes in the Middle East, of having to live in constant fear of attack, of having to live under the technology provided in a mutual relationship between the United States and Israel, the Iron Dome, with David's Sling, and with all the technology to shoot missiles down.

How many Americans would like to be sitting in Manhattan, D.C., Austin, Dallas, San Francisco, or any other part of this country, knowing that the only reason they are safely sitting there is that the missiles that are constantly being fired at them are being taken down by technology? I don't think that would sit too well with most Americans. I don't think most Americans would sit back if rockets

were being fired into our Nation from Juarez into El Paso.

I don't think we would just sit back and say that is great, fine, keep firing missiles, and we will just put up a shield and shoot them down. I think we would do something about it, and I think it would be pretty violent. I think we would be right to do so.

Look at October 7 for our friends in Israel. Let's start with the fact that 22 American citizens were killed. Let's add to it that 1,000 Israelis or more were killed and almost 3,000 injured. Mr. Speaker, 4,500 rockets were fired from Gaza by Hamas into Israel, and 1,300 targets were struck. Not since the Holocaust has this large of a number of Jews been killed in a single day. That is the truth.

Hamas beheaded at least 40 babies. Let that sink in for a minute. Hamas beheaded at least 40 Israeli babies.

Hamas terrorists not only raped and murdered Israeli women, but they forced husbands, families, and friends to watch. That happened. We have documentary evidence. We know this occurred.

A compilation of those atrocities captured on video shows gunmen shooting the dead bodies of civilians in cars, militants in the process of beheading a body with a hoe, burnt corpses thrown in a dumpster.

An eyewitness on October 7 said: "To be afraid for your kids' life and your wife, it is a whole new level of fearing."

A survivor of the attacks in Israel on October 7 said: "I just waited pretty much that they will come and murder me, my wife, and my kids inside our house. I thought maybe if the terrorists enter my house, I will go out so they will kill me and they will leave my family aside."

Another one: "It was the worst horrific war scenes that you see only in movies around us."

Another: The gunfire "was nonstop," and we were "waiting and waiting, and it is continuing, and you hear only the weapons of Hamas," and realize "no one is here to save us."

"As a woman who was there, I can say that the fear is endless. It can't be described in words. To be a woman in captivity is to be in constant fear, but the men there also undergo abuse," said one woman who was abducted during the October 7 attack.

There remain today over 100 hostages being held. So now steps in the International Criminal Court, the ICC. When President Trump came into office, he rightfully recognized the threat of the International Criminal Court. The international court was created under the guise of investigating and prosecuting the world's most serious crimes, but it actually represents a significant threat to our Nation's sovereignty.

In 2020, when President Trump came into office, he issued an executive order punishing by way of sanctions anyone at the ICC who goes after the United States, United States service-members, or our allies, such as Israel.

What did President Biden do in all of his infinite wisdom? He revoked those sanctions as soon as he got in office, effectively giving the ICC a free pass to target United States citizens and our allies, such as Israel.

They made an escalatory and unprecedented step just recently threatening to issue illegitimate arrest warrants for Prime Minister Netanyahu and other Israeli officials for alleged war crimes in Gaza. The application marks the first time ICC has sought to prosecute a major United States ally or the leader of a democratic country.

What you are seeing happen is an unprecedented assault on Western civilization on Israel and, by extension, on our sovereignty as Americans.

I view this court as an illegitimate court. It has no authority over America. Technically, we are a signatory to the court because President Clinton signed on, but he did not submit it to the Senate for any kind of ratification, so it has no legal force in America. Do you think that the ICC will target Americans? You bet they will.

If we don't act right now to quash what is occurring with the ICC targeting the Prime Minister of Israel—think about that. An international court with no real legal authority in the United States is targeting the Prime Minister of Israel for responding with military force to the attacks—rockets, murders, rapes, beheadings—levied against the citizens he represents as the Prime Minister, levied against them directly from Hamas.

By the way, Israel is a nation that has taken the unprecedented step in history to give warnings to citizens, civilians in Gaza, up to 2 weeks' advance notice. In one case, it dropped 15 million leaflets across Gaza to warn them that they needed to clear out because Israel was going to take out Hamas facilities, leaving text messages and voicemails, taking every step possible to warn civilians to move away from Hamas targets.

□ 1930

This is going to be studied for years to come what Israel has been doing to keep the civilian to combatant casualty as low as it is. We believe it is somewhere between 1 and 2. That is, frankly, well below the norms and the standards the United Nations talks about, well below some of the historic norms even for the United States.

This must be stopped because when they are going after the Prime Minister of Israel they are going to go after us. Put that aside. We can't stand by and allow an international tribunal to be targeting our ally and friend Israel for simply defending itself against attack.

This is why I was proud to join with Representative MAST from Florida and Representative STEFANIK from New York to introduce the Illegitimate Court Counteraction Act to impose sanctions on the ICC officials who seek to go after U.S. citizens or our allies. It

is modeled very similarly to the Trump executive order. It is also mirrored in legislation offered by Senator TOM COTTON from Arkansas over in the United States Senate.

As I have stated, the ICC, the International Criminal Court, is an illegitimate court. It represents a threat to the United States and our sovereignty. Frankly, we should be more aggressive than what we have put in this legislation. We are seeking to move quickly in a world in which the current administration is at war with Israel while they are trying to contend that they are allies.

In 2021, President Biden reportedly ignored a request for a phone call with the Israeli Foreign Minister. Earlier this month, President Biden threatened to cut off Israel's military aid while they are fighting a war against Hamas. Now, he is actively criticizing Israel's military strategy on the world stage.

In a Politico article it was stated: "Top officials are publicly calling Israel's strategy in Gaza self-defeating and likely to open the door to Hamas' return—a level of criticism of the Middle East ally not seen since the war began in October."

The Biden administration betrayed Israel, and frankly, our own well-being as a nation at the United Nations earlier this year when America abstained from a vote—abstained from a vote—when the United Nations was calling and demanding for an immediate cease-fire, which would have been a one-sided cease-fire, hamstringing Israel in its defense against Hamas.

The United Nations lowered its flag to mourn the recent death of the "Butcher of Tehran," the President of Iran. The United States Deputy Ambassador to the United Nations, Robert Wood, stood for the moment of silence in honor of the former president of Iran.

This is what this administration is doing. They are taking steps directly to undermine Israel. We have never seen this kind of unprecedented undermining of one of, if not our closest, ally at a time when they most need our support.

I am not one to believe in blind support. I have, in fact, voted against funding here because I thought the funding was foolish and misguided because it included funding that would go to Hamas. We voted for, I think, about 15 or \$16 billion of aid to Israel, something I generally supported, but it included \$9 billion in humanitarian aid which we knew based on history, common sense, and experience would go to Hamas, and, in fact, it has.

We should not blindly support anybody. We should not just write blank checks. We should not pat ourselves on the back for support. When you have got an International Criminal Court that has no legal force in the United States, when you have got an International Criminal Court threatening to go after the Prime Minister of our very

close, if not closest, ally for defending itself when it is having rockets fired at itself from enemies that beheaded 40 of their own babies, I am sorry, that criminal court needs to be forcefully condemned by the United States.

At the same time this is all going on—and I hope we will bring forward this legislation forthwith. It is a good bill. It has, I think, 60 cosponsors and growing with a cross-section ideologically of the Conference. I hope we will bring this bill forward when we get back from Memorial Day recess.

I want to compliment the Speaker of the House, MIKE JOHNSON, for his work in trying to move this bill forward. I want to compliment the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, MICHAEL MCCAUL, for his work in trying to get this moved forward and working with a broad cross-section of us to get legislation to condemn the International Criminal Court, pass sanctions, force them to understand that if they are going to act against our ally, if they are going to take an unprecedented step of issuing warrants against the Prime Minister for alleged war crimes, that we will sanction them and that they will have no welcome mat in the United States.

By sanctioning, we mean that all of the actors involved will not be welcome here. Their families will not be welcome here. Their visas would be revoked. Other penalties and measures, including any funds that potentially flow from the United States to get to the International Criminal Court, which are not supposed to occur but often do through these various NGOs, that we would take all the steps we can to undermine an International Criminal Court that has no basis.

While that is going on remember this: At every stage of the war from October 7, the regime of Egyptian President el-Sisi has undermined Israel's war effort in a bid to prevent the Jewish state from defeating Hamas.

Now, the financial interests of the el-Sisi family appeared to have been advanced significantly through cooperation with Hamas' efforts to build tunnels across the border with Egypt.

Now, how do we know that? Well, in the last 10 days or so, going back to May 11, Israel revealed that during early stages of the IDF's, the Israeli Defense Forces' operation in Rafah—now pause for a second. The world geniuses, all of the elites in the world body said, no, Israel can't go into Rafah. They were adamant about it. These are war crimes. You can't go into Rafah. There are civilians there.

Well, Israel has been going into Rafah. They need to root out the battalions there. They need to kill more Hamas. They need to destroy Hamas, leveling it to the ground, minimize civilian casualties and find every way they can to restore peace and well-being by destroying their enemy. We would want nothing less as Americans, I assure you.

Israel revealed that during the early stages of their operation in Rafah, IDF forces discovered more than 50 underground tunnels that traversed the international border between Egypt and Gaza. This story is not getting nearly the attention that it deserves.

What is it that the international bodies, what is it that the Palestinians in Gaza, the folks associated with Hamas and those that are enemies of Israel, what is it that they didn't want us to know?

The scope of the cross-border tunnel project indicates that Egyptian authorities were not merely aware of Hamas' operation, they were supporting it. They were partners. They were making money. By the way, there are all sorts of existing international agreements dating back to 1979 between Egypt and Israel.

How much American money is flowing to Egypt? How much American money is flowing to the very countries, the very entities that are attacking Israel? Yet, here they didn't want people to go into Rafah. They didn't want Israel to go in. Why? Because they knew that the game was going to be given up, that there was a concerted, coordinated effort throughout the Middle East region to find ways to dismantle, disrupt, attack, and destroy Israel.

That is the truth.

This President is effectively supporting it. He is pulling back on the resources given to Israel, undermining the diplomacy, calling for one-sided cease-fires, funding Iran, lifting sanctions on Iran, allowing billions of dollars of their oil money to flow to China, which is enriching Iran and empowering China and undermining our national security, undermining our ally, Israel. That is all occurring right now, all while the International Criminal Court is targeting the Prime Minister of Israel.

Now, this is nothing new. Egypt has tried to undermine Israel's military operations in Gaza every step of the way. Egypt has blocked the exit of Gazans from the war zone. Egypt has blocked humanitarian aid from entering Gaza while accusing Israel of genocide at the International Court of Justice.

Egypt has threatened to abrogate its peace treaty with Israel and tied the future of peace to Israel's bowing to pressure not to operate in Rafah. Egypt has undermined hostage talks and waged political warfare against Israel at the United Nations and other international arenas.

There is nothing new here, except we now know right in front of us the new information about Egypt reveals what we have known about the region's attack and assault on Israel.

There are 50 tunnels, and they keep counting them. Bodies of hostages have been found in the tunnels. It has been clear that there has been the movement of weaponry through the tunnels.

This is just more of the same from an administration that is endangering

America on the world stage, undermining the safety and security of the American people, a disastrous, radical, progressive Democratic regime in the White House. Basically, all that regime is propping up a President and using him as a puppet to carry out their radical leftist agenda.

There has been no accountability for the disastrous Afghanistan withdrawal. There has been no justice for the 13 servicemembers who died there. There has been no accountability for the billions in military equipment left behind.

This administration has created the worst border crisis in the history of our Nation and endangered our citizens. Authorities in this country apprehended an illegal alien just this week with a van they called a rape dungeon on wheels. They found children's toys inside with condoms and ropes.

This is your country.

This is happening in your backyard.

There are little girls getting sold into the sex trafficking trade as we speak. An illegal alien from Nicaragua is accused of restraining and blindfolding a 12-year-old girl while attempting to sexually assault her. The alien illegally crossed the Texas border in October of 2021 and was released—released. Mr. Speaker, 80 known or suspected terrorists have been encountered at the southwest border just in fiscal year '24—more than all of those encountered in FY '17 to '21 combined.

Meanwhile, we have sent \$175 billion for a proxy war in Ukraine. We have no clear strategy and no defined objective, no oversight on spending. This administration is endangering the citizens it is supposed to be taking care of under the Constitution and defending our borders and securing us against enemies foreign and domestic.

That is the truth.

There is no defense.

If organizations like the ICC, the International Criminal Court, if organizations like the United Nations, if organizations like the World Health Organization, and the rest of them actually cared about human rights, they would be going after the real war criminals. They don't care about Hamas' crimes.

Yeah, the ICC says they are issuing warrants for Hamas, but they are trying to constrain Israel from going out and attacking and destroying Hamas.

What they care about is attacking and tearing down everything that is great and good about Western civilization that has done more for more people around this world than any other civilization in history.

Whether the President knows it is going on or not, that is what the Biden administration's actions have all been driving towards these past 3 years. They are destroying our sovereignty and weakening us on the outside while pushing chaos, economic ruin, and moral disintegration domestically.

I hope my colleagues will support the ICC sanctions bill. It is important. I hope we will all support it.

I have to address one other thing because while I think we will have unity among Republicans in pushing back on this International Criminal Court that is undermining our sovereignty and targeting our friend and ally Israel, and while I hope that we will be able to speak with one voice when we get back on that subject, there is another thing that is going on consistently here in this town.

Mr. Speaker, 18 months ago some of us set out to change the institution. We set out to change the rules and open up the process to be able to have more amendments, have more voice for the entirety of the majority in the decisionmaking of the leadership.

□ 1945

For a while that resulted in some changes. Last year, we were able to get Republican and broad support for what we called the Limit, Save, Grow Act in order to put forward a vision for limiting the increase in debt while expanding fiscal responsibility.

It was good legislation. We passed the strongest border security bill that we have ever passed. It had no amnesty in it. It had legitimate border security measures that have been rejected by Democrats, but would, by any objective measure, secure the border of the United States and almost assuredly would have meant that the killer who was paroled into the United States by the Biden administration would not have been able to be paroled and would not have been able to kill Laken Riley.

We passed that bill. We passed that bill as Republicans, uniting to do that. We passed seven appropriations bills. We processed about 1,100 amendments. We were able to move the ball forward in order to unite, in order to get this train back on track to see if we could do the appropriations process the right way.

There are many people in this body, particularly among my Republican colleagues, who want to hide behind rules and hide behind votes on rules, taking down rules, to say that we are not actually carrying out regular order.

Now, what does that mean for the average citizen out there? There are people in this town who want to have every excuse possible for blowing the budget of the United States, racking up debt, leaving the border wide open, sending more money overseas for endless wars, and then coming to us and crying about how, somehow, we don't get it. We don't get it.

We are supposed to all work as a team and agree to all the rules. Does it matter what is in the rule? What good is unity if your unity is for a terrible and stupid and destructive purpose? What good is unity if unity is going to rack up more debt and destroy our budget and destroy our children's futures and empower bureaucrats, empower tyrants, take away liberty, leave borders open, allow people to die, empower China, and send money to Ukraine?

What good are promises to say that you are going to secure the border of the United States before you deal with Ukraine and then do nothing of the sort? What good are rules that carry out that as a result?

When you hear a Republican decrying the fact that some of us want to say no and stand athwart history, yelling stop, to quote William F. Buckley, ask them what they have done. Ask them what they have done to limit spending, cut spending, secure the border. Ask them if they have done anything they said they would do. Ask them. Ask them to prove it. Ask them to show their votes, because nothing is going to change in this town as long as people bow down to the power brokers who tell you how it is.

I will again state on the floor of this Chamber, I answer to God, the Constitution, and the 750,000 people who sent me here. I answer to no committee chairman. I answer to no Speaker. I answer to no colleague. I answer to those Texans I represent and following the law.

My election certificate is every bit as valuable as anybody else's here. If they don't like it and want to go home and explain why they saddle up with Democrats for more Democrat support and majority Democrat support and they want to try to explain their votes, go ahead.

Explain the kill switches on cars that you voted for. Explain the Republicans who voted against defunding UNRWA last September 3 weeks before Israel was attacked by people funded by UNRWA. Explain that. The American people sent us here to change this place.

I had a colleague just a minute ago in a meeting who was just saying: Been here 14 years and we have done none of the things that we set out to do.

Amen.

We have an obligation as Members of this body to actually do the things we said we would do. I believe that the efforts that we set out to do 18 months ago resulted in positive change, and I am not going to let go of those things.

We did manage to hold nondefense spending flat. Defense spending that went up was paid for out of the hide of the IRS expansion and out of COVID money. We passed the best border security bill we could. We set the terms of the fight with the Limit, Save, Grow bill, for the defense spending bill. We put caps in place, which have already been busted. We started to push this place in the right direction and that is the direction we ought to go back to.

Over the next 5 or 6 months, the American people are going to have choices to make. I believe that they ought to return a Republican majority of the House and give us a Republican majority in the Senate, and I think they ought to put Donald Trump in the White House.

None of that will matter if Republicans aren't willing to come here and do what we said we would do and put

every ounce of your election certificate on the line to do what you said you would do. We didn't come here to sit around for 2 years talking about how we get re-elected. We came here to save the country.

I hope that is what we will focus on doing. I hope most Americans will sit and watch my friend from Arizona's detailed explanations of where this country is headed if we do not seek, not just fiscal responsibility in the broadest sense, but, as he will no doubt say in a few minutes, smart ways that we go about doing what we can do to save this country with its mountains of debt piling up for a variety of reasons, all of which are things we can deal with if we just had the courage to do it instead of looking at each other talking about the next election. Once we get elected, we should do something with it.

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

THE BENEFITS OF MORALITY AND REALLY GOOD MATH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I say to my friend from Texas, your intro was actually brilliant because we are going to try to do something this evening that is going to make a whole bunch of people really cranky.

Mr. Speaker, let's see if I can frame this in a way that I don't sound too much like a jerk. Week after week after week after week, I have come to the floor here and walked people through saying, the blue here, that portion we get to vote on and that every dime a Member of Congress votes on is on borrowed money.

This is all borrowed, plus actually a portion of your Medicare, if you look at the math, is actually borrowed. Gross interest is going to be \$1.2 trillion, making interest the second biggest expense in this government.

One of the arguments I deal with over and over is trying to find moral, effective ways that we can save ourselves; that you could actually impact this remarkable amount of debt where we are hovering around borrowing about \$100,000 a second.

Every second of every day, we are just a little below that. Then the really uncomfortable is when you walk through the data, it is interest and healthcare. I am not a doctor; I am good at math.

The dear Lord gave me one thing, I am good at math, but I thought I would try something new and exciting. How about if I brought, A, my friend who just happens to be benefited with a medical school education. That is why we will call him Dr. HARRIS and talk about if healthcare is the primary driver of U.S. sovereign debt, why not engage in the morality of a society that is healthier, that could be more vibrant?

I have come here, and we have talked about diabetes being 33 percent of all U.S. healthcare, being 30 percent of Medicare spending, the cascade of conditions that come from obesity in America and the morality of loving our brothers and sisters and having a healthier society.

My economists right now, we are working on our reply to the President's budget. We are vetting all the math, and we are highlighting things. We are still about 2 more weeks from our publication. We estimate that obesity will result in anywhere between \$8.2 and \$9.1 trillion in excess medical expenditures over the next decade.

Maybe the most powerful thing you and I could do for U.S. sovereign debt and burying your retirement and our children and our great-grandchildren and our great-great-grandchildren in piles of debt would be to actually work on policies to make us a healthier society.

You get the benefits of the morality and really good math. I just happen to have a medical doctor who is a Member of Congress who is on the Appropriations Committee who has an expertise that I don't have and can talk about things that I can't say, but understand, we mean this from a portion of optimism.

There is a path here, but we have to do something that is brutally uncomfortable for us: We have to tell the truth.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS).

Is that a fair set up?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding me some time today.

Mr. Speaker, to those who see the gentleman virtually every week come up here and talk about the economics of the United States and our debt problems and things like that, today, we will take a little different view because we are going to talk about something that doesn't just have to do with economics; it has to do with providing a healthier America. An America where, yes, we would save money if we were healthier, but the other benefits are so tremendous.

We are not doing this just because we want to save money; we are doing this because we think this is actually the right approach for Americans. If you look at the cost of healthcare, about 70 percent is to take care of chronic diseases and the big chronic diseases are hypertension, diabetes, and obesity. They are the big chronic diseases.

Cancer is not a chronic disease. It is an acute disease. It is the chronic diseases that are costing literally hundreds of billions of dollars to the United States.

Today, we are going to focus on obesity. Now, hopefully in the future, we will focus on diabetes, maybe on hypertension. The reason why it is so important to start with these three is that the amount of spending, as the gentleman indicates, is tremendous.

I am going to pull some data from this study from the Milken Institute. It is called America's obesity crisis. It is from 2018, so 5½ years ago, October 2018, but it is subtitled, "The Health and Economic Cost of Excess Weight." The health and economic costs because they are both costs.

Again, it is not just dollars and cents. They count, but the fact of life is just not as good for someone who has a chronic disease, so let's do something to prevent it.

However, the first thing you have to do is say, what is the history of obesity in the United States?

Look, I have been on this Earth 67 years. I will tell you that it has been noticeable that more Americans are obese or overweight. It is true throughout the world, but let's concentrate on America.

These are medical definitions. If you are higher than the normal range of weight, you are overweight, if you are slightly higher; then you are obese if you are higher than that; and then severe obesity or morbidly obese, as well.

Using these definitions, the same definitions in 1962, 3.4 percent of adults were considered obese. Again, it is not overweight; it is obese. If it is more than overweight; it is obese.

From 1962 to 2000, 30.5 percent. In 2016, 39.8 percent. Mr. Speaker, 8 years ago, it was 39.8 percent. The latest data the CDC has which is from 2017 to 2020, 41.9 percent. Mr. Speaker, 41.9 percent of Americans classified as obese.

Now, why is that classification important?

By the way, the demographic breakdown is very interesting because what we ought to be doing is, we ought to be looking at the demographics and paying attention to where it exists in the population: 49.9 percent of Black adults are obese, 45.6 percent of Hispanic adults, 41.4 percent of White adults, 16.1 percent of Asian adults.

□ 2000

It actually is overrepresented in the Black and Hispanic communities, but why is that important? By the way, that is adults.

The striking thing is for children in the last year that we have data: 16.1 percent overweight; 19.3 percent obese, one in five children are considered obese; one in 16, 6.1 percent, severe obesity in children. Again, that severe obesity in children number is actually higher at 6.1 percent than the entire adult population back in 1962.

It begs the question of why it is so important that we identify obesity. It is because I think a lot of people don't understand the broad range of diseases, including expensive healthcare diseases, in which the risk of that disease is higher if you are obese. It is not everybody who is obese who has these problems, but if you are obese, you are statistically more likely to have these problems.

I want to read the list so you understand why this is such a large eco-

nomics problem. Alzheimer's and vascular dementia, most people don't realize obesity is a risk factor for that. We worry a lot about that because the cost of Alzheimer's in America and the treatment, again, is measured in the hundreds of billions of dollars. Other diseases include asthma and COPD; breast cancer—we know that cancers are; chronic back pain; colorectal cancer; congestive heart failure—again, a large consumer of healthcare dollars; coronary artery disease; diabetes, of course. Again, diabetes and obesity kind of go hand-in-hand, but only 20 percent of the cost of obesity, again, the approximately \$1.7 trillion annual cost back in 2016, only 20 percent of that can be attributed to the coexistence of diabetes and obesity. Again, diabetes has to be handled by itself, but obesity is a risk factor for that.

Dyslipidemia, so people with high cholesterol and lipids; end-stage renal disease; endometrial cancer; esophageal adenocarcinoma; gallbladder cancer; gallbladder disease; gastric adenocarcinoma, so stomach cancer; hypertension; liver cancer; osteoarthritis; ovarian cancer; pancreatic cancer; prostate cancer; renal cancer; and stroke—all of these have a higher incidence in someone with obesity.

Scientifically, we say that if we can reduce obesity, we will reduce the incidence of all these diseases and the costs associated with them. The costs associated with them attributable to obesity are over \$1.5 trillion a year, both direct costs, the cost to actually treat someone, and the indirect costs, the cost of decreased productivity and decreased contribution to the GDP and the economy by someone who is ill, all these indirect and direct costs. These numbers are just staggering.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Yet, I promise you, tomorrow, we will have things on our phone attacking us for telling the truth.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to argue our willingness to come here and tell the truth—I love people. I want them to flourish.

Doctor, we are about to have our fifth year of prime-age males where their life expectancy is shorter. You were actually walking me through some of the math earlier.

Does anyone care?

The concentration I see of the lack of family formation, productivity, the ability to participate in society, the healthcare costs—what would happen if we had a society where we were not afraid to talk about the stigma?

We are saying there are policies. I have the stacks of charts and these things, but there are policies we can engage in to make a difference.

This is on topic and uncomfortable, but one of the things I come here and talk about over and over—let's just use this chart down here. Medicare is singularly the primary driver of our debt. It is healthcare costs. It is an earned benefit. You paid your 40 quarters for Social Security, but the average couple

will have paid in \$227,000 in FICA taxes, the portion that goes toward Medicare, but they get back \$725,000. That differential right there is the primary driver of U.S. sovereign debt.

Do you do what some of the folks around here want to do, my Democratic colleagues, where they want to basically say Medicare for All? We are going to ration it. It is going to be government everything. The doctors you have are going to be government employees, that sort of model. Or should we actually take on something much more moral, much more creative, and much more, I would argue, doable?

Let's look at the government policies we engage in where we subsidize people's misery. Could we turn some of the very programs we have to make them more moral and help make our society healthier?

Doctor, I know that has been one of your fixations. You have been in front of committees over and over, talking about things we could do, everything from agricultural legislation, nutrition legislation—the things I do in Ways and Means, trying to finance access to therapies to make people healthier.

Mr. HARRIS. Sure. I chair the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, and we are in charge of funding the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, the SNAP program.

If you were paying attention about an hour ago, an hour and a half ago, to the folks from the other side of the aisle, all they wanted to do was push more money into the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.

The second word there, by the way, is "nutrition." If you go back to the original founding, the program was founded to provide nutrition. In the early days of the program, there was a significant number of people in the country who actually did not receive enough calories. Literally, they didn't receive enough calories. At that time, the emphasis was to get food of all kinds to these folks so that they are not calorie starved.

Again, I talked about the trend in obesity, and what we see is that something is happening. We have programs like the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program where the last time they looked at it was in 2016—it might have been earlier than that—where 10 percent of the funds went to sugary soda. Remember, this is a \$122 billion a year program of taxpayer dollars. We ask taxpayers to pony up or to borrow \$122 billion to put into the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. Ten percent is on sugary soda, \$12 billion, our best estimate, is spent on something that we now know—maybe 40 or 50 years ago when the obesity rate was 6 percent or 3-plus percent, we didn't know that.

We do know now what contributes to obesity. We do know that insulin resistance, the presence of sugars and

processed foods in the diet, directly cause obesity. Of course, diabetes, which again we will get to in the future, and probably also hypertension to some extent, are all interrelated diseases. We actually know that that is bad.

I have proposed taking out nonnutritious—it is about 20 percent. It is 10 percent sugary soda beverages and another 10 percent salty snacks, ultra-processed food. Again, it raises your insulin levels. It does all the bad things that ultimately lead to an increased amount of fatty tissue and obesity.

Let's just say that we will allow States to restrict that in a program and take that money and spend it on fruits and vegetables or something. That sounds like a pretty novel idea. That sounds like a pretty good idea based on the scientific evidence.

The pushback has been tremendous, mainly from the other side of the aisle, which is: No, all we need to do is spend more money on this program.

I would suggest to the gentleman from Arizona that we have enough proof that what we have been doing hasn't been working. In fact, it has been making the problem worse because the data on people who receive Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program shows they are more obese and more overweight.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. And sicker.

Mr. HARRIS. Of course, they are sicker because we know these diseases relate to it. The studies were done against individuals who had the same socioeconomic status, same income, but were not getting SNAP benefits.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Doctor, the morality argument I really want us to make is the way we have designed these programs, as they were originally designed decades and decades and decades ago, we now understand, we are financing people's misery instead of financing the opportunity to be healthier, to be part of society, to actually live longer.

It is uncomfortable, but we have to have a moment of honesty. I don't understand the left's fixation on basically using borrowed money to finance misery.

Mr. HARRIS. I agree. This is not just about economics. It is using borrowed money to actually cause the need for more borrowed money in the future.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Yes. On the economic side, we call it knock-off effects, second-degree, third-degree effects. In some ways, they are not even that. They are just the principal effects.

Mr. HARRIS. It is direct. Again, even if this were economically neutral—but it is not—one would make the argument that the right thing to do for people is to give them a better, healthier life.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. In the hearing today, we had someone suggest that all we need to do is do public service announcements, that we will just do education.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. And?

Mr. HARRIS. One of the experts said, quite accurately, that when you deal with an addiction—and we won't get into that today, but by the way, just so everybody understands, it is now pretty clear from brain chemistry that sugar—and when we say sugar, mostly it is fructose because the other sugar is cane sugar, which is sucrose, a combination of fructose and glucose. Fructose, basically, we understand that it is actually physically addictive in the brain because it results through the modifier of MGO, a chemical called MGO, which binds to receptors in the brain. It actually releases dopamine.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Yes. Would this explain my ice cream problem?

Mr. HARRIS. It could. Every single addictive issue in front of us involves—whether it is an addiction like opioid addiction, an addiction like sugar addiction, an addiction like gambling, or your cell phones and the fact that our youth now spend 7 hours a day on their cell phones, on the internet and playing games and things, it is because this is designed to release dopamine in the brain.

We understand it is the exact same mechanism, and it is up to us. People say to educate. Our government shouldn't be involved in this. Wait a minute, we are talking about regulating the industry for children with regard to apps, regulating the opioid industry because it is addictive, dealing with gambling because it is addictive. Why wouldn't we talk about a food addiction that leads to misery and huge economic costs?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Doctor, look, my personal philosophy, I am probably a little bit more libertarian here. Have what you want, but understand, A, should government finance things that make our population less healthy, and, as a matter of fact, make much of the population very sick? The reality of it is when the majority of healthcare partially is financed in some fashion through government, we have an interest. In some ways, it sickens me, but that is the reality we have to sort of mechanically deal with.

The statistics, the data, are just crashing on us since the pandemic, the curve of our brothers and sisters who are getting sicker and sicker. Now, I am dealing with some of the data we are looking at of those moving into their retirement benefits being also much sicker and trying to figure out how we finance that. We are financing it with partially borrowed money.

It is honestly a good economics and moral argument. Maybe we should change the way we do nutrition assistance in America. Maybe we should change even down to some of the agricultural policy of adding more variety. I have given presentations on the concentration of certain crops and the whole way commodity pricing works, and the black swan theory of that level of concentration, God forbid something ever happened to one of the crops, but

it all ties together. It is a unified theory. If I care about healthcare spending—and, understand, ObamaCare was a financing bill. It was about who got subsidized and who had to pay. Our Republican alternative was a financing bill.

□ 2015

We are right now doing the hardest thing in Congress. We are actually talking about what we pay for. Could we actually reduce healthcare spending by having a healthier country, a healthier population? That would actually be much more egalitarian with prosperity.

Mr. HARRIS. There is no question that that is true. The fact is that we can send a strong economic signal through our ability to modify what is available under food programs, not only direct payments but also the fact that, over the past 50 years, we have kind of funneled all the production, as you said, into only a handful of major crops.

In my district, for instance, they used to grow tomatoes. It used to be one of the tomato capitals of the country. I didn't even know this, but it is not anymore. It is just soybeans and corn, partly because we have a big poultry industry, but the variety of crops has just disappeared.

Again, everything comes together. Everything points in the same direction. We must address the obesity crisis. We know what causes it.

We actually have a pretty good idea of how to solve it, how to get there, but we have to decide that that is something we are going to do. I think the average American understands it. I think they do.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. It is fascinating when I am home in Arizona, the number of folks I walk up to who will almost pull me aside and say: I can't believe you were willing to talk about that. You told the truth.

It is almost like they weren't ready to have those of us from the political class do something that is uncomfortable.

The math is the math. If you take a look at mortality statistics, is it moral to have a society, particularly working, prime-age males—I mean, you were actually quoting some of the statistics in our previous conversation. They are dying younger and younger.

What we have done to younger people in the country, what we are doing to seniors, we can fix this. We just have to be willing to do some difficult policy here—it is not difficult policy.

There are some experiments out there—and you and I have not talked about this before, so we are winging it—where it was the food box and saying that we are going to deliver to our brothers and sisters who need nutrition support a box. There was a problem. Sometimes, the fruits and those things were thrown away, so they experimented with other ways to deliver it.

It was in a microwave pouch, and it turned out that it was working. They

were making people healthier, and then that pilot program disappeared.

We are talking billions and billions of dollars, which means there will be armies of lobbyists in the hallway here tomorrow really cranky about what we talked about.

Can we make the argument that we should do the right thing? Is this Republican or Democrat? It should be just the right thing.

Mr. HARRIS. That is right. You bring up a good point.

The first thing you start with is say that we don't have to change—let's do a few pilot programs. Let's get some data. Otherwise, it is incredibly difficult to see whether some of these ideas work to change the way people buy and their habits. Obviously, it will take a generation for the obesity that already exists to plateau.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I am more optimistic than you.

Mr. HARRIS. I mean, with Ozempic and Wegovy, maybe it is quicker, but these are not the solution. The solution is not to become obese and then take a drug to reduce the obesity. It is not to become obese in the first place, but your point is critical.

Right now, a 3-year-old has a lower life expectancy than a 60-year-old had at the same age. That is because our adults are getting these chronic diseases at an increasing rate. That 3-year-old, if we don't change the trajectory, will have much less of a chance to live to the same age as their grandfather did or their father did.

We cannot accept that in America. We are actually in a situation where our children have a lower life expectancy than us.

This is the opposite of everything anybody does anything for. As a father, you want to do everything for your children so they have it better than you.

We are kind of intentionally, because we are intentional in how we spend dollars, forcing our children to a lower, shorter life expectancy than we have. Shame on us if we don't fix this.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. We are already crushing the next generation, the next three generations. My wife is my age, and I have an 8-year-old and a 23-month-old.

Mathematically, my 23-month-old, when he is 20 years old, U.S. taxes will have to be double what they are today to maintain baseline services.

This is what we are doing to our society. We are coming behind these microphones, and we have done the economic presentations. We can do the Democrats' tax scheme. You get about 1.5 percent of GDP if you were able to tax maximize everything.

For those of us who want to cut things, we get about a point of discretionary nondefense. That is \$300 billion there if we could cut that much, so 2.5 percent.

This fiscal year so far, we were expecting to borrow about 5, 5.5 percent of GDP. We are closer to 9. Does anyone see a math problem there?

If this is the political rhetoric, that they want to raise taxes and we want to cut, and you only get this much, maybe we need to promote policies that disrupt the cost of government and the cost of healthcare.

A couple of weeks ago, I gave a series of presentations here on using technology, using AI, those things, to make government much smaller. We can do things like this. There are paths.

Mr. Speaker pro tempore, are we up against time?

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

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. HARRIS for joining me, and I yield back.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Kevin F. McCumber, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly an enrolled joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 109. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to "Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 121".

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 23, 2024, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

EC-4277. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2023-1883; Project Identifier MCAI-2023-00804-T; Amendment 39-22734; AD 2024-08-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 17, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4278. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's annual report on material violations or suspected material violations of regulations relating to Treasury auctions and other offerings of securities during the period of January 1, 2023, through December 31, 2023, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3121 note; Public Law 103-202, Sec. 202(d)(1); (107 Stat. 2358); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-4279. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Nicaragua that was declared in Executive Order 13851 of November 27, 2018, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-4280. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans that was declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-4281. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to North Korea that was declared in Executive Order 13466 of June 26, 2008, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-4282. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a determination under Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-4283. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a Memorandum of Justification for the drawdown of defense articles and services and military education and training under Sec. 506(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-4284. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: RSAT cast 24-10259, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-4285. A letter from the General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the Board's Inspector General Semi-annual Report to Congress for the period October 1, 2023 through March 31, 2024, pursuant to section 405(c) of the Inspector General Act; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4286. A letter from the Chairman, Labor Member, and Management Member, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's 2023 calendar year annual report; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4287. A letter from the Deputy Chief, National Forest System, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the final maps and perimeter boundary descriptions for Cottonwood Creek Wild and Scenic River, in California, added to the National Wild and Scenic River System, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106(a)(1); Public Law 97-258 (as amended by Public Law 101-576, Sec. 306(a)); (104 Stat. 2854); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-4288. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation of Colored Federal Airway Blue 3 (B-3) in Western Alaska [Docket No.: FAA-2023-2103; Airspace Docket No.: 22-AAL-24] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received May 17, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4289. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Saginaw, MI [Docket No.: FAA-2024-0273; Airspace Docket No.: 24-AGL-4] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received May 17, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4290. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Lake Charles, LA [Docket No.: FAA-2024-0270; Airspace Docket No.: 24-ASW-3] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received May 17, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4291. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace and Amendment of Class E Airspace, Harrisburg, PA [Docket No.: FAA-2023-0214; Airspace Docket No.: 23-AEA-05] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received May 17, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4292. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of United States Area Navigation (RNAV) Routes Q-30 and T-370; Eastern United States [Docket No.: FAA-2024-0696; Airspace Docket No.: 23-ASO-54] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received May 17, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4293. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Dixon, IL [Docket No.: FAA-2024-0271; Airspace Docket No.: 24-AGL-2] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received May 17, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4294. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Beaumont/Port Arthur, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2024-0269; Airspace Docket No.: 24-ASW-2] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received May 17, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4295. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31545; Amdt. No.: 4112] received May 17, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4296. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31544; Amdt. No.: 4111] received May 17, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4297. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2024-0771; Project Identifier AD-2023-01251-E; Amendment 39-22720; AD 2024-06-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 17, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4298. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2023-2397; Project Identifier MCAI-2023-00601-T; Amendment 39-22730; AD 2024-07-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 17, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4299. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Winder, GA [Docket No.: FAA-2023-2467; Airspace Docket No.: 23-ASO-42] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received May 17, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4300. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Huntington, WV [Docket No.: FAA-2023-2360; Airspace Docket No.: 23-AEA-24] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received May 17, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4301. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG [Docket No.: FAA-2024-0036; Project Identifier MCAI-2023-00731-E; Amendment 39-22739; AD 2024-08-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 17, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4301. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG [Docket No.: FAA-2024-0036; Project Identifier MCAI-2023-00731-E; Amendment 39-22739; AD 2024-08-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 17, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 7189. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a national congenital heart disease research, surveillance, and awareness program, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-517). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 7208. A bill to reauthorize the Traumatic Brain Injury Program; with an amendment (Rept. 118-518). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of Union.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 7224. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Stop, Observe, Ask, and Respond to Health and Wellness Training Program (Rept. 118-519). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 6829. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize and support the creation and dissemination of cardiomyopathy education, awareness, and risk assessment materials and resources to identify more at-risk families, to authorize research and surveillance activities relating to cardiomyopathy, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-520). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. COMER (for himself and Ms. PORTER):

H.R. 8489. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require additional ethics disclosures for the President, Vice President, and their family members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BERA:

H.R. 8490. A bill to establish the Office of Social Connection Policy, to establish a national strategy on social connection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. MOULTON):

H.R. 8491. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to make certain improvements in the laws relating to coal royalties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Financial Services, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BUSH, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LIEU, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MENG, Mr. NADLER, Ms. PORTER, Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. TITUS, and Ms. TLAIB):

H.R. 8492. A bill to prohibit wildlife killing contests on public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CRAIG:

H.R. 8493. A bill to establish the Task Force to Stop Price Gouging, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 8494. A bill to provide that certain local parks are eligible for E-Rate support, to provide that local parks are eligible for the loan, lease, or transfer of certain excess research equipment, and to direct the Secretary of Labor to carry out a program to make grants for conducting technology training programs in local parks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DUARTE (for himself, Mr. VAN ORDEN, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 8495. A bill to ensure electric vehicle companies do not use child or slave labor in the manufacture of, or sourcing of materials for, electric vehicles; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the

Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GALLEGO:

H.R. 8496. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to the definition of protection determination and protection merits interview; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLEGO:

H.R. 8497. A bill to provide the Secretary of Homeland Security certain direct hiring authorities; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARBARINO (for himself, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. VALADAO, Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia, Mr. LALOTA, Mr. D'ESPOSITO, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LAWLER, and Mr. MOLINARO):

H.R. 8498. A bill to authorize funding for necessary expenses for the rehabilitation, modernization, and construction of facilities and infrastructure at the United States Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 8499. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to establish requirements for voting by absentee ballot in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HORSFORD (for himself and Mr. CLEAVER):

H.R. 8500. A bill to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to collect and make publicly available data on properties receiving an allocation of credit under the low-income housing tax credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACOBS (for herself, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 8501. A bill to prohibit the issuance of licenses for the exportation of certain defense articles to the United Arab Emirates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE (for herself, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, Ms. JACOBS, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 8502. A bill to provide protections for children in immigration custody, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. BERA):

H.R. 8503. A bill to provide States with support to establish integrated care programs for individuals who are dually eligible for Medicare and Medicaid, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as

fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MALLIOTAKIS (for herself, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MOYLAN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LAWLER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 8504. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish the critical supply chains reshoring investment tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself and Mr. EZELL):

H.R. 8505. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to expand the authority of the Administrator of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration to assess penalties for violations of laws and regulations relating to the shipping of household goods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. DELUZZO, and Mrs. SYKES):

H.R. 8506. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage domestic insourcing and discourage foreign outsourcing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. PELTOLA:

H.R. 8507. A bill to provide for the designation of areas within which fishing activities carried out using bottom trawls may be carried out; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. PELTOLA (for herself, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 8508. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to reauthorize the bycatch reduction engineering program and establish the Bycatch Mitigation Assistance Fund; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. STRICKLAND (for herself, Mr. CARSON, and Mr. TORRES of New York):

H.R. 8509. A bill to reform pattern or practice investigations conducted by the Department of Justice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. TOKUDA:

H.R. 8510. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to encourage the use of native vegetation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. TORRES of California:

H.R. 8511. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress a report on transitioning military acquired credentials to the civilian workforce; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 8512. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2025 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. VASQUEZ:

H.R. 8513. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a demonstration project to allow Tribal entities to purchase agricultural commodities under the commodity supplemental food program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VASQUEZ:

H.R. 8514. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for an annual increase in stipend for books, supplies, equipment, and other educational costs under Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WALTZ:

H.R. 8515. A bill to promote and recruit the United States maritime industry workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIFFITH (for himself, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. BOST, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. PALMER, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. PERRY, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. OGLES, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. PENCE, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. MOONEY, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, and Mr. ELLZEY):

H.J. Res. 152. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Hazardous and Solid Waste Management System: Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals From Electric Utilities; Legacy CCR Surface Impoundments"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ALLRED (for himself, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. TONKO, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mrs. FLETCHER, and Mr. COSTA):

H. Res. 1250. A resolution commemorating the 60th anniversary of President Lyndon Baines Johnson's Great Society; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia (for himself and Mrs. DINGELL):

H. Res. 1251. A resolution honoring Rosalynn Smith Carter's legacy in mental health advocacy; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GUEST (for himself, Mr. HUDSON, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. BACON, Mr. MCCORMICK, Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. CAREY, Ms. WILD, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAHOOD, Ms. PETERSEN, Mr. EZELL, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. RYAN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Ms. STEFANIK, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER):

H. Res. 1252. A resolution honoring the commitment and care of emergency medical services personnel; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY AND SINGLE SUBJECT STATEMENTS

Pursuant to clause 7(c)(1) of rule XII and Section 3(c) of H. Res. 5 the following statements are submitted regarding (1) the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution and (2) the single subject of the bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. COMER:

H.R. 8489.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution, in that the legislation is "necessary and proper for carrying into Execu-

tion the . . . Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

The single subject of this legislation is: Presidential and Vice Presidential ethics reporting requirements.

By Mr. BERA:

H.R. 8490.

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

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

The single subject of this legislation is: Social Connection

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 8491.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

The single subject of this legislation is:

The Coal Royalty Fairness and Communities Investment Act of 2024 would close loopholes in the federal coal royalty payment system and use royalties to help diversify and strengthen economies of struggling coal communities. (Natural Resources)

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 8492.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States

The single subject of this legislation is: Environmental Protection

By Ms. CRAIG:

H.R. 8493.

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

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

FTC, DOJ and USDA task force to address costs affecting consumers.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 8494.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the powers enumerated under section 8 and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is: Technology

By Mr. DUARTE:

H.R. 8495.

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

Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To ensure electric vehicle companies do not use child or slave labor in the manufacture of, or sourcing of materials for, electric vehicles

By Mr. GALLEGRO:

H.R. 8496.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: [The Congress shall have Power . . .] To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is: Immigration

By Mr. GALLEGRO:

H.R. 8497.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: [The Congress shall have Power . . .] To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is: Immigration

By Mr. GARBARINO:

H.R. 8498.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The single subject of this legislation is:

This legislation would authorize funds to support the implementation of the Full Speed Ahead infrastructure plan, created by The Maritime Security Infrastructure Council (MSIC) in order to address critical infrastructure needs at the USMMA. Funding would be authorized from FY24-FY34 in the amount of \$54 million the first year, and \$107,333,333 each subsequent year.

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 8499.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Absentee Ballot Requirements

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 8500.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States

The single subject of this legislation is:

Housing

By Ms. JACOBS:

H.R. 8501.

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

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To prohibit the issuance of licenses for the exportation of certain defense articles to the United Arab Emirates until the President certifies to Congress that the UAE is no longer providing materiel support to the Rapid Support Forces in Sudan.

By Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE:

H.R. 8502.

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

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

The single subject of this legislation is:

To increase child protection in the immigration system

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 8503.

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

Article I Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Health

By Ms. MALLIOTAKIS:

H.R. 8504.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution gives Congress the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish the critical supply chains reshoring investment tax credit

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 8505.

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

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill would give the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration more authority to protect consumers from fraud in the interstate transportation of household goods.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 8506.

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

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is.

Taxation

By Mrs. PELTOLA:

H.R. 8507.

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

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To provide for the designation of areas within which fishing activities carried out using bottom trawls may be carried out.

By Mrs. PELTOLA:

H.R. 8508.

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

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Magnuson-Stevens Act to authorize the Bycatch Reduction Engineering Program and establish the Bycatch Mitigation Assistance Fund

By Ms. STRICKLAND:

H.R. 8509.

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

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is.

This bill would bolster pattern-or-practice investigations into discrimination by police departments, prosecutors, judges, and certain other officials.

By Ms. TOKUDA:

H.R. 8510.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Encouraging the use of native plants in National Resource Conservation Service conservation programs.

By Mrs. TORRES of California:

H.R. 8511.

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

According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

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

The single subject of this legislation is:

To direct the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress a report on transitioning military acquired credentials to the civilian workforce.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 8512.

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

Among other powers, those vested in Congress pursuant to Article I, Section 8 to: Provide for the common defense and general welfare for the United States; Regulate commerce; and Make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution Congress's other powers as provided under that Article.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2025 for intelligence and intelligence related activities of the United States Government,

the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

By Mr. VASQUEZ:

H.R. 8513.

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

Article 1, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United State Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of the Congress.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Tribal nutrition

By Mr. VASQUEZ:

H.R. 8514.

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

Article 1, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United State Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of the Congress. Funding

The single subject of this legislation is:

Veteran Education

By Mr. WALTZ:

H.R. 8515.

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

Article I Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill enhances the U.S. maritime workforce and industry.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.J. Res. 152.

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

Article I Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is.

Congressional disapproval of the Environmental Protection Agency's "Hazardous and Solid Waste Management System: Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals From Electric Utilities; Legacy CCR Surface Impoundments".

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 14: Mr. KENNEDY.
 H.R. 36: Mr. BACON.
 H.R. 38: Mr. CARTER of Texas.
 H.R. 211: Mr. GOOD of Virginia.
 H.R. 234: Mr. PAPPAS.
 H.R. 253: Mr. VASQUEZ.
 H.R. 301: Mr. GOOD of Virginia.
 H.R. 333: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 392: Mr. GOOD of Virginia.
 H.R. 396: Mrs. DINGELL.
 H.R. 537: Ms. MANNING.
 H.R. 756: Ms. CHU.
 H.R. 789: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 838: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
 H.R. 860: Ms. Boebert.
 H.R. 902: Ms. PORTER.
 H.R. 932: Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 954: Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.R. 994: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 1015: Mr. ELLZEY, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Ms. DELBENE, and Ms. SLOTKIN.
 H.R. 1088: Mr. CROW, Mr. STANTON, and Mr. MCGARVEY.
 H.R. 1092: Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 1111: Mr. CARTER of Louisiana.
 H.R. 1134: Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 1199: Mr. YAKYM.
 H.R. 1321: Mr. KUSTOFF, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. RUTHERFORD.
 H.R. 1526: Mrs. PELTOLA.
 H.R. 1572: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. MCGARVEY, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 1591: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
 H.R. 1617: Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 1624: Mr. SUOZZI.
 H.R. 1638: Mrs. PELTOLA and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 1666: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 1668: Mr. SUOZZI.
 H.R. 1692: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 1776: Ms. BROWNLEY.
 H.R. 1787: Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 1806: Ms. TENNEY and Mr. ARMSTRONG.
 H.R. 1822: Mr. LAWLER.
 H.R. 1831: Mr. HUFFMAN.
 H.R. 2394: Mr. SOTO.
 H.R. 2407: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 2501: Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 2708: Mr. GOLDEN of Maine.
 H.R. 2874: Ms. SEWELL.
 H.R. 2880: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 2923: Mr. AMO, Mrs. FOUSHEE, and Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2955: Ms. BALINT.
 H.R. 2957: Mr. BACON and Mrs. MCBATH.
 H.R. 3086: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 3112: Ms. TLAI.
 H.R. 3149: Mr. PAPPAS.
 H.R. 3170: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
 H.R. 3240: Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 3312: Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 3350: Mr. SORENSEN and Ms. MATSUI.
 H.R. 3418: Mr. GUTHRIE.
 H.R. 3475: Mr. SUOZZI.
 H.R. 3481: Mr. SABLAN.
 H.R. 3503: Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 3596: Ms. BALINT.
 H.R. 3646: Mr. LYNCH.
 H.R. 3656: Mr. SUOZZI.
 H.R. 3693: Mr. GUTHRIE.
 H.R. 3853: Mr. EVANS.
 H.R. 3940: Mr. VAN DREW, Mrs. KIM of California, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PANETTA, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. BERA, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. PINGREE, and Ms. BROWNLEY.
 H.R. 4021: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 4121: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
 H.R. 4275: Mr. YAKYM.
 H.R. 4384: Mr. BACON.
 H.R. 4438: Mr. MCHENRY and Mrs. FOUSHEE.
 H.R. 4534: Mr. VAN DREW.
 H.R. 4563: Mr. NEHLS.
 H.R. 4572: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. CRAIG, and Mr. PETERS.
 H.R. 4582: Ms. STANSBURY.
 H.R. 4646: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 4731: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H.R. 4745: Ms. DE LA CRUZ.
 H.R. 4896: Mr. BACON.
 H.R. 4974: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER and Ms. DELBENE.
 H.R. 4975: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 5077: Mr. BERA.
 H.R. 5275: Mr. FERGUSON.
 H.R. 5316: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 5402: Mr. EVANS.
 H.R. 5414: Ms. ROSS and Mr. LANDSMAN.
 H.R. 5432: Mr. PASCRELL.
 H.R. 5455: Mr. BACON.
 H.R. 5480: Mr. EVANS.
 H.R. 5526: Ms. ROSS.
 H.R. 5530: Ms. BALINT.
 H.R. 5577: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
 H.R. 5744: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 5761: Mr. CAREY.
 H.R. 5778: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
 H.R. 5813: Mrs. FOUSHEE.
 H.R. 5840: Mr. SUOZZI and Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California.
 H.R. 6012: Mr. HUFFMAN.
 H.R. 6049: Mrs. RAMIREZ.
 H.R. 6103: Mr. TONKO and Mr. TORRES of New York.
 H.R. 6123: Mr. GUTHRIE.
 H.R. 6161: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

- H.R. 6301: Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 6394: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 6433: Ms. BALINT.
H.R. 6487: Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 6608: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 6613: Mr. BACON and Ms. ROSS.
H.R. 6640: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 6643: Mr. THANEDAR.
H.R. 6749: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 6763: Mr. LATURNER.
H.R. 6847: Mr. CLYDE.
H.R. 6881: Ms. TLAIB.
H.R. 6951: Mr. BRECHEEN, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, and Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina.
H.R. 7022: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
H.R. 7116: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 7142: Mr. PASCARELL and Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 7233: Mrs. KIM of California.
H.R. 7285: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H.R. 7297: Mr. PETERS and Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.
H.R. 7379: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 7438: Mr. MEUSER and Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California.
H.R. 7450: Ms. TENNEY, Mr. MANN, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, and Mr. YAKYM.
H.R. 7469: Mr. MEUSER.
H.R. 7478: Mrs. HOUCHEIN.
H.R. 7481: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 7504: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 7539: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 7661: Mr. GARBARINO.
H.R. 7766: Mr. BERA.
H.R. 7770: Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. KHANNA, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. HARDER of California, Ms. PORTER, Ms. BUDZINSKI, and Mrs. MCBATH.
H.R. 7771: Ms. GARCIA of Texas and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 7849: Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California.
H.R. 7891: Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. DUNN of Florida, and Mr. CASTEN.
H.R. 7894: Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. AMO, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 7906: Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 7909: Mr. NEHLS and Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 7937: Mr. TIMMONS.
H.R. 7940: Mr. BOWMAN.
H.R. 7958: Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 7977: Mr. DELUZIO.
H.R. 7999: Mr. FLOOD.
H.R. 8012: Mr. BERGMAN.
H.R. 8055: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 8057: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 8061: Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 8068: Mrs. LESKO.
H.R. 8076: Ms. ROSS.
H.R. 8093: Mr. IVEY.
H.R. 8098: Mrs. FLETCHER.
H.R. 8114: Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 8141: Mrs. TRAHAN.
H.R. 8164: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 8193: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 8208: Mr. MOORE of Alabama.
H.R. 8211: Mrs. FISCHBACH.
H.R. 8212: Mr. LAWLER, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
H.R. 8224: Mr. CLYDE.
H.R. 8247: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Ms. MCCLELLAN.
H.R. 8266: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 8268: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 8271: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 8281: Mr. OWENS, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. TIMMONS, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 8282: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. HUNT, Mr. FALLON, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. GUEST, and Mrs. CHAVEZ-DE REMER.
H.R. 8292: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 8345: Mr. ARMSTRONG.
H.R. 8349: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 8354: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.
H.R. 8368: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 8371: Mr. BALDERSON and Mrs. BICE.
H.R. 8372: Mr. CLINE.
H.R. 8374: Mr. ROSENDALE.
H.R. 8375: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 8377: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 8390: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 8397: Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 8420: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 8421: Mr. MILLS and Mr. RESCHENTHALER.
H.R. 8426: Ms. TLAIB.
H.R. 8434: Ms. DE LA CRUZ.
H.R. 8466: Mr. GARBARINO and Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia.
H.R. 8483: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 8485: Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. PORTER, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, and Ms. BROWN.
H.J. Res. 76: Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MRVAN, and Mr. FOSTER.
H.J. Res. 134: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CLYDE, and Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.J. Res. 138: Mr. PALMER, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. MORAN.
H.J. Res. 144: Mr. ALFORD.
H.J. Res. 151: Mr. MANN.
H. Con. Res. 33: Mr. SUOZZI.
H. Res. 643: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H. Res. 702: Mr. THANEDAR.
H. Res. 899: Mr. D'ESPOSITO.
H. Res. 1121: Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania and Mrs. RAMIREZ.
H. Res. 1131: Mr. LAWLER and Mr. NICKEL.
H. Res. 1158: Ms. LOFGREN.
H. Res. 1198: Mr. DOGGETT and Ms. SCHA-KOWSKY.
H. Res. 1206: Ms. BONAMICI and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H. Res. 1215: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H. Res. 1217: Mr. NICKEL.
H. Res. 1221: Mr. TIFFANY.
H. Res. 1228: Mr. NICKEL.
H. Res. 1246: Mr. D'ESPOSITO and Mr. LAWLER.
H. Res. 1248: Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. TORRES of New York.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative OGLER, or a designee, to H.R. 5403 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 170

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 22, 2024

No. 89

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable PETER WELCH, a Senator from the State of Vermont.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, this day we give You our lives, for without You, we are like dust in the wind. Shield us from disgrace as You surround us with Your protection, mercy, and love. Remind us that disgrace comes to those who seek to deceive others.

Lord, sustain our lawmakers, show them the right plans, point them to the right path, and lead them to the right destination. Continue to keep them from stumbling or slipping, so that one day they will stand in Your presence with great joy.

We pray in Your sovereign Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer 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.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mrs. MURRAY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U. S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 22, 2024.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable PETER WELCH, a Sen-

ator from the State of Vermont, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATTY MURRAY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WELCH thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 4381

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk that is due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4381) to protect an individual's ability to access contraceptives and to engage in contraception and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide contraceptives, contraception, and information related to contraception.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I would object to further proceeding.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BORDER ACT OF 2024—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 397, S. 4361.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 397, S. 4361, a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for border security and combatting fentanyl for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

DONALD TRUMP

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I would like to begin with a few words about Donald Trump's dangerous post last night on Truth Social. What Donald Trump said, falsely suggesting his political opponents are out to kill him, is beyond the pale and is the stuff that leads to political violence. Donald Trump seems to have no consideration for the sanctity and peacefulness and further functioning of our democracy.

Everyone who was here on January 6 should immediately see what he is doing—what Donald Trump is doing—using conspiracy theories to spin the hard right into a frenzy, and it is despicable for Members of Congress to spread Donald Trump's lies. This is how people get killed, how the seeds of political violence are sowed, and how people lose faith in this democracy. Donald Trump has no regard for that. He would basically rip up parts of our democracy for what he thinks is his own personal gain.

Let's speak truthfully. What the FBI did was follow standard practice. They worked with the Secret Service at Mar-a-Lago ahead of time to coordinate how to carry out a search warrant. Donald Trump wasn't even in Florida but instead in New Jersey on the day of the search.

So this idea that his political opponents are out to kill him is absurd. Every single Member of the House and Senate, Democrat and Republican, should condemn Donald Trump's outlandish and dangerous statement. It

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S3819

should be the easiest thing they do today.

If words like Donald Trump's are not fiercely condemned, we are only begging for something far worse to happen to our democracy down the line. We cannot let this man, Donald Trump, or anybody else throw these kinds of matches to light flames that could burn our democracy. It is just horrible. I can't believe that someone would do something like that.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now on judges, a much better note, today, the Senate reaches a significant milestone: 200 judges confirmed to lifetime appointments under President Biden and this very proud Democratic majority: 200 judges who are restoring balance in excellence to our courts, 200 judges who are increasing the diversity and dynamism of our judiciary, 200 judges who are committed to applying the law fairly, impartially, equally. Of those 200 judges—I am so proud—127 are women; 125 are people of color, both traditionally underrepresented demographics on the bench. We are making our courts look more like America. It is not just going to be male White partners in fancy law firms. It is much more diverse, and the bench is better for it. It is something we can all be proud of.

Mr. President, 127 women, 125 people of color, over twice as many women, and more than three times as many people of color have been confirmed under the last administration. We have confirmed more Black judges, more Latino judges, more Asian-American judges. We confirmed the first Muslim-American man and woman on the bench, the first Navajo Federal judge, the first Black woman to serve on the Supreme Court, of course, Justice Ketanji Brown Jackson.

We have confirmed more judges who have served as public defenders and civil rights lawyers and consumer lawyers and immigration lawyers and labor lawyers; again, not just partners of big law firms. We have confirmed more judges, in other words, who embody the very ideal of America, a place where the rule of law is protected, where the rights of all are honored, and where everyone—everyone—gets a fair shake.

I commend Chairman DURBIN. I commend the Judiciary Committee for their great work processing judges in and out of our committee. I commend President Biden for nominating so many of these people and working with our Senate colleagues as to who would be best from their States and regions.

Senate Democrats are very proud of our record. We are proud of our judges, and we will keep going.

BORDER ACT OF 2024

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on the border, well, tomorrow, Senators face

an important decision: Will both sides come together to advance a bipartisan border security bill or will partisanship get in the way yet again?

Three months ago, Donald Trump told his Republican allies to block the strongest bipartisan border security bill Congress has seen in a generation. Luckily, we are trying again tomorrow, and I hope this time Republicans join us to achieve a different outcome.

The only way—the only way—we are going to fix the border is through bipartisan legislation, just like the one both sides spent months negotiating a few months ago and which we are taking up again tomorrow. We don't expect every Democrat or every Republican to support this bill. It wasn't designed that way. It wasn't designed to get all the votes of one party, which then almost inevitably means you get none of the votes from the other side. It was intended to be a compromise that could pass and become law.

We know there are disagreements, as there always are, about the best way to proceed on the border. But that is precisely why I have emphasized from day one, we need to have strong border support if we hope to get border done.

Unlike H.R. 2, a very partisan bill, the bipartisan border bill was written with the goal of getting 60 votes in the Senate, with support from both Republicans and Democrats. It had input from both Republicans and Democrats. H.R. 2 can't claim that. If anything is political, it is H.R. 2. It didn't receive a single Democratic vote in the Senate because Democrats weren't consulted. It didn't even get the full support of Senate Republicans. H.R. 2 was the definition of political theater, one side sitting in a room by itself writing what it wanted not even thinking of how you pass a bill.

Our bill, however, is what a serious attempt at border reform looks like. Now, most people might not remember, but a few months ago, there was a lot of bipartisan interest in getting our border bill passed before Donald Trump killed it in its tracks. Our Republican colleagues—including the Republican leader—was adamant. We needed to get border security done as part of the national security supplemental. This is what the Republican leader said right before our bill was released:

I think this is the ideal time to do it.

He then added, Leader MCCONNELL added:

This is a unique opportunity where divided government has given us an opportunity to get an outcome.

These aren't the words of someone who thinks our efforts were political theater. These are the words of someone who thinks we were close to reaching a breakthrough, and he wasn't alone. My friend from South Carolina also said that.

To those who think that if President Trump wins . . . that we can get a better deal, you won't.

He added:

This moment will pass. Do not let it pass.

Republican Senator from South Carolina.

So let's be perfectly clear: Our bipartisan border bill represented a real chance—in fact, the best chance in decades—to act on border security, to make a law, not just to make a political point.

Importantly, the bill would have made huge strides toward cracking down on the scourge of fentanyl. It would have given billions for DEA, for DHS to hire officers to focus exclusively on drugs and billions for state-of-the-art equipment to detect the flow of drugs at border crossings and ports.

And some of my Democratic colleagues will be talking about that, at 12:30, at an event, how this bill really does more than anything we have done thus far, and we have worked hard on it to deal with the scourge of fentanyl. So, today, my Democratic colleagues will shine a spotlight on the immense good this bill will do to protect our country from the free flow of this dangerous drug, fentanyl.

If you told me a year ago that this was the kind of bill we had before us, I would have been certain Republicans would have helped enact this bill into law. By any objective measure, it is strong, necessary.

And one final note, the last time we came close here was 2013 when we passed comprehensive immigration reform. We did it bipartisan. It was the only way to do it. I and my late friend, good friend, John McCain had a Gang of 8—four Democrats, four Republicans. We got, I believe it was, 69 votes on the floor of the Senate. Unfortunately, the House didn't pass it.

But it is just a lesson to all of us. Bipartisanship is the only way to go. H.R. 2 is not the least bit bipartisan. Our bill was completely bipartisan.

So, tomorrow, we are going to lay out a clear choice. Tomorrow, we will see who is serious about actually wanting to fix the border and who prefers to merely talk about fixing the border.

FARM BILL

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now on the farm bill, tomorrow, House Republicans will mark up their partisan farm bill that, frankly, completely misses the mark.

The farm bill should support the farmers who grow our food. It should protect our land. It should invest in jobs for rural communities big and small to rebuild their economies. The farm bill should provide lifesaving hunger assistance for the millions of Americans who rely on programs like SNAP, and it should extend SNAP benefits to our friends in Puerto Rico who have been excluded from this program for decades, and it will expand it to them.

It is sad to see that rather than working together to get a serious farm bill passed, House Republicans are playing games and pushing a one-sided, insufficient partisan bill.

Senate Democrats, on the other hand, have released a farm bill proposal that maintains a bipartisan coalition and invests in all of the areas I mention. So I commend Chair STABENOW for her work.

Let me be clear: A purely partisan farm bill that departs from the long-standing spirit of bipartisanship has no future in the Senate. And, unfortunately, I might add, it seems to be where this House—the Republican House leadership and party—always goes. They always retreat to a corner of partisanship. They are not interested in improving the lives of American people. They are just interested in scoring political points to a narrow group back home, the MAGA group that seems to have such power in the party.

So I hope that doesn't happen on the farm bill. It has always been bipartisan. House Republicans, come on. Wake up. Do you want to help our farmers? Work together with Democrats and pass a bipartisan bill.

RIGHT TO CONTRACEPTION ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on contraceptives, yesterday, we began the process for the Senate to consider the Right to Contraception Act led by Senators MARKEY and HIRONO in June.

Now, more than ever, contraception is a critical piece of protecting women's reproductive freedoms, standing as nothing short of a vital lifeline for millions of American women across the country.

Senate Democrats are committed to restoring women's freedoms and will fight to protect access to contraception and other reproductive freedoms that are essential safeguards for millions of women to control their own lives, their futures, and their bodies.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

RUSSIA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, last week, just days after President Orban rolled out the red carpet in Budapest for President Xi, the Chinese dictator rolled out a red carpet in Beijing for Vladimir Putin. The "friendship without limits" struck between America's

greatest strategic adversaries will now endure "for generations to come." And it appears to be rooted in a shared myth about the nature of world conflicts and a victim complex that would be laughable if it didn't carry such grave consequences for Western peace and security.

At last week's summit, Russia and China together accused the United States of threatening the world's strategic balance, as if it is Washington rather than Beijing or Moscow trying to redraw borders by force or to disrupt global order.

Well, if you are looking for the government that has doubled its nuclear arsenal in 3 years, you will find it in Beijing, not Washington. In fact, Americans' own strategic deterrent continues to suffer from chronic neglect. And the Biden administration continues to submit defense budgets that fail to keep up with inflation, much less with the growing threat posed by the PRC.

And if you are looking for the regime recklessly developing an insanely provocative and destabilizing nuclear weapon to deploy in space, you will find that one in Moscow.

The world's leading authoritarians never seem to let the facts get in the way. But economic and military realities matter enormously to the future of fledgling democracies and developing nations who are vulnerable to their economic coercion and thuggish political intimidation.

The challenge to Western peace and security is not confined to the Taiwan Straits and the trenches of Ukraine. Chinese debt traps and Russian security forces are expanding malign influence from Central America to Central Asia to Africa and to our own Western Hemisphere.

Russia's efforts to strangle democracy and wrestle free societies back under its control are perhaps most glaring along the borders of Europe.

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, the unshackled nations have largely chosen freedom and worked to build democratic governments and societies oriented squarely to the West. And the neo-Soviet imperialists in the Kremlin see that as a threat.

Leaders in Washington are prone to forget how fragile our own experiment in democracy was during its earliest days and how precious are the safeguards our Founders enshrined in our government to protect the minority from the excesses of authoritarianism of majority rule.

Sometimes, of course, politicians in Washington even flirt with the idea of tearing down these safeguards of democracies to deny the minority any meaningful power.

Fortunately, there is still a bipartisan firewall in the Senate against this sort of shortsighted radicalism. But for nascent, vulnerable democracies, such safeguards face even graver threats. And in Georgia, a parliamentary majority's quest for power

is threatening to suffocate the nation's civil society and unravel the guardrails of its democracy.

In an attempt to consolidate its hold on government, the Georgian Dream Party would stamp out the Euro-Atlantic aspirations of the Georgian people.

And while the political opposition is large, it is chronically divided against itself. Despite their feckless party leaders, thousands of Georgians have taken to the streets to protest. Their desire for self-determination and freedom from Russian coercion is obvious. Four in five Georgians tell pollsters they want a distinctly European future.

They believe that planting themselves firmly in the West, among democratic nations where the rule of law prevails, is in their best interest.

Whether Georgia looks East or West matters to the United States. Standing with free people resisting the aggression of tyrants like Putin or Xi is in our own interests. This is true of Taiwan and Ukraine, Estonia, and Japan.

And it is true of Georgia. The Georgian people deserve the right to write their own future, not have it dictated to them by Moscow's preferred party chiefs.

And why is it that Russians obsess over controlling Georgia's future? It is about more than acting out Putin's neo-imperialist fantasy. Geography matters. For millennia, Georgia and its Black Sea coast stood at the crossroads of the civilized world. It is a key transit point for critical resources. And today, along with Armenia, it sits as a tantalizing link in the land bridge between authoritarian partners in Moscow and Tehran.

The people of Georgia have a long history of enduring conflict and conquest. They have a long tradition of resilience and a rich culture to be proud of. And they know there is a difference between bending to Russia and turning to the West.

So, like friends of the Georgian people across the West, I am hopeful this moment will be one which can take yet more pride, as a moment when the opposition to Russian coercion puts petty differences aside and stands united.

Of course, this must also be a moment for Georgia's ruling party to recognize the costs of ignoring their people's will in order to fulfill Putin's whims and to stop short of shredding their relationship with the West.

I hope those in power in Tbilisi will put sovereignty over subjugation and withdraw the coercive "Russia law" from parliament.

ENERGY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, now on another matter, last Thursday, the Biden administration announced its plan to sacrifice yet another source of affordable, reliable American energy on the altar of climate activism.

After years of freezes and bans on onshore and offshore oil and gas leasing,

the administration's latest attempt to appease Democrats' radical base is a ban on new coal leasing in the Powder River Basin of Wyoming and Montana.

This region is responsible for producing nearly half of the Nation's coal. Last year alone, the basin created more than 250 million tons of coal and employs more than 4,000 people. Shutting off development will result in lost jobs and millions of dollars of lost revenue for Montana and Wyoming.

The sting of the administration's War on Coal is one Kentuckians know all too well. And working families across the country are already struggling with persistent inflation. Energy prices alone have risen more than 40 percent since President Biden took office.

But Washington Democrats' radicalism may have finally stretched their own party to a breaking point. In fact, the Biden administration's war on affordable, reliable American energy has proven so radically harmful to consumers, workers, and our global competitiveness that it is facing bipartisan opposition right here in the Senate.

Just yesterday, a bipartisan majority passed Senator CRUZ's resolution disapproving of the Department of Energy's new rule to effectively ban affordable natural gas home furnaces.

This rule would significantly increase the existing efficiency standard and effectively ban the sale of more affordable home heating furnaces that don't meet it. By one estimate, this rule will heap as much as \$4 billion in new costs onto consumers who already can't afford the high cost of the Biden economy.

The American people have suffered enough, from Bidenomics to the Green New Deal. I am glad a majority of the Senate agrees it is time to slam the brakes on the administration's assault on gas appliances. And I am thankful to my colleague Senator CRUZ for bringing attention to this madness.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Angela M. Martinez, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 8369

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the State of Israel is facing the deadliest threat to its existence in a generation.

To its south, Israel is waging a war of survival against Hamas terrorists, who slaughtered 1,200 Israelis and abducted more than 250 men, women, and children. To its north, Hezbollah—the most armed terrorist organization in the world—is menacing Israeli towns and forcing tens of thousands to flee their homes. Just last month, Iran launched more than 300 ballistic missiles and attack drones at Israel—for the first time attacking the Jewish State from Iranian territory. Outlaw rebels and brigands in Yemen are also firing missiles and drones at Israeli and allied shipping, to include U.S. naval vessels.

As Israel is under siege at home, it is also under diplomatic assault abroad from Hamas's proxies at the United Nations, the International Criminal Court, and even American college campuses.

Joe Biden's allies on Capitol Hill have grown increasingly hostile as well. The majority leader and the former Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, called for the removal of Binyamin Netanyahu from power. The majority leader said that Israel needs new elections. I think New York may need new elections.

Senator BERNIE SANDERS said we should not send "another nickel for Netanyahu," while Congresswoman ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ supports a bill that would strip the tax-exempt status of pro-Israel charities.

That is bad enough, but, unfortunately, instead of backing our Israeli friends to the hilt in this moment of maximum danger, the Biden administration has sanctioned Israelis, condemned its military, and second-guessed it, while trying to undermine its democratically elected leader.

Two weeks ago, Joe Biden went a step further, halting the shipment of bombs and precision-guided bomb kits that Israel needs to limit civilian casualties and destroy Hamas strongholds inside of Rafah and, for that matter, to free hostages, including American citizens.

The President also announced that he will withhold additional offensive weapons to Israel if Israel targets Hamas in Rafah, as if there were much difference between offensive and defensive weapons when Israel is surrounded on all sides by mortal enemies.

Joe Biden is instituting a de facto arms embargo on Israel that will save Hamas. The reason appears to be simple: He wants to appease a small minority of pro-Hamas voters in his own party in critical swing States he believes are necessary for his reelection.

That is why I have partnered with Congressman KEN CALVERT to pass the Israel Security Assistance Support Act, which would reverse Joe Biden's arms embargo on our ally. This legislation simply requires the prompt delivery of all weapons shipments approved by Congress. It also withholds pay from any Department of State or Defense bureaucrat who withholds vital military aid from Israel.

Earlier last week, the House did its part and passed the Israel Security Assistance Support Act with a bipartisan majority that included over a dozen Democrats. Now it is the Senate's turn.

Therefore, Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 398, H.R. 8369. I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. In my capacity as Senator from Vermont, I object.

Mr. COTTON. I regret that the Democrats will not allow this bill to come up for a vote, which, again, would simply ensure that aid that Congress has approved is delivered promptly to Israel in the middle of a shooting war of survival—a bill that, I would remind everyone, passed the House of Representatives with a bipartisan majority.

The time is now to reverse Joe Biden's de facto arms embargo on Israel.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican whip.

STUDENT LOAN DEBT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, last month, President Biden announced yet another student loan giveaway. Among other things, this latest scheme would waive accrued and capitalized interest for certain borrowers and, staggeringly, provide significant loan forgiveness for three-quarters of a million borrowers with an average household income—get this—of \$312,976.

That is right. President Biden's latest reckless expenditure of taxpayer dollars would go, in part, to providing loan forgiveness to three-quarters of a million borrowers with an average household income above \$300,000.

All told, the President's latest student loan giveaway will cost nearly \$150 billion. That is on top of the \$475 billion in loan forgiveness the President announced last summer.

That scheme, which the administration dubbed the Saving on a Valuable Education Plan, will implement de facto loan forgiveness on a massive scale by creating a system in which the majority of future Federal borrowers will never fully repay their student loans.

The Department of Education estimated that borrowers with only undergraduate debt enrolled in the SAVE Program can, on average, expect to pay back just \$6,121 for each \$10,000 that they borrow. That amounts to the Federal Government taking on, on average, almost 40 percent of the cost of these borrowers' student loans.

There are so many problems with the President's plan it is difficult to even know where to begin.

First, there is the staggering cost of these and other Biden administration student loan programs. The Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget,

where the President's own Treasury Secretary used to sit on the board, had this to say:

Including the Biden administration's new student debt cancellation plan, we estimate all recent student debt cancellation policies will cost a combined \$870 billion to \$1.4 trillion. That's more than all federal spending on higher education over the nation's entire history.

That, again, is a quote from the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget.

Let me just repeat that last line:

That's more than all federal spending on higher education over the nation's entire history.

And "the vast majority of this debt cancellation," the committee goes on, "was put in place through executive actions under President Biden."

So the staggering cost of President Biden's giveaways is one major problem, especially when you consider another major problem, which is that the President's giveaways will do nothing to fix the actual problem, which is the cost of higher education. In fact, they could very well make things worse.

For one, there is reason to fear that his student loan giveaways could actually encourage colleges to raise their prices. And, of course, the President's giveaways will do nothing to encourage students to only borrow what they can afford. Indeed, there is a good chance students will increase their borrowing as a result of the President's plans.

President Biden's student loan schemes will cost a massive amount of money, while doing nothing to solve higher education costs.

But the problems don't end there. To start with, there is the question of whether or not what the President is doing is even lawful. Last summer, the Supreme Court struck down the President's original student loan forgiveness plan because the President lacked the statutory authority to forgive student loans, and there is reason to wonder whether his SAVE Plan or these latest measures could be struck down in the courts as well.

Of course, on top of all of these issues, there is also the fundamental issue, and that is the unfairness of asking taxpayers who never went to college or worked hard to pay off the full balance of their student loans or who worked their way through school to avoid a heavy loan burden or who covered the costs of their education by enlisting in the military and risking their lives for their country to shoulder the massive cost of all this loan forgiveness. Why should someone who never went to college be taking on the burden of loan forgiveness for borrowers making in excess of \$300,000 a year?

Then, of course, there is the troubling message sent to students when we teach them that they can expect to be bailed out for the debt they take on, even though they agreed to repay it.

I could go on.

The President announced his first student loan forgiveness scheme 2

months before the 2022 congressional elections. I don't think there is a coincidence about that, and I suspect it is no coincidence that he expects to implement his latest student loan giveaway this fall before the 2024 election.

Last week, I joined Senator CASSIDY and Congresswoman FOXX on a bicameral letter to the Secretary of Education, urging him to withdraw this latest plan. But, unfortunately, I suspect that the President and his administration won't be withdrawing anything that they think could win them a few votes in November. So the American people will, once again, have to endure yet another disastrous Biden administration spending plan.

I yield the floor.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 8369

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, I was in the Chair and objected in my capacity as the Senator from Vermont to the unanimous consent request of the Senator from Arkansas. I would like now to have an opportunity to explain the basis of that.

First, the Senator from Arkansas essentially said that President Biden is appeasing pro-Hamas voters in imposing an arms embargo on Israel and, also in that assertion, suggesting that President Biden is not fully supportive, as he has been throughout his political life, to Israel.

Let me start by saying what I believe represents the unanimous points of view of this U.S. Senate, and that is that the attack by Hamas on Israel, the taking of hostages, the sexual assaults, the murder of so many innocent Israelis are condemned by each and every one of us. No one condemns it more than President Biden, who went to Israel on his own to show his solidarity and empathy for what happened to the Israeli people.

Second, I believe that every Member of the U.S. Senate supports the Jewish, democratic State of Israel.

Third, while the Senator from Arkansas suggested an "arms embargo," the U.S. Congress—without my support, by the way, for reasons I will explain—has sent billions of dollars in aid with the supplemental appropriations bill.

The fact that the President is raising questions about how best to secure the long-term status of Israel as a Jewish and democratic State in the context of this conflict in Gaza is in no way a suggestion of lack of support.

There is serious debate within Israel about the war plan that is being prosecuted by the Netanyahu government. In fact, a member of the war cabinet has indicated that he will leave the war cabinet if, in fact, the Prime Minister does not come up with a plan for what happens after the cessation of hostilities in Gaza.

Is there going to be an occupation by Israel? Is there going to be a joint Arab force that will be peacekeeping? Will there be an effort to constitute a Pales-

tinian Government that has the support of its people?

None of these plans envision Hamas having a role, and they can't have a role. But the President is asking responsible questions that are being asked by seriously engaged military, political, and security folks in Israel.

So to suggest that the President is raising questions because he is looking over the horizon and saying that adding to the 35,000 casualties in Gaza—half or more women and children—to suggest that the President, when he says Israel should not invade Rafah because of the catastrophic consequences of more humanitarian losses, to suggest that when the President says 2,000-pound bombs that would be dropped on the most densely populated couple of square miles in the world, without massive civilian casualties, is not showing support for Israel, I dispute that. I disagree with that.

This effort requires judgment, and the President has been given authority by this Congress to send arms to Israel. He has made a decision that 2,000-pound bombs should not be included in that. And he is not alone. There are many in Israel raising the question about the wisdom of how this war is being prosecuted.

We know that in order for there to be peace between Israel and the Palestinians, we must have a two-state solution. That is not just the policy of the Biden administration; it has been the policy of the Obama administration, the Bush administrations, and the Carter administration. Two states for two people where the respective rights of those people for self-governance and the renunciation of violence toward one another has got to be the long-term goal.

We have a situation right now where our ally Israel—and the current government Israel—disagrees with that two-state solution approach. And, in fact, the Netanyahu government position is that there should be one state.

And what we are seeing right now is the escalation of violence by extreme settlers in the West Bank that is causing more instability. So the President, as our Commander in Chief, must be given some latitude about how best to distribute whatever munitions have been authorized by the U.S. Congress. And in the President's judgment, 2,000-pound bombs to Rafah are the wrong munitions at the very wrong time.

All of us have enormous heartbreak for what has happened to those Israelis and their families, to those Palestinians in Gaza who are being used by the vicious Hamas as human shields. But the President is committed, as I am committed—as I believe all of us are committed—to peace and security in the Middle East, and we believe—most of us—that that requires a two-state solution where there is an independent, democratic Palestinian state—self-governing, respectful of Israel's security—and where there is an Israeli state that reciprocates toward the Palestinians in Gaza and in the West Bank.

And it is for those reasons, Mr. President, that I stood in opposition and objected to the unanimous consent request of my colleague from Arkansas.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask consent that I be allowed to complete these remarks before the rollcall begins.

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

JUDICIAL CONFIRMATIONS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, over the past 3 years, something profound has happened on the floor of the U.S. Senate. We have been building one of the most important accomplishments of the Biden-Harris administration: the confirmation of highly qualified, independent, evenhanded judges to the Federal bench.

Today, the Senate will confirm the 200th lifetime judge since President Biden took office. This is an extraordinary slate of judges, who are ruling with reason and restraint. These judges respect the rule of law; adhere to precedent; and, above all, answer only to the Constitution.

I have served on the Senate Judiciary Committee for more than two decades, including as chair for the past 3 years. During that time, I have been called on to evaluate and vote on over 1,000 judicial nominees that the committee has considered and have been brought to the Senate floor. In my opinion, the record is clear: President Biden's nominees to the Federal bench represent the best in our judiciary. They are highly qualified. Not a single one of these nominees—these 200—have failed to be found “qualified” or “well qualified” by the American Bar Association. That is a departure from the previous administration's record.

I have heard some of my Republican colleagues extolling the quality of those nominees in the previous administration as compared to those of President Biden, so I want to set the record straight as clearly as I can. For each judicial nominee that comes before the Senate, the American Bar Association conducts a nonpartisan peer review that ranks their qualifications. The qualifications are based on integrity, professional competence, and judicial temperament.

During the Trump administration, Senate Republicans confirmed eight Trump nominees whom the American Bar Association found unqualified to serve on the Federal bench. Compare that to President Biden's record. Under this administration, not one of the 200 judges we have confirmed received an unqualified rating—not one. When there was a suggestion that one might receive that rating and they asked me whether we should move forward, I said: The answer is clearly no.

So when I hear some of my Republican colleagues reminisce about the former President's nominees, I have to wonder: Which ones are they talking

about? Are they talking about several nominees who had never tried a case? How about the district court nominee in the previous administration who challenged the legal basis for both surrogacy and in vitro fertilization or the Sixth Circuit nominee who likened abortion to slavery? And who could forget the Ninth Circuit nominee in the previous administration whose colleagues called him “arrogant, lazy, an ideologue, and lacking in knowledge of the day-to-day practice of law.”

Yet some Republican Senators have relied on increasingly absurd criticisms in an attempt to criticize President Biden's nominees. In a new low, some of my Republican colleagues have gone so far as to falsely claim that a historic nominee, who would be the first Muslim American to serve on the Federal appellate court, is anti-Semitic and anti-law enforcement. As I have said previously, these bigoted attacks are false and should not stand.

Something that stands out about President Biden's nominees, aside from their qualifications and integrity to the rule of law, is the professional and demographic diversity they bring to the bench. We have made history, confirming more Black women to the Federal circuit courts than all prior Presidents combined. Of course, we have confirmed the first ever Black woman to serve on the Supreme Court: Justice Ketanji Brown Jackson. And we have confirmed historic numbers of Asian American, Latino, and LGBTQ judges.

As we celebrate Asian American and Pacific Islander Heritage Month, I want to take a moment to recognize that President Biden has appointed more AAPI judges than any previous President. This includes several “firsts” to the Federal bench: the first ever Asian-American judge in the Third and Seventh Circuits, the first South Asian judge on the Ninth Circuit, and the first Asian-American judge in Virginia.

Beyond this demographic diversity, there is recordbreaking professional diversity. In the past 3 years, we have confirmed more public defenders as circuit judges than all prior Presidents combined. In addition, we have confirmed State court judges, Federal magistrates, bankruptcy judges, and prosecutors who have made significant contributions to this country's justice system. We have confirmed jurists with experience protecting the rights of voters, the rights of workers, civil rights, women's rights, and LGBTQ rights.

Another notable aspect of this record is that the vast majority—nearly 90 percent—of these confirmations have been bipartisan—nearly 90 percent. This includes over three-quarters of the appellate nominees.

In addition, I want to thank a number of my Republican colleagues who have worked in good faith with the White House, with me, and with the committee to fill vacancies in their States. This focus on qualified, consensus nominees will go a long way to-

ward restoring trust and faith in our judiciary.

The American people deserve Federal judges who not only look like America but understand the American experience from every angle. We have accomplished this during the longest evenly divided Senate in history and now with a narrow majority. We celebrate these 200 judges, but we should not stop here. We will continue elevating jurists who are qualified, principled, and committed above all to protecting the Constitution. The American people deserve nothing less.

Mr. President, let me close by saying it has been an honor to serve as chairman of the committee, but our success in bringing these nominees to the floor really belongs to the members of the committee—10 Democrats and 10 Republicans. Those Democrats in particular have dutifully come to the committee hearings and to the votes and waited patiently for the opportunity to vote and bring these nominees to the floor. We wouldn't be here without them. I salute them and their dedication to the rule of law and our responsibility on the Judiciary Committee.

NOMINATION OF ANGELA M. MARTINEZ

Mr. President, today, the Senate will vote to confirm Judge Angela Martinez to the U.S. District Court for the District of Arizona.

Born in Tucson, AZ, Judge Martinez received both her B.A. and J.D. from the University of Arizona.

After clerking for the late Judge John M. Rolle on the U.S. District Court for the District of Arizona, Judge Martinez began her legal career in private practice as an associate at Lewis and Roca, LLP, where she litigated employment and commercial matters. She then joined the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Arizona, where she represented the United States in illegal immigration prosecutions, alien and drug smuggling offenses, and hostage taking and international kidnapping cases. She later returned to private practice as an associate at Farhang & Medcoff PLLC before serving as a law clerk for Judge Jennifer G. Zippas on the U.S. District Court for the District of Arizona. Judge Martinez returned to the U.S. attorney's office for nearly a decade before she was appointed to serve as a U.S. magistrate judge on the same district to which she is nominated.

The American Bar Association unanimously rated Judge Martinez “well qualified,” and she has the strong support of her home State Senators, Ms. SINEMA and Mr. KELLY. Judge Martinez's deep ties to the Arizona legal community, combined with her courtroom experience, will make her well-positioned to serve on the Federal bench with distinction.

I thank my colleagues for supporting her nomination.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. 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.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, this is an amazing moment in the history of the Senate and of all Senates because in just a few moments, the Senate will confirm Angela Martinez to be a district judge for the District of Arizona. Judge Martinez will be the 200th Federal judge under the Biden administration and this Democratic majority. Reaching 200 judges is a major milestone.

Simply put, our 200 judges comprise the most diverse slate of judicial nominations under any President in American history. Our Federal judiciary is now far more balanced, far more diverse, far more experienced than it was just a few years before President Biden took office.

I am so proud of the 200 judges. Mr. President, 127 are women, and 125 are people of color. That is a majority of the judges—more than a majority. Over 60 percent are women. Two-thirds women, two-thirds people of color; 58 Black judges, 37 Black women judges—each a record; 36 Hispanic judges, 33 Asian American Pacific Island judges—also a record. It is amazing.

Also, there is not just demographic diversity but professional diversity. It is not just a lot of White male partners in big fancy law firms anymore; it is people who are public defenders, civil rights lawyers, labor lawyers, immigration lawyers, consumer lawyers. We have so much greater diversity on the bench, and that is so good for America because the bench, the powerful Federal judiciary filled with lifetime appointments, should reflect America. It has taken too long to get to this point. We still have more ground to make up, but we are getting there, and we are so proud of it. And, of course, the first Black woman to serve on the Supreme Court, Justice Ketanji Brown Jackson.

Ever since I have gotten on the Judiciary Committee, it has been my goal to diversify the bench. The judges I have chosen in New York have been like that for over two decades. But now, under the Biden administration and under the great leadership of Chairman DURBIN and his Judiciary Committee, we have really moved forward.

I want to give special consideration—because she works full time on this—to my nominations director—we work so closely with the White House—and that is Catalina Tam, who has been so important and so dedicated behind the scenes in getting these judges confirmed.

This is a really fine day for America. When you look at all the trouble and all the things swirling around, and then you realize so many fine people who never would have even had access to the Federal bench are getting on the

bench, it gives you faith in the future of this great country.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON MARTINEZ NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Martinez nomination?

Mr. CARDIN. 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 28, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 177 Ex.]

YEAS—66

Baldwin	Hassan	Peters
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Risch
Booker	Hirono	Romney
Brown	Hoeven	Rosen
Butler	Kaine	Sanders
Cantwell	Kelly	Schatz
Capito	King	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Lankford	Sinema
Casey	Lujan	Smith
Cassidy	Lummis	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Tillis
Coons	Marshall	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	McConnell	Warner
Cramer	Merkley	Warnock
Crapo	Moran	Warren
Duckworth	Murkowski	Welch
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Fetterman	Murray	Wicker
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Wyden
Graham	Padilla	Young

NAYS—28

Barrasso	Ernst	Rubio
Blackburn	Fischer	Schmitt
Boozman	Grassley	Scott (FL)
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Scott (SC)
Britt	Johnson	Sullivan
Budd	Kennedy	Thune
Cornyn	Lee	Tuberville
Cotton	Paul	Vance
Cruz	Ricketts	
Daines	Rounds	

NOT VOTING—6

Hagerty	Manchin	Mullin
Hawley	Menendez	Tester

The nomination was confirmed. (Mr. OSSOFF assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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 the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 571, Dena M. Coggins, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of California.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Richard Blumenthal, Laphonza R. Butler, Alex Padilla, Tim Kaine, Margaret Wood Hassan, Christopher Murphy, Peter Welch, Tammy Duckworth, Tammy Baldwin, Christopher A. Coons, Tina Smith, John W. Hickenlooper, Chris Van Hollen, Mark Kelly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Dena M. Coggins, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of California, 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. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 178 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Baldwin	Graham	Reed
Bennet	Hassan	Rosen
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Sanders
Booker	Hickenlooper	Schatz
Brown	Hirono	Schumer
Butler	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	Kelly	Sinema
Cardin	King	Smith
Carper	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Casey	Lujan	Van Hollen
Collins	Markey	Warner
Coons	Merkley	Warnock
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warren
Duckworth	Murray	Welch
Durbin	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Fetterman	Padilla	Wyden
Gillibrand	Peters	

NAYS—44

Barrasso	Fischer	Risch
Blackburn	Grassley	Romney
Boozman	Hoeven	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Britt	Johnson	Schmitt
Budd	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Capito	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Lee	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lummis	Thune
Cotton	Marshall	Tillis
Cramer	McConnell	Tuberville
Crapo	Moran	Vance
Cruz	Murkowski	Wicker
Daines	Paul	Young
Ernst	Ricketts	

NOT VOTING—6

Hagerty	Manchin	Mullin
Hawley	Menendez	Tester

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 44.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dena M. Coggins, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

ISRAEL

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, last week, on May 14, our friend and ally Israel celebrated its 76th Independence Day.

As we all know, Israel was founded in the wake of the Holocaust to give the Jewish people a homeland that would allow them to return to their ancestral land that they had been forcibly removed from.

I am proud—very proud—that the United States was the first country to recognize Israel; and since then, we have been steadfast allies that support one another through times both prosperous and challenging.

However, this year's Israeli Independence Day came during a time of great turmoil, as Israel battles terrorist forces that have ruthlessly waged war against them since October 7.

We join them as they mourn the loss of over 1,200 Israelis killed in that initial attack and pray for the safe return of the hostages still kept in captivity by Hamas.

In an alarming development, this longstanding U.S.-Israel relationship is now becoming unnecessarily strained by President Biden's quest to appease those in his party who do not support the State of Israel, a bastion of democracy and freedom in the Middle East.

The October 7 attack marks the most horrific attack Israel has suffered since its founding and the deadliest day for the Jewish people since the Holocaust. So how did we get to this point?

The common refrain for those opposed to Israel now has been to call for cease-fire now. We have seen it all across our college campuses. And we saw President Biden clap along to these demands, again, as he delivered a commencement address just this past weekend.

And what is even more mind-boggling is that those who are protesting, who are they demanding a cease-fire from? I haven't heard a single campus protest group call for Hamas to lay down its arms or call for Hamas to release the hostages.

Why? Why? Because they want Israel to stop fighting, because they want Israel to stop defending itself, and because they want Israel to lose. We cannot forget the fact that a cease-fire was in place on October 7, and that cease-fire was broken by Hamas as they deliberately attacked innocent civilians in the most brutal and barbaric ways.

So let's not forget that some of these communities, the border towns in Israel that were attacked by Hamas, were some of the most ardent supporters in Israel for the Palestinian people.

They were some of the biggest advocates for peace. Yet despite the reality, here in the United States, our colleges have become embroiled in controversy over this and play host to anti-Israel and anti-Semitic protests that ultimately stopped Jewish students from attending class and even led a rabbi at Columbia University to recommend Jewish students return home for their own safety.

These protesters demand that Israel drop their weapons, yet refuse to acknowledge that Hamas is the instigator of the war. But we now know what Hamas' entire plan was: to minimize any chance of peace in the region, to attack Israel's most peace-promoting citizens in the most brutal of fashions, especially, and most dangerously and horrifyingly, toward Israeli women.

To undermine the incredible progress that had been made possible through President Trump's Abraham Accords, to stop an emerging normalization deal with Saudi Arabia, and to conduct an attack on Israel so horrific that Israel had no other choice but to respond.

In what world would we ever expect a country to be attacked in such a brutal fashion and not fight to defend itself? It is important to note that the chaos and instability benefits one bad actor above all else, and that is the Iranian regime.

Without Iran's help, both financially and militarily, Hamas would not have been able to execute their terrorist attacks on the Israelis. Iran has further supported Hamas's efforts by launching over 300 projectiles at Israel on April 13. And lest we forget, it was an Iranian-made drone that killed three American soldiers in Jordan on January 29.

We must recognize that the deep ties between Hamas and Iran and their common goal of destroying Israel and bringing harm to the United States and our citizens. Calls for a cease-fire only embolden Hamas and their stated aim to repeat the October 7 attacks a second, third, and fourth time. Israel must defend itself, and they must root out the evil that is Hamas.

So earlier this week, we learned that the International Criminal Court would seek arrest warrants for leaders of Hamas and Israel for war crimes.

It is simply shocking to me that the ICC would seek to establish a delusional level of equivalency between the actions of Israel and the actions of Hamas. I have seen the footage of the attacks on Israeli and American citizens that occurred on October 7, and it is clear that Hamas is the real criminal involved in this conflict.

Hamas continues to show no regard for its own people, spending billions of dollars on over 300 miles of tunnel sys-

tem, but yet they are refusing to allow their Palestinian citizens to shelter there; and they continue to use hospitals, schools, places of worship for military purposes, knowingly placing citizens in harm's way.

While Israel was founded on the principle of promoting development for the benefit of all of its inhabitants, Hamas's only mission is to destroy Israel. The differences between their founding principles, their leadership, and their actions could not be any more different. And it is abhorrent that the ICC would attempt to argue otherwise.

In these times of instability, you would hope that the President of the United States would display strength. Instead, President Biden has decided to play politics by placing a hold on security assistance that this Congress most recently approved.

This is just the latest foreign policy blunder from an administration plagued by weakness on the international stage. Shortly after this policy of withholding weapons was announced, Hamas steps away from the negotiations on the safe return of the hostages.

It seems like a pretty big coincidence to me. Hamas is still holding American hostages captive; although, I wonder how many of these hostages are still alive, as we discovered—I think it was last week, four bodies were discovered.

And President Biden should be doing everything within his power to bring home those American hostages. Instead, he is publicly withholding weapons from our ally and giving their adversary cover.

When President Biden took office, he pledged ironclad support for Israel, but now he is publicly backing down from that promise.

He is projecting to our allies and our adversaries that the U.S. promises' can be subject to political pressure.

To further underscore the administration's lack of responsibility, my EPW committee came across something very disturbing this week in our ongoing oversight of President Biden's so-called Inflation Reduction Act. You might wonder what EPW or the IRA have to do with Israel in their battle against terrorists. But we discovered that the Climate Justice Alliance, a group that received \$50 million from the Biden administration in December, openly denies Israel's right to exist and actively supports the horrific actions of Hamas. They even promote graphics that glorify the bulldozers used by Hamas on October 7.

It is despicable that the EPA is sending millions of dollars through the IRA to a group that perpetrates hatred and violence under the guise of fighting climate change and this administration would allow U.S. taxpayers' dollars to fund these anti-Semitic activities.

There is no doubt that the last 7 months have been an incredibly difficult time for the people of Israel and Jewish Americans here at home. Never,

never in my life, never would I have ever expected to hear and see the anti-Semitic discourse that I see being conducted on our own land, our own American shores, and the violence and intimidation towards the Jewish community.

Together we must condemn the rise of anti-Semitism and make clear that this hatred has no home in our country and in our world.

My Republican colleagues and I will continue to display our unwavering support for Israel and push for the assistance that they need to ensure their survival and victory in this fight, as allies do have needs, particularly in this time of need.

So with that, I yield the floor to my friend from North Dakota, Senator HOEVEN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I am pleased to join my colleague from West Virginia and others who you will be hearing from—next, our colleague from Nebraska—in regard to our absolutely ironclad support for Israel and why it is so important that we stand and we stand strongly with our friend and ally Israel.

On October 7, Hamas committed appalling atrocities against Jews in Southern Israel. I went to Israel one month later to show my support for our close ally during this very dark hour, and I am still today very proud to stand with Israel.

But I am very concerned about the Biden administration holding up weapons that need to be delivered to Israel. That is why I have cosponsored two important pieces of legislation requiring the President to expedite delivery of defensive aid to Israel: first, Senator COTTON's Israel Security Assistance Support Act and then the assistance support act that Senator CRUZ put forward as well; that is the Assuring Resupply of Munitions Act, or ARM Act.

Congress has moved decisively to support Israel, and these bills make crystal clear—there is no doubt about it—our desire that Israel receive our support without hesitation. We said that October 7 can never happen again, but if we say “never again,” we should mean it. If we truly mean “never again,” then the only path forward is for Israel to win the war—to win the war.

And that is why it is so important that we give Israel the tools it needs to win the war as soon as possible. Destroying Hamas means allowing Israel to reestablish security for its people. Destroying Hamas also means it can no longer terrorize and repress the people of Gaza. If we are concerned about the lives of Jews and Gazans, the sooner Hamas is defeated the better. The sooner Hamas is completely defeated, the better.

Putting limits on military assistance only means prolonging a conflict that Israel must win, and it means greater loss of life among both Israelis and Gazans.

Delaying or halting military aid also sends the wrong message to both our allies and our adversaries. Our allies, like Israel, rightly wonder whether U.S. promises will be kept when times get tough. Our adversaries, like Hamas and Iran, wonder if they can manipulate us into failure. When we hesitate to keep our promises and give our enemies the chance to regroup, we incentivize the very behavior that we must oppose.

We have to wipe out terrorism. We have to work with our allies—not just Israel but all of our allies—to wipe out terrorism.

If Hamas survives, it will certainly seize more hostages in the future. That is what Hamas does. If Hamas survives, it will keep using innocent civilians as shields. Think about that: using innocent citizens as their shields. If Hamas survives, it will see October 7 as a triumph rather than a disaster.

The administration may believe that pausing military assistance will save lives or limit suffering, but it will only sow the seeds of future conflict. There is no substitute—there is no substitute—for victory over Hamas.

Congress has provided the resources to support our ally Israel, and I call upon the administration to keep our promises, to act according to the will of the American people, and to accept nothing less than the complete defeat of Hamas.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, this weekend, President Biden called for an immediate cease-fire in Gaza. What the President didn't acknowledge is that Israel and Gaza were not in a state of war until October 7, when Hamas broke a cease-fire. They stormed Israel's borders, and they raped, tortured, and killed innocent civilians.

Far-left, pro-Hamas activists are painting Hamas as freedom fighters that want to liberate their fellow Palestinians. Nothing could be further from the truth. Hamas uses innocent civilians—anyone from babies to the elderly—as human shields. They shelter themselves in schools and in hospitals. They have no regard for human life or dignity, not for Israelis and not for Palestinians.

Members of Hamas film themselves laughing as they maim and murder innocent people. They use sexual assault as a weapon of war. These are no freedom fighters; they are terrorists.

We saw a sobering example of that this weekend. The Israeli military recovered the bodies of four hostages who were captured, abused, and murdered by Hamas. They found them lying in a tunnel in Gaza. These included the body of Shani Louk, a young woman Hamas captured at the Nova music festival on October 7. She and the other hostages ran from the armed terrorists, who were killing people to their left and to their right, but Hamas caught

up with them. They sexually assaulted and maimed Shani before they murdered her.

This weekend, the Israeli military returned the mutilated body of a young daughter to her grieving parents. These are not the deeds of freedom fighters. These are the deeds of terrorists.

There are still over 100 hostages being held in Gaza, many of whom are believed to be dead. Eight of those hostages are Americans, three of whom are dead as well—three Americans.

When President Biden calls for a cease-fire—one neither party has agreed to yet—he is just calling for Israel to surrender. He is emboldening Hamas and abandoning the dozens of people still being abused by these terrorists. He is equivocating because of political pressure.

President Biden must stop sacrificing a moral backbone for political gain. You don't negotiate with terrorists. Hamas is using hostages as political pawns, and no amount of diplomacy is going to change that.

The Biden administration should not be telling Israel's democratically elected government what they must do. Israel must make those decisions to protect their people and protect their country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. RICKETTS. Madam President, I rise today to join my colleagues in expressing my complete support for the State of Israel and the war against Hamas terrorists.

There was a cease-fire in place prior to October 7. Hamas broke that cease-fire. Hamas attacked Israel and murdered over 1,200 Israelis and Americans. They also took hundreds of hostages, including Americans as well.

Hamas is responsible for every death on October 7 and every death since that day. They need to surrender. Hamas must surrender.

If Hamas surrenders and releases the hostages, aid can freely flow into Gaza to support the Gazans. Instead, Hamas continues to prosecute this war. In fact, after October 7, they said they would continue to do atrocities like October 7, if given the chance. They will continue to try to destroy Israel. They will continue to murder Israeli citizens.

They just don't chant “Death to Israel.” They chant “Death to America” as well.

Terror groups like Hamas and Hezbollah represent an existential threat to Israel. They have repeatedly declared their intention to wipe Israel off the map.

Israel has the right and the obligation to destroy the terrorist group Hamas. They must have the ability to defend themselves. And they will be doing the world a favor by destroying Hamas.

We need to support Israel and their efforts to do just that. Part of that support means pushing back on anti-Semitic organizations, like the United

Nations or the International Criminal Court, that attack Israel's legitimacy and their sovereignty.

The International Criminal Court's ludicrous decision to apply for arrest warrants for Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu and Israel's defense chief is the most recent example of their anti-Semitism. This outrageous decision not only emboldens terrorists around the world but creates problems for us here in the United States as well.

In the statement, the ICC prosecutor describes crimes that have been committed on "the territory of Israel and the State of Palestine." That is exactly backward. He should have said "the State of Israel and the territories of Palestine." But that was intentional.

It is a continuation of the rampant anti-Semitism in these organizations, like the ICC and the U.N. It is designed to delegitimize the State of Israel.

And the crazy thing is, the ICC's action, in itself, is illegitimate. It lacks legal basis. Under its own charter, the ICC is banned from moving forward with prosecutions unless the relevant government is unwilling or unable to police themselves.

The ICC knows Israel has a robust and independent judiciary. The ICC knows and has admitted that Israel has trained lawyers who advise commanders and a robust system intended to ensure compliance with international humanitarian law. By moving forward with these arrest warrants, the ICC is calling Israel's laws, government, and democracy illegitimate. It is wrong.

There is no moral equivalency between the State of Israel, democracy, and the terrorist organization Hamas. There is no moral equivalency between Hamas's terrorist actions and atrocities on October 7 and Israel's right to defend itself and to take action to destroy that terrorist organization.

Hamas terrorists have shot unarmed civilians, dismembered soldiers, raped women, and massacred children. Meanwhile, Israel has fought its war while taking great pains to avoid unnecessary civilian casualties.

We need to be supporting Israel in its mission, not undermining the Israeli Government. It is in our interest to do so.

Neither Israel nor the United States are members of the ICC. Both countries are outside of the ICC's jurisdiction. Yet the ICC is going after Israel anyway. America should take note. If the ICC can violate Israel's sovereignty, it can violate America's sovereignty.

The ICC needs to face the consequences of its anti-Israel policies. While it is good that President Biden has condemned the arrest warrants as "outrageous," Israel needs more than words. It needs actions.

Last month, my Republican colleagues and I sent a letter to the ICC with a warning: If the ICC moved forward with arrest warrants for Israelis, we would push to end all American support for this disgraceful organization.

We are here today to tell President Biden one simple thing: If your commitment to Israel is really ironclad, as you say, you will join us in holding these anti-Semitic organizations accountable. Let's sanction the ICC's employees and associates and prevent them from coming to the United States. Let's work with our allies to ensure that they refuse to honor the ICC's indictments against either Israel or the United States. Let's truly demonstrate our ironclad support and stand with our ally Israel in its hour of need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BUDD. Today is the 229th day of captivity for eight American citizens held hostage in Gaza by the terrorist organization Hamas—229 days of being deprived of food, water, and medical care; 229 days of being subjected to unbearable violence, abuse, and psychological torture by Hamas terrorists; 229 days that mothers and fathers—many of whom I have met—and husbands and wives and brothers and sisters have had to live with the pain, the anguish, and the uncertainty of their loved ones' well-being. But if you flip on mainstream media tonight or if you watch the protests on college campuses or if you listen to the Biden White House, the conversation has been dominated by everything but securing the release of American hostages.

We have seen the prosecutor for the International Criminal Court seek arrest warrants of Israeli leaders as well as Hamas leaders. Equating the Israeli Prime Minister with Hamas terrorists is despicable, and it shows a complete lack of moral clarity.

We have read about the State of Qatar reportedly temporarily expelling Hamas leaders from Doha, only to reverse course and welcome them back later. To be clear, Qatar is hosting a brutal terrorist organization with American blood on their hands. This continued dithering and flip-flopping is not helping. Qatar must pressure Hamas leaders to release the hostages now or expel them from Doha. It is just that simple. To do anything less, my friends, is unbecoming of a major non-NATO ally.

When we look to the President of the United States, we continue to see weakness and a lack of moral clarity on this issue. In a total betrayal of our friend and ally, the Biden administration withheld lethal aid to Israel earlier this month. This signaled to Hamas that they can drag their feet and hold out because the so-called ironclad bond between the United States and Israel, in Biden's mind, is not so ironclad after all.

I know firsthand that Biden is overruling his national security team, and he is letting a few radical activists on his staff dictate foreign policy as American lives hang in the balance. At the end of day, there is nothing more important in U.S. foreign policy than protecting American citizens. The best

way we can bring the hostages home from Gaza is by increasing pressure on Hamas.

On the international stage, we need global bodies, like the ICC and the U.N., to grow a moral core, identify the evil being committed, and to rally the community of nations to pressure Hamas to release innocent hostages. We need the State of Qatar to end its straddling and doublespeak and to permanently expel Hamas leaders from Doha. Here at home, we need the Justice Department to file charges and hunt down every Hamas terrorist responsible for the murder of over 40 Americans on October 7 and the kidnapping of 8 who remain in captivity. We need the President of the United States to show strength and to show some moral leadership on this issue.

Friends, the line between good and evil in this conflict is crystal clear. President Biden needs to use every lever of national power to secure the hostages' freedom.

After 229 days, let's be united in working for the release of these eight hostages.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ROSEN). The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Madam President, to kind of continue on the theme of my good friend from North Carolina, apparently today or yesterday, the countries of Ireland, Spain, and Norway recognized a Palestinian State.

Here is my question: Who is in charge of the state? Who is running the place? What are its boundaries? Did you recognize Hamas being in charge of Gaza? Do you want to keep the PA as we know it now in the West Bank, as old and corrupt? What did you recognize?

These are allies, but they need to hear from a friend that what you did is reprehensible. You are rewarding terrorists.

On October 7, Hamas attacked the State of Israel and murdered 1,200 innocent people, put babies in ovens, raped women, set people on fire, and recorded it all. And your response is to create a Palestinian State? You are rewarding terrorists. The way a Palestinian State will be created, if ever, is through direct negotiations between the State of Israel and Palestinians, not a unilateral recognition of a Palestinian State after the largest terrorist attack against the Jewish people since the Holocaust.

To my friends in Ireland, Spain, and Norway, what you did was reward Hamas. Here is the message you are sending: Kill Jews, and you will get a reward.

Again, tell me about the state you just recognized. Who is in charge, and what are the boundaries? You can't answer those questions, but you went ahead and recognized the Palestinian State for political reasons.

The world has turned upside down.

Madam President, you have been a stalwart defender of Israel, and we appreciate it.

Here is what I would say: After October 7, Hamas is engaged in using the Palestinian people as human shields at a level I haven't seen in warfare. The response is to punish Israel, who is in a no-win situation. The battalions have to be destroyed. The tunnels are underground. Why do you need a 2,000-pound bomb? Because there are underground tunnels that only a major bomb will be able to destroy.

When it comes to civilian infrastructure, the destruction of it has been in large part because Hamas has used schools, mosques, and hospitals as military sites, putting all that infrastructure in jeopardy by militarizing it.

On top of all of that, the International Criminal Court has decided to issue an arrest warrant for the Prime Minister of Israel and the Defense Minister of Israel as well as Hamas leaders. Boy, has the world turned upside down.

To consider Israel like Russia—Putin had an arrest warrant issued because there is no rule of law in Russia. People fall out of windows who are opposition leaders. People get poisoned. There is no rule of law in Russia.

There is a robust legal system in Israel. It is probably the pride of the world. The most independent judiciary maybe on the planet lives and resides in Israel.

So Israel is not Russia, and the Prime Minister and the Defense Minister of Israel are not Hamas, but in the ICC world, they are all the same. That is despicable.

Here is what has happened: Apparently, a lot of legal experts, some well-known, famous people, advised the ICC that Israel needed to be charged—the State of Israel, the Prime Minister and the Defense Minister. They are legal experts under international law. I would not pay these people 5 cents given my undersigning of their own statute.

I, along with seven members—four Republicans and four Democrats—engaged the ICC weeks ago, arguing that for you to bring a charge against the State of Israel, you would have to believe that the judiciary in Israel is not independent and that Israel is not acting in good faith—they are acting in bad faith—when it comes to allegations against Israeli forces and policies of Israel. It is called complementarity.

Israel is not a member of the ICC, nor are we. In 2015, the ICC recognized the Palestinians as a state for ICC purposes even though they are not recognized by the U.N. Why they did that, I don't know. But they took over jurisdiction of this conflict, and where do we lie now?

On May 20, a couple of days ago, a representative of the ICC was supposed to land in Israel to set up a meeting between legal officials, government officials of the State of Israel and the prosecutor, Khan, next week.

The group that I was involved in urged the ICC to sit down and talk with Israel—called complementarity.

Under their own statute, the ICC cannot act unless the nation in question is unable or unwilling to proceed with an investigation or if the investigation is conducted in bad faith. There is no way you can find Israel is not acting in good faith when they were willing to meet you 2 days ago.

So here is what happened: We were misled and lied to by the ICC.

This group thinks they have jurisdiction of the entire world; they are going to roam the globe and right wrongs. They were created to deal with voids where there is no rule of law or rogue states like Russia, where the rule of law has been destroyed, not come and second-guess robust democracies like Israel and the United States.

They threatened to come after our soldiers in Afghanistan years ago, and Senator ERNST, who was a member of the U.S. Army serving abroad. We objected to high heaven.

We have a very robust military legal system. We have a very independent judiciary. Israel has the most independent judiciary on the planet.

So they canceled the meeting. Israel called and said: When will you get here? The man in question for the ICC said: I have been told I can't come. And Israel heard about the arrest warrant on CNN. They had prerecorded this interview—Mr. Khan had—with a CNN reporter before the meeting.

Senator CARDIN has been awesome on this.

We are trying to get Israel to engage with the ICC, listen to their complaints, and see if we can move forward. They acted in bad faith. A meeting was set up, the man did not attend, and before Israel knew anything, they heard it on CNN.

So I am hoping that we can come together—and I want to applaud President Biden, Secretary of State Blinken, and Jake Sullivan for issuing strong statements condemning the actions of the ICC against the State of Israel.

Now it is time to impose sanctions not only to help our ally but also to help ourselves. I want everybody to know that if you deal with the ICC in this sham trial against Israel, you will never come to this country. Your visa will be revoked, and if you have assets here, they will be lost. You have to pick what I think is an abuse of the rule of law over doing business with America.

If we don't do that as a body, we are next. I have tried for months to find a way forward with my colleagues, who have been terrific, trying to find a way for Saudi and Israel to recognize each other, come up with a better deal for the Palestinians, to end this conflict in a permanent way.

In the middle of this sensitive moment, the ICC, in a very deceptive way, brings charges against the Prime Minister of Israel and the Defense Minister, who are in a fight for their lives. They are surrounded by Hezbollah, Hamas, and Iran.

Where was the ICC when the Iranians drug a young girl off the bus and beat

her to death? Where are they in North Korea? They pick Israel—a nation with one of the most robust, independent legal systems on the planet. They lied to eight U.S. Senators. They cannot get away with this. If you let them get away with this, then you are going to regret it.

So I look forward to working with Republicans and Democrats and the administration to send a clear signal: We are not going to sit on the sidelines while the rule of law is politicized, turned upside down, to the detriment of our allies and our own Nation.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Ms. ERNST. Madam President, first, I would like to thank the Senator from South Carolina. We know that normalization between Saudi Arabia and Israel is incredibly important, and the Senator from South Carolina has been knee-deep in efforts to bring those two nations together. I would like to thank him first for that.

America's promises mean something—or at least they should. President Biden has repeatedly promised that his commitment to Israel is ironclad, but revoking much needed military support for our closest Middle Eastern ally says otherwise.

Let's be clear: The Middle East—really, the entire world—right now is on fire, and the blame lies, in large part, on the shoulders of the administration. President Biden's weak leadership has consistently appeased our enemies and abandoned our allies.

This dangerous trend began with the disastrous withdrawal from Afghanistan, where he left behind Americans and Afghan allies to the mercies of Taliban rule. As a result, terrorists across the globe rejoice at Biden's decisions instead of trembling in fear of the United States as they once did and should.

Two weeks ago, I returned from Israel, where I advocated for the release of American hostages held captive by Iran-backed Hamas. I stood before Israeli officials, including Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu, and assured them that America has your back. Yet, as my words were still reverberating, the Biden administration sent a far different, far more damaging message to our ally: We are withholding key munitions.

Unbelievable and unconscionable.

Let's not miss that the very weapons that President Biden is withholding include kits that will convert bombs into precision-guided weapons—tools that would help Israel conduct very precise strikes against Hamas, thus reducing civilian casualties.

Mind you, reducing civilian casualties is the administration's stated goal when it comes to how the IDF prosecutes their rightful retaliation. Yet the Biden White House is withholding the very means Israel needs to accomplish this goal.

It is total hypocrisy, folks.

As Prime Minister Netanyahu said to me and to the world, the United States withholding these precision-guided capabilities will not stop Israel from defending itself.

But make no mistake, Biden's decision will make it harder for Israel to avoid civilian deaths. This, my friends, is a very, very grim reality.

In April, Congress, with my help, stood firmly with our ally by approving critical weapons support for Israel. Leading up to the passage of this bill, President Biden himself declared the aid to Israel was critical and called for "swift and decisive action" to ensure Israel had everything it needed to defend itself. Yet, now, when it is his time to act, Biden fails to do so.

Since October 7, Israel has faced existential, Iran-backed threats on every side. In the Gaza Strip, Hamas terrorists continue to attack our friend and hold dozens of hostages, including Americans—our American eight. Hezbollah forces continue to bomb northern Israel, forcing the evacuation of 60,000 Israelis. Houthis have also attacked dozens of ships crossing the Red Sea in order to strangle the Israeli economy. And, of course, Iran—the supporter of all of these terrorist groups—launched more than 300 projectiles against Israel last month in an unprecedented escalation, not to mention the attacks by Iranian proxies on our own servicemembers in the region. Three American servicemembers were killed at Tower 22 in Jordan. Let's not forget.

As Israel faces these dangers, we must give her the arms needed to fight and win—to destroy the Hamas terrorists that continue to hold our—our—fellow citizens hostage, the American eight.

What must not get lost in all the noise is that the decision to withhold weapons from Israel reeks of politics. The President is choosing to capitulate to an anti-Israel, pro-Hamas faction within his own party. He does so at his own peril and, more importantly, at the peril of countless lives.

President Biden, you have made your choice. You are choosing the side of Iran-backed Hamas terrorists who brutally rape women and burn children. You are choosing the side of anti-Semites who are ruining the lives of Jewish students across this country. You will live with the consequences of your choices and, most gravely, so will the American hostages and U.S. servicemembers being targeted by Iranian proxies every single day.

Republicans will not waver in our support for Israel and our Jewish friends. "Never again" is not just a slogan; it is a solemn vow, and in this pivotal moment, we will stand on the right side of history.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

BORDER ACT OF 2024

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, nearly every day, Republicans come to

this floor to tell us how much they care about the border and how much they believe in border security. Yet—and yet—when they have an opportunity to do something about it, they don't just balk; they run for the hills.

If you care about securing the border, then you actually have to pass legislation that secures the border. It doesn't secure itself by itself. Our statutes are outdated. Our Border Patrol doesn't have enough resources. You have to change the law. You have to put more resources on the border. That is what the bipartisan border security bill did. I regret the fact that all but four Republicans voted against it after they requested that we engage in a bipartisan process to develop that border security bill, after they demanded that we pass bipartisan border security legislation.

But because we believe that this issue is so important—because the American people believe that securing our border and compassionately treating those who arrive at our border is such an important issue—we are going to bring this bill back for another vote tomorrow. We are going to give Republicans a second chance to do what they say they want to do: work across the aisle in a bipartisan way to provide more resources to control our southwest border.

So I am glad to be on the floor today with a number of my colleagues who believe as I do; that this is the time to pass significant bipartisan legislation to secure our border, to reform our broken immigration system. It is what the American people want.

We should stop playing political games. Republicans should choose the security of this country ahead of their Presidential candidate's political prospects, and we have the opportunity to do that this week. So I am grateful to have so many of my colleagues on the floor.

I believe starting our remarks will be Senator KAINÉ.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINÉ. Madam President, I am thrilled to join my colleagues on the floor to talk about the importance of this border security bill, but I am also going to talk about my own naivete and admit to being a very naive Senator.

When I came to the Senate in 2013 with Senator MURPHY, one of the first things we did in June of my first year in the Senate was to pass a significant and bipartisan immigration reform bill. That immigration reform bill was comprehensive, including a \$40 billion-plus investment in border security. We passed it in a bipartisan way in this body with nearly 70 votes.

My naivete was this: Yes, there was a Republican House. When the bill went over there, having been a Governor and having watched how State legislatures worked, I assumed that the Republican House wouldn't just embrace our bill

but that they would do their own version of an immigration bill, and then we would sit down in a conference and hash out some middle ground. No. I was wrong. The Republican majority House decided to bottle the bill up in committee. They never took it up and never did their own bill. That was in 2013—the education of a naive Senator.

Years later, in 2018, during the Trump administration, when we had a Republican majority in this body, we dealt directly with President Trump. He wanted \$25 billion in border security over 10 years. We basically came up with an offer that was, Can you take yes for an answer?

I was part of an eight-member crew negotiating a bipartisan deal: protection for Dreamers and \$25 billion in border security—every penny Donald Trump asked for and not one penny less. He told us that he supported Dreamers. He told us that if the bill got to him, he would sign it. Because we had a Democratic House, if we could get it through this body, we would get it to President Trump's desk. But as soon as we rolled out the bill with eight Democrats and eight Republicans as cosponsors, President Trump did a 180, turn tail. He trashed the Dreamers. He said the bill was awful and encouraged Republicans to vote against it, and we couldn't get to the 60-vote margin.

So, for the second time, we did a bipartisan deal that was going to do good things and invest a whole lot in border security that was killed by President Trump and now this most recent effort.

I so applaud Senator MURPHY, Senator SINEMA, Senator LANKFORD, and others from the administration who worked on this deal, a bipartisan border security provision with other important provisions: the normalization of Afghan refugees. We have more in Virginia than almost any other State. There is really important work in this bill—bipartisan.

It is not lost on me how hard it is to do a deal where both the American Immigration Lawyers Association and the Border Patrol union, which tend to be quite opposite politically, take a look at a compromise and say: You know, this isn't perfect, but we need to do this.

I don't know of another issue where these two organizations have said: We need to do this. That was the needle that these Senators were able to thread after months and months and months of negotiation.

But just as in the first two instances, a significant effort to protect our border and make our country safer in a bipartisan way got shot down when President Trump came out and encouraged Republicans to oppose it. Even though they had been briefed on the negotiation every step of the way and supported it, as soon as President Trump said they should oppose it, folks turned tail and ran. President Trump was honest. I mean, I will give him this. He was honest about the reason.

He didn't say to oppose it because he didn't like clause A or clause C. He pretty much said: We don't want to fix this problem. We would rather raise heck about this problem and blame Joe Biden about this problem than fix this problem.

We are sent here to solve problems, and when we have a bipartisan solution that fits this narrow window where both left and right say it is the right step to take, we should do it. I am so glad that this is going to be up on the floor for a vote tomorrow. I look forward to joining my colleagues in supporting it. I urge others to do the same.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I am really pleased to be here on the floor with my colleagues who just want to get something done on the border. I mean, how long have we talked about this? Senator KAINE talked about 2013. I was here as well. It was an amazingly difficult piece of legislation to negotiate at the time, but it was comprehensive, and in the end, it was a big bipartisan vote in the U.S. Senate.

I agree with Senator KAINE. When it went to the House, we thought: OK. We put together this comprehensive bill that is not only border security, it is about how we manage and create a pathway to citizenship and address young people who have been here their whole lives—who have been here as juniors—and for agriculture jobs, which I work with all the time. Our farmers need ag labor and want to know there is a legal path to be able to have people work here. It covered everything. At that time, Republicans in the House didn't want to deal with it, didn't want to solve it.

So we have been down this road before, but I really did think, this time, in the context of the national security bill, the demand from Republican colleagues, that they wouldn't consider the supplemental security issues without a tough border bill. I said: OK, here we go.

We all know, there were major negotiations, months of negotiations. Senator MURPHY, Senator SINEMA, Senator LANKFORD—everybody was stretching and pushing and trying to get to a spot for something that would really, really make a difference.

They did, and the vast majority of us said OK, we are going to support it. But that was 105 days ago—105 days ago that Republican colleagues had a chance to solve the issue that they come to the floor to speak on every day. They keep coming to the floor every day saying: We need you to do something about the border. We need you to do something about the border.

Well, we offered a bipartisan bill—a tough bill—to do something about the border, and at the last minute, they said no.

I want to speak for a moment about one piece in here that is so important.

We think about the southern border, and there is certainly funding in here for the northern border. But one of the things that is in here I know our Presiding Officer cares deeply about as well, affects every part of the country—it certainly affects Michigan—is the capacity to stop the flow of deadly fentanyl. It is so important, and it is in this bill.

On April 2 the Justice Department announced the largest law enforcement seizure of fentanyl in the entire history of Michigan, April 2. Forty kilos of fentanyl were found—enough to kill every single Michigan resident.

On April 19, a Michigan medical examiner raised the alarm on what was quoted as a really bad patch of fentanyl in Michigan and warned the public that there had been 6 drug overdoses in 11 days, raising the flag of what was going on here. It only takes one pill to be able to cause a death.

These are just two headlines from last month in Michigan, and they do not come close to encapsulating the pain and the tragedy Michigan families have faced over the years due to drug overdoses.

So we have got to do more to combat the fentanyl crisis. This bill does that. This bill actually does that. We need to give the U.S. Customs and Border Protection the tools they need to stop the drug from crossing the border to combat the fentanyl crisis. This bill would invest in 2,400 more in Customs and Border Protection officers—desperately needed—and new innovative inspection equipment to decrease detection. We know there are all kinds of ways it is coming in, from tires in every part of a vehicle—every imaginable way it is coming in—and there is equipment that can detect that. We need that new innovative equipment at the border to help our agents.

Drug Enforcement Agency efforts to disrupt drug trafficking networks in Mexico, in this bill; enhanced lab analysis of fentanyl samples, in this bill; improve technology for autonomous capabilities, air assets, in this bill—in the bill we will be voting on tomorrow.

So when we hear colleagues talking about doing something about drug overdoses, about fentanyl, they have a chance tomorrow to vote to do that.

But it has been 105 days since Republicans were given the opportunity for a strong bipartisan bill that included fentanyl efforts, and 105 days ago they killed the bill.

We know why. We know why. It has been said over and over again: Donald Trump told them to. He called people, and he said: "We don't want to solve this. We want chaos. That is my middle name." Maybe it is his first name, I don't know. But chaos, chaos, chaos: "We want people to be afraid. We want chaos. We don't care if people are getting hurt or what is happening."

He actually was quoted as saying: "Please blame it on me." I want you to vote against it. "Please blame it on me," which we are more than happy to do because it was him. It was him.

We want to solve the challenges at the border. We know they are serious, and we want to give the Biden administration additional tools to solve them.

They want that. In every single budget since President Biden was elected—every single budget—he has asked for more resources to do the things in this bill. And folks have said no, no, no, no, no.

This legislation does what needs to be done. And as I said before, it was toughly negotiated in a bipartisan manner, and we appreciate that.

Let's be clear. This bill would significantly improve our Nation's security in a number of important ways. It would reform the broken asylum system so that decisions would be made more quickly on who should be allowed to remain in the country and who should be deported.

Those allowed to stay would be provided authorization to work so that they could take care of themselves and their families and fill crucial jobs in our economy while waiting for their cases to be resolved.

The legislation would create a new emergency authority that would allow the President of the United States to pause the processing of asylum claims of migrants who arrive between ports of entry when cases rise above a certain point.

It would expand legal pathways to citizenship and increase access to work authorizations—something that Republicans claim to support.

And those immigrants who serve in our military—who serve in our military—would gain quicker access to citizenship—something I think we can all agree they have earned.

People sometimes forget that Michigan, my home State, is a border State. This bill would provide up to \$100 million in grants to States and local and Tribal law enforcement agencies to secure the northern border, which is extremely important to me and the people I represent.

Republicans say they care about solving the challenges at the border. Their actions, unfortunately, show otherwise.

We stand ready to pass this legislation. We stand ready to strengthen our border security and to keep our communities safe. We are ready to do it. Let's go.

Tomorrow, our Republican colleagues will be given another chance to join us to pass this bipartisan bill, and I urge them to vote yes.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, for years, many of our colleagues have said on this Senate floor, they have said in committee hearing rooms, they have said on cable news shows that there is a crisis at our southern border. And they have been right.

Well, today, we actually have the opportunity to do something about it. Once again, we have bipartisan legislation before us that works to address

the challenges of a broken and decades-old immigration system.

Along with our other colleagues here this afternoon, I rise to urge all Members of the Senate to put aside politics, to do what I think we all believe to be the right thing, and to vote in favor of the bipartisan Border Act.

As a former chairman of the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, I know that we have tried to come together in Congress to fix our immigration system for about as long as I can remember, under Presidents and congressional leadership of both parties.

Our colleagues have oftentimes heard me say that bipartisan solutions are lasting solutions, and that is true. And in the case of fixing our Nation's immigration laws, that has never been more true.

Thanks to the tireless work of a Democrat from Connecticut, a Republican from Oklahoma, and an Independent from Arizona, along with members of their staffs, we have reached a bipartisan compromise on one of the toughest issues our country faces today.

I am proud to say that after 4 long months of negotiations between our three colleagues and members of the Biden administration, including the Secretary of Homeland Security, we have crafted the strongest border security bill in decades.

The legislation produced during these negotiations proved that bipartisanship is not just aspirational; it is ours for the grasp; it is ours for the taking. The legislation produced during these negotiations proves that bipartisanship is not just aspirational, but it is actually possible.

Yet despite all of this hard work and the countless hours our colleagues invested in hammering out this critical piece of legislation, many of our Republican colleagues rejected this same bill earlier this year, largely at the behest of Donald Trump.

I would like to quote again, as Senator STABENOW has, what Donald Trump said on his social media account earlier this year. This is a quote:

Republicans should stop wasting their time on immigration until after we elect more Senators and Congressmen/women in November. Dems are just playing games, have no intention of doing anything to solve this decades-old problem. We can pass great legislation after the Red Wave.

While Democrats, Republicans, and Independents negotiated in good faith, it was Donald Trump who decided he would rather attempt to sow chaos—chaos at the border, rather than to deal with it and to fix it.

It was also incredibly disappointing to see so many of our Republican colleagues, especially in the House, turn their backs on this bipartisan approach and play politics with our immigration policy. They chose to put Donald Trump first over what is best for our country.

Fixing the crisis at our southern border requires tough policy choices, but

it also gives us an opportunity to seek some wisdom from the Scripture. I believe we need to look no further than the New Testament's Matthew 25, where we find these words: When I was a stranger in your land, did you welcome me? That is what it says: When I was a stranger in your land, did you welcome me?

Many immigrants seeking refuge here oftentimes leave their home countries and brave horrible conditions at home in order to seek a better life in this country—a life of freedom and a life of opportunity.

We know all too well the factors that have contributed to the challenges at our border. Among them are a global pandemic, increased violence and criminal activity, the smuggling of illicit narcotics, and our Nation's own devastating addiction to illegal drugs, not to mention authoritarian government rule and poverty throughout the Southern Hemisphere. Those are just some of the root causes.

If we are serious about addressing the challenges of our immigration system, it is imperative that we focus on these root causes of migration.

The bipartisan Border Act before us would finally work to make our country safer by increasing resources and implementing policy changes both at the border and to our immigration system as a whole.

This legislation has numerous endorsements from some unlikely places, including the Border Patrol union and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

So today, we now have another opportunity to choose policy over politics, to choose principle over politics. Everyone on the Senate floor today knows that improving the security of our border is not just good policy; it is the right thing to do.

In fact, some 84 percent of all voters in this country believe that we should be prioritizing reforms to our immigration system rather than sticking to the status quo—84 percent.

As U.S. Senators, we are elected to serve our constituents, the American people, and we have an opportunity today to meet that responsibility by enacting the legislation that is before us. Our three Senate colleagues have proven that working together is possible, and now it is up to the rest of us to do the right thing.

Let's finish the job. Let's implement a lasting solution, and let's do it together.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I agree with my colleagues. We have a crisis at our southern border. And in New Hampshire, it is affecting us because there are too many deadly drugs flowing into our country and not enough technology and equipment and personnel to stop it.

So it is not every day that I agree with my Republican colleagues on an issue as big as the border, but on this one, I agree.

We needed to act. That is why a group of negotiators—Republicans were led by Senator LANKFORD; Democrats, by Senator MURPHY and Senator SINEMA. I appreciate the work that all three of them did. They rolled up their sleeves. They got to work. For months, they passed paper back and forth. They ironed out big and small details of the bill that we voted on, that is before us.

And the final agreement is the strictest—I think that is worth repeating. It is the strictest border security legislation that we have seen certainly since my time in the Senate. It is a historic agreement to supply the border with critical resources that are necessary to increase security, to stop the flow of illicit drugs, and to better protect all Americans.

Now, our Republican colleagues were for this bill until Donald Trump put his thumb on the scale and said: Don't fix the border. I want to campaign on it as a crisis.

And as we heard, he acknowledged that we should blame him for the fact that the border deal failed.

But, unfortunately, our colleagues walked away from the strictest border security deal that we have had in decades, all because Donald Trump told them to make it a campaign issue rather than do what is in the best interest of the country.

Now, we need to pass this bill because it includes more funding for identifying, tracking, and stopping fentanyl at the border. I don't know about all of our colleagues, but in my home State of New Hampshire, we have lost too many people because they have died from fentanyl overdoses. In the period from 2013 to 2023, New Hampshire lost 4,616 people from drug overdoses—4,616. The majority of those people died as the result of fentanyl. About 70 percent of those deaths were the result of fentanyl.

And anything—anything—we can do to cut down on the amount of fentanyl that is coming into the United States, we ought to be doing it. We know that fentanyl is moved across the U.S.-Mexico border in huge quantities, often in cars and trucks, and we know that it comes across—almost 100 percent—at our ports of entry. And they can't search every vehicle in every way, and that is why we need technology.

We need to be able to scan vehicles for drugs and other contraband. We need to make sure they can expand these capacities, which is why there is a provision in the bill to provide significant increases in funding for CBP to deploy more nonintrusive inspection technology that would more efficiently and effectively search for fentanyl and other drugs.

The bill also gives Immigration and Customs Enforcement increased funding to focus on counter-fentanyl investigations and enforcement, because we need more boots on the ground dedicated to finding fentanyl and other drugs and dedicated to holding those accountable who are bringing these deadly drugs into our country.

The danger of the continued fentanyl epidemic demands more action from Congress. We need more funding. We need more agents on our borders. And with this bill, we would do just that.

Now, New Hampshire doesn't border our southern border, but it does border Canada, which has the longest international border in the world—over 5,000 miles. New Hampshire has a very short piece of that, but there are many stretches of the border, particularly in New Hampshire, that are remote, that are sparsely populated, and, unlike many other borders, not militarized.

That means our northern border is vulnerable to exploitation. And we have a program that we have had in past budgets called Operation Stonegarden. It is in the Department of Homeland Security. So Senator PETERS, I know, knows that program. But it helps police departments, providing annual grants to help them, particularly in rural areas that are really struggling to fund normal operations, let alone responsibilities along the border. These are funds that allow police departments to pay overtime for officers to patrol the border along with the U.S. Border Patrol.

Sadly, on the northern border, most of those funds have been diverted to the southern border, and many of our agents who have patrolled the northern border have been diverted to the southern border. That is a challenge for States like New Hampshire and others, where we have large sections of that border that are rural, where, in parts of New Hampshire's border, we don't even have access to internet. So there are cameras on the border, but they can't pick up anything because we don't have a signal. But despite this program's importance, it has been underfunded for a number of years, leaving States without sufficient resources.

So one of the pieces that is in this legislation that we are going to vote on tomorrow is \$100 million, with 25 percent of it that would go to States that are not on the southwest border—States like New Hampshire—to make sure that our law enforcement is also supported and well funded.

So we have a lot to do with our border. Passing this bill tomorrow, getting our Republican colleagues to join us, would make a huge difference in addressing the challenges at our southern border. I hope that they will join us, that they will put aside the opposition from Donald Trump, and that they will do what is in the best interest of the country, not what is in the best interest of Donald Trump.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, tomorrow, the Senate will consider legislation that would send critical resources to secure our borders. This legislation was forged by serious bipartisan negotiations, but when it first came to the Senate floor this past February as part of a foreign aid package,

my Republican colleagues voted against it and blocked us from even having a debate on this most serious of issues.

They plan, unfortunately, to do the same tomorrow. They are, once again, refusing to even come to the table to help strengthen our border security and support lawful trade and travel that drives our economy.

This bill is not perfect. It is not comprehensive immigration reform. We must keep working toward a broader approach where we modernize immigration laws and address the immigration system as a whole. But we cannot let that hold us back from taking action right now to secure our borders. This legislation is a meaningful step in the right direction. It would address some of our most pressing challenges on the issue and tackle them head-on.

The bill would allow us to hire more than 2,000 CBP officers, addressing a critical shortage of frontline personnel who safeguard our national security at points of entry each and every day. It would provide \$2 billion for advanced screening technology. This would allow CBP to expand use of these tools, helping them to identify illegal cargo and stop dangerous drugs like fentanyl from reaching and poisoning our communities. Fentanyl overwhelmingly enters this country through our ports of entry.

This bill also aims to change the asylum application process, a priority that Congress has been unable to pass for decades.

Republicans in Congress certainly like to talk about the need to secure our borders, but they use this issue to stoke fear in our communities all across the country. But when you get a commonsense bill, like the bill that we have before us, to vote on—a bill that aims to address the problems they claim that they want to solve—they simply walk away.

They talk the talk, but they refuse to walk the walk. We need to walk the walk. And that is why Republicans walked away last February. They took orders from Donald Trump, when he told them to vote against this bipartisan legislation. They made it abundantly clear that Republicans would rather campaign on this issue than actually fix it. They would rather throw rocks than solve the problems facing our country. And, unfortunately, it looks like they are going to do it all again tomorrow.

Americans deserve better. Our communities deserve better. Our frontline personnel deserve better. The victims of the fentanyl crisis deserve better. Those fleeing often horrendous conditions in their home countries and seeking asylum on our southern border, they deserve better. And it is an absolute shame that my Republican colleagues have decided not to act, because these challenges are not going to go away on their own.

As chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, I have worked hard to

craft bipartisan bills and pass commonsense border security legislation in my committee. I have had the opportunity to work with key Senators on this issue, including Senators LANKFORD, SINEMA, and MURPHY, who helped broker this deal in the first place; and I am going to keep working with any Member of this Chamber who is willing to come together and find common ground and forge solutions to help our country. And I hope some Republicans join me.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam President, I rise today in support of securing our border and taking action to fix our broken immigration system.

Let's back up for a minute. Fixing our broken immigration system and securing our border has evaded Congress for decades. We have poured many hours and much ink into trying to solve the very real issues that we have, and we have come close. I was proud to advance the bipartisan Gang of 8 immigration reform that would have tightened border security, provided pathways to citizenship for those already here, and expanded work visas. I, along with many in this Chamber, also voted for a bipartisan bill that would have given a path to citizenship for the 1.8 million Dreamers who came to our country as children.

We nearly passed the Common Sense Plan, a bill that would have invested \$25 billion in border security and also provided a pathway to citizenship for our Dreamers. All of these efforts—every single one of them—died at the hands of congressional Republicans.

Recently, Democrats and Republicans came to the table, yet again, to find a path forward on border security and fixes to our immigration system. Together, my colleagues from both parties worked hard to find a bipartisan compromise, and they did. The result was a strong measure, even endorsed by the largest Border Patrol union, that curbs the flow of fentanyl from coming across our border, expedites our asylum process, and boosts border security. Then, many Republicans walked away again, apparently deciding that it was better politics not to secure our border.

And what hits closest to home for me and every family who has watched a loved one pass away from fentanyl poisoning or an overdose is that we have a real chance to disrupt the flow of these dangerous drugs into our communities.

In the 2-year period from 2021 to 2022, over 2,800 Wisconsinites died of an opioid-related overdose. In just 2 years, thousands of Wisconsin families lost a loved one and gained an empty seat at the dinner table.

I have heard from countless parents devastated by losing their child. One mother, Michelle, got a call one November morning in 2021 notifying her that her son Cade, a freshman at UW-Milwaukee, had passed away. The night

before, Cade had gone out with friends in his dorm. He took one pill that he thought was Percocet. It turned out to be 100 percent fentanyl.

Michelle told me earlier this year that Cade “had his entire life ahead of him. He was home from college the weekend before he died talking about changing his major to psychology and how he wanted to travel the world. He deserved to learn from his mistake, not die from it. He didn’t overdose from taking one pill. He was poisoned.”

That is the stark reality of fentanyl: One pill can kill. In 2020, over 85 percent of opioid deaths in Wisconsin were connected to a synthetic or manufactured opioid like fentanyl. We can and we must do more to stop illicit drugs from coming into our communities. We have that chance in front of us right now.

We are bringing this bill back up because this is what the American people are demanding. While Wisconsin is not on the southern border, we are impacted by the flow of fentanyl coming across that border, and Wisconsinites want action. This bipartisan border compromise is that action.

This legislation will invest in 100 new cutting-edge inspection machines that help detect fentanyl at our ports of entry. This bill would also strengthen border security with more than 2,400 new Customs and Border Protection officers at our southwest border and give the President new authority to shut down the border when the system is overwhelmed.

Not only would this compromise combat the fentanyl crisis, but this also gives us the opportunity to take on an immigration system that has been broken for decades. If passed, this bill would invest in asylum officers and immigration judges to expedite the process. We would also send more resources to help communities across this country struggling to provide critical services to newcomers and expedite work permits for people who are in this country and qualify so that newcomers can provide for their families and help us meet workforce demands for Wisconsin businesses and farms.

With communities across Wisconsin and the country receiving migrants, this bill would deliver the necessary resources so that our local boots on the ground can effectively welcome those legally entering this country and not stress their often-stretched budgets.

Many Republicans walked away from this deal that they negotiated more than 100 days ago because some would rather make this a campaign issue. Well, I, for one, would prefer to make a difference. Our constituents expect—frankly, they demand—that we come here and work in good faith and find compromise where possible.

Our colleagues found a compromise on immigration reform and securing our border. Is it perfect? No. Would it have been a huge step in the right direction? Yes. I, nor anyone else, got everything that they wanted. This bill is

a compromise, and there is more work to do. Even if we pass this bill, we must remain committed to fixing our immigration system, including creating a clear path to citizenship for immigrants already here, especially our Dreamers.

But in this instance, we cannot let the perfect be the enemy of the good. We cannot allow politics to win out over progress. We cannot allow the same old Washington games to stop us from saving lives. Right now, we have a chance to take a step in the right direction, a chance to do the right thing for moms like Michelle and every parent who has lost a child to fentanyl. Let’s do something together right now to secure our border, stop the flow of fentanyl, fix our broken immigration system, and make a real difference for Americans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I am honored to join my colleagues in this colloquy and to support this measure. We are nearing the end of the debate for today. We are nearing a vote tomorrow.

But the debate will continue, and we will have other votes. Whether this measure passes or not tomorrow, it is only the beginning of what we need to do. So that debate nationally and in this body will continue. And there will be votes on other steps that carry forward the effort that this bipartisan security act reflects.

But we must act. Everyone agrees that we must act to make our border more secure, to fix our broken immigration system, to find a path toward earned citizenship for millions—tens of millions—of undocumented people in this country who are paying taxes and playing by the rules and, of course, for the Dreamers and for people seeking visas so they can work here and fill jobs that otherwise will be vacant.

We often hear Republicans talk about the need to secure the border. I sit on the Judiciary Committee where it seems like my Republican colleagues want to talk and talk and talk about the border. Every hearing, every markup, regardless of our actual agenda, they want to talk. Republicans want to talk about the border so much that they sent us contrived Articles of Impeachment against a Cabinet Secretary for the first time in 150 years. More talk.

Politics is the reason that this body failed to pass this measure just months ago. So for Republican colleagues who now claim politics is the reason we are here—yes, their politics, their presumptive Presidential nominee saying that they should not vote for it because of the political advantage they would have from keeping it as an issue. They made clear that all they want to do about the border is talk and use it politically.

Democrats spent months negotiating with Republicans. I give great credit to

my colleagues, Senator MURPHY, Senator SINEMA, Senator LANKFORD, and others, who have worked on this issue over the years.

I remember well in 2013, the Judiciary Committee overwhelmingly approved a bipartisan measure that then was approved by an overwhelming bipartisan majority in this body, and it went to the House where it died, not because it was voted down but simply because it had no vote. The Speaker of the House refused to give it a vote.

We will have a vote tomorrow on a measure that falls way short of what that one did in 2013. We provided a path to earn citizenship for 11 million then-undocumented—for the Dreamers. We provided billions of dollars for border security. And we reformed visa and asylum programs, among other ways, by enabling more fairness in that asylum system.

This bill is the strongest measure in recent history. It was endorsed by the National Border Patrol Council and the union of Border Patrol agents.

Let’s be very clear-eyed. It was a tough compromise. It limited asylum claims in ways that many Democrats and I remain concerned about doing. But it includes some key Democratic priorities, including providing new pathways to citizenship for our Afghan at-risk allies, ensuring legal representation to vulnerable children under 13 attempting to navigate the immigration process on their own, and providing for new ways for family members to enter the United States legally for short stays to visit relatives and attend major life events. That is an issue I have worked with colleagues across the aisle for years as well as some of those other provisions.

These are key parts of the Democratic vision for immigration: fix our broken immigration system to continue growing our economy and maintain America’s international leadership at a time of severe global unrest.

It will be tough for my Republican colleagues to vote for this measure. It will be tough for many of us. But that is why we are here, and that is the measure of why it is a compromise. A lot of what is here, we would not choose to include.

Let me conclude by saying, Donald Trump wants to campaign on the border, not fix it. The question is whether my Republican colleagues are so beholden to him that they will follow that lead like lemmings off a cliff and, at the end of the day, take the country with them.

My Democratic colleagues and I are not giving up. To the Dreamers, we will keep faith with you. To the undocumented millions around the United States who are paying taxes, working hard, following all the rules, we will keep faith with you. To businesses that want more visas so they can have workers, skilled and others, we will keep faith with you. We will keep faith with America on this issue. We are not abandoning this effort. We are not going away.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The senior Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be permitted to speak prior to the scheduled vote: Myself for up to 5 minutes, Senator SCHUMER for up to 2 minutes, Senator MURPHY for up to 10 minutes, Senator BUTLER for up to 5 minutes.

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

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I rise today along with Senators MURPHY and BLUMENTHAL and so many others in support of bipartisan legislation to improve our immigration system.

As we face global and domestic threats, securing our borders and points of entry must be a top priority. As we have discussed, we had an opportunity in February to move forward in a bipartisan manner on broad and important reforms and security measures that Senators MURPHY, LANKFORD, and SINEMA spent months negotiating.

I will note that this legislation, as Senator BLUMENTHAL noted, included my bipartisan bill to keep our covenant with the thousands of Afghans living in the United States who fought shoulder to shoulder with our troops. It is a top priority of the VFW and top priority of the American Legion, a top priority of those who have served in Afghanistan. These were their interpreters. These were the ones that gathered their intelligence. And now 80,000 of them are in our country, living with a trapdoor under them, not knowing if they will be sent back to the Taliban. They are working, yes, but what they need is permanent status.

And that is what this bill that I have with Senator GRAHAM, with support, on the Afghan Adjustment Act. As cosponsors, there are Senators like Senator MULLIN and Senator WICKER, the ranking member of Armed Services, and Senator RISCH, the ranking on Foreign Relations. They are all on this bill.

When it comes to our borders, though, as we are talking about today, this comprehensive legislation would have invested in hiring more Border Patrol agents and immigration judges while giving law enforcement the tools and technologies they need to make a safe border—order at the border. It would have fixed our broken asylum system, providing 250,000 new employment and family visas.

Yes, Madam President, we have another opportunity to actually right this wrong and get this bipartisan bill done. Border security demands that we invest in both our southern and northern borders, which is something I like about this legislation, having lived in a State that borders Canada—the longest border in the world, America and Canada. A strong, secure northern border is critical for maintaining our trade relations, for maintaining the terror screening database.

And we have witnessed terrible instances of drug smuggling and human

trafficking. Last year, Border Patrol agents and sheriff deputies in Kittson County, MN, stopped a human smuggling attempt. That is why this legislation is so important.

And of key importance to me and I know you, Madam President, and the State of Wisconsin is fentanyl and the work that can be done if this bill passes. It not only gives the President emergency powers to shut down the border but also ensures that we take on fentanyl trafficking.

These pills are getting in the hands of schoolchildren. These pills are getting in the hands of people who have no idea that the pills they have are laced with fentanyl.

Fentanyl is the leading cause of death for Americans ages 18 to 45. Synthetic opioids like fentanyl kill more than 150 people a day, and a dose of just 2 milligrams—small enough to fit on the tip of a pencil—can be lethal.

These aren't just numbers. It is 22-year-old Alex Davis of West St. Paul, who died of a fentanyl overdose while he was a student at the University of North Dakota; 32-year-old Katie Flick from Erskine, MN, who was killed by a fake pill laced with fentanyl; Devin Norring from Hastings, who bought a Percocet over Snapchat that wasn't really a Percocet, laced with fentanyl. It killed him. He was only 19.

That is why we call on our colleagues to join us in support of the Border Act. This legislation, supported by Border Patrol agents, gives law enforcement officers significant funding and support to hire more officers and intercept fentanyl coming into our country.

I thank Senators LANKFORD, MURPHY, and SINEMA for their work on this bill. I thank Senator SCHUMER and Senator MCCONNELL for their leadership.

There is not controversy about this bill except on the political side. If you look at this from the viewpoint of Americans and what makes people safer and what will stop kids from dying because they take one pill and they don't know there is fentanyl in it, the answer is simple: Vote for this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, first, I want to thank Senator MURPHY for organizing this important floor block. I want to thank all of my colleagues who participated. I see Senator BLUMENTHAL, of course Senator KLOBUCHAR, and others who participated.

What we are talking about is the need to pass our bipartisan border bill to crack down on fentanyl entering our country. Every one of us in our States has talked to families who have lost loved ones because of fentanyl, particularly young people, and it breaks your hearts. Some of these family members didn't even know their loved ones had taken fentanyl and were dead within 24 hours—just gone. I have experienced that with some families.

So now we have a chance to do something with it in this bill. Tomorrow,

Senators face an important decision: Will both sides come together to advance a bipartisan border security bill or will partisanship get in the way yet again?

Three months ago, Donald Trump told his Republican allies to block the strongest bipartisan border bill Congress has seen in a generation—something that would have done a great deal to stop the flow of vicious fentanyl into the United States.

So we are trying again tomorrow because we hear about these families that Senator KLOBUCHAR mentioned, that I mentioned, that others have mentioned. We have to. And I hope this time our Republicans will join us to achieve a different outcome.

Unlike H.R. 2, a very partisan bill, this bipartisan bill was written with the goal of getting 60 votes in the Senate. It had input from both Republicans and Democrats. H.R. 2 can't claim that. It was totally put together by Republicans, got virtually no Democratic support. If anything is political, it is H.R. 2—has been used politically but never seriously to get something done.

So let's be perfectly clear. Our bipartisan border bill represents a real chance—in fact, the best chance in decades—to act on border security.

The bill would make huge strides towards cracking down on the scourge of fentanyl, deliver billions for the DEA, for DHS, to hire officers to focus exclusively on drugs, and billions—we now have state-of-the-art equipment that can detect the flow of drugs at the border. Why the heck aren't we allocating the money to pay for it instead of playing political games? We should be doing that right now.

I thank my Democratic colleagues who today are here highlighting how this bill does more than anything we have done thus far to deal with the scourge of fentanyl.

If you told me a year ago that this was the kind of bill that we had before us, that really cracked down on fentanyl, which we must fight, I would have thought we would have had a good chance, and we thought Republicans would have leapt at the opportunity to enact this bill into law. By objective measure, it is strong, it is necessary.

So, tomorrow, we are going to have a clear choice. Tomorrow, we will see who is serious about actually wanting to fix the border, who is serious about actually cracking down on fentanyl, and those who prefer to merely talk about it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, tomorrow, we are going to have a chance to come together, Republicans and Democrats, to be able to secure our border, make better sense of our immigration system. This is what the American people want us to do. They don't elect us to hold press conferences. They don't elect us to post on social media.

They don't elect us to argue. They elect us to solve problems.

To my great gladness, there are Republicans who are willing to solve these problems. Senator LANKFORD is one of them. Senator SINEMA, an Independent, Senator LANKFORD, and I sat in a room for 4 months, and we negotiated a bipartisan compromise—a compromise—that would allow us to get tougher on our southern border, to make sure that only the right people are coming into the United States, those that have a legitimate claim of asylum, those that are legitimately fleeing terror and torture. That would create a more compassionate, more effective, more efficient system of immigration.

We were engaged in this process because Republicans demanded it. Republicans said: We want you to pass bipartisan immigration reform. We want you to get to a result. We will vote for it if you achieve that result.

They selected Senator LANKFORD as the chosen negotiator.

We achieved that result. Senator MCCONNELL was in the room for those negotiations. It was endorsed by some of the most conservative outlets and organizations in the country, including the Chamber of Commerce, the Wall Street Journal, and the very conservative Border Patrol union. But it only got four Republican votes.

So I want to talk for just a minute about why that happened, what the bill does, and why it is important that we have another vote this week.

First, let's just talk briefly about what this bill does.

Probably first and most importantly, it fixes the broken immigration system, the asylum system in particular. Right now, you come to this country and apply for asylum, it takes sometimes as long as 10 years before you get your claim heard. That is not fair. That is not fair for the individual who is applying, but that is not fair for others who are waiting outside of the country to try to come to the United States. It is not fair for communities that ultimately have to house and provide services for all of those individuals who are waiting to apply for asylum. So this bill fixes that broken system. It takes that 5- or 10-year wait down to weeks or months.

This bill gives the President emergency authorities to close down portions of the border when crossings get too high. You can't handle 10,000 people a day at the border. We all know that, Republicans and Democrats. The American public knows that. They saw that chaos at the end of last year. This bill says the President, whether you are Republican or Democrat, has the emergency authority to close down the border during times of high crossings.

This bill makes significant investments in combating fentanyl. My colleagues have talked about the scourge of fentanyl, hundreds and hundreds of people dying in my State, thousands across this country. This bill invests

significant new resources in stopping the flow of drugs across our border. It is a \$20 billion investment overall. Much of that money is targeted toward fentanyl.

Then it just takes a bunch of commonsense steps to treat those who are coming to the United States in a more humane way. It says that if you are coming here and you have a legitimate claim of asylum, you should be able to work while your claim is being processed, that you should have a right to a lawyer during that process, that we should provide a little bit of money for young kids, for 8-year-olds to have representation. It provides a pathway to citizenship for certain really critical populations, including Afghans, including the children of H-2B holders.

Inside this bill are a number of really important reforms, and the system just makes more sense, it is more effective, it is more humane. But at the foundation of this bill is border security—making sure we have a border that is manageable, that is not chaotic.

I agree with my colleagues—this bill does not do everything we need to do to reform our broken immigration system. Of course I want a pathway to citizenship for people that are living in the shadows. I want to make sure that those kids who know nothing except for being Americans have a chance to stay here permanently. But this bill is a really important downpayment—a really important bipartisan downpayment on border security and immigration reform.

The question is, Why did it fail? Why did a bill that had the support of Senator LANKFORD, the appointed negotiator, and had the support of Senator MCCONNELL fail? And the answer is simple: Donald Trump told Republicans to kill the bill. Donald Trump told Republicans that their party would be better off if the border was a mess, if nothing passed, because more Republicans would get elected this November if there were scenes of chaos at the border. So even though you have a bipartisan border bill, kill it because politically it is better for Republicans if the border is a mess.

That is not my analysis; that is literally what Republicans have said on the record repeatedly. Senator MCCONNELL said it himself, said: Donald Trump told us to do nothing. Senator MCCONNELL didn't say: Donald Trump told us to write a better bill; he said: Donald Trump told Senate Republicans to do nothing.

So that is why we are here today, because the American public wants us to pass bipartisan border security legislation, Democrats want to pass bipartisan border security legislation, but as far as I can tell, Republicans do not because they want the border to be a mess.

We will see tomorrow. We will have another chance. If this is an emergency like Republicans say, then let's give it one more shot.

Let me end with this because I do think it is important to just explore

for a minute why keeping this issue of immigration unsolved, keeping the border chaotic, is so important to Republicans and in particular to Donald Trump. The reason is that making Americans afraid of each other, turning us against each other, is the centerpiece of Donald Trump's message and thus, for this election at least, the centerpiece of the Republican platform.

The idea is to keep the border broken, to keep the immigration system broken because it helps breed and maintain resentment towards immigrants, towards people that are different from you.

Just last month, Trump said this. He said: Immigrants are not human; they are animals.

I mean, if a major political figure said that 20 years ago, there would be, I think, Republicans and Democrats both standing up and condemning that kind of language. Donald Trump calls immigrants animals, says they are not human—he says it on a regular basis—and he is celebrated by Republicans.

I wish this weren't true. I wish it weren't a foundational aspect of modern republicanism to try to turn us against each other, to try to make us afraid of people who are coming to this country just to save their families' lives, but that is where we are. That is where we are. But that doesn't obviate us from the responsibility to govern.

So Republicans can complain that we are asking them to vote on a negotiated, bipartisan compromise, because it is inconvenient for them to vote against a bill that was endorsed by high-profile Senate Republicans and by high-profile conservative groups. It is inconvenient for them to vote against a bill that actually brings security to the border, that fixes the problem that they want to be fixed, but that is our job.

Our job is to come here and not just do press conferences, not just search for clicks online. Our job is to fix problems, and the broken border and our broken immigration system is a problem. This bill doesn't fix all of those problems, but it is the biggest fix we have had a chance to vote on in a generation.

So, yes, we need to vote on this again to give Republicans the chance to do the right thing, to choose the security of this country, to choose fixing a problem that they identify instead of choosing to try to gain some political advantage in this election, instead of choosing to continue to double down on this strategy of dividing Americans from each other. That is why we are voting tomorrow.

I am hopeful that Republicans and Democrats will come together to support this important, bipartisan border security legislation.

I yield the floor.

NOMINATION OF DENA M. COGGINS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, today, the Senate will vote to confirm Dena Coggins to the U.S. District

Court for the Eastern District of California.

Born in Sacramento, Judge Coggins received her B.S. from California State University, Sacramento, and her J.D. from the University of the Pacific McGeorge School of Law. She then entered private practice, where she worked on general litigation and family law matters. From 2013 to 2015, she worked as a deputy legal affairs secretary for then-Governor Jerry Brown. Judge Coggins later served as a supervising attorney and hearing officer at the California Victim Compensation Board and as an administrative law judge at the State of California's Office of Administrative Hearings. As an administrative law judge, she presided over more than 150 evidentiary hearings or trials that resulted in proposed or final decisions. Since 2021, Judge Coggins has served as a judge on the Superior Court of California in Sacramento County. In that role, she has handled assignments in both the criminal division and juvenile court. Judge Coggins has presided over approximately 100 juvenile dependency trials, and she has served as the presiding judge of the Juvenile Court since 2023.

The American Bar Association rated Judge Coggins as "well qualified" to serve on the Eastern District of California. She has deep ties to the district, and she enjoys the strong support of her home State Senators and the California legal community.

Judge Coggins's litigation background and her courtroom experience as an advocate, administrative law judge, and State court judge ensure that she will be an asset to the district court. I am proud to support her nomination, and I ask my colleagues to join me in my support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from California.

NOMINATION OF DENA M. COGGINS

Ms. BUTLER. Madam President, in just a few moments, this Chamber is going to consider the confirmation of Judge Dena Coggins to be U.S. judge for the Eastern District of California, and I would proudly want to rise and speak in support of her confirmation.

Before I begin, I do want to appreciate that Judge Coggins's family is watching proudly and eagerly the Senate floor today. Her mother, Cynthia Ambrose, Judge Coggins's son Elias and her daughter Elaya, who I met during their nominations hearing—I know they are excited about the opportunity today for their mother to continue her public service at the highest levels in one of the busiest districts in the State and in the country. And so I just want to take the time to thank Ms. Coggins's mother, Ms. Ambrose; Elias; and Elaya for supporting their mom, their daughter. She, indeed, is an incredible woman.

If confirmed, Judge Coggins will join the Federal bench at a critical moment for California's Eastern District. The Eastern District of California is currently seeing an average of 803 filings

for each judgeship on the court. That caseload level is the sixth highest in any Federal district in the country.

And given her remarkable track record serving Californians from all walks of life, I have the utmost certainty and confidence in Judge Coggins's readiness for this role. Her work ethic, integrity, and unwavering commitment to the rule of law make her an exceptional nominee to meet this moment with the urgency that it demands, and I am confident that she will be successful.

Born and raised in Sacramento, Judge Coggins has devoted her career to serving the community in which she was raised. She completed her undergraduate degree at California State University Sacramento, received her Juris Doctorate degree from the University of the Pacific McGeorge School of Law in Sacramento. Judge Coggins began her career in general litigation and family law, where she built a strong reputation as a skilled litigator with experience in both Federal and State court.

From 2015 to 2017, and again from 2018 to 2021, Judge Coggins served as an administrative law judge at the State of California's Office of Administrative Hearings. In this capacity, Judge Coggins presided over more than 150 evidentiary hearings and trials. She also served as supervising attorney and hearing officer for the California Victim Compensation Board, where she oversaw legal proceedings and ensured that victims of violent crimes receive the compensation and the support that they needed.

Since 2021, Judge Coggins has served in the Superior Court of California in Sacramento County. She has handled assignments in both the criminal division and the juvenile court. And since 2023, she has served as the presiding judge of the juvenile court, presiding over 100 juvenile dependency trials.

I will also note that if Judge Coggins is confirmed, she would be filling the seat currently held by Chief Judge Kimberly J. Mueller, who was the first woman to ever serve on the district court of California and for whom Judge Coggins served as an extern early in her legal career.

Judge Coggins is an experienced jurist who has seamlessly transitioned to and excelled in numerous roles on the State bench. The respect and reverence she has earned is validated by the overwhelming support she has received since her nomination, including a letter written by several of her colleagues at the State bench addressed to the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Speaking of her service on the juvenile court as a juvenile court judge, they said:

She is a humble and quiet leader, not seeking the spotlight or the fanfare, simply working day in and day out to improve the court. We know when she speaks, she has put considerable thought into her words and that her reasoning and judgment are sound.

They go on to say:

In the courtroom, she also demonstrates her steady and fair temperament. She is thorough and diligent. Judge Coggins is efficient with her time on the bench and has handled substantial caseloads. She analyzes issues in a careful and balanced manner and provides thoughtful, well-reasoned, and common-sense decisions. She is compassionate to all who appear before her and takes time to understand the impact each decision will have on them.

Judge Coggins is exactly the kind of jurist that we need in the Eastern District and has exactly the kind of experience California's Federal bench needs. Her legal intellect, her composure, her record as an effective, efficient, thoughtful jurist makes her a strong nominee.

And her appointment to the bench comes at a historic time. Just this morning, we marked the milestone of confirming President Biden's 200th appointment to the Federal judiciary, including 1 Supreme Court Justice, 42 Circuit Court judges, 155 District Court judges, and 2 judges to the U.S. Court of International Trade.

President Biden has nominated and the Senate has confirmed 126 non-White Federal judges, more than any President in history. The majority of these judges are women—127 exceptionally qualified jurists. Notably, the professional diversity of these confirmations are so remarkable and unprecedented, including public defenders and other legal backgrounds whose perspectives and experiences have not been fully represented on our Federal bench.

With this in mind, confirmation of Judge Coggins's nomination is a part of our broader work to strengthen our judicial system. So I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting her confirmation to the Eastern District of California.

I yield the floor.

VOLE ON COGGINS NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Coggins nomination?

Ms. BUTLER. 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 179 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Baldwin	Blumenthal	Brown
Bennet	Booker	Butler

Cantwell	Hirono	Sanders
Cardin	Kaine	Schatz
Carper	Kelly	Schumer
Casey	King	Shaheen
Collins	Klobuchar	Smith
Coons	Lujan	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Markey	Tester
Duckworth	Merkley	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murphy	Warner
Fetterman	Murray	Warnock
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Warren
Graham	Padilla	Welch
Hassan	Peters	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Reed	Wyden
Hickenlooper	Rosen	

NAYS—44

Barrasso	Fischer	Risch
Blackburn	Grassley	Romney
Boozman	Hoeven	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Britt	Johnson	Schmitt
Budd	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Capito	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Lee	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lummis	Thune
Cotton	Marshall	Tillis
Cramer	McConnell	Tuberville
Crapo	Moran	Vance
Cruz	Murkowski	Wicker
Daines	Paul	Young
Ernst	Ricketts	

NOT VOTING—6

Hagerty	Manchin	Mullin
Hawley	Menendez	Sinema

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BUTLER). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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 the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 552, Melissa Griffin Dalton, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

Charles E. Schumer, Jack Reed, Richard J. Durbin, Tammy Duckworth, Tammy Baldwin, Catherine Cortez Masto, Brian Schatz, Cory A. Booker, Mark R. Warner, Patty Murray, Gary C. Peters, Elizabeth Warren, Margaret Wood Hassan, Jeanne Shaheen, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Angus S. King, Jr., Debbie Stabenow, John W. Hickenlooper.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Melissa Griffin Dalton, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force, 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. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), and the Senator

from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 180 Ex.]

YEAS—56

Baldwin	Heinrich	Rosen
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Rounds
Blumenthal	Hirono	Sanders
Booker	Hoeven	Schatz
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Butler	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	Kelly	Sinema
Cardin	King	Smith
Carper	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Casey	Lujan	Tester
Collins	Markey	Van Hollen
Coons	Moran	Warner
Cortez Masto	Murkowski	Warnock
Cramer	Murphy	Warren
Duckworth	Murray	Welch
Durbin	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Fetterman	Padilla	Wyden
Gillibrand	Peters	Young
Hassan	Reed	

NAYS—38

Barrasso	Ernst	Risch
Blackburn	Fischer	Romney
Boozman	Graham	Rubio
Braun	Grassley	Schmitt
Britt	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Budd	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Capito	Lankford	Sullivan
Cassidy	Lee	Thune
Cornyn	Lummis	Tillis
Cotton	Marshall	Tuberville
Crapo	McConnell	Vance
Cruz	Paul	Wicker
Daines	Ricketts	

NOT VOTING—6

Hagerty	Manchin	Merkley
Hawley	Menendez	Mullin

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). On this vote, the yeas are 56, the nays are 38.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Melissa Griffin Dalton, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. OSSOFF. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the confirmation on the Dalton nomination occur at 11 a.m. tomorrow, Thursday, May 23; further, that the cloture motion with respect to the motion to proceed to S. 4361 ripen at 2 p.m. tomorrow.

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

BORDER ACT OF 2024

Mr. OSSOFF. Madam President, for years, too many Democrats have been in denial about the national security risks at our southern border. And I have been critical of fellow Democrats who have failed to acknowledge these risks, who have failed to recognize that knowing and controlling who enters our territory is fundamental to our sovereignty and our national security.

But now the situation has changed. There are more than enough Democratic Senators ready and willing to pass a strong bipartisan border security bill—a border security bill coauthored by a conservative Republican Senator, Senator LANKFORD of Oklahoma, who has done extraordinary work in crafting this legislation; a bill that would surge enforcement resources to the southern border; that would tighten asylum standards; that would expedite the removal of those who abuse asylum to enter our country unlawfully; that would hire urgently needed Border Patrol officers and take the fight to the drug cartels flooding our communities with fentanyl.

This is a bipartisan bill to help defend the Nation against terrorists who would exploit weakness at our southern border to enter our country and kill Americans. And now it is Republican Senators who have already once blocked and this week are threatening again to block bipartisan border security legislation.

Why, the American people ask, would Republicans in Congress block border security legislation amidst a national security crisis?

The answer is simple. Asked recently on FOX News why Senate Republicans were blocking the Border Act, Senator LANKFORD, the Republican coauthor of the bill, put it very simply:

President Trump said: Don't fix anything during the Presidential election.

President Trump said: Don't fix anything during the Presidential election.

The former President would rather wield the border as an election issue than see Congress secure it, and Republicans in Congress appear to be falling in line even though it leaves the country at grave risk. I urge my Republican colleagues to reconsider their position.

Just as I have criticized Democrats who for years buried their heads in the sand about the threat at the southern border, just as I have criticized the Biden administration for its failures at the southern border, this is a time for Republican Senators to stand up to President Trump and say: No, we will not obey your command to leave the country at risk. Instead, we will do what is right for the Nation.

The threat of terrorism associated with unlawful entry at the southern border is real; it is pressing. If the Senate fails to pass border security legislation, refuses to tighten asylum standards, refuses to hire more Border Patrol officers, refuses to expedite the removal of those who abuse our asylum system to enter the country unlawfully, our Nation faces a grave national security risk.

The first vote we will take later this week on the Border Act will not even be a vote on the passage of the bill. It will be a vote on whether the Senate agrees to debate and consider amendments to the legislation. Senate Republicans think this bill is imperfect. If they want to offer amendments, they will have that opportunity.

I urge my Republican colleagues: Ignore the former President.

President Trump said: Don't fix anything during the Presidential election.

He is not your boss. He is not your constituent. We have an obligation to national security. The country is at risk. Let us debate the Border Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 696

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Madam President, it is great to hear my Democratic colleague come out against what is happening at the border. It is a disaster, and it is a national security threat.

Three weeks ago, two illegal immigrants attempted to break into the Marine base at Quantico in Virginia. Both individuals are Jordanian nationals who were apprehended by Customs and Border Protection at the southern border and released into the United States. One of them was allegedly on the Terrorist Watchlist.

Now, how did we get here? How did we get to the point where two people who entered the country illegally and were not screened or vetted tried to drive a truck onto a military base?

Let me say that again: These people are not being screened or vetted. We have no idea who these people are.

But here is what we do know about the people who have invaded our country: 25,000 Chinese nationals have entered our country since October 1, 2023; 184,000 Haitians have entered under Joe Biden's mass parole program; along with 101,000 Venezuelans, 91,000 Cubans, and 75,000 Nicaraguans. And this doesn't count the 76,000 Afghans who came here after Joe Biden's disastrous withdrawal from Afghanistan.

As I have repeatedly said, I have no problem with legal immigration, nor do my Republican colleagues. America is the land of freedom and opportunity. If people want to come here legally, we will welcome them; but we cannot—we cannot—have terrorists crossing our borders unverified. Ask the FBI.

Beyond the safety concerns, we simply cannot afford to support the 11 million illegal immigrants who have illegally crossed our borders in the past 3½ years. I don't know if Joe Biden missed the memo, but, folks, we are dead broke—dead broke—yet we are shelling out hundreds of billions of dollars to support these 11 million illegal immigrants, and this does not count the millions of what we call “got-aways.” Obviously, if they can come across and not be apprehended, why in the world would they go somewhere and run from the Border Patrol? It is because they are criminals.

A recent report from the House Committee on Homeland Security estimated the southern border surge is costing the American taxpayers about \$450 billion a year. You got that right. It is costing the American taxpayers \$450 billion a year. After 10 years, we are looking at a \$5 trillion bill. In

terms of actual benefits, it is estimated that illegals receive \$42 billion in welfare annually, \$68 billion in education, and \$7 billion in healthcare. We are spending hundreds of billions of dollars to support all of these people. The American taxpayers simply cannot afford it.

So why are Joe Biden and the globalist Democrats allowing this to happen? Why is this going on?

It is simply because Democrats care more about keeping power than they do about safety and protecting the American taxpayer and the American citizen. A New York Congressman confirmed this. She said that she welcomes illegal immigration because it helps with redistricting.

The President and his progressive left Democratic Party know that the more people they can get into this country, the longer they will stay in power—by increasing the population in the blue districts. It is a simple fact.

But enough is enough. Too many American lives have been lost due to the blatant disregard of U.S. law by the Biden administration. It is time elected officials fulfilled their obligation and the oath of office, starting with protecting the country from all enemies, foreign and domestic. This bill, the Border Act of 2024 that SCHUMER is forcing us to vote on, is basically an absolute joke.

By the way, President Trump has never told me—and I talk to him weekly. He has never said one word about the border. I don't know where my colleague from Georgia got this information, but it is false. If he had told anybody, he would have told me.

This bill, the Border Act of 2024, doesn't even have the word “security” in the title. That is because this bill will only make the crisis at the southern border worse. It is a border invasion bill; it is not a border bill. It is a border giveaway paid for by the American taxpayers in the trillions of dollars.

It also weakens the power of the President by suggesting the President close the border only when Customs and Border Protection has apprehended 4,000 illegal immigrants a day. Yes, you heard that—a day. So we are going to pass a bill that is going to allow 4,000 people to come here a day. That is insane. The last time I checked, the Commander in Chief already has full authority to secure the border. There is nothing new about that. That is supposed to be a basic requirement of his job: to protect the American citizens; to protect our borders; to protect our country.

The bill also includes zero funding for the border wall—zero, and it codifies dangerous catch-and-release policies.

So how did we get here? How is a border bill crafted that does nothing to secure the border?

Republican leadership put together this bill. They pushed things without telling the rest of the caucus and said: At the end of the day, this is the bill

that we have come up with—and we rejected it. Most of us didn't even know what was in the bill even at almost the time of the vote. The bill is just another public relations stunt from globalist Democrats pretending to care about the border during an election year.

We need to get serious about the national security disaster created by open borders—serious. If we don't believe that, we need to ask our allies over in Europe who have pretty much had their countries destroyed by immigration.

The American people don't want another messaging exercise. They want to feel safe in their neighborhoods. They pay our bills. They deserve it. We are here for them.

Over the last 3 years, Americans have watched in disbelief as Joe Biden has intentionally erased our borders and invited millions of illegal immigrants to invade our country. My bill, the Border Safety and Security Act, would shut down our borders until the Department of Homeland Security regains operational control because, as we speak, the border is being overrun. That means the border would be completely closed until DHS is able to track exactly who is coming into the country by either detaining them or setting up a program similar to “Remain in Mexico.” It is that simple.

If Democrats are serious about securing the border, they will support the Border Safety and Security Act.

Madam President, as in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 696 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; 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 (Mr. OSSOFF). Is there objection?

The majority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, the background that leads up to this moment is worth a minute or 2 to be explained.

It was October. We faced some ominous challenges around the world. Our allies and friends were in conflict, and the United States wanted to stand by them.

President Biden made a request for a defense supplemental and said: We need to move on this quickly. For example, our friends in Ukraine, who are fighting off the barbaric tactics of Vladimir Putin, need our continued help. We shouldn't waste any time.

At the time, several Members of the Senate on the other side of the aisle said: No, you cannot even consider helping Ukraine fight this war against Putin unless you do something about our border. There has got to be a change in our border policy.

So there eventually emerged a group that took on the task of writing a bipartisan bill.

Make no mistake, legislation on a subject as serious as this will never pass as a partisan piece of legislation. It has to be bipartisan. Both sides of the aisle decided to enlist our colleagues to sit down in a deliberative effort to write a bipartisan border bill to address the crisis we face at the border.

The Republicans chose as their spokesperson, as their negotiator, JAMES LANKFORD of Oklahoma. JAMES LANKFORD is a certifiable conservative Republican who is respected on both sides of the aisle. I join in that chorus of respect for him.

The Republicans said to us: None of these freewheeling efforts. JAMES LANKFORD is our man. He will negotiate this, and we will stand by him.

At that point, CHRIS MURPHY, a Democrat from Connecticut, was enlisted to be part of that negotiating effort, along with the Senator from Arizona. They sat down and started a three-way effort to find a bipartisan bill. They worked on it not just for weeks but for months.

During that period of time, I met with them from time to time, not to interject my efforts or any ideas I had, but just to measure their progress. They were not happy about the course of business and how quickly they could reach a conclusion, but the fact of the matter is they did. They reached a bipartisan agreement, one which I don't agree with in many aspects, but it is a good one—a heartfelt, serious effort; a bipartisan Democratic and Republican effort.

We were prepared and did call on the floor of the U.S. Senate this bipartisan bill that Senator LANKFORD had led the Republicans into establishing. I believe it ended up with four votes—four votes.

The Republicans were told: Keep your hands off, Democrats, when it comes to Lankford's efforts. Let him do the work.

When he finally produced an effort, a good-faith effort, they rejected it, walked away from it.

The Senator from Alabama just explained that they didn't have time to read it. If I recall, several days had passed where that bill was available for our staffs to analyze and others to look at. Most of us who wanted to know the contents of it. I thought it was a step in the right direction moving forward. But it was rejected by the same Republicans who initiated the process by saying that there will be no supplemental for defense until there is a bipartisan bill, and the bipartisan bill is to be put together by the Senator from Oklahoma. When it finally appeared before us, they walked away from it. They walked away from this bipartisan bill.

I would just tell the Senator from Alabama, I have worked on this issue for a number of years. The only effort I have seen that finally resulted in comprehensive immigration reform that came to the floor was totally bipartisan. A gang of eight Senators, which I was part of, led by Senator MCCAIN on the Republican side, pro-

duced a good bill that received over 65 votes. It wasn't taken up by the Republicans in the House, but it was a good-faith, bipartisan effort. That is the only way we can pass legislation that is meaningful when it comes to immigration.

The bill that the Senator from Alabama produces here today will not secure our border. It will not prevent the flow of illicit drugs through ports of entry or improve public safety. It would allow the Secretary of Homeland Security to suspend the entry of all asylum seekers at the border anytime the Secretary deems it necessary to achieve "operational control" of the border—whatever that phrase means.

Let's be clear. No Secretary of Homeland Security, including the Secretary under President Trump, has ever achieved operational control of the border.

The bill also requires the suspension of entry at the border of all asylum seekers if all asylum seekers cannot be detained and placed in expedited removal. One again, no administration, Republican or Democratic, has ever been able to detain and place in expedited removal all or even most asylum seekers—not even President Trump. It couldn't be done. No Congress has been willing to provide the funding that would be necessary to do it.

This bill would indefinitely end asylum protection without additional resources for the Department of Homeland Security, without any alternatives for desperate women and children fleeing persecution, and without any additional consequences for those who violate our laws.

We have learned from past experience that attempting to shut down the border is inhumane and simply doesn't work. To assume that this is one big wall that we could close the gate on is just wrong. It is not the reality. Our experience with title 42 emergency health authorities demonstrated this. Repeated attempts at unlawful crossings soared despite title 42, as did the number of noncitizens who successfully evaded Border Patrol, often referred to as "got-aways."

Recent data from CBP shows that in fiscal year 2024, the daily number of "got-aways" was 70 percent lower than the period immediately before the end of the use of title 42.

The reality is that our current laws for processing asylum seekers at the border are fundamentally broken, and measures like this bill will not fix them.

The bottom line is, the buck stops here. The buck stops here in the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives.

The last time we passed meaningful immigration reform was over 30 years ago, and we wonder why this broken system continues to be broken. It is because of our dereliction.

In contrast, we have the opportunity to vote on a bipartisan border bill, which will be offered tomorrow. It was

written by Senator LANKFORD, a Republican of Oklahoma, Senator MURPHY, and Senator SINEMA.

This legislation would actually help secure the border and provide essential national security funding. It would reform broken laws that are not working to process asylum seekers at our border, and it would provide desperately needed resources to our Agencies to allow them to implement these new provisions.

While these new processes are being implemented, the bipartisan border bill would provide for a temporary suspension of asylum in between ports of entry if the number of asylum seekers arriving at the border exceeds the capacity of DHS to process.

I have some concerns about the bill, but it reflects a genuine, bipartisan effort to create solutions to outdated laws and underfunding that have plagued our immigration system for years.

I was really disappointed, as I am sure Senator LANKFORD was, to see most of my Republican colleagues vote against that bipartisan bill. Although the bill was written by Senate Republicans' designated negotiator, Senator LANKFORD, and endorsed by the National Border Patrol Council—the union that represents Border Patrol agents—the Speaker of the House declared it "dead on arrival" in the House before the text was even released. To think that the Border Patrol agents said that this will improve the situation—the Lankford bill—and the Republicans still voted against it tells us the whole story.

I hope my colleagues will work with me to pass immigration legislation that the American people deserve, one that supports our frontline law enforcement, addresses the needs of our economy, provides a path to citizenship for Dreamers and immigrant farmer workers, and lives up to our Nation's legacy of providing safe harbor to refugees fleeing for their lives.

The American people are tired of partisan posturing and bickering over immigration. That is why this bipartisan bill, which was encouraged by the Republicans and the Democrats, needs to be the starting point of our negotiation. They want us to work together to secure the border, support our economy, and stand by America's fundamental values.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Well, there you have it. The American people have their answer. Democrats don't care about securing the border. They never have, and they never will. They pretend to. They continue to choose open borders—more crime, more fentanyl overdoses, more human trafficking, and more American deaths.

Democrats will say Republicans tanked the bill that would have secured the border. You just heard that.

This is a blatant lie. This bill, crafted by Democrats, would have done absolutely nothing to strengthen the border—not one thing. In fact, it would have made things worse. It would codify the problems that we have had the last 3½ years.

My Republican colleagues have offered real solutions for the last month to fix the problem. We have a huge problem. Somebody needs to recognize that. But my Democratic colleagues have voted against and objected to every single thing that we have brought up.

Don't buy into this lie.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 505

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, let's start at the grassroots of Iowa.

The question that comes up frequently at my county meetings—and next week, I am going to hold a Q&A in 12 of Iowa's 99 counties, and I expect I will get this question that I am going to pose to you: Senator, what are you going to do about the open border, people illegally entering our country?

My answer is usually pretty short—that long before I came to the Congress, Congress passed laws saying you can't come to our country without our permission. In fact, I add that we are a very favorable country toward immigration because about 1 million people come here every year, and maybe we should have more who come here under our laws, within those laws, not breaking our laws by entering the country illegally.

I don't get much of a pushback from that because I explain to them that we pass laws, and then the President enforces those laws under our Constitution.

The President has decided not to enforce the immigration laws. It shouldn't surprise us that he has taken that position for 3½ years because he told us before the election that he was going to open the border.

But there are some things Congress can do about immigration. That is why I am here on the floor today to ask unanimous consent for a piece of legislation that I put in. Maybe if this legislation becomes law, the President still might decide not to enforce it, like every other law.

Since day one, the Biden administration has pursued an open border policy. The result has been utter chaos and a crisis at the southern border. This crisis has become an indelible hallmark of President Biden's America.

However, President Biden, as I have said, has the authority to secure the border. He is already empowered under current law to do that. He could do it today if he really wanted to. It is the same authority that President Trump used to secure our border just a few years ago.

The Constitution makes very clear that the President takes an oath that he shall take care to faithfully execute

the laws. President Biden doesn't follow that constitutional oath to take care in regard to the immigration laws. Trump did take that oath very seriously.

Under the Biden administration, some 9 million migrants have been allowed to illegally enter our country. That is about three times the population of my home State of Iowa. The President has done that for 3½ years. Let me repeat that that 9 million figure is like the entire population of Iowa nearly three times over.

So instead of taking care that the laws be faithfully executed, enforcing these immigration laws already on the books, this administration chooses to ignore our border and abuse our Nation's immigration parole and asylum system. That is what my bill deals with, the parole system.

Immigration parole is supposed to allow the executive branch to temporarily grant individuals entry into the United States on a limited but case-by-case basis for urgent humanitarian reasons or significant public benefit. But instead of case by case, the Biden administration uses this program to admit entire categories of people as a means to bypass the legal immigration pathways outlined by Congress—in other words, not doing it on a case-by-case basis.

The actions of President Biden are completely out of line with what Congress intended to be the parole authority. So to address this loophole, I have introduced S. 505, the Immigration Parole Reform Act.

My bill will close this loophole and ensure compliance with Congress's original intent as a limited authority for exceptional circumstances. My bill outlines specific parameters for what constitutes an urgent humanitarian reason or significant public benefit. This bill would also provide clarity on the timing and extension of immigration parole, among other reforms.

So at this point, Mr. President, as in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 505 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from California.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this week has given the American people yet another clear window into the Republican mind when it comes to immigration: They are not serious about addressing immigration or about having secure or humanely managed borders.

Instead, Republicans only seem to believe in highlighting the challenges at our border instead of actually taking action to address them, and it is because they are prioritizing how it may

impact the results at the ballot box this November. That is their goal: to stoke more and more fear of immigrants every month between now and election day.

So I have asked before, and I will ask again: My Republican colleagues, when are you ready to get serious about immigration reform?

All but ending the practice of parole and cutting off legal pathways to immigrants is not a serious approach to the immigration problem. They know it can't happen in practice, and maybe that is exactly why they are calling for it.

Let's be clear what this is and what this isn't. This is not updating the amnesty process, which is legal but in dire need of additional resources, so that we can provide due process for those who may be seeking amnesty and provide them determinations on their requests sooner rather than later.

This is not updating work visa programs, because I know that all of us are hearing from employers across industries that there is a need for additional workers to keep our economy thriving.

What we are talking about here with this measure is parole in place. Every President since Eisenhower has used the parole authority on a case-by-case basis to allow a safe and secure path for immigrants who are fleeing natural disasters or who need urgent, specialized medical care to come to the United States. That is what we are talking about. Both Republican and Democratic Presidents have used it because it is a humane way to help address global crises.

I will give you some more recent examples. We have been able to provide protections for families of our military members. We have been able to provide protections for people fleeing the war in Ukraine. We have been able to provide protections for people who fled Afghanistan after the Taliban takeover, and for Haitians, more recently, and Venezuelans and those of other nationalities seeking refuge from violence and instability in their home countries.

Taking it away will actually force more people to come to the southern border, instead of using other lawful pathways like parole to come in a more orderly way. Is that what Republicans really want—because that is what would happen—to force more people to go to the border so they can continue to point fingers at a crisis of their own making?

The President's ability to grant parole on a case-by-case basis to people fleeing horrific and dangerous conditions is actually fundamental to America's continued leadership and our proud history of embracing strategic immigration as part of our success.

This bill represents a lack of respect for humanity and the laws of our Nation, and, therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to speak for 30 seconds before I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I regret that there was objection because fixing the Biden border crisis begins with regaining operational control and security at the border. This responsibility ultimately falls to President Biden, as head of the executive branch, to enforce the border and immigration laws already on the books. In other words, I would ask President Biden to honor his oath, where he said, in upholding the Constitution, he would take care to faithfully execute the laws.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BUDD. 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. BUDD. 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—H.R. 2494

Mr. BUDD. Mr. President, in order to be a strong nation, we have to have strong borders, and right now we don't have that. We haven't had that for 3½ years. In fact, we are in the middle of the worst border crisis in American history.

This is a crisis of President Biden's own making. Starting on his first day in office, he has intentionally and repeatedly undermined security at the southern border. During his first 100 days in office, President Biden took 94 Executive actions to open the border, and, 3½ years later, nearly 10 million illegal aliens have entered our country.

Now, those 10 million include an unknown number of dangerous individuals, hundreds on the Terrorism Watch List, countless transnational cartel members, drug smugglers, and human traffickers. It is a laundry list of evil. And perhaps the worst consequences that we have seen over the past 3½ years are the tragedies: the innocent men and women taken from their families by an illegal alien who should have never been here in the first place.

So imagine being a mother or a father. You send your daughter off to college. You are beaming with pride, but you are also a little heartsick that they are going to be out there on their own. Then, a few months later, you get the worst call in your life. And that is the reality for the family of Laken Riley.

Or another situation: Let's imagine that your uncle is a sheriff's deputy. You couldn't be prouder of him. You know he gets up and he goes to work every day to defend and protect his community. One day, you see his name on the news as a victim of a pack of il-

legal alien gang members who brutally murdered him while he was on duty. That is the reality for the family of Wake County, NC, Deputy Sheriff Ned Byrd.

Now, I recognize that the debate around illegal immigration is full of passion and sometimes antagonism, but I believe we can all agree that if an illegal alien commits the crime of assaulting a police officer, he or she must be subject to immediate deportation.

And that is why I stand here today to propose that the Senate pass the POLICE Act. It is a straightforward bill. The POLICE Act simply states that an illegal alien can be deported for assaulting a police officer, firefighter, or other first responder. The bill has already passed the House, and it can be sent to the President's desk by passing it right now. Any Senator who claims to support the police should have no problem supporting this bill. So let's help remove dangerous individuals before another tragedy strikes.

Mr. President, notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session and that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2494 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this is an interesting bill to be offered for unanimous consent because it actually does nothing. It does nothing.

Why? Because individuals are already subject to deportation for assault—whether they assault a police officer, whether they assault a milkman, whether they assault your family member. People who are convicted of serious assaults of law enforcement are already deported. They already can face both State and Federal criminal allegations.

Under current law, if an individual is convicted of any crime of violence and sentenced to a year or more in prison—that is an aggravated felony—that person is deportable. Even more so, any crime of "moral turpitude," where the crime is punishable by imprisonment of 1 or more years, is subject to deportation.

Additionally, any noncitizens that are convicted of any aggravated felony, including misdemeanor offenses—including misdemeanor offenses—are subject to deportation.

This bill doesn't do anything. If you are here waiting for an asylum claim or on a green card and you assault a police officer, you are subject to deportation under existing law.

So why are we considering taking this up under UC? Well, I think Senator BUDD referenced it in his underlying remarks. It is part of an effort to try to make Americans believe that there is a specific dangerous threat posed to you by immigrants; that you should be afraid of immigrants; that

there is a crime wave sweeping this country caused by people who are coming to this country to seek a better life.

Listen, I spent 5 months negotiating a bipartisan border deal because I believe that we need to come together in a bipartisan way to bring greater order to the southwest border. So I won't take a backseat to anybody when it comes to making the tough decisions necessary to bring some border security to this country.

But the Senator offering this motion voted against that bipartisan bill. So did almost every other of his Republican colleagues. We had an opportunity to do something about bipartisan border security, and Republicans rejected it.

Why? Because President Trump said: No. Let's keep the border chaotic. Let's keep this an open political issue. Do nothing until the election.

We had a chance to come together, in a thoughtful way, on a bipartisan border bill, and we did not.

The facts are this. Whether you choose to want to believe the facts or not, that is not my decision; it is your decision.

But immigrants commit crimes in this country at a rate lower than natural-born citizens. You may not believe that if you watch FOX News every night, but I hate to tell you, it is the truth. So if you want a safe town or a safe neighborhood, you are better off—you are statistically safer—if you have immigrants because they commit crimes of violence at a rate lower than people who are born in the United States.

I don't know why we are being asked to vote on this bill because it doesn't do anything other than feed this idea, this false narrative, that this country has something to fear from families that are coming to the United States fleeing either economic desperation or violence or terror or torture for a better life.

For that reason, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. President, it is such an honor to serve the people in North Carolina, all 100 counties, all from different backgrounds. I don't profess to know what it is like in Connecticut, but I thank my colleague for his remarks.

But it is disheartening to hear that a simple piece of legislation, the Police Act, which states that an alien—illegal alien—could be deported for assaulting a police officer, firefighter, or first responder is nothing. I don't profess to understand that. Perhaps it is different in Connecticut than North Carolina. I don't know.

I don't want to put words in the mouth of the family of Laken Riley or the family of Deputy Sheriff Byrd, but I don't believe it is nothing.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4292

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, as in legislative session, notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be discharged from further consideration of S. 4292 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; 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?

Mr. PADILLA. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I read the measure that is being attempted to be brought up by this motion. I want to make one thing perfectly clear. It is already a Federal crime for noncitizens to vote in Federal elections. Every Member of the Senate should know that. In fact, any noncitizen convicted of even registering to vote could face up to 5 years in prison.

Every single State has a law prohibiting noncitizens from voting in Federal elections. The consequences for noncitizens go beyond prison time. Claiming to be a U.S. citizen, under penalty of perjury, while registering to vote or while actually voting are deportable offenses. So it is already against the law with significant consequences for violations.

And, in fact, experts have found that voting by noncitizens is exceedingly rare. A study of the 2016 election, for example, found that noncitizen votes accounted for—let me get this right—0.0001 percent. Doing the math, that is about 30 incidents of suspected—not even proven, suspected—noncitizens voting out of 23.5 million votes cast.

What does that tell us? It tells us that our current laws are working. Don't just take my word for it. The Cato Institute agrees. In November of 2020, the Cato Institute found that "noncitizens don't illegally vote in detectable numbers."

So, colleagues, plain and simple, this bill is a solution in search of a problem. What it attempts to do is, once again, make it harder for eligible Americans to vote or to discourage people from voting, particularly American citizens who happen to be experiencing homelessness, for U.S. citizens of color, for U.S. citizens without driver's licenses. Do they have any less of a right to vote than any of us or less of a claim to our country?

I speak today, Mr. President, as both a former California secretary of state as well as being a Member of this body. I have always believed that our democracy works best when as many eligible people participate. That is why I, along with several of our Democratic colleagues, introduced the Freedom to Vote Act. Now, the Freedom to Vote Act does not extend registration or voting rights to noncitizens. What does the Freedom to Vote Act do? It in-

cludes pro-voter policies for eligible Americans, like early voting, vote-by-mail. Imagine that, making it easier for eligible U.S. citizens to exercise their franchise. That is the American way. Whereas, this bill would only serve as yet another barrier to participation by imposing not just extremely burdensome but unnecessary requirements on registering to vote.

Therefore, Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, it is unfortunate that it didn't have the chance to pass this today. I would have loved to have passed it. The reason I would love to have passed it is because, as my friend and distinguished colleague, the Senator from California, just noted, it is illegal for a noncitizen to vote. Because it is illegal for a noncitizen to vote, we need to make sure that it doesn't happen.

The fact that it is prohibited by a law with Federal criminal penalties attached to it doesn't mean that it doesn't happen. It doesn't mean that it couldn't happen. It doesn't mean that it is not more likely to happen when we bring a whole lot more noncitizens into the country. There are now an estimated 30 million or so noncitizens inside the United States.

My friend and colleague from California cites a couple of studies. One of those studies is from the Cato Institute from 2020. This was about 12 million noncitizens ago. Under this administration, we let in an additional 12 million or so noncitizens into the United States. That rapid of an influx can cause problems.

He also cites another study from 2016. That 2016 study was probably 15 or 16 million noncitizens ago. Things do change.

Now, the Cato study, the one from 2020 that he mentioned, says that there is no evidence that noncitizens are voting in detectable numbers. It doesn't mean it is not happening. It may mean that they are difficult to detect. But the more noncitizens we have, the more time that elapses when the National Voter Registration Act, or NVRA, remains intact, the more predictable, foreseeable, and, indeed, likely it becomes that many people, some of them perhaps maliciously, knowingly intend to violate the law. Others who might be in sort of a gray area, not quite realizing what they are doing or the fact that it is illegal, might end up registering to vote.

Let's remember, in 1993, Congress passed the so-called motor voter law, the National Voter Registration Act.

It made it very easy to register to vote in Federal elections. All you have to do is check a box and sign your name. It is all on the honor system. If you do that, you are registered to vote.

Now fast-forward two decades. The Supreme Court of the United States decides a case interpreting the National Voter Registration Act as prohibiting

the States—preempting the field in such a way that States may not request any proof, any evidence of citizenship when registering someone to vote such that they would be eligible to cast a vote in a Federal election.

Meanwhile, we have a change in trend. Decades ago when the NVRA was passed, No. 1, we had far fewer illegal aliens in the country, and we also, No. 2, had a lot of States that wouldn't issue a driver's license or were reluctant to do so to someone who was illegally in the United States. It is now the case that at least 19 States issue driver's licenses to individuals who are unlawfully, illegally in the United States. All 50 States plus the District of Columbia issue driver's licenses to noncitizens generally.

What that means is that somewhere in the neighborhood of 30 million people, or at least the adult segment—that portion of the nearly 30 million people who are noncitizens inside the United States today—all they have to do is go get a driver's license, which most of them, if they have any interaction with other members of society, are likely to do, to go get a driver's license—you need a driver's license for all kinds of things. Once they do that, if they check that box and sign their name, all on the honor system, they are registered to vote. Not only does the State not necessarily know that they are noncitizens and ineligible to vote, the State is legally constrained, legally prohibited from asking for any evidence establishing whether or not they are citizens.

So this really is concerning. We shouldn't treat it lightly. And the fact that it is difficult to detect makes it more important, not less, to require evidence supporting citizenship.

Look, we have to do this in other contexts. Anyone that travels abroad or might at some point in the future travel abroad will have to apply for a U.S. passport. To do that, you are going to have to produce some sort of evidence of U.S. citizenship.

When you start a new job in the United States, you have to fill out an I-9 form. Under the I-9 form, if you are a noncitizen, you have to produce evidence of your visa and your eligibility under your visa program to work. If you are not here on a visa and you are an American, then you have to produce evidence that you are, in fact, a citizen of the United States.

So if you have to produce that stuff to get a passport, if you have to produce that stuff whenever you start a new job, why would it not make sense to require proof of citizenship upon registering to vote in a Federal election? How else are we supposed to protect our elections, our sacred elections within our constitutional Republic, from foreign interference?

Look, one person, one vote. One citizen, one vote. This is how it is supposed to work. This is a foundational principle, and it is under unprecedented threat today. It is under threat

specifically because President Biden and Secretary Mayorkas have refused willfully to enforce the law. Now we face a direct threat to our electoral system as a result.

Consider this: Since President Biden's inauguration, over 9.5 million undocumented immigrants have entered the United States illegally and have been observed. An estimated 12 million or so have come in. That includes the people estimated to have entered without being observed. This figure exceeds the populations of 36 U.S. States, creating a crisis that has been met with just troubling silence and inaction from many across the aisle.

With millions of unauthorized entrants on U.S. soil, the potential for election fraud through ineligible voting is not just a hypothetical risk, it is a looming reality.

Instead of urging the President of the United States to address this crisis, Democrats seem to prefer to resurrect the so-called Orwellian-named Border Security Act, a bill that has already failed in this body and will do nothing to mitigate the border issues at hand—the border issues created and then exacerbated by this administration.

With the influx of noncitizens under this administration, even if just a fraction—say 1 in 100—were to vote, this could translate to hundreds of thousands of votes, enough certainly to sway tightly contested elections and potentially alter the outcome even in something as significant and with nationwide implications as far-reaching as a Presidential election.

This is concerning considering that a recent study found noncitizens have ample openings to illegally vote. Somewhere between 10 percent and 27 percent of noncitizens are registered to vote, and somewhere between 5 percent and 13 percent of noncitizens vote in Federal elections, including Presidential elections.

Across the Nation, instances abound where States have inadvertently facilitated the crisis. I say inadvertently, but in some ways, their hands are tied. "Inadvertently" here sort of refers to the fact that they don't necessarily mean to; it is that they are prohibited from asking for proof of citizenship.

From unsolicited voter registration forms mailed to noncitizens, to driver's licenses issued without adequate checks, practices relying merely on the honesty of noncitizens, including illegal aliens, have opened the floodgates to voter fraud.

While it is true that it is already illegal for noncitizens to vote in Federal elections, there really are no effective systems in place to verify the citizenship of voters. A mere check on a box is all it takes, with little risk—very little risk—of being caught due to inadequate State election infrastructure.

Federal law even prevents States from requiring proof of citizenship when registering voters via Federal forms.

An increasing number of localities permit noncitizens to vote in local

elections, further blurring the distinctions meant to protect the integrity of our elections.

Prominent Democrats have openly discussed these tactics as not just existing elements but as things that are beneficial to their agenda. Only months ago, every Senate Democrat voted to count illegal aliens in the census to help them shore up more seats in Congress and more electoral votes in the electoral college.

This cannot continue. It is our responsibility, it is our moral imperative to close these gates. My bill, the Safeguard American Voter Eligibility Act—also known as the SAVE Act—would be a vital step in securing the electoral process, ensuring that in every State, every vote cast is legitimate and every voter is duly registered.

The SAVE Act proposes amending the National Voter Registration Act to enable States to require proof of citizenship when registering voters for purposes of Federal elections.

Under the SAVE Act, we mandate that States obtain concrete documentary proof of citizenship at the time of voter registration. It specifies acceptable documentation that really is desperately needed. It is far more injurious, if you want to compare the two. If you want to talk about the amount of burdensome paperwork that goes on relative to what it is that needs protecting, I think it is at least as harmful, if not far more so, to fail to require documentation and proof of citizenship in the context of voting in a Federal election than it is when completing an I-9, which everyone has to do when they start a new job, citizen and non-citizen alike.

Furthermore, the SAVE Act compels States to proactively remove noncitizens from voter rolls and introduces Federal penalties for those who intentionally register noncitizens.

This bill echoes the sentiments of the American people from coast to coast. It transcends political affiliations and speaks directly to the core of what makes our country great: fair, free, and secure elections.

This is about preserving the integrity of our elections and ensuring that each State will have the opportunity to participate in a way that involves each vote being cast to reflect the American will.

If this administration insists upon keeping America's borders open, then the administration must also ensure that none of these illegal immigrants are thwarting our free and fair elections.

Look, this border crisis—make no mistake—was deliberately engineered and has been willfully perpetuated by this administration. Now, they shouldn't want open borders. There are a lot of good reasons why this is a bad idea, a lot of reasons why we shouldn't allow this. There are a lot of people like Laken Riley who have lost their lives or have otherwise endured heartache, trauma, and devastating con-

sequences because of people who should not have been here to begin with.

But if this is what they want, then for the love of all that is sacred and holy, please, they should at a minimum have the decency to their fellow Americans to make sure that those same people who they have willfully allowed to enter our country against our law and against the will of the American people at least not be able to vote in our elections because they are not citizens.

Every day we delay, the foundation of our electoral processes erodes a little more. We can't wait for this administration to enforce the law because this administration isn't enforcing the law.

By passing the SAVE Act, we send a clear message that in the United States, voting is not just a right and a privilege of citizenship, but it is also a protected and a cherished one—one that our own government won't deliberately allow to be diluted and made less meaningful.

As debates about election integrity rage, the SAVE Act stands out by guaranteeing that only American citizens will have a say in our elections, thereby keeping those elections free from foreign interference—something we all care about.

American elections must be decided by American voters, full stop.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4387

Mr. LEE. Our country is in the grips of the worst border security crisis in our history. President Biden's open border policies have caused an unprecedented humanitarian disaster, with grave consequences for public safety, national security, and, indeed, for the rule of law.

For years, Democrats have stood by and watched as President Biden presided over and intentionally exacerbated this historic crisis. They know that President Biden has the authority to secure the border. Yet, instead of taking him to task, they remain silent.

No, instead of calling on the President to fix the problem, we are here attempting to revise the so-called Border Security Act—a bill that has already failed to pass muster in this body and will do nothing to secure the border and, if anything, would likely make it worse if, heaven forbid, it became law. It would certainly make it worse when administered under this administration because of the amount of executive branch discretionary authority this bill creates.

Look, let's be honest here. This is a political exercise, not a serious debate, because that bill is going nowhere, and we all know that.

Since President Biden's inauguration, over 9.5 million undocumented immigrants have entered the United States illegally. Those are just the ones that we know about, just the ones that have been observed, that have been recorded by our border security

personnel. It is larger than the population of 36 States. Most of our States are smaller than the number of people who have been observed and recorded as crossing into our country through our southern border unlawfully just since January 20, 2021.

The magnitude of the border security crisis is hard to comprehend. What is not hard to comprehend is that this is a public safety crisis, and it should be treated as such. Our constituents from our various States know this, and we know it from them. They feel strongly about it, and they don't like it.

So let's not pretend that President Biden lacks authority to secure the border and needs new legislation or else he won't be able to do anything about it. That isn't true. That is science fiction fantasy. That is a fraudulently produced statement. It is a truth-free assertion.

President Biden, you have the power right now to secure this border. You have it and you know that you have it and you deceive the American people when you suggest otherwise.

Let's not waste the American people's time by debating a bill that stands to make the crisis even worse—even worse—by giving you, sir, more power to make this worse, which it would do. And we know already how you would utilize that discretionary authority because we know how you utilized the discretionary authority you have already been given.

We should be considering measures that force this administration to actually secure the border, that stay the President's hand, and that force him to do his job, which is to secure the border. We can do just that or at least move in the right direction on that front simply by passing my legislation, known as the VALID Act.

Thanks to the Biden administration, inadmissible aliens are not just entering the United States on foot, they are being flown on commercial flights—often at government expense—into and throughout the country. The CBP One mobile app, which was never intended to be used by migrants seeking entry into the United States, has been repurposed into a tool by the Biden administration to facilitate the entry of even more illegal aliens into the United States.

Today, migrants can download the app, put in whatever identifiable information they would like—no matter the accuracy of the information, regardless of whether they just made it up, just like they walked into a party and wrote their name down on a name tag saying: Hello, my name is thus and such. And then they can use the app as their sole exclusive form of ID necessary to enter the United States.

So the rest of us, if we travel outside the United States, need a passport to come back into the United States. But if you are an illegal alien: No documents, no citizenship, no visa, no problem; we got you covered. All you have got to do is color inside the lines. Just

write down whatever information you want to make up. Put it on the app. That is your ticket. You are getting in.

I can't tell you how many times my constituent service operation in my State office back in Utah gets calls from frantic, concerned American citizens. They are somewhere outside the United States. They lose their passport. It is a real crisis. We do our best to help them. We can almost always figure out a way to solve the problem, but it creates real difficulty.

The American citizens don't have access to the CBP One mobile app, but do you know who does? Illegal aliens, and it helps them get into the country.

Now, not only can illegal immigrants use the app to enter the United States by plane, but they can also use it to travel throughout the United States, within the United States, on domestic flights paid for by the U.S. Government. Migrants don't need a legitimate ID or a passport. They can board a plane using Biden's CBP One mobile app, which the TSA now proudly advertises at airports nationwide.

Of course, if you are an American citizen, you will have an entirely different airport experience. You will be expected to wait in long security lines, show proof of valid identification, and then potentially be subjected to an additional invasive security screening. Americans are expected to follow our country's laws. Yet illegal immigrants who are in the United States only because they broke our country's laws that govern how you get into this country are held to a lower standard. It is almost an insult to standards to call it a standard at all. It is a nonstandard.

The Biden administration is rewarding people illegally entering our country with their own personalized form of TSA PreCheck. But it is better than TSA PreCheck; it is free. You don't have to provide any documentation. You don't have to have any real security review.

This backward policy has real consequences. Hundreds of thousands of otherwise inadmissible aliens have entered the United States using the CBP One mobile app as their sole form of identification for travel authorization.

Among those who have entered by using the app include a Haitian migrant who, after entering the United States through the CBP One mobile app, was arrested for committing a double homicide in New York. Cory Alvarez, another man who entered the country through the app, was arrested for sexually assaulting a disabled 15-year-old girl.

Americans deserve the right to fly without fear, which is impossible when we have a President who allows people without verifiable information to enter our country against our laws.

My bill can end this unacceptable lapse in security and public safety, and it can do it today. All I am asking for is a vote, a vote on legislation that would prohibit individuals from flying from foreign countries into the United

States if they are using the CBP One mobile app, a notice to appear order, or a notice to report order as their sole form of identification or travel authorization.

This shouldn't be a hard idea to get behind. This shouldn't be controversial, not remotely. Before you board a plane, you should prove who you are, just like the rest of us have to do. We do it all the time. We have to prove who we are when we go to the doctor's office, the pharmacy, when we check into a hotel, pick out a rental car, if we get pulled over on the highway for speeding. Anytime we do just about anything of significance, it seems we have got to produce identification to show who we are.

Look, this has been a pretty widespread practice that Americans have been required to follow for a long time at airports, certainly since 9/11. Everybody just understands it is what you have got to do.

Even for a U.S. citizen to fly from one U.S. city to another, he or she must establish identification, proving identity. President Biden is reversing that standard and importing crime into every community in America. No community in our country should be forced to fear that foreign nationals whose identities we cannot confirm can travel free throughout the United States—freely, often at government expense; freely, without even having to produce so much as identification papers.

Earlier this month, one of our colleagues was quoted as saying: There is only one party that is serious about border security. It is the Democratic Party. We are going to ask Republicans to join us.

Look, I will pose the same question that he asked and impose it now to all my Democratic colleagues. If you are, as you claim, the party that is serious about border security, then, for the love of Pete, prove it. Step up. Go on record and show the American people where you stand on this commonsense border security reform, and let's pass the VALID Act.

(Ms. HASSAN assumed the Chair.)

So to that end, Madam President, notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session and that the Senate proceed to S. 4387, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I have a great deal of respect for my colleague from Utah. He and I have collaborated on a number of really important pieces of legislation, especially in the national security space. So I say all of this with tremendous respect for the Senator from Utah.

First, let's go to the heart of the argument that he is making because he makes an argument that you hear very often on this floor, that tens of thousands of people are entering the country illegally. They are entering the country illegally.

The Senator knows the law, I would probably guess, better than most here, and so he knows that those people who are entering the United States without permission also have a corresponding right to apply for asylum. So, technically, they enter the United States without permission, but then they are allowed to apply for asylum. And that right to asylum is a superseding right.

And so there has been no dispute—whether the President is Joe Biden or the President is Donald Trump—that if you enter the United States and claim asylum and have a valid claim of asylum that you are able to make, thus passing the credible fear screen, you get to stay in the United States to process that claim.

And so this idea that people coming to the United States to apply for asylum are here illegally is obviated by longstanding law that, in fact, requires the United States to allow those people to stay here while that claim is being processed.

I just think it is important for everybody to understand what the law is and that both Democratic and Republican administrations have allowed people with valid claims of asylum to stay here and to process those claims.

As to the specifics of this bill the Senator is asking for unanimous consent on—again, I say this with great respect for my friend—I have no idea what the Senator is talking about. I literally have no concept of the problem that he just described because it doesn't exist. There are not hundreds of thousands of people coming to the United States using CBP One as their only form of identification. That is not true, and I would suggest that the Senator check with his staff.

In order to qualify for CBP One, you have to have a passport. In fact, you have to have another means of identification in order to qualify for the CBP One program.

CBP One papers are not an accepted form of documentation by TSA. Individuals who are showing up at the airports are showing up with a passport or another means of acceptable identification.

The Senator may have examples of exceptions, but there are certainly not hundreds of thousands of people coming to the United States with only CBP One documentation to present to TSA. It is just not true.

CBP One, in fact, is the way by which we assure that individuals who are coming to the United States are, in fact, who they say they are. Many of the programs, through which we use CBP One, include a vetting process—a vetting process, frankly, that, admittedly, often does not take place outside of CBP One. When people come to the border and claim asylum, if you don't have detention capability—as has been the case under both President Trump and President Biden—many of those people are allowed into the country to process their asylum claim without the kind of vetting that is done in the CBP One program.

I just don't recognize the problem that the Senator is trying to solve here today, and I do think it creates a pretty problematic misimpression that you have the idea that there are hundreds of thousands of people showing up at TSA and plopping down a CBP One document, coming to the United States with only that document.

In fact, the only way you get the CBP One document is to have shown and verified your proper documentation.

In addition, this amendment just feels kind of unworkable. And if there is a specific workaround to the existing system that requires documentation, proof of identity in order to get a CBP One document, then I am happy to work with the Senator on it, but this amendment or this bill makes the requirement operative on the airline. The airline is not actually the entity that checks documentation. Those are entities run by the Department of Homeland Security.

So I just don't see the same problem that the Senator does. In fact, I think the CBP One program is an incredibly important way to validate identity to be able to do important vetting. And through certain processes through which we use CBP One documentation, it is a way to control the number of presentations at the border.

Remember, through CBP One and the CHNV Program, we have been able to greatly reduce the number of people who are showing up in an unplanned way at the border, in particular Cubans, Haitians, and Nicaraguans.

I understand Republicans have a policy disagreement with the mechanism by which we use the CBP One Program to fly individuals into the country with a sponsor, with vetting, so they don't show up in an unplanned way at the border, but it is, in fact, greatly reducing the number of people who are stressing our resources at the southwest border.

So I will continue to defend the use of CBP One as a very legitimate way to make sure that we have an ability to vet individuals and we have an ability to relieve pressure on the southwest border.

I just see this bill as attempting to tackle a problem that I have not been able to exist—I am happy to talk to the Senator offline to see if there is a more limited problem that he has identified that we can perhaps discuss and work together on.

But my broader frustration is this: If the Senator would just vote yes on the motion to proceed tomorrow, we could work on this in the context of a bipartisan foundation. If the Senator is upset about the underlying parole program, well, the bipartisan border security bill—negotiated by Senator LANKFORD, Senator MCCONNELL, myself, Senator SINEMA—it makes significant changes to that parole program. In fact, it eliminates for all intents and purposes the parole program used in between the ports of entry, the 236(a) program. It makes other substantial

reforms to the parole programs that limit the use of parole to true humanitarian purposes. That was vigorously negotiated by Senator LANKFORD and Senator GRAHAM and others.

I understand that the bipartisan bill is not perfect. It is not everything Senator LEE would want, not everything Senator LANKFORD would want, and not everything I would want. But it is a compromise. The vote tomorrow is just to begin debate, just to get on the bill so that we can see what amendments might be able to get to 60.

Maybe there is a more limited version of this—I would argue—badly crafted bill that could be added on to the bipartisan border bill, but we can't even have that debate, we can't even get to the bipartisan foundation because, almost to a person, Republican Senators are choosing—are choosing—to vote against this bipartisan bill, even considering the bipartisan bill.

Maybe this is not true for the Senator from Utah, but certainly others have been pretty clear about the fact that President Trump has decided that he wants no compromise, no changes in border policy before the election because he wants the border to be a mess. He thinks that is good politics for him. He wants Republicans to vote against everything—everything—in order to preserve this issue for political purposes.

I think we would be better off having a debate next week, getting onto the bipartisan border bill, which does have Republican support and has Democratic support—not all Democratic support because it is a real compromise. There are many of my Members who don't support the bipartisan border bill. But we could choose to get on this bill tomorrow, take the Senator's idea, vet it, work it out between the two parties, and have an old-fashioned Senate debate. But we are not going to do that because Republicans are going to vote almost to a person to reject even taking up the bipartisan border bill. Maybe not for every Republican Senator, but for many, that seems to be because President Trump wants to keep the border a mess for political purposes. And I regret that, I think the American people regret that.

I am looking forward to having a conversation with the Senator I have worked with on a lot of other issues, but this bill seems to attack a problem that I can't yet identify. For that reason, I would object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I appreciate the thoughtful analysis—consistent with his always thoughtful, analytical approach to matters—that has been offered up by my friend and colleague, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. Yes, he and I have worked together on a lot of things, including in the national security space. It reminds me, he and I need to talk about one of those things sometime soon.

I do, however, disagree with a number of conclusions that he has reached. I think I see where he is going, and I understand how he gets there, but I think he is mistaken on a couple of points.

No. 1, there have, in fact, been hundreds of thousands of people who have entered the United States using the CBP One mobile app as their basis for entering the country and as their form of identification—hundreds of thousands.

In fact, my understanding is that between October of 2022 and the end of September of 2023, that calendar year, there were a total of 221,456 such people who did that just from four countries alone—from Venezuela, Haiti, Cuba, and Nicaragua—people being brought in and then paroled. These were people who, as I understand it—the Department of Homeland Security has acknowledged—had no valid basis for entering the country, and that is why they had to be paroled into the country. They were using immigration parole illegally, illegitimately, to bring them in because to actually use immigration parole, the statute requires that it be made on an individualized basis, not a categorical one. These were brought in categorically.

With respect to his assertion regarding entry into the United States followed by an assertion of a right to proceed under our asylum laws, that is a different question altogether. First of all, if you enter the United States unlawfully and then apply for asylum, you still have entered unlawfully.

He describes, then, these individuals as having a right to asylum. Nobody has a right to asylum in the United States. We do have asylum laws. Those laws allow the Department of Homeland Security, through authority that goes through the Secretary of Homeland Security, to extend asylum status on a discretionary basis. There is no statutorily conferred right, certainly no constitutionally conferred right to asylum.

In effect, what we do have is that if you enter the United States without documentation and then you apply for asylum, you have to have your asylum claim adjudicated. That can take years. In fact, a number of people who are entering the United States now, if they apply for asylum after entering, they are often told that their court date may not occur until well into the 2030s.

We know that most asylum applications are denied. Most people who apply for asylum are ultimately deemed not eligible for asylum.

You can't call this a statutorily or a constitutional right—a statutorily conferred or a constitutionally conferred right—nor can you say that they are asylees as of the moment that they apply.

Under our asylum laws, while there is some complexity to them, I think that the most natural reading of them is that they are supposed to be de-

tained while their asylum applications are pending and until they are finally resolved, which, as I just noted, most asylum applicants are ultimately denied that.

So to tell them: OK, fill out this form using the app. That could be your form of identification. You may enter the country using that as your ID. You may fly about the country at will using that ID.

To say that that is based on some sort of lawful immigration status isn't accurate, and it certainly ignores the fact that we are flouting in countless circumstances either immigration parole or asylum in order to get them to that point.

As to the suggestion that those entering the country with the CBP One mobile app—if I understand my colleague's assertion correctly, I think he is saying you have to have other forms of ID, perhaps a foreign passport or something akin to that, in order to use the CBP One mobile app to enter the United States. That is not my understanding at all. I have had countless conversations—I as well as my staff—with officials within the Department of Homeland Security when we have raised these concerns. I have never heard any suggestion anywhere that the ability to use the app in that fashion is conditioned upon the ability to show, to produce a foreign passport or other official form of foreign identification.

I would add here, I am quite certain that that is not the case for the additional reason—not only because that would have come up by now in the countless conversations we had about this but also for an additional reason. You see along our southern border people ditching their identification papers—their identification cards, passports, driver's licenses, whatever they are—from their home jurisdictions at the moment they cross the border. They ditch them. They ditch them because they don't need them. They ditch them because that way, they can fill out the CBP One mobile app and make their name or their date of birth or whatever it is whatever they want. This is a very known phenomenon. These are varied widely observed facts along the southern border.

He said that these are not hundreds of thousands who have been here. Look, this is not my understanding. Madam President, 221,000-some-odd people flew in just from the four countries I mentioned alone and just for the 12-month interval I mentioned. We have many hundreds of thousands who have come in using the CBP One mobile app.

Look, at the end of the day, we do have a problem. We have a problem because we have so many people coming in here who don't have a visa to be here, who don't have citizenship, don't have status as lawful permanent residents or otherwise, and they are entering without documentation, without any other legal right.

The fact that this administration has chosen to paper over the fact that in any other administration, in any other era of American history or at least modern American history since these things started happening, those would be regarded as illegal aliens, which, of course, they are.

In this administration, they do their best to try to paper over that by either declaring them eligible for immigration parole even though they are not because you are not allowed to use immigration parole that way—you use immigration parole in two instances, both of which are specific, neither of which may be categorical.

There is the humanitarian use. For example, your mother is in the United States. You are outside the United States. You don't have a visa. You are not a citizen. You are a citizen of another country. You want to come in because your mother is sick. She is about to pass away. For humanitarian purposes, they will let you in for a brief period of time, understanding that it is momentary. The other is a public use purpose—public use. Let's say you speak a language that is needed in the United States—I don't know, interpret at somebody's trial, translation services or something like that. Either way, it has to be a specific individualized determination.

This administration is using these things by the hundreds of thousands to say: Come on in. If you are from Venezuela, Haiti, Cuba, Nicaragua, one of the other favorite countries on this, just come on in.

So papering over them doesn't make them legal. They are still illegal aliens, and we are still facilitating the process by which they enter the United States and making it easier for them to enter the United States without proper identification. This would fix that. This bill would fix that.

Now, I ask today not that we pass it by unanimous consent; I asked only that we turn to it, that we get on to it. Even that drew an objection. That is most unfortunate.

Finally, I want to make the point with reference to the 45th President of the United States. I, like many—I believe like most of my Republican colleagues, have grave concerns with the so-called border security measure—it is really more of an immigration bill than a border security measure—that Democrats want us to turn to next, that they want us to get onto. I have grave concerns with that, and most of my Republican colleagues do.

I will say this: Most of us had real concerns with this long before the 45th President of the United States weighed in on it.

My objections, though, had nothing do and still have nothing to do with the preferences of the 45th President of the United States with regard to that bill. They have everything to do with what that bill actually said.

Now, I understand a number of people put a lot of time into that bill. I get it.

But that bill didn't do what most of us as Republicans asked that it do, which is that it remove the President's vast discretion to make it easier to paper over and document illegal aliens to make them appear legal when, in fact, they are not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I know my other colleagues are waiting to speak. Very quickly, I know terminology matters a lot to my colleague, so I want just to put a fine point on this.

Republicans may have an objection to the way in which the President uses his parole authority, but the President has always had broad parole authorities. And the individuals who are here under CBP One are not illegal. They have been granted the ability to be in the United States under the President's parole authority. You can have a policy objection to that, and the courts may opine on whether the President has the authority to use parole in the way that he is using it, but those individuals are not here illegally.

That is really important. Again, it is, I think, an unfortunate misimpression to present.

Second, there is a difference between people using CBP One as the legal means to enter the United States versus using CBP One as their documentation to get on an airplane.

It is true. Tens of thousands of people from those four countries have used CBP One as the mechanism to be lawfully in the United States. It is not true that they are not providing documentation in order to use CBP One and in order to board an airplane. They are using passports and other documentation for those two purposes. So those are two different issues.

Yes, tens of thousands of people use CBP One as the means to come into the United States legally. No, hundreds of thousands of people do not use CBP One as their identification mechanism to get on an airplane. I just think it is important to distinguish between the two.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, let me just defer to my colleague from Utah for a few short moments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I will be brief, and I appreciate my friend and colleague for indulging me on this as I have just a couple of points.

Look, they are entering unlawfully. Again, this administration is using other laws to paper over their illegality. The fact that President Biden is unlawfully using immigration parole to make them appear legal still doesn't make it legal.

I believe it was Mark Twain who asked rhetorically: If you count the tail of a dog as a leg, how many legs does the dog have? I would respond

that it is still just four legs. It is still a tail and not a leg.

Somebody who enters unlawfully isn't made lawful in the United States just because the President of the United States is unlawfully using an authority that doesn't allow him to make them legal to do that.

As to the suggestion that those who enter using the CBP One app have uniformly provided a passport, it just isn't true. In fact, I had it confirmed right now with the person who helps me with these things, who helps constituents—the people in my State—who confirmed just now that it is not a requirement. They are not required to provide a passport in order to do this, and we know that this has been used over and over and over again by people who do not have documentation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I have a handful of unanimous consent requests to get out of the way.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to 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.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. TESTER. Madam President, I was absent due to a personal matter when the Senate voted on vote No. 177 on confirmation of Angela M. Martinez, of Arizona, to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Arizona. On vote No. 177, had I been present, I would have voted yea.

Madam President, I was absent due to a personal matter when the Senate voted on vote No. 178 on the motion to invoke cloture on Dena M. Coggins to be U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of California. On vote No. 178, had I been present, I would have voted yea.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF WVTM 13

• Mrs. BRITT. Madam President, I wish to recognize and honor Alabama's longest continuously broadcasting station, WVTM 13, on its 75th anniversary.

WVTM 13 originally began as WAFM-TV, an affiliate of CBS, on May 29, 1949, becoming the first television station to broadcast in the Birmingham area and across our entire State. For over seven decades, the central Alabama region has benefitted greatly from WVTM's legacy of local reporting.

A few iterations later, the station's call letters became WVTM for "Vulcan

Times Mirror" on March 28, 1980, and have remained for decades. The "V" references the location of the station, on top of Red Mountain at Vulcan Park, and Vulcan statue, the largest cast iron statue in the world that exemplifies Birmingham's important iron and steel heritage.

Similarly, WVTM represents a significant piece of central Alabama's history, as well as its future. I am confident that just as this station has diligently served our local communities for 75 years, WVTM will serve Alabamians for the next 75 years.

From the station's founding to current leadership under Susana Schuler, WVTM has benefited from incredible professionals and stewards of its community. Now an affiliate of NBC, WVTM embodies its mission under Hearst Television each and every day to provide quality local news and information in an independent, fair, and unbiased manner.

On behalf of the people of Alabama, I offer my heartfelt thanks to the reporters, television anchors, video editors, producers, and entire WVTM staff who remain committed to broadcasting accurate, timely news to the communities they serve. Alabamians are proud to invite WVTM into their homes each and every day because the station has truly earned their trust through decades of diligence and excellence. Thank you, WVTM 13, for 75 years of exemplary service to our State.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. GEORGE E. LEWIS

• Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I rise today to honor Dr. George E. Lewis, for his outstanding service to our Nation and Maryland as he steps down as chair of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal NHP Federal Advisory Commission. Dr. Lewis began his service in 1966, when he was commissioned as a second lieutenant in the Army. As an Army officer, Dr. Lewis contributed to significant advancements to protect and treat our Nation's warfighters and citizens.

He proudly accepted in 1989 the Pentagon responsibilities of both the executive assistant to the Assistant Surgeon General for Medical Research and Development and the Army Surgeon General's liaison to the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Research, Development and Acquisition. Dr. Lewis also was the senior medical biological warfare defense expert in the Pentagon during Operations Desert Shield and Storm.

In 1991, Dr. Lewis served as a U.S. delegate to the 1991 United Nations Biological Weapons Convention Review Conference. In August 1992, he was assigned as program manager for combat medical systems and assumed command of the U.S. Army Medical Material Development Activity at Fort Detrick. In 1996, he retired after 30 years of military service.

Colonel Lewis's record of service and leadership extends well beyond his

military service. He has led efforts to preserve historical landmarks, to promote good citizenship, and to support tourism and the arts in Frederick County. He has been a critical partner to the C&O Canal NHP and Maryland's congressional delegation in the success of major initiatives including the restoration of the Catocin and Conococheague Aqueducts, the reconstruction of the towpath at Big Slackwater, and the completion of a new park headquarters near the canal's midpoint in Williamsport.

In recognition of his years of service to our country and Maryland, Dr. Lewis was the recipient of the Department the Army Research and Development Achievement Award, and his personal military decorations include the Legion of Merit, two oakleaf clusters; the Joint Service Commendation Medal; and the Army Commendation Medal, one oakleaf cluster.

In conclusion, I extend my gratitude to Dr. George E. Lewis for his outstanding service to his country and community.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:10 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha I.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 807. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the invaluable service that working dogs provide to society.

H.R. 3019. An act to establish an inspections regime for the Bureau of Prisons, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3317. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to remove the lifetime exemption from the prohibition on procurement of rolling stock from certain vehicle manufacturers for parties to executed contracts.

H.R. 5527. An act to amend section 1078 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 to increase the effectiveness of the Technology Modernization Fund, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5754. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 350 W. 1st Street, Los Angeles, California, as the "Felicitas and Gonzalo Mendez United States Courthouse".

H.R. 5799. An act to designate the checkpoint of the United States Border Patrol located on United States Highway 90 West in Uvalde County, Texas, as the "James R. Dominguez Border Patrol Checkpoint".

H.R. 5863. An act to provide tax relief with respect to certain Federal disasters.

H.R. 5887. An act to amend chapter 3 of title 5, United States Code, to improve Government service delivery, and build related capacity for the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6248. An act to require Amtrak to report to Congress information on Amtrak

compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 with respect to trains and stations.

The message also announced that pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 34, 118th Congress, and the order of the House of January 9, 2023, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. SCALISE of Louisiana, and Mr. JEFFRIES of New York.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

At 5:58 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled joint resolution:

H.J. Res. 109. Joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to "Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 121".

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 807. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the invaluable service that working dogs provide to society; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 3019. An act to establish an inspections regime for the Bureau of Prisons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3317. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to remove the lifetime exemption from the prohibition on procurement of rolling stock from certain vehicle manufacturers for parties to executed contracts; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 5527. An act to amend section 1078 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 to increase the effectiveness of the Technology Modernization Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5754. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 350 W. 1st Street, Los Angeles, California, as the "Felicitas and Gonzalo Mendez United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 5799. An act to designate the checkpoint of the United States Border Patrol located on United States Highway 90 West in Uvalde County, Texas, as the "James R. Dominguez Border Patrol Checkpoint"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5863. An act to provide tax relief with respect to certain Federal disasters; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 5887. An act to amend chapter 3 of title 5, United States Code, to improve Government service delivery, and build related capacity for the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 6248. An act to require Amtrak to report to Congress information on Amtrak compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 with respect to trains and stations; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 4381. A bill to protect an individual's ability to access contraceptives and to engage in contraception and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide contraceptives, contraception, and information related to contraception.

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-4692. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Reynolds Channel, Atlantic Beach, NY" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2022-0854)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4693. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Security Zone; Cooper River, Charleston, SC" ((RIN1625-AA87) (Docket No. USCG-2024-0228)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4694. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Security Zone; Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Corpus Christi, TX" ((RIN1625-AA87) (Docket No. USCG-2024-0314)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4695. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Heavy Weather and Natural or Other Disasters in San Juan Captain of the Port Zone, Sector San Juan" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2023-0269)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4696. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Ohio River Mile Marker 6.2-13.3, Pittsburgh, PA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2024-0004)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4697. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Gulf of Mexico, Marathon, FL" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2024-0079)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4698. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of

Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Vineyard Wind 1 Wind Farm Project Area, Outer Continental Shelf, Lease OCS-A 0501, Offshore Massachusetts, Atlantic Ocean” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2023-0269)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4699. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Sabine River, Orange, TX” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2024-0224)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4700. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Panama City, FL” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2024-0138)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4701. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Oceanside Pier, Oceanside, CA” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2024-0318)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4702. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Kokosing ROV Survey Operation, Straits of Mackinac, MI” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2023-0204)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4703. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Presque Isle Bay, Erie, PA” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2024-0294)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4704. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Gordie Howe Bridge Construction, Detroit River, Detroit, MI” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2024-0293)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4705. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Submarine Power Cables Stone Laying Project, Straits of Mackinac, MI” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2024-0278)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4706. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Security Zone; 2024 NFL Draft, Detroit River, De-

troit, MI” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2023-0204)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4707. A communication from the Director of Rulemaking Operations, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Uniform Procedures for State Highway Safety Grant Programs” (RIN2127-AM45) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4708. A communication from the Congressional Affairs Specialist, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revised Management Measures for the 2020 Guided Sport Pacific Halibut Fisheries in International Pacific Halibut Commission Regulatory Areas 2A, 2C, and 3A” (RIN0648-BJ89) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4709. A communication from the Congressional Affairs Specialist, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region; Golden Crab Fishery of the South Atlantic Region; Dolphin and Wahoo Fishery of the Atlantic; Acceptable Biological Catch Control Rules” (RIN0648-BL98) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4710. A communication from the Congressional Affairs Specialist, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Pacific Island Fisheries; 2019-2021 Annual Catch Limits and Accountability Measures” (RIN0648-BJ41) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4711. A communication from the Assistant Division Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safeguarding and Securing the Open Internet; Restoring Internet Freedom” ((RIN3060-AK41) (WC Docket Nos. 23-320 and 17-108)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4712. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Television Broadcasting Services; Missoula, Montana” (MB Docket No. 23-380) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4713. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Establishment of the Comptche Viticultural Area” (RIN1513-AC77) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4714. A communication from the Director of Rulemaking Operations, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled

“Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Automatic Emergency Braking Systems for Light Vehicles” (RIN2127-AM37) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4715. A communication from the Congressional Affairs Specialist, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “National Marine Sanctuary Regulations; Corrections and Correcting Amendments” (RIN0648-AV85) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4716. A communication from the Congressional Affairs Specialist, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region; Amendment 49” (RIN0648-BL93) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4717. A communication from the Chairman of the Office of Proceedings, Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Reciprocal Switching for Inadequate Service” (RIN2140-AB60) (Docket No. EP 711) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4718. A communication from the Attorney Adviser, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Notice of Funding Opportunity for the FY 2023-2024 Consolidated Rail Infrastructure and Safety Improvements Programs” (FR-CRS-24-001) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4719. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the second session of the 118th Congress; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4720. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “All-In Pricing for Cable and Satellite Television Service” ((MB Docket No. 23-203) (FCC 24-29)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4721. A communication from the Biologist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approach Regulations for Humpback Whales in Waters Surrounding the Islands of Hawaii Under the Marine Mammal Protection Act” (RIN0648-BF98) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4722. A communication from the National Listing Coordinator, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Endangered and Threatened Species; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Nassau Grouper” (RIN0648-BL53) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4723. A communication from the Special Assistant, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Takes of Marine Mammals Incidental to Specified Activities; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to the Revolution Wind Offshore Wind Farm Project Offshore Rhode Island; Correction" (RIN0648-BL52) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4724. A communication from the Special Assistant, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Taking or Importing of Marine Mammals: Coast Guard's Alaska Facility Maintenance and Repair Activities" (RIN0648-BK57) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4725. A communication from the Biologist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Taking of Marine Mammals Incidental to Commercial Fishing Operations; Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Plan Regulations" (RIN0648-BM31) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4726. A communication from the Marine Resources Management Specialist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Takes of Marine Mammals Incidental to Specified Activities; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to the Coastal Virginia Offshore Wind Commercial Project Offshore of Virginia" (RIN0648-BL74) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4727. A communication from the Marine Resources Management Specialist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Takes of Marine Mammals Incidental to Specified Activities; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to the Ocean Wind 1 Project Offshore of New Jersey" (RIN0648-BL36) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4728. A communication from the Biologist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Takes of Marine Mammals Incidental to Specified Activities; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to the Empire Wind Project, Offshore New York" (RIN0648-BL97) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4729. A communication from the Branch Chief, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Prohibition of Commercial Fishing in the Northeast Canyons and Seamounts Marine National Monument" (RIN0648-BL70) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4730. A communication from the Chief, Space Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Parts 2 and 25 of the Commission's Rules to Enable GSO Fixed-Satellite Service (Space-to-Earth) Operations in the 17.3-17.8 GHz Band, to Modernize Certain Rules Applicable

to 17/24 GHz BSS Space Stations, and to Establish Off-Axis Uplink Power Limits for Extended Ka-Band FSS Operations" ((IB Docket No. 20-330) (IB Docket No. 22-273)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4731. A communication from the Management Analyst, 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 39-22725" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0993)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4732. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; MHI RJ Aviation ULC (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes; Amendment 39-22710" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0026)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4733. A communication from the Deputy Chief, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to Geophysical Surveys in the Gulf of Mexico" (RIN0648-BL68) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4734. A communication from the General Attorney, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Enhancing Transparency of Airline Ancillary Service Fees" (RIN2105-AF10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4735. A communication from the General Attorney, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Refunds and Other Consumer Protections" (RIN2105-AF04) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4736. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 25, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4737. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs, Department of Transportation, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 25, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4738. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Federal Highway Traffic Safety Administration,

Department of Transportation, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 25, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4739. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Disadvantaged Business Enterprise and Airport Concession Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program Implementation Modifications" (RIN2105-AE98) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 26, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4740. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class C Airspace; San Juan Luis Munoz Marin International Airport, PR" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2023-1906)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4741. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airman Certification Standards and Practical Test Standards for Airmen; Incorporation by Reference" ((RIN2120-AL74) (Docket No. FAA-2023-1463)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 26, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4742. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Leonardo S.p.a. Helicopters; Amendment 39-22684" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2023-2245)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4743. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Leonardo S.p.a. Helicopters; Amendment 39-22697" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2023-2244)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4744. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Canada Limited Partnership (Type Certificate Previously Held by C Series Aircraft Limited Partnership (CSALP); Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes; Amendment 39-22699" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2023-1818)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4745. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Engines, and Various Restricted Category Rotorcraft; Amendment 39-22723" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0774)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4746. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Diamond Aircraft Industries Inc. Airplanes; Amendment 39-22724” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0991)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4747. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39-22706” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2023-1413)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4748. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Canada Limited Partnership (Type Certificate Previously Held by C Series Aircraft Limited Partnership (CSALP); Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes; Amendment 39-22701” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2023-2135)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4749. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39-22716” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0764)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4750. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39-22712” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0009)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4751. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited Airplanes; Amendment 39-22715” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2023-2400)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4752. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG; Amendment 39-22704” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2023-2233)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4753. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4108” ((RIN2120-AA65) (Docket No. 31540)) received in the Office of the President of the

Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4754. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4107” ((RIN2120-AA65) (Docket No. 31539)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4755. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Wallops Island, VA” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2023-2204)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4756. A communication from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revised Management Measures for the 2020 Guided Sport Pacific Halibut Fisheries in International Pacific Halibut Commission Regulatory Areas 2A, 2C, and 3A” (RIN0648-BJ89) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4757. A communication from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Pacific Island Fisheries; 2019-2021 Annual Catch Limits and Accountability Measures” (RIN0648-BJ41) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4758. A communication from the Attorney for Regulatory Affairs Division, Office of the General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Standard Mandating ASTM F963 for Toys” (Docket No. CPSC-2017-0010) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4759. A communication from the Attorney for Regulatory Affairs Division, Office of the General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Standard for Automatic Residential Garage Door Operators” (Docket No. CPSC-2015-0025) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4760. A communication from the Chief of the Industry Analysis Division, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Annual Employment Report” (MB Docket No. 98-204) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4761. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish; Amendment 20” (RIN0648-BH16) received during adjournment of the Senate

in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4762. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Framework Adjustment 29 to the Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery Management Plan” (RIN0648-BH56) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4763. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Framework Adjustment 12 to the Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fishery Management Plan” (RIN0648-BI41) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4764. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Skate Complex; Framework Adjustment 4” (RIN0648-BH03) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4765. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Deep-Sea Crab Fishery; 2019 Atlantic Deep-Sea Red Crab Specifications” (RIN0648-XE900) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4766. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revisions to Framework Adjustment 57 to the Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan and Sector Annual Catch Entitlements; Updated Annual Catch Limits for Sectors and the Common Pool for Fishing Year 2018” (RIN0648-XG503) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4767. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northern Gulf of Maine Measures in Framework Adjustment 29 to the Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery Management Plan” (RIN0648-BH51) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4768. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled

“Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Framework Adjustment 57” (RIN0648-BH52) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4769. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Surfclam and Ocean Quahog Fishery; 2018–2020 Fishing Quotas” (RIN0648-XF641) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4770. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Tribal Usual and Accustomed Fishing Areas” (RIN0648-BH97) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4771. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries Off West Coast States; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Annual Specifications” (RIN0648-XG121) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4772. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries Off West Coast States; Highly Migratory Fisheries; California Drift Gillnet Fishery; Implementation of a Federal Limited Entry Drift Gillnet Permit” (RIN0648-BG81) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4773. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Adjustment of Southern New England/Mid-Atlantic Yellowtail Flounder Catch Limits” (RIN0648-XF987) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4774. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy, Department of Transportation, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4775. A communication from the Associate Chief Counsel, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Preventing the Improper Use of CHIPS Act Funding”

(RIN0693-AB70) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4776. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of VOR Federal Airway V-132 and Revocation of VOR Federal Airways V-131, V-307, and V-350 in the Vicinity of Chanute, KS” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2023-2247)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4777. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Establishment and Amendment of United States Area Navigation (RNAV) Routes; Eastern United States” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2023-2040)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4778. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4109” ((RIN2120-AA65) (Docket No. 31541)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4779. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4110” ((RIN2120-AA65) (Docket No. 31542)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4780. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Britten-Norman Aircraft, Ltd. Airplanes; Amendment 39-22736” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0044)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4781. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; CFM International, S.A. Turbofan Engines; Amendment 39-22727” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2023-1991)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4782. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; GA 8 Airvan (Pty) Ltd. Airplanes; Amendment 39-22728” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0035)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4783. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Adminis-

tration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Hamilton Sundstrand Corporation Propellers; Amendment 39-22721” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2023-1820)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4784. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Engines; Amendment 39-22720” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0771)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4785. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Preventing the Improper Use of CHIPS Act Funding; Revised Definition of Material Expansion” (RIN0693-AB70) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 7, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4786. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Preventing the Improper Use of CHIPS Act Funding” (RIN0693-AB70) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 7, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4787. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “CHIPS Incentives Program—Facilities for Semiconductor Materials and Manufacturing Equipment [Note: The Department has concluded that this notice is not a ‘rule’ within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. 804(3). Nevertheless, out of an abundance of caution, the Department is submitting it to each House of Congress and to the Comptroller General consistent with the procedures set forth in 5 U.S.C. 801(a).]” received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 7, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4788. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Notice of Funding Opportunity CHIPS Incentive Program - Commercial Fabrication Facilities [Note: The Department has concluded that this notice is not a ‘rule’ within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. 804(3). Nevertheless, out of an abundance of caution, the Department is submitting it to each House of Congress and to the Comptroller General consistent with the procedures set forth in 5 U.S.C. 801(a).]” (RIN0693-AB70) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 7, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4789. A communication from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Regulations and Security Standards, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Flight Training Security Program” (RIN1652-AA35) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4790. A communication from the Attorney Advisor of the Regulatory Affairs Division, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pipeline Safety: Periodic Updates of Regulatory References to Technical Standards and Miscellaneous Amendments" (RIN2137-AF13) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4791. A communication from the Deputy Chief Counsel, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Preventing the Improper Use of CHIPS Act Funding; Revised Definition of 'Material Expansion'" (RIN0693-AB70) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4792. A communication from the Acting Chief Counsel, Federal Transit Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Public Transportation Agency Safety Plans" (RIN2132-AB44) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4793. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Telemarketing Sales Rule" (RIN3084-AB19) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4794. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airman Certification Standards and Practical Test Standards for Airmen; Incorporation by Reference" (RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-1463) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4795. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands; 2018 and 2019 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish" (RIN0648-XF636) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4796. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Pacific Halibut Catch Limits for Area 2A Fisheries in 2018" (RIN0648-BH71) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4797. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Management Systems" (RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0491) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4798. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd Airplanes; Amendment 39-22740" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0045) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4799. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; MHI RJ Aviation ULC (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes; Amendment 39-22729" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0031) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4800. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; International Aero Engines, LLC Engines; Amendment 39-22719" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2023-1989) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4801. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39-22726" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2023-1214) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4802. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39-22717" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-2240) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4803. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes; Amendment 39-22740" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2023-2139) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4804. A communication from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Prohibition of Commercial Fishing in the Northeast Canyons and Seamounts Marine National Monument" (RIN0648-BL70) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4805. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Catch Sharing Plan" (RIN0648-BH53) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4806. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Groundfish Bottom Trawl and Midwater Trawl Gear in the Trawl Rationalization Program" (RIN0648-BH74) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4807. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Catch Sharing Plan" (RIN0648-BH58) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4808. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone off Alaska; Yellowfin Sole Management in the Groundfish Fisheries of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands" (RIN0648-BH02) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4809. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands; Final 2020 and 2021 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish" (RIN0648-XH080) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4810. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone off Alaska; Pacific Halibut and Sablefish Individual Fishing Quota Program; Community Development Quota Program; Modifications to Recordkeeping and Reporting Requirements" (RIN0648-BG94) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4811. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Approval of New Gear Under Small-Mesh Fisheries Accountability Measures" (RIN0648-BF57) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, without amendment:

S. 3564. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to include Indian Tribes among entities that may receive Federal surplus real property for certain purposes, and for other purposes.

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 3880. A bill to amend the Federal Assets Sale and Transfer Act of 2016 to make improvements to that Act, and for other purposes.

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, without amendment:

S. 4359. A bill to amend the National Dam Safety Program Act to reauthorize that Act, and for other purposes.

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 4367. A bill to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4688. An act to direct the Administrator of General Services to sell the property known as the Webster School.

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 Ms. WARREN (for herself, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 4385. A bill to reform pattern or practice investigations conducted by the Department of Justice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORAN:

S. 4386. A bill to amend the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a program under which the Secretary shall award competitive grants to eligible entities for the purpose of establishing and enhancing farming and ranching opportunities for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 4387. A bill to prohibit transportation of any alien using certain methods of identification; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. WELCH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SMITH, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 4388. A bill to improve the administration of justice by requiring written explanations by the Supreme Court of its decisions and the disclosure of votes by justices in cases within the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court that involve injunctive relief, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 4389. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to promote the increased use of renewable natural gas, to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and other harmful transportation-related emissions that contribute to poor air quality, and to increase job creation and economic opportunity throughout the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL:

S. 4390. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to prohibit the President, Vice President, Members of Congress, and other senior Executive branch personnel from accepting any foreign emoluments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. KAINE):

S. 4391. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to recognize digital skills and digital literacy as critical adult education and literacy objectives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. COTTON, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. RISCH, and Ms. ERNST):

S. 4392. A bill to establish the Southern Border Wall Construction Fund and to transfer unobligated amounts from the Coronavirus State and local fiscal recovery funds to such Fund to construct and maintain physical barriers along the southern border; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HIRONO, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 4393. A bill to provide protections for children in immigration custody, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mr. MORAN):

S. 4394. A bill to support National Science Foundation education and professional development relating to artificial intelligence; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. KELLY, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Ms. LUMMIS):

S. Res. 701. A resolution designating the week of May 19 through May 25, 2024, as "National Public Works Week"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 704

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 704, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for interest-free deferment on student loans for borrowers serving in a medical or dental internship or residency program.

S. 789

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 789, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a coin in recognition of the 100th anniversary of the United States Foreign Service and its contribution to United States diplomacy.

S. 1193

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1193, a bill to prohibit discrimination against individuals with disabilities who need long-term services and supports, and for other purposes.

S. 1266

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1266, a bill to amend titles 10 and 38, United States Code, to improve benefits and services for surviving spouses, and for other purposes.

S. 1673

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1673, a bill to amend title XVIII to protect patient access to ground ambulance services under the Medicare program.

S. 2150

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2150, a bill to establish an Interagency Council on Service to promote and strengthen opportunities for military service, national service, and public service for all people of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 2371

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2371, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income interest received on certain loans secured by rural or agricultural real property.

S. 2539

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2539, a bill to clarify that, in awarding funding under title X of the Public Health Service Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services may not discriminate against eligible States, individuals, or other entities for refusing to counsel or refer for abortions.

S. 3283

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3283, a bill to amend the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act to support workers who are subject to an employment loss, and for other purposes.

S. 3452

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3452, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to determine the eligibility or entitlement of a member or former member of the Armed Forces described in subsection (a) to a benefit under a law administered by the Secretary solely based on

alternative sources of evidence when the military service records or medical treatment records of the member or former member are incomplete because of damage or loss of records after being in the possession of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

S. 3502

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3502, a bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to prevent consumer reporting agencies from furnishing consumer reports under certain circumstances, and for other purposes.

S. 3679

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 3679, a bill to reauthorize the Dr. Lorna Breen Health Care Provider Protection Act, and for other purposes.

S. 3757

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 3757, a bill to reauthorize the congenital heart disease research, surveillance, and awareness program of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and for other purposes.

S. 3765

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) were added as cosponsors of S. 3765, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children program.

S. 3775

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 3775, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the BOLD Infrastructure for Alzheimer's Act, and for other purposes.

S. 3779

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3779, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants to establish or expand programs to implement evidence-aligned practices in health care settings for the purpose of reducing the suicide rates of covered individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 3959

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3959, a bill to require the Transportation Security Administra-

tion to streamline the enrollment processes for individuals applying for a Transportation Security Administration security threat assessment for certain programs, including the Transportation Worker Identification Credential and Hazardous Materials Endorsement Threat Assessment programs of the Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 4074

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4074, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to approve interstate commerce carrier apprenticeship programs for purposes of veterans educational assistance, and for other purposes.

S. 4084

At the request of Mr. WELCH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4084, a bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make grants to professional nonprofit theaters for the purposes of supporting operations, employment, and economic development.

S. 4091

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 4091, a bill to strengthen Federal efforts to counter antisemitism in the United States.

S. 4206

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4206, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to prohibit certain activities involving prohibited primate species, and for other purposes.

S. 4251

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4251, a bill to establish a payment program for unexpected loss of markets and revenues to timber harvesting and timber hauling businesses due to major disasters, and for other purposes.

S. 4258

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4258, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to punish criminal offenses targeting law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

S. 4296

At the request of Mrs. BRITT, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4296, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide more opportunities for mothers to succeed, and for other purposes.

S. 4300

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr.

BROWN) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) were added as cosponsors of S. 4300, a bill to require the Secretary of Labor to maintain a publicly available list of all employers that relocate a call center or contract call center work overseas, to make such companies ineligible for Federal grants or guaranteed loans, and to require disclosure of the physical location of business agents engaging in customer service communications, and for other purposes.

S. 4321

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4321, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to prohibit the payment of annuities and retired pay to individuals convicted of certain sex crimes.

S. 4323

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4323, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for a housing loan guaranteed by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to certain individuals who performed active duty for training.

S. 4333

At the request of Mr. VANCE, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4333, a bill to provide for the discharge of parent borrower liability if a student on whose behalf a parent has received certain student loans becomes disabled.

S. 4368

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 4368, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require, as a condition of receiving Federal Medicaid funding, that States do not prohibit in vitro fertilization (IVF) services, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4368, *supra*.

S. 4371

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4371, a bill to amend the Investor Protection and Securities Reform Act of 2010 to provide grants to States for enhanced protection of senior investors and senior policyholders, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 82

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE), the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SCHMITT), the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 82, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5,

United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Food and Drug Administration relating to “Medical Devices; Laboratory Developed Tests”.

S. RES. 505

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 505, a resolution condemning the use of sexual violence and rape as a weapon of war by the terrorist group Hamas against the people of Israel.

S. RES. 574

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of Florida, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VANCE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 574, a resolution expressing support for starting and growing a family through in vitro fertilization.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. KAINE):

S. 4391. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to recognize digital skills and digital literacy as critical adult education and literacy objectives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I rise today to introduce the Investing in Digital Skills Act, a bill that would help strengthen computer skills in the American workforce. This bill, which I am introducing today with my colleague Senator TIM KAINE, would make important updates to the Workforce Investment and Opportunity Act, known as WIOA, to help workers meet the digital skills demands of today’s jobs.

A key goal of WIOA is to help Americans overcome barriers to obtaining high-quality jobs and careers. The law requires State and local service providers to offer adult education and skills development programs that accelerate achievement of diplomas and credentials among American workers. This Investing in Digital Skills Act would allow information literacy and digital skills to be included among the skills development programs within these adult education programs.

Our legislation would help prepare individuals for the evolving demands of the digital economy, enhancing their employability and skill sets in a technologically advanced job market. Recent research conducted in partnership between National Skills Coalition and the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta found that 92 percent of jobs require digital skills, yet more than 30 percent of workers lack even foundational digital abilities. The research also found huge financial incentives for this upskilling: Jobs that require at least one digital skill earn 23 percent more than a job requiring none.

This issue is important to Mainers. Lisa Robertson, the director of York Adult Education, wrote to me, saying,

“Your bill would address a significant gap in current workforce development initiatives by recognizing the importance of digital skills training for adult learners. In today’s rapidly evolving job market, proficiency in digital literacy is no longer just a valuable asset; it is essential for individuals to succeed. . . .” I appreciate Lisa’s insights about today’s workforce needs. By modernizing WIOA with new tools to teach digital skills, the Investing in Digital Skills Act would help Americans maintain their competitive edge in workforce.

I urge my colleagues to support our legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 701—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF MAY 19 THROUGH MAY 25, 2024, AS “NATIONAL PUBLIC WORKS WEEK”

Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. KELLY, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Ms. LUMMIS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 701

Whereas public works professionals work around the clock to ensure the vital infrastructure, facilities, and services of communities to deliver dependable, sustainable, and resilient human needs that include the health, safety, and well-being of the people of the United States, while advancing the quality of life for all;

Whereas public works infrastructure, facilities, and services could not be provided without the dedicated efforts of public works professionals who represent Federal, State, and local governments, and private sector organizations throughout the United States;

Whereas public works professionals design, build, operate, and maintain the transportation systems, water infrastructure, sewage and refuse disposal systems, public buildings, sanitation and waste management systems, and other structures and facilities that are vital to the people and communities of the United States;

Whereas many public works professionals are first responders and are the first to arrive and last to leave a natural disaster area or incident scene; and

Whereas understanding the role that public infrastructure plays in protecting the environment, improving public health and safety, contributing to economic vitality, and enhancing the quality of life of every community of the United States is in the interest of the people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of May 19 through May 25, 2024, as “National Public Works Week”;

(2) recognizes and celebrates the important contributions that public works professionals make every day to improve—

(A) the public infrastructure of the United States; and

(B) the health, safety, and well-being of our communities that public works professionals serve; and

(3) urges individuals and communities throughout the United States to join with representatives of the Federal Government and the American Public Works Association

in activities and ceremonies that are designed—

(A) to pay tribute to the public works professionals of the United States; and

(B) to recognize the substantial contributions that public works professionals make to the United States.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I have 11 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 ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2024, at 9:45 a.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2024, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2024, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

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, May 22, 2024, at 2:30 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, May 22, 2024, at 10 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, May 22, 2024, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2024, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2024, at 3:15 p.m., to conduct a business meeting.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2024, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed business meeting.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC POLICY

The Subcommittee on Economic Policy of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2024, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

The Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2024, at 4:45 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Alexandra Gelber, a detailee to the Senate Judiciary Committee, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the 118th Congress.

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

NATIONAL PUBLIC WORKS WEEK

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 701, submitted earlier today.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 701) designating the week of May 19 through May 25, 2024, as "National Public Works Week".

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MURPHY. 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. 701) 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, MAY 23, 2024

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m. on Thursday, May 23; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Dalton nomination postcloture and that if the nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be im-

mediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order following the remarks of Senator BARRASSO and Senator WYDEN.

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

The Senator from Wyoming.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—
S. 4392

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor today to continue this discussion of the crisis at our southern border.

When Joe Biden walked into the White House, the southern border was secure. Tragically, for our country, he then signed 94 Executive orders in his first 100 days. He rolled out the welcome mat, and millions and millions of illegal immigrants flooded into our Nation. The Democrats in Congress joined him. They joined the President. They worked with him. They aggressively rolled back Republican-led policies that had worked to keep our country safe. Our southern border is now a pipeline for illegal crossings. Since Joe Biden took office, almost 10 million illegal immigrants have invaded America.

The Democrats' uncontrolled illegal immigration strains our tax dollars; it undermines the safety of our citizens; and it endangers our communities. Hard-working American taxpayers are now paying. They are paying for housing; they are paying for healthcare; they are paying for government handouts—all for illegal immigrants. According to one study, the Democratic border crisis costs States and cities close to \$450 billion each and every year.

The heaviest costs of this crisis are borne by families, by communities, and by local law enforcement. Day after day, lives are cut short or changed forever. Just 2 weeks ago, in Florida, an 11-year-old girl was kidnapped and sexually assaulted by a 20-year-old illegal immigrant brought into this country under the catch-and-release program of President Biden. He is here because of this dangerous program.

The local sheriff in Florida had this to say:

The Federal Government is victimizing the people who live in this country by letting these people in.

To my Democratic colleagues, I would say: You voted for open borders. I would ask you, What if this were your daughter or what if this were your granddaughter who had been kidnapped by an illegal immigrant brought in by catch-and-release—a 20-year-old here. Terrible. Frightening.

Fortunately, this young girl's mother was able to identify the situation, and she ran desperately to get that daughter who had been kidnapped.

We are here fighting to secure the border to make our communities safer. Democrats in this body have done nothing to secure the border. They have done nothing to stop the flood of illegal immigrants. The record by the Democrats in this body is appalling, and let me start with H.R. 2.

H.R. 2 is, of course, the House bill. It is called the Secure the Border Act of 2023. It is the strongest border security bill in our history. It completes the wall because walls work. It surges new technology to the border. It hires more Border Patrol agents and gives them a bonus. It ends catch-and-release, and it reinstates the successful plan of "Remain in Mexico." If signed into law, H.R. 2 would stop the flood of illegal immigrants.

Now, the House of Representatives passed this bill, the Secure the Border Act of 2023, on May 11 of 2023. Well, that was over a year ago. The Senate majority leader refuses to bring this House-passed bill to the floor, and he has been blocking the bill for over a year.

Of course, it is not just blocking the Secure the Border Act that is the problem. Democrats will not vote for real border security measures. For 3 years now, open border Democrats—each and every one of them—have rejected solutions aimed at fixing the border crisis not once, not twice but in 22 different recorded votes. Democrats banded together to say no to finishing the wall, no to ending catch-and-release, and no to restoring the "Remain in Mexico" policy. They blocked the Laken Riley Act.

Meanwhile, they have embraced policies that have tried to smooth the flow of illegal immigrants when people all across America are saying: Stop this flood. This includes sending illegal immigrants cash payments paid with taxpayer dollars. The Democrats continue to fund sanctuary cities. For 3 years, my Democratic colleagues have seemed to welcome the crisis at our southern border. They now want to run away from their record, and we know why. It is because election day is less than 6 months away, and they can read the polls. Democrats can run, but they cannot hide.

The majority leader recently said that the situation at the border is unacceptable. I am not sure he actually believes that. After all, one of his first comments after the 2022 election was that he endorsed amnesty for illegal immigrants. The majority leader said at the time that opening our country to illegal immigrants is "the only way we are going to have a great future in America." It is "the only way." That is what the majority leader said. It is "the only way we are going to have a great future in America"—amnesty for illegal immigrants.

The Democrats have no desire to secure the border. Every single Democrat

in this Capitol is responsible for the drugs, the deaths, and the destruction brought on by the invasion of our Nation by illegal immigrants.

This is a cycle of suffering that Senate Republicans are determined to stop. This week, I introduced a bill called the Build the Wall Act. We know that the border wall works. My proposal finishes the wall. It pays for it by clawing back unused COVID funding. This wall is absolutely vital to our Nation's security.

You know, once upon a time, Senator SCHUMER actually supported a border wall. Many of his Democratic colleagues supported a border wall. When Joe Biden was then-Senator Joe Biden—and I served with him in this body—he actually voted for a border wall. They have all flip-flopped, and we know why—politics, plain and simple.

To my Democratic colleagues, I say this: You are responsible for innocent Americans being victimized by illegal immigrants in communities all across the Nation. If Democrats are serious about securing the border, they should start by voting for a policy that actually works and is paid for. That is the reason to vote for the bill I have introduced, the Build the Wall Act.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the Senate resume legislative session and proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 4392, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I share our colleague's view that the southern border is serious business. I strongly favor smart, effective policies to deal with it.

The reason I can't support what he has proposed is that defunding infrastructure does not make sense, and that has long been the position of the Senate.

The money that is being discussed here has been supported unanimously over three particular initiatives here in the Congress. The authors of this, and I would say this specifically, have been Senator CORNYN, a member of the leadership on the other side of the aisle,

and our colleague from California, Senator PADILLA.

Let me repeat that. We have gone through this three times with strong bipartisan support from Republican leadership—our colleague from Texas, Senator CORNYN—and Senator PADILLA from California. The reason why is that we have said we can come up with smart policies on the border and also maintain our infrastructure.

Unfortunately, the funding that my colleague is talking about would harm the effort to ensure we build the roads and the bridges and that we deal with lead pipes in schools. That is what we are talking about. That is why the States and the localities have been such strong supporters of this.

My colleague serves on the Finance Committee. There are a number of areas where we have worked together. I will note that this week in the Finance Committee, a number of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have talked about how they want to generate more growth—a smart idea. Put me down as interested and wanting to work in a bipartisan way.

Well, the reality is, you can't generate big-league economic growth with little-league infrastructure, and that, unfortunately, is what is going on here. Where we agree that we ought to be tackling a very serious issue—the southern border—we disagree on the method of funding that effort.

I think defunding infrastructure is the end result of what my colleague is talking about, and it turns upside down the bipartisan coalition that has allowed us to use that money at the State and local levels with Republican leadership and our friend from California.

So that is why I have to object. Therefore, I do object this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, let me be very, very brief in just pointing out that this bill calls for using unspent COVID money, specifically as a result of the COVID pandemic that hit our Nation, money sent to be spent for that. It does seem to me and to probably just about every American that we are way beyond that period of

time, and money designated for that purpose has not yet been spent. It should be readily available for a project like this.

I would also note that my friend and colleague who is on the floor was, along with President Biden and Senator SCHUMER, one of those who did vote on September 29, 2006, for a bill, at the time, that was called the Secure Fence Act of 2006.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, just very briefly, having participated in these debates—this specific discussion now, on several occasions—again, my friend and I just have a difference of opinion. Senator CORNYN and Senator PADILLA have repeatedly talked about this being for the roads and bridges and dealing with lead pipes in schools. That is so central to the brighter future we all—Democrats and Republicans—want for our country.

So as we wrap up, I want it understood that I share my colleague's view about how serious the southern border is. What we differ on is how we are going to pay for it. And defunding infrastructure—which Senator CORNYN and Senator PADILLA set out to do, and I think in a very smart way—is not the way to go.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BARRASSO. I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:47 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, May 23, 2024, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 22, 2024:

THE JUDICIARY

DENA M. COGGINS, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA.

ANGELA M. MARTINEZ, OF ARIZONA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING LOWER SOUTH-AMPTON POLICE SERGEANT RAYMOND BRANDEN'S RETIREMENT

HON. BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an extraordinary constituent from my district, Sergeant Raymond Branden of Lower Southampton Township. His distinguished career as a law enforcement officer spans an impressive 37 years and now culminates in his well-merited retirement.

Raymond was born in Philadelphia and currently resides in Holland. He started his career in 1987 working part-time for Chalfont Borough, Newtown Borough, and Yardley Borough. Raymond secured a full-time position as an officer in 1988 and by April 1989, he joined the Lower Southampton Township Police Department.

Over the course of 15 years, Raymond was a member of the South-Central Bucks County SWAT team, serving as a valuable and esteemed team leader. Concurrently, he was a member of the Lower Southampton Township Police Honor Guard, exhibiting unwavering reliability as an accident investigator and reconstructionist.

During his tenure with Lower Southampton Township, Raymond's ascent within the police department was marked by commendable rapidity. Elevated to the rank of Corporal in 2004 and further to Sergeant in 2006, his trajectory underscored his exceptional leadership and dedication to duty. Noteworthy among his myriad achievements are instances where he displayed promptness and efficacy in responding to medical crises, deftly averted threats posed to fellow officers, and apprehended perpetrators of burglary.

Along with this patrol sergeant duties, Raymond was also the traffic safety coordinator for the police department. Tasked with scheduling traffic and DUI enforcement details, he led numerous initiatives aimed at enhancing the force and community as a whole.

Sergeant Branden plans to enjoy his retirement by spending quality time with his wife Tami, daughters Nichole and Morgan, and grandchildren Luna and Rory. I express profound gratitude to Sergeant Branden for the life of dedicated service he has given to our community, district, and country. His noble character is an example of civic stewardship for new generations of law enforcement to embody.

Raymond's devotion to the force will be greatly missed, but I wish to congratulate him on his 37 years of service to the citizens of Bucks County and his deserved retirement from the Lower Southampton Township Police Department. I am looking forward to seeing him embark on this new journey and I sincerely hope that all his future endeavors are met with great success.

RECOGNIZING GENERAL KINEMATICS FOR RECEIVING THE ROBERT O. COVEY AWARD

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize General Kinematics for receiving the Robert O. Covey Award for embodying the spirit of American ingenuity and community engagement. From its humble beginnings in a Barrington storefront in 1960, General Kinematics has blossomed into a global leader, serving clients across the world with innovative solutions.

General Kinematics' success story is a testament to the power of hard work, dedication, and a commitment to continuous improvement. What started with a small team of six employees has grown to a robust workforce of over 192, with countless retired employees who have contributed to the company's legacy. This remarkable growth is a result of General Kinematics' unwavering dedication to its employees, fostering a culture of innovation and providing opportunities for professional development.

The company's commitment to its employees extends beyond the workplace. General Kinematics actively invests to the growth of young people in the community, providing training programs and mentorship opportunities that empower the next generation. This dedication to community development is reflected in their positive impact on Crystal Lake and beyond.

General Kinematics' journey is one of constant evolution. From its initial focus on the foundry industry, the company has expanded its reach to serve mines, recycling plants, and a diverse range of global clients. This expansion is driven by innovation, with General Kinematics continuously developing new equipment and products to meet the ever-changing needs of its customers.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent the community of Crystal Lake and I ask my colleagues to join me in acknowledging General Kinematics and its employees for their remarkable contributions to the community, their dedication to innovation, and their commitment to building a sustainable future.

HONORING PETE BOUDREAUX

HON. GARRET GRAVES

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a man who selflessly served his alma mater for more than 50 years. Coach Pete Boudreaux, Catholic High School track coach, teacher, guidance counselor, and legend, is a member of the Catholic High

School Class of 1959. After a stint in the Army and an SEC Championship-worthy track career at LSU, Coach Boudreaux returned to his alma mater to begin his service career. Over his career, Coach Boudreaux brought home 52 state championships between cross country, indoor track, and outdoor track. He is the first man to be inducted into both the Catholic High School and St. Joseph's Academy High School Athletic Halls of Fame and is also a member of the Louisiana Sports Hall of Fame.

Beyond his legendary coaching career, Coach Boudreaux is a man who passionately worked to get the most out of his students. Some of the constants in Coach Boudreaux's approach are to work to prepare his students for the future and mold them into good people. Coach Boudreaux's ability to evolve and contribute to the lives of young men over the course of generations is unparalleled, and Catholic High has been fortunate to have such a dedicated teacher, guidance counselor, and coach. As a former sprinter under "Coach Boo," I join thousands of Catholic High graduates in wishing him a huge congratulations on his retirement and go Bears.

SUPPORTING THE JOHN R. LEWIS VOTING RIGHTS ADVANCEMENT ACT

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, in the more than ten years since the Supreme Court gutted the Voting Rights Act in the Shelby vs. Holder case, state legislatures have targeted voters and erected deliberate barriers to the ballot box in what amounts to the most coordinated effort to restrict voting access in generations. These new laws would: Close polling stations without advanced notice, purge voter rolls, curb early voting and voting by mail, impose strict ID requirements and limit multi-lingual voting materials.

If we are to gather here today and discuss solutions to rid this Nation of voter disenfranchisement, then I suggest that instead of the Republican misguided bill, the House finally take up H.R. 14, the John Robert Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act.

Named for our late great colleague and Civil Rights hero, the bill would establish a modern-day formula to prevent states with a recent history of voter discrimination from enacting restrictive voting laws.

Generations of Americans marched, fought and even died for the right to vote, many in my hometown of Selma, Alabama. We cannot let the continuation of unjust practices threaten their legacy and undermine our democracy.

The right to vote is the most fundamental right in our democracy. With the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act, we're ensuring that every eligible American can make their voices heard in fair, accessible, and transparent elections.

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

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

I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will finally join me and fellow Democrats in this worthwhile endeavor.

It was John Lewis who said “that the right to vote is precious, almost sacred. It is the most powerful non-violent tool in a democratic society. We must use it.”

I urge my colleagues to join me in defending this precious right so that H.R. 14 can finally be brought forward for a vote; and show once and for all to our constituents that we are united in defense of our democracy and our most sacred right to vote.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF
MAJOR BENJAMIN JONES

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and honor Major Benjamin Jones' impressive record of service to our country. Ben was born in Raleigh, North Carolina and attended high school at Clayton High School in North Carolina. He attended North Carolina State University and received his commission as an Armor Officer through Officer Candidate School in 2010.

Major Jones has served on active duty for just over ten years. He has served as a Reconnaissance Platoon Leader within 25th Infantry Division in Hawaii. He commanded two Cavalry Troops within 1st Armored Division in Texas. After command, he served as an exercise planner for Joint Modernization Command, within Army Futures Command. He also has an operational deployment to Kuwait in 2017 as a Troop Commander. Prior to his current assignment in the Army House Liaison Division as a Legislative Liaison, Major Jones served as the Defense Fellow/Military Legislative Liaison for Representative Filemon Vela of Texas' 34th Congressional District.

As a Legislative Liaison, Ben was the face of the Army for 435 members of the U.S. House of Representatives, with direct influence over 10 states spanning 85 individual members. Ben built, promoted, and facilitated lines of communication between Congress and the Army that were instrumental in maintaining the relationship between the executive and legislative branches. Through his ability to clearly define the Army's message and help navigate the needs of Congress to provide essential oversight requirements, Ben has had a lasting and outsized impact on the government and the nation's ability to respond to global threats, ensure the military modernizes, and maintains readiness at the highest level.

In June, Major Jones will be attending the National Intelligence University as he continues his career as a strategic intelligence officer continuing his post graduate studies and continues to honorably serve our great Nation. I wish Ben, his wife Lauren, and his two children Colin and Harper, the best of luck in their future endeavors and their continued dedication to this great country.

RECOGNIZING BARBARA DEMEREST FOR HER YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE TOWN OF AMHERST AND WESTERN NEW YORK AT LARGE

HON. NICHOLAS A. LANGWORTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Barbara Demerest for her many years of community engagement and civic duty as a tireless conservative advocate in the Town of Amherst and across Western New York.

Barbara graduated with a master's degree and Advanced Certificate in Trauma Counseling from the University at Buffalo School of Social Work, and a Certificate in Supervisory Studies from the Cornell School of Industrial Relations. She went on to work in the healthcare sector, serving the region as both a clinician and administrator. As she advocated for stronger measures to combat family violence, Barbara connected with longtime State Senator Mary Lou Rath. Barbara Demerest's voice on community issues was appreciated, and Senator Rath later brought her on as the Director of Community Services, where she continued to have a large impact on policy, advising the Senator and working with the community on a wide range of issues, with a special emphasis on her background in healthcare.

Even in retirement, Barbara Demerest continues to be a trusted advisor to candidates and elected officials as a leader in the Town of Amherst Republican Committee and respected advocate in the community.

On behalf of the United States Congress and the constituents of New York's 23rd Congressional District, I thank Barbara Demerest for her tireless efforts to improve Western New York through her community engagement and activism.

RECOGNIZING BOB BLAZIER FOR RECEIVING THE LIFETIME ACHIEVEMENT AWARD

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Bob Blazier for receiving the Lifetime Achievement Award from the Crystal Lake Chamber of Commerce. This recognition acknowledges Mr. Blazier's unwavering commitment to serving his community in various capacities.

Bob Blazier's career in Crystal Lake began in 1962 as the Principal of Lundahl Middle School. His passion for education extended beyond the classroom, as he became a founding member of the Crystal Lake Chamber of Commerce Ambassadors in 1977.

From 1985 to 2002, Bob served as superintendent of District 47 in Crystal Lake, leaving an enduring legacy on the district's educational system. After his tenure as superintendent, he continued making a difference by serving as Vice President of the Northern Illinois Medical Center where he played a piv-

otal role in establishing the Centegra Foundation.

Bob's involvement in the Crystal Lake Chamber of Commerce reached its peak when he served as President from 1990 to 2008. During his presidency, he spearheaded the creation of the Crystal Lake Chamber Foundation, which has since awarded thousands of dollars in scholarships to deserving high school seniors.

Even at the age of 97, Bob remains actively engaged in the community, working at Home State Bank. His unwavering dedication to Crystal Lake is a testament to his unwavering commitment to making a positive impact on the lives of others.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent the community of Crystal Lake and I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Bob Blazier's lifelong leadership and dedication to serving others. His unwavering commitment serves as an inspiration to all who strive to make a lasting difference in their communities.

RECOGNIZING LOWER SOUTHAMPTON POLICE SERGEANT MICHAEL WOJNAR'S RETIREMENT

HON. BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding constituent from my district, Sergeant Michael Wojnar of Lower Southampton Township Police Department who is retiring after 27 years of dedicated service as a law enforcement officer.

He started his career in 1996 working for Jenkintown Borough and Rockledge Borough Police. He attended Bucks County Community College for his Associates of Art Degree in Criminal Justice and Political Science from 1992 to 1995 and enrolled in the Police Academy at Montgomery County Community College in 1995. By June 1997, he joined the Lower Southampton Township Police Department.

For 18 years, Michael served as a valuable asset within the South-Central Bucks County SWAT team, fulfilling pivotal roles in HAZMAT SWAT operations and crisis negotiator. Additionally, he was a member of the Lower Southampton Township Police Honor Guard, demonstrating a steadfast commitment to excellence in law enforcement.

During his tenure with Lower Southampton Township, Michael quickly rose through the ranks of the police department, promoted to Corporal in 2014 and Sergeant in 2018. Michael Wojnar has an array of worthy achievements, exemplified by his courageous rescue efforts at the Ridgecrest Nursing Home amidst perilous conditions of heat and smoke, and his adeptness in providing key information leading to the arrest of a serial bank robber.

Along with his patrol sergeant duties, he was extremely involved in accident investigation and reconstruction. While performing these responsibilities, he was also at Peirce College getting a Bachelor of Applied Science in Criminal Justice and Law Enforcement Administration in 2021, and earning a Master's Degree in Criminal Justice and Corrections from the University of Arizona Global Campus from 2022 to 2023.

I express profound gratitude to Sergeant Wojnar for the life of dedicated service he has given to our community, district, and country. His exemplary character serves as a model of civic stewardship and sets a precedent for future generations of law enforcement to emulate. Michael's devotion will be greatly missed, but thankfully he has continued to serve for the Bucks County Sheriff's Department as Deputy Sheriff. I wish to congratulate his service to the citizens of Bucks County, and I eagerly anticipate witnessing his future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING KATHY DAILY'S
DEDICATED SERVICE TO HOOSIER
VETERANS

HON. RUDY YAKYM, III

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

Mr. YAKYM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Kathy Daily for the incredible work she does day in and day out caring for those who have worn the uniform of the United States Military.

As a registered nurse for mental health at the Jackie Walorski VA Clinic in Mishawaka, Indiana, Kathy serves on the frontlines in the ongoing battle to make sure Hoosier veterans are well-cared for and receive the quality mental health treatment they need and deserve. When our veteran heroes return home from battle, they often struggle with invisible scars and wounds that are not physically noticeable. Kathy works tirelessly to bind up and heal those wounds and support veterans in crisis situations.

Kathy's extensive background in the military and with veterans' groups is part of what makes her such an effective advocate for them. From serving in the U.S. Army during Operation Desert Storm to now serving as Vice Commander of the Edwardsburg VFW Post in Cass County, Michigan, along with various veteran suicide prevention groups, there are few people who better understand the veteran community and their challenges and needs better than Kathy does.

One of the veterans who Kathy went above and beyond for in a time of crisis is someone I have also had the privilege of getting to know well: retired Sergeant Ted Grubbs. An Operation Iraqi Freedom veteran, Ted was diagnosed with service-connected complex post-traumatic stress disorder and complex traumatic brain injury after returning home from duty. In April 2023, Ted experienced a severe mental health crisis and put a pistol in his mouth before, fortunately, putting the pistol down.

In the immediate aftermath of that incident, Kathy was there and available for Ted 24/7, and she made sure he was supported and received the treatment he needed. It is not hyperbole to say that Kathy saved Ted's life, and there are other veterans who woke up this morning and can say the same because they had Kathy in their corner. As we reflect on all the tremendous sacrifices our veterans have made across the generations defending liberty and preserving this great American experiment, it is equally important to express our gratitude to those individuals who care for them when they return home.

I, and many others, are extremely grateful to Kathy Daily for being a voice for veterans when no one else will speak up for them, and to make sure crisis situations don't turn into tragedies. I thank Kathy and all those doing diligent, dedicated work supporting and caring for America's veterans.

HONORING ASIAN AMERICAN, NATIVE
HAWAIIAN, AND PACIFIC
ISLANDER HERITAGE MONTH 2024

HON. LUCY MCBATH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to celebrate Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander Heritage (AANHPI) Month 2024. Each May, our Nation commemorates the anniversaries of the immigration of the first Japanese people to the United States on May 7, 1843 and the completion of the transcontinental railroad on May 10, 1869. Since a commemoration of these anniversaries was first proposed in 1977, we have celebrated the history, accomplishments, and contributions of the Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander communities in America. On Wednesday, May 29, it is my distinct honor and privilege to join Gwinnett County's 2024 Asian American & Pacific Islander Heritage Month Celebration.

Gwinnett County is home to Georgia's largest AANHPI community. I am proud to represent such a beautiful tapestry of ethnicities, nationalities, faith traditions, and experiences, and I am truly privileged to know and work with so many of these individuals in Georgia every single day. Whether running a business, working with students, or inspiring civic participation in our political system, Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders in our community have made an indelible mark in their professional fields and in the lives of those they serve. Since 2023, I have also been a member of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus to fight for the AANHPI communities here in Georgia and across our country. Together, we can support the hard-working Americans who bring their unique experiences to our Nation, advocate and advance our shared goals, and celebrate the many contributions that have made America a more perfect union.

This month and always, I am honored to represent the cultures, nationalities, and spoken languages that make up this vibrant community. Happy Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander Heritage Month.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE AND
SERVICE OF BRIAN MCCORMICK

HON. PAT FALLON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and service of Mr. Brian "Mac" William McCormick of Colleyville, Texas, who peacefully passed away on April 15, 2024.

Mr. McCormick was born on June 8, 1942, in Oneida, New York, to Aaron and Berniece

McCormick. After graduating from Norwich High School, he attended Powelson Business School in Syracuse to study accounting. In 1966, Mr. McCormick was drafted into the United States Army during the Vietnam War. Although he could have denied the draft due to his younger brother already having enlisted, he nevertheless heeded the call to serve his country. During basic training in Fort Riley, Kansas, Mr. McCormick was assigned to the 9th Infantry Division, which was known as the "Old Reliables". In Vietnam, he served as a forward observer on an armored personnel carrier and performed numerous search and destroy missions in the Mekong Delta. For his exemplary service, Mr. McCormick received several awards, including the Vietnam Service Medal with one bronze star, Combat Infantryman Badge, and the Republic of Vietnam Campaign Medal with Device.

After returning home in 1968, Mr. McCormick was waiting to be processed out in Fort Meade, Maryland, during the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr. This led to riots and civil unrest across the country, and he was temporarily called back to service to patrol the streets of Washington, D.C. In civilian life, Mr. McCormick remained active with his American Legion Post and volunteered in his community. He also helped organize company reunions and spoke at these events, in which he was recognized for his outstanding work and community service. Mr. McCormick was a loving father whose selfless service and compassion will be remembered for many years to come.

I have requested the United States flag to be flown over our Nation's Capitol to honor Mr. McCormick's extraordinary life and service to our Nation. He will be dearly missed by his friends, family, and all who knew him.

RECOGNIZING CAPTAIN ANTHONY
WILLIAMS, JR.

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Captain Anthony W. Williams, Jr. as he concludes his tour as Army Legislative Liaison in the Office of Congressional Legislative Liaisons. Originally from Augusta, Georgia, Captain Williams attended Fort Valley State University where he graduated as a 2013 Distinguished Military Graduate. Today, Captain Williams resides in Albany, Georgia, and I am proud to call him one of my constituents.

Throughout his life, Captain Williams has attained an impressive list of educational degrees, to include a Bachelor of Arts Degree in Criminal Justice from Fort Valley State University, a Master of Science Degree in Logistics Management from the Florida Institute of Technology, and a Master's in Policy Management from Georgetown University.

During his career in the United States Army, Captain Williams has served in several duty stations across the country where he was selected to fill mission-critical roles. His first duty station was Fort Campbell, Kentucky, followed by Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Fort Bragg, North Carolina, and the Pentagon where he served as a General Bradley Fellow, leading

the Department of Defense in the Global Posture Executive Council's Military Construction Prioritization Process before moving on to the Office of Congressional Liaisons in the U.S. House of Representatives.

As a Congressional Liaison, Captain Williams was responsible for liaising with 72 Members of Congress and their staff, covering eight states and two U.S. territories. He was a key player for developing engagement opportunities between Army Senior Leaders and Members of Congress, and he promoted legislative objectives and programs with a unique style of his own. Captain Williams did an exceptional job at executing communications and logistics support for Members and congressional staff as they attended CODELS and STAFFDELS. In fact, he received exceptional acclaim from my colleagues for his strategic excellence and logistical attentiveness during their CODEL to the INDOPACOM theater.

Beyond his adept coordination and organizational skills, Captain Williams proved to be innovative in his approach to the role of liaison. He took the initiative to incorporate his own strategies and programming that left a mark on Army Senior leaders and Members of Congress with whom he worked. Following his roots as a graduate of Fort Valley State University—the State of Georgia's 1890 land-grant university—Captain Williams promoted and facilitated lines of communication with the Congressional Black Caucus and the Bipartisan Historically Black College and Universities (HBCU) Caucus. Through his ability to clearly define the Army message, Captain Williams was able to assist the caucus members with questions about national and international issues pertaining to the Army and discuss Army issues impacting the African American community.

Truly, Captain Williams' personal example, commitment to excellence, and exemplary performance of duty reflects distinct credit upon himself, the Office of the Chief of Legislative Liaison, and the United States Army. Former Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm once said that "service is the rent we pay for the space we occupy here on this earth." Captain Williams has paid his rent, and he has paid it well. Undoubtedly, he will continue in his service to the American people in whatever role he takes next.

Captain Anthony Williams has accomplished so much in his life, but none of it would have been possible without the grace of God and the enduring love and support of his wife, Courtney, and their three children, Trey, Journey, and Sydney.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join my wife, Vivian; and me, along with the more than 765,000 people of Georgia's Second Congressional District, in recognizing the tremendous contributions Captain Williams has made to help serve the U.S. Army and the American people during his career. We wish him and his family all the best as they move on to the next chapter of their lives.

RECOGNIZING HEREDITARY
ANGIOEDEMA DAY AND THE
HAEA'S 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize May 16th as Hereditary Angioedema Awareness Day and to call attention to challenges and opportunities faced by this patient community. Hereditary Angioedema (HAE) is a rare, severe, and potentially life-threatening genetic condition in about 1 in 10,000 to 1 in 50,000 people. HAE symptoms include painful and disabling episodes of edema, or swelling, in all body parts including the abdomen. Throat swelling can close the airway and cause death by asphyxiation. While minor trauma or stress may trigger an attack, swelling often occurs without a known trigger. Symptoms of hereditary angioedema typically begin in childhood and worsen during puberty. Untreated individuals may have an attack every 1 to 2 weeks with most episodes lasting 3 to 4 days.

HAE used to be associated with an incredibly high mortality rate, but recent breakthroughs in medical science have taken the condition from a death sentence to a manageable chronic illness. With the advent of innovative therapies, HAE patients no longer experience disability and dependency, but rather live full, productive, and largely suffering-free lives. HAE affected individuals require near constant access to life-saving care and medication and additional research advancements are needed to sustain progress toward an elusive cure.

Loss of productivity at work and school is one of the many side effects of those suffering from HAE, particularly when it is not managed correctly and comprehensively. In an earlier survey conducted by the U.S. Hereditary Angioedema Association (HAEA), 57 percent of patients reported as not having equal advancement in career pathways and 48 percent stated they did not achieve the educational level that they wanted. I look forward to working with my colleagues to continue to improve coverage and access and lowering out-of-pocket costs for patients with rare and chronic illnesses.

I am also proud to recognize the HAEA. This organization is celebrating its 25th anniversary and the tremendous advancement in research and patient care improvements over that time. They are an exemplary patient research advocacy organization in terms of support for the community and impact for the patients they serve.

I call on my colleagues to continue to support efforts to advance medical research, improve coverage and access, enhance patient care, and join me in recognizing May 16th as Hereditary Angioedema Awareness Day.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PATRICK T. McHENRY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Speaker, due to the unforeseen circumstances, I was unable to cast

my votes for H.R. 5863 or H.R. 3019. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 219 and YEA on Roll Call No. 220.

RECOGNIZING BECKY ARBAUGH'S
BRAVERY AND HEROISM

HON. BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the remarkable actions of a constituent in my district, Becky Arbaugh. Becky is a dedicated manager at a Taco Bell in Richboro where on the afternoon of April 13th this year she demonstrated unparalleled courage and quick thinking, saving the life of an eleven-week-old baby in a moment of crisis.

It was an ordinary day at 4:45 PM, at the Taco Bell where Becky works, until an extraordinary event unfolded. A frantic scene emerged as screams were heard outside of the drive through window from mother, Natasha. Baby Myles Long suddenly stopped breathing. Without hesitation, Becky sprang into action upon realizing how dire the situation was. In those crucial moments, Becky's actions proved to be the difference between life and death. Becky began performing CPR on Myles, working tirelessly to revive the infant. Becky's own daughter had faced a similar life-threatening situation in the past. Drawing from the lessons learned during her daughter's ordeal, Becky approached the situation with a unique blend of empathy, experience, and unwavering determination.

As the ambulance arrived and whisked the baby away to receive further medical attention, Becky's actions stood as a testament to the power of compassion and selflessness. Her bravery serves as an inspiration to us all, reminding us of the impact that one individual can make in the lives of others.

Becky Arbaugh's actions that day are a beacon of hope, embodying the true spirit of heroism. Today, we honor Becky and extend our heartfelt gratitude for her unwavering commitment to the well-being of others.

HONORING HEIMAN CHEIM

HON. DOUG LAMALFA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and career of respected businessman and lifelong Yuba-Sutter resident, Heiman Cheim who passed away at the age of 86 years old.

Heiman was born on May 27, 1937, in Sacramento, California, to parents Harry and Lea. Heiman's Yuba-Sutter family roots run deep, as his maternal great-grandfather William G. Murphy was a member of the 1846 Donner Party. His father's side immigrated to Marysville in the mid-1800s from Germany.

Heiman attended Marysville High School, where he was active in sports and played the trombone. After graduation in 1954, he would first attend Menlo College in Palo Alto, CA, and was later recruited to play football at Westminster University in Salt Lake City, UT.

While at Westminster, he would meet his wife, Kaye, who he would marry in 1958. They would go on to have five children, along with many pets and countless family memories.

Heiman spent much of his early adulthood working with his father and uncles at the Union Lumber Company and Cheim Ranch. Heiman would eventually buy the company from his uncles and continue the family-owned legacy with his son, Harry. Heiman was a hard worker, his 64-year career was a testament to his tireless work ethic, and his deep connection with the community.

Heiman had an endless appetite for life, which included trips around the country and learning to ride a Harley-Davidson. His favorite place to be with family was Jackson Hole, Wyoming; together they would: flyfish, ski, track down bear jams, and enjoy our country's National Parks. After his wife passed away in 2004, it was imperative to carry on that tradition and make every holiday and birthday special. He shared many of these moments with his companion of twenty years, Donna.

Heiman is survived by his children, Heidi, Lorie, Harry, Charlotte, and Alison; twelve beloved grandchildren and one great grandchild. He is also survived by Donna Helms, along with many extended family and friends. His humor, generosity, drive, and joy in life inspired everyone around him. He will be deeply missed by all who knew him. May he rest in peace.

RECOGNIZING DENISE SMITH FOR RECEIVING THE CARL E. WEHDE AWARD

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Denise Smith for receiving the esteemed Carl E. Wehde Award. This award, presented in memory of the late Mayor Carl E. Wehde, acknowledges individuals who embody the spirit of service, leadership, and dedication to improving the quality of life in the greater Crystal Lake area.

As the organization chair for the Downtown Crystal Lake Association, Denise plays a vital role in promoting the city's downtown area. She is also an active volunteer with numerous local charities, including St. Thomas Catholic Church, the Jake Keitner Memorial Blood Drive, the Family Health Partnership Clinic, and Girls on the Run.

Denise's passion for community involvement extends to her coordination of four premier races in the area. Three of these races, the Crystal Lake Aquathon, Crystal Lake Half Marathon, and McHenry County Santa Run, are dedicated to supporting charitable causes. The McHenry County Patriot Run benefits Veterans Path to Hope and the Veterans Assistance Commission.

In addition to her community service, Denise is an adjunct instructor at McHenry County College in the Physical Therapist and Assistant Program. She also owns a business in Crystal Lake, which she established in 2015 with the support of the Crystal Lake Chamber of Commerce, the Downtown Crystal Lake Association, and the broader community.

Denise's commitment to her community extends to her role as a recently elected rep-

resentative on the Crystal Lake City Council. She is also a graduate of the Leadership Greater McHenry County organization, demonstrating her dedication to the region's well-being.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent the community of Crystal Lake and I ask my colleagues to join me in acknowledging Denise Smith for her selfless service to the Crystal Lake community.

RECOGNIZING THE RETIREMENT OF CHEF SILVANA SALCIDO ESPARZA

HON. RUBEN GALLEGO

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Chef Silvana Salcido Esparza's retirement and all her accomplishments. Since opening Barrio Café, she has been featured in *Sunset Magazine*, *Esquire Magazine*, and *Food Network's Diners, Drive-Ins and Dives*, and has been a finalist for the James Beard Award several times. Throughout the years, Chef Silvana has shared her expertise, mentoring the next generation of chefs and small business owners. Inducted into the Arizona Culinary Hall of Fame, Chef Silvana has left her indelible mark on the Phoenix food scene.

Chef Silvana is a community leader and civil rights advocate in her own right. She has tirelessly advocated for the rights of all in Arizona and against abusive and discriminatory legislation like SB1070. Chef Silvana cooked and distributed food to those in need during the COVID-19 pandemic. Her leadership and vision have transformed a stretch of 16th Street into 'Calle 16,' a hub for local economic development, flourishing with Mexican art, murals, culture, and food.

Since 2002, Barrio Café has been a Phoenix institution, serving world-renowned Mexican food—'comida chingona'—and promoting Mexican American arts and culture. Chef Silvana's story lives on with her autobiographical book, 'La Hija de la Chingada: Chronicles of a Mexican Chef in the U.S.A.' I am lucky to call Chef Silvana a friend, and I wish her all the best in her future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING SCHARMEL ROUSSEL

HON. J. FRENCH HILL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Scharmel Roussel.

In 2009, Ms. Roussel became a founding member of Arkansas Affiliate of Interfaith Power and Light which fights to protect the Earth and our environment.

In March of 2024, Roussel received the Peace Activist of the Year award from the Arkansas Coalition for Peace and Justice.

Roussel's dedication to environmentalism has earned her several grants, including such from the EPA and the USDA.

Scharmel Roussel is more than deserving of this award, and I thank her for her important

work to help preserve the world's ecosystems through faith.

HONORING PASTOR EUGENE ROBERSON ON THE OCCASION OF HIS 30TH PASTORAL ANNIVERSARY

HON. BRADLEY SCOTT SCHNEIDER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and honor Pastor Eugene Roberson, an esteemed leader and dear friend in our community as he marks his 30th pastoral anniversary at First Corinthian Missionary Baptist Church in North Chicago. In 1994, First Corinthian named Pastor Roberson as the Shepherd of their congregation, beginning a tremendous period of growth in faith and service to our community. Thirty years on, I am proud to formally recognize his service and dedication to his congregation, a truly remarkable achievement.

Pastor Roberson's faith journey began in his home state of Mississippi, where he was the fourth of ten children born to John and Lula Roberson in Tutwiler. Educated in Clarksdale, Mississippi, Pastor Roberson earned his B.A. in Social Studies from Jackson State University. He entered into the ministry in 1979 where he ascended in service to his faith from Deacon to Assistant Pastor to the late Pastor Peter Goudeaux, Jr., and ultimately becoming his successor.

I have the privilege of knowing Pastor Roberson as a friend, community leader, man of faith and servant of the community. His passion and leadership are consistently a source of inspiration for me and countless others. I am grateful to have joined Pastor Roberson and his congregation on many occasions. During each visit, I feel at home and leave with a renewed feeling of hope and determination.

Pastor Roberson's work extends well beyond the doors of his church. Through his work on the Lake County Commission on Government Reform and Accountability, the Workforce Development Board, and twice as the elected President of the North Shore Baptist Ministers Alliance, he has had great impact lifting up the lives of Lake County residents.

Pastor Roberson is a regular fixture at service initiatives that make our community stronger, such as back to school giveaways, annual Christmas food basket giveaways, weekly soup kitchens and assisting families in crisis.

Pastor Roberson also holds the honor of being a guest chaplain for the House of Representatives, opening a session of Congress on October 24, 2001.

Under Pastor Roberson's leadership the congregation at First Corinthian has built a strong and resilient community that has touched the lives of people throughout North Chicago and Illinois's Tenth District. Setting an example for many to follow, and I am honored to be his representative in Congress.

Congratulations once again to Pastor Eugene Roberson, his remarkable wife, Sis. Geraldine Roberson, and his entire family. I am deeply honored to congratulate him and First Corinthian Missionary Baptist Church on their 30th pastoral anniversary, and I wish him only

great success in his future. I look forward to sharing the Journey with him.

HONORING THE LIFE OF
SERGEANT JESSE CLAY, JR.

HON. RANDY K. WEBER, SR.

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of an extraordinary Texan, Sergeant Jesse Clay, Jr., who recently passed away. Born on September 16, 1929, in Kirbyville, Texas, Jesse exemplified dedication and bravery. Mr. Clay was a devout and dedicated member of the Mt. Carmel Baptist Church in Dickinson. He was baptized there and served throughout his life as an usher and member of the male chorus.

In 1952, he enlisted in the United States Army, and on June 14, 1953, during the Korean War, he was wounded under intense artillery fire. For his bravery, Jesse was awarded the prestigious Purple Heart Medal.

Despite his injury, Jesse's commitment to our Nation didn't end there. He reenlisted, serving another two years with distinction before being honorably discharged again in 1955. His dedication to duty and country is a shining example of the American spirit.

After his military service, Jesse continued to contribute to his community. He worked at Gay Pontiac, McRee Ford, and retired from NASA Clay Holt and Dickinson I.S.D. after 30 years of service. His meticulous care for the Dickinson High School football field was well-known around town, and his efforts ensured that the field was always in pristine condition.

Jesse's legacy is one of service, dedication, and community. His story is a powerful reminder of the sacrifices made by our veterans and the enduring impact of their service.

Sergeant Jesse Clay, Jr.'s life and service to our country will never be forgotten.

HONORING GARY GREEN

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Gary Green, a long-time constituent of Palm Beach County, for being inducted into California's Music Hall of Fame and Museum. Mr. Green, known as the "Outlaw Folksinger" created music with an important message.

Mr. Green's artistry in lyrics served as a rallying cry for social change and inspired a generation of writers to utilize music as a tool for organizing and activism. Mr. Green's albums are a part of the Smithsonian Institution's Folkways Collection. His musical significance and impact as a musician were recognized when the late Pete Seegar said, "There should be a ballad of Gary Green." In turmoil times, where speaking out on social issues was frowned upon, Mr. Green continued to press forward. He is a true trailblazer, performing music of inclusive and transformative lyrics, at civil rights, labor, anti-war, and LGBTQ+ movements.

I am honored to congratulate Mr. Green for his successful contributions to both the art and

social movements. I am confident that he will continue his life path of exceptional work.

HONORING DENTON COUNTY
CHAMBERS WASHINGTON, D.C.
FLY IN

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the members of the Denton County leadership delegation who are visiting Washington, D.C. this week. The Denton County Chambers come to visit every two years, and I am once again honored to host them this year.

I value these trips as they give our local leaders an insight and first-hand experience of what's happening here on the Hill. Legislation that we work on highly affects our communities back home. I am pleased to offer this opportunity and welcome the members of the Denton County Chambers to our Nation's Capitol.

I would like to thank them for their continued collaboration with my office in ensuring the economic prosperity of Denton County, making Texas the best place to live, work, and raise a family.

I would like to include in the RECORD the following names of the Denton County delegation:

Lisa Carignan, Doug Carignan, Erin Carter, Lori Fickling, Nina Hernandez, Kelly Heslep, Cindi Howard, Jon Kixmiller, William Meredith, Jim Moll, Kelly Murray, Scott Murray, Claire Powell, Sally Quezada, Ingrid Rex, Ryan Schroer, Kristi Tucker, Elliott Tucker, Ben Utley, Lori Walker, Neal Walker, and Charlotte Wilcox.

RECOGNIZING BERNIE RICKE

HON. RASHIDA TLAIB

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, today I want to recognize Bernie Ricke, former president of UAW Local 600, based in Dearborn, Michigan, for his hard work on behalf of workers across Southeast Michigan.

Mr. Ricke joined UAW Local 600 as a member in 1973 when he was hired at Ford Motor Company's Detroit Parts Distribution Center. He rose through the ranks of the union's leadership, serving in many roles including Financial Secretary, Bargaining Committee-person, and Vice President before holding the role of President from 2009 until 2023. Mr. Ricke played a key role in negotiating national labor contracts for Ford laborers over the past twenty years, amassing gains for workers and keeping jobs from being eliminated. He drew experience from his start as an hourly worker while keeping an eye towards the future to lead with compassion and advocate for the workers' best interests.

Please join me in recognizing the numerous and remarkable contributions of Mr. Bernie Ricke to Southeast Michigan, and Michigan's 12th Congressional District.

HONORING DR. SAM HILL AND
MRS. LILLIAN HILL

HON. ABIGAIL DAVIS SPANBERGER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Sam Hill and Mrs. Lillian Hill for their lifetime of service to their community.

Throughout their lives, Dr. and Mrs. Hill have dedicated their time and energy to serving their community. Throughout their career in the field of education—Dr. Hill as the provost of Northern Virginia Community College and Mrs. Hill teaching students who are deaf and hard of hearing—they continuously provided students with guidance and instruction that prepared them for their next steps. Along the way, they have also volunteered with countless local organizations, donated their expertise and time as board members of various organizations, and have been involved with the Hylton Performing Arts Center since its inception. Their commitment to service is clear and worthy of recognition.

Their devotion to the betterment of their community, and the selfless mentality they bring to their volunteer work, serves as a shining example that we all can strive to follow. To pay tribute to Dr. and Mrs. Hill for their years of dedicated service, the Hylton Performing Arts Center honored them both at their 14th Anniversary Gala. It is my pleasure to congratulate Dr. and Mrs. Hill on this well-deserved recognition of their legacy of public service and commitment to education in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in celebrating and thanking Dr. Sam Hill and Mrs. Lillian Hill. Their contributions to the Commonwealth of Virginia will continue to uplift our neighbors for generations to come and I look forward to celebrating their continued success.

RECOGNIZING THE MINNESOTA
STATE UNIVERSITY MANKATO
MAVERICKS

HON. BRAD FINSTAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

Mr. FINSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize this year's NCAA Division Two Men's and Women's Basketball Champions: the Minnesota State University Mankato Mavericks.

Both Mankato's men's team and women's team took home this year's championship trophy—making the Mavericks the first school in forty years to win a double national championship. In fact, it's only the third time in history that any school won both the men's and women's championships in the same season.

Under the leadership of Coach Matt Mergenthaler, Mankato's men's team earned their first national title by defeating Nova Southeastern 88 to 85, finishing with a 35 and 2 record, while Coach Emilee Thiesse's women's team defeated Texas Woman's University 89 to 73, securing their second-ever national title and ending the season with a record of 32 to 5.

Thanks to the tireless leadership and encouragement from the teams' coaches, staff, families, classmates, and community—these talented young men and women earned a state championship title and all of us across southern Minnesota are incredibly proud to call them our own.

Congratulations to the Mavericks on an unbelievable season.

SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF LORAIN COUNTY'S BICENTENNIAL

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the Bicentennial of Lorain County, Ohio. The perseverance of pioneers and settlers to overcome the challenges faced during the early years of the county's history has persisted throughout the past 200 years. The hard work and spirit shown by generations of county residents have made Lorain County an outstanding example of American ingenuity.

In 1822, the Ohio Legislature enacted legislation creating Lorain County; however, the county became judicially independent in 1824. The original proposed name for the county was "Colerain", but the final name "Lorain" was chosen by Heman Ely, who had previously founded and named the City of Elyria. The county's name is based on the former German and now French province of Lorraine and encompasses roughly 923 square miles. The county is an asset to the great State of Ohio through its many contributions in the fields of manufacturing and agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, by remembering the 200th Anniversary of Lorain County, community members recognize the outstanding achievements, maintain the pioneer attitude, and strive to better their county through the principles on which it was founded. Thank you and congratulations to Lorain County on this significant milestone.

HONORING PRESTON SHARP

HON. DOUG LaMALFA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

Mr. LaMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a very special young man, Preston Sharp, for his passion, commitment, and accomplishments in honoring our nation's veterans.

Preston is a resident of Shasta County, a loving son, and grandson with a heart of gold. His hard work and devotion to honor veterans in his own community and our country will be felt for generations.

On Veterans Day in 2015, when Preston was just 10 years old, he visited the grave of his grandfather, a Navy veteran, at a local Redding cemetery. He placed a flag and flowers on his grandfather's headstone to thank him for his sacrifice. As he looked around, he was troubled by the lack of flags and flowers at the gravesites of all the other veterans. With encouragement from his loving mother and grandmother, Preston used that compas-

sion to make a positive change in the world. He set a goal, and in just 5 months, by doing odd jobs and chores, he had earned enough to purchase flags and carnations to honor all 500 veterans in that cemetery in Redding, California. This gratifying success prompted him to set another goal, to honor veterans in all the Redding cemeteries. He began speaking at local groups and organizations who enthusiastically donated to his worthy objective, seeing in this young boy with a passion to honor and appreciate those who served. Soon, Preston was honoring veterans in cemeteries all around our North State, throughout California, and beyond.

Preston has organized the placement of more than one million flags and red carnations on veterans' headstones throughout the homeland. His crusades have inspired citizens in communities across the United States to participate in similar acts of patriotism and respect for veterans by coming out to clean headstones, replace weathered flags and flowers, and say "Thank You" to those that have served our country.

Preston does not just honor our fallen veterans. He often visits veterans at the local veteran's home or takes them out to lunch and enjoys listening to their stories. His goal is clearly to honor and help all veterans in any way possible, as evidenced by his current initiative, to help prevent and spread awareness of veteran suicides, which has become a top priority.

Preston's contagious ambition has spurred him to start other movements like the Flag and Flower Challenge to encourage everyone in the United States, especially youth, to honor veterans in their own hometowns. He also established Veterans Flags and Flowers, a non-profit organization with a vision to "honor veterans across the country" and a mission to "honor veterans every day, not just the holiday". As a teen member of the Sons of the American Legion, Preston helped inspire the Flying Flags for Heroes program and became their national spokesperson.

Preston was invited to the White House and was honored with a seat beside the First Lady during President Trump's inspirational State of the Union Address in 2018. President Trump commended 12-year-old Preston Sharp for "a job well-done" and praised young patriots like Preston who teach all of us about our civic duties as Americans.

Preston has been recognized and is supported by nearly every local club, organization, school, and business in northern California. He has been an honored guest, speaker and advocate at countless events, services, and fundraisers. He has been featured on the History Channel and highlighted social studies curriculum such as Inspire My Kids. He continues to collect accolades around the country for his work such as being awarded the title of Legacy Keeper by the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs and is allied with the Wreaths Across America program.

Preston's goal was to honor veterans in all 50 States which sent him travelling across the country, meeting veterans, visiting cemeteries, inspiring communities, and sharing the experience of planting flags and flowers along the way. Despite setbacks during the COVID-19 shutdowns, on Veterans Day, November 11, 2022, Preston Sharp officially met his goal by presenting flags and flowers in honor of veterans in all 50 of our U.S. states. Quite a celebrated accomplishment.

Preston is now planning on taking his cause overseas to Normandy for the 80th anniversary of D-Day. He will be placing 17,000 American flags and red carnation flowers at every gravestone, saying each veteran's name out loud, and thanking them for their service.

This young man reminds us that we all have a sacred duty to honor and remember those who served and sacrificed for our nation, no matter how old we are.

INTRODUCTION OF THE HOUSEHOLD GOODS SHIPPING CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce the Household Goods Shipping Consumer Protection Act. This bill would give the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) more authority to protect consumers from fraud in the interstate transportation of household goods. Specifically, this bill would give FMCSA the authority to assess civil penalties against unregistered shippers and against entities that hold consumers' personal goods hostage, give FMCSA the express authority to reimburse states for enforcing federal consumer protection laws related to the transportation of household goods and establish requirements to ensure that motor carriers, brokers and freight forwarders that seek registration are operating legitimate businesses. Representative MIKE EZELL is co-leading this bill with me.

FMCSA receives thousands of complaints every year from Americans who are the victims of fraud in the shipment of household goods. Fraudsters have launched moving companies with fake 5-star online reviews to draw in customers, intending to overcharge customers or to hold their personal goods hostage until an additional fee is paid. After receiving negative reviews, fraudsters open a new moving company under a new name and a new FMCSA license. FMCSA lacks the authority to prevent and punish these types of fraud.

In 2019, a Department of Transportation Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) ruled that FMCSA lacks authority to assess civil penalties for violations of commercial regulations and registration requirements, including unauthorized brokerage and for failure to return household goods to consumers. Under current law, as interpreted by the ALJ's decision and final agency order, FMCSA may not assess civil penalties for violations of commercial regulations. Instead, the Department of Justice must initiate an action in federal court. This bill would reverse the ALJ's decision and provide explicit authority for FMCSA to adjudicate and assess civil penalties for unfair business practices and consumer protection violations, as well as give FMCSA authority to enforce roadway safety regulations against fraudsters.

This bill would also provide explicit authority to FMCSA to withhold registration from any applicant that fails to provide a valid principal place of business or disclose common ownership with any other registered entities at the time of registration. Household goods carriers, brokers and freight forwarders have registered

with addresses where no legitimate operations take place, often designating their official address as a retail package store, vacant parking lot or business address unrelated to the registered entity. FMCSA already requires motor carriers to designate a principal place of business and disclose common ownership. However, FMCSA may only take enforcement action after the entity is already registered and refuses to cooperate with investigations at the designated address.

This bill would also permit states to use Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program and High Priority program funding to conduct commercial regulatory and consumer protection standard reviews and enforcement actions against household goods motor carriers, brokers and freight forwarders. It would also clarify that states may retain the penalties and fines imposed in proceedings relating to violations of household goods statutes and regulations. These provisions would support states in their efforts to protect the American people from predatory practices.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I had to miss yesterday's vote due to being stuck in traffic. During that time, I was unable to make Roll Call vote No. 219. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner: YEA on Roll Call No. 219, On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended, the Federal Disaster Tax Relief Act.

HONORING THE LIFE OF KEN AXELSON

HON. BRAD FINSTAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

Mr. FINSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Ken Axelson; a World War II veteran and cherished member of the Wanamingo community, who passed away on April 11th, just a week after celebrating his 100th birthday.

Ken graduated from Red Wing High School in 1943, and afterwards—like many in the Greatest Generation—he answered the call to serve his country.

As a combat medic for the U.S. Army, Ken landed on Omaha Beach on D-Day, and was later transferred to the 101st Airborne Division. During the Siege of Bastogne, he and his unit were held captive by German forces for five months before they were liberated by U.S. troops.

When he returned home from the war, Ken married his wife, Billie, and raised their six children in Wanamingo, where Ken was active in the community, working as a carpenter, building inspector, and photographer.

When he wasn't doing what he loved—spending time outdoors—Ken was giving back to those around him. He served on the Wanamingo City Council, while also giving his

time to the volunteer fire department and the Wanamingo VFW.

Ken was a true embodiment of who we are in southern Minnesota. He served his country, put his family first, and was never too busy to lend a hand to a fellow neighbor.

He leaves behind a legacy that will long be remembered. May he rest in peace.

CELEBRATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF NAPERVILLE FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Naperville Fire Department as they mark 150 years of dedicated service across the Naperville community. With more than 200 employees, ten active fire stations, and six consecutive years of international accreditation, the department is an outstanding model of excellence in its field.

Established in 1874 after Naperville's first purchase of firefighting equipment, the department has pursued its mission of responding to calls and promoting public education programs. Over the years, the Naperville Fire Department has evolved to meet the changing needs of the community, adopting new technologies and techniques to ensure the highest level of safety and protection for its residents.

The Naperville Fire Department has played a crucial role in educating the public about fire safety and prevention. Through its various outreach programs and initiatives, the department has empowered residents with the knowledge and skills needed to protect themselves and their families in the event of a fire. This commitment to public education is vital and has undoubtedly saved countless lives over the years.

As we celebrate the Naperville Fire Department's 150th anniversary, let us take a moment to recognize and appreciate the tireless efforts of its employees. Their dedication to the community is truly inspiring, and we are grateful for their unwavering commitment to keeping us safe.

I am proud to represent such a distinguished department, and I ask my colleagues to join me in commending the Naperville Fire Department for its outstanding service and dedication to the community in their remarkable 150 years of service.

RECOGNIZING DARREN CORSON'S RETIREMENT AFTER 40 YEARS OF SERVICE WITH THE IRS

HON. BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a notable constituent from my district, Mr. Darren Corson of Newtown, Pennsylvania who is retiring after over 40 years of dedicated service as a Public Servant.

Darren graduated from Temple University with a bachelor's degree in accounting. After graduation, Darren made the decision to de-

vote his career to public service and joined the Department of Treasury's Internal Revenue Service (IRS) where he remained for over 40 years.

During his career, Darren spent time working in many parts of the IRS, including Criminal Investigations Division, Exam, and Problem Resolution. In 2000, Darren joined the Taxpayer Advocate Service after Congress ordered the creation of a Taxpayer Advocate as an independent organization within the IRS.

Since then, he has worked tirelessly to advocate for the rights of taxpayers facing individual and systemic issues. However, after forty years of dedicated government service and leadership, Darren is retiring.

Today, I am proud to recognize Darren Corson as an individual who has devoted his career to public service in an organization that impacts all Americans across the country. We are incredibly grateful for the impact Darren Corson has made throughout his long career at the Internal Revenue Service. As an avid sports fan, he will enjoy spending more time rooting for the Phillies.

We are all incredibly grateful for the positive impact Darren has had through his long career, and we wish him countless blessings during his retirement.

CONGRATULATING PRESIDENT LAI CHING-TE

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the American people extend congratulations to the Honorable Lai Ching-te on being sworn in as President of Taiwan on Monday, May 20, 2024. His successful 28-year career in politics as Vice President and Premier under President Tsai Ing-wen, Chairman of the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP), 1st Mayor of Tainan, and Member of the Legislative Yuan demonstrates his ability to be a strong leader for the people of Taiwan.

Additionally, the vibrant democracy of the Republic of China (Taiwan) has elected Hsiao Bi-Khim as Vice President. During her four terms in the Legislative Yuan, she focused on agriculture and transportation in her district of Hualien, along with championing issues such as gender equality, foreign affairs, and human rights.

My appreciation of the people of Chinese heritage is personal as I am the only member of Congress serving as the son of a Flying Tiger in World War II to liberate China. My father, First Lieutenant Hugh deVeaux Wilson with the U.S. Army Air Corps developed a great affection for the people of China.

Lai Ching-te's presidency extends the rule of the DPP, which China views with skepticism, as the party promotes Taiwanese nationalism and identity, and supports the people of Taiwan's right to decide their own future.

Taiwan continues to face rising threats from China, as almost daily, military warplanes and vessels are sent toward them, many of which crossing the median line in the Taiwan Strait. Sadly, incursions into Taiwan's air defense zone nearly doubled in 2022 and continued at a high pace in 2023 with 1,738 incursions. In December of 2022, 71 Chinese aircraft flew

into Taiwanese airspace, the largest breach in history. On May 15, 2024, Taiwan's National Defense Ministry reported 45 Chinese military aircraft around the island, in just one day. With these growing tensions, the pressure on President Lai to balance security risks with promises of protecting the independence of Taiwan are high.

Though the United States does not have official relations with Taiwan, the people of Taiwan have our unwavering support. We remain the island's most significant arms supplier and international backer, having approved over \$8 billion in military aid last month in the National Security Supplemental Aid Package to support Taiwan and other key allies in the Indo-Pacific confronting Chinese aggression.

President Lai's priorities for Taiwan align with his predecessor Tsai Ing-wen, with plans to boost defenses, including increasing military budgets, improving its military force structure, and concentrating on economical mobile weapons systems and more vigorous civil defense. Domestic reform is one of his top priorities, including social spending for the improvement of national health insurance and re-directing economic policy from motives for certain industries to developing more service sector jobs and encouraging domestic consumption.

Lai has retained the majority of the Tsai team, including her foreign minister, Joseph Wu, who now leads his National Security Council, and former NSC head Wellington Koo, who now is the defense minister. He also recruited several private-sector executives for his cabinet, prominently JW Kuo, chair of Topco. Along with the Lai administration, I look forward to working with Taiwan's ambassador to the U.S., Ambassador Alexander Yui.

The inauguration of President Lai Ching-te at the presidential office building in central Taipei featured an overwhelming amount of sup-

port for him, as crowds, including a show of marching bands and performers, gathered in a nearby plaza to show their support and listen to his inauguration speech. A bipartisan delegation of former senior U.S. officials, including former Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage, also attended the inauguration.

Sadly, we are in a war we did not choose, between dictators with Rule of Gun invading democracies with Rule of Law. We must stand firm to protect the borders of Taiwan, Ukraine, Israel, and the United States.

I am confident in the leadership of President Lai Ching-te as Taiwan continues to face adversities to keep their allies who acknowledge them as a sovereign nation, amidst pressure from the Chinese Communist Party.

I look forward to working with President Lai Ching-te on achieving Peace Through Strength, advancing our shared interests, strengthening our longstanding informal relationship, and maintaining stability across the Taiwan Strait.

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, May 23, 2024 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 29

2 p.m. Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe
To receive a briefing on Ukrainian culture in wartime. RHOB-2359

JUNE 4

2 p.m. Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe
To hold hearings to examine supporting Georgia's sovereignty and democracy. TBA

JUNE 5

10 a.m. Committee on Environment and Public Works
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the budget of the Federal Highway Administration. SD-406

JUNE 12

10 a.m. Committee on Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2025 for the Fish and Wildlife Service. SD-406

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S3819–S3859

Measures Introduced: Ten bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 4385–4394, and S. Res. 701. **Page S3855**

Measures Reported:

H.R. 4688, to direct the Administrator of General Services to sell the property known as the Webster School, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

S. 3564, to amend title 40, United States Code, to include Indian Tribes among entities that may receive Federal surplus real property for certain purposes.

S. 3880, to amend the Federal Assets Sale and Transfer Act of 2016 to make improvements to that Act, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

S. 4359, to amend the National Dam Safety Program Act to reauthorize that Act.

S. 4367, to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S3854–55**

Measures Passed:

National Public Works Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 701, designating the week of May 19 through May 25, 2024, as “National Public Works Week”. **Page S3858**

Measures Considered:

Border Act: Senate continued consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 4361, making emergency supplemental appropriations for border security and combatting fentanyl for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024. **Page S3819**

Dalton Nomination—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Melissa Griffin Dalton, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force. **Pages S3838–48**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 56 yeas to 38 nays (Vote No. EX. 180), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S3838**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the confirmation vote on the nomination occur at 11 a.m., on Thursday, May 23, 2024; and that the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 4361, making emergency supplemental appropriations for border security and combatting fentanyl for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, ripen at 2 p.m., on Thursday, May 23, 2024. **Page S3858**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the nomination, post-cloture, at approximately 10 a.m., on Thursday, May 23, 2024. **Page S3858**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 66 yeas to 28 nays (Vote No. EX. 177), Angela M. Martinez, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona. **Pages S3822–25, S3859**

By 50 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. EX. 179), Dena M. Coggins, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of California. **Pages S3826–38, S3859**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 50 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. EX. 178), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Pages S3825–26**

Messages from the House: **Page S3849**

Measures Referred: **Page S3849**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Pages S3819, S3849**

Executive Communications: **Pages S3849–54**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S3855–57**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Page S3857**

Additional Statements: **Pages S3848–49**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S3857–58**

Privileges of the Floor: Page S3858

Record Votes: Four record votes were taken today. (Total—180) Pages S3825–26, S3837–38

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:47 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, May 23, 2024. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S3859.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: DOE AND NNSA

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2025 for the Department of Energy, including the National Nuclear Security Administration, after receiving testimony from Jennifer M. Granholm, Secretary, and Jill Hruby, Under Secretary, National Nuclear Security Administration, both of the Department of Energy.

APPROPRIATIONS: SAA AND USCP

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, concluded hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2025 for the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate and the United States Capitol Police, after receiving testimony from Karen H. Gibson, Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate; and J. Thomas Manger, Chief, United States Capitol Police.

DOE ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES AND DOD NUCLEAR WEAPONS PROGRAMS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces concluded a hearing to examine the Department of Energy’s atomic energy defense activities and Department of Defense nuclear weapons programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for Fiscal Year 2025 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from Jill Hruby, Under Secretary for Nuclear Security, Admiral William Houston, USN, Deputy Administrator for Naval Reactors, and Marvin L. Adams, Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs, all of the National Nuclear Security Administration, and William White, Senior Advisor for the Office of Environmental Management, all of the Department of Energy; and General Thomas A. Bussiere, USAF, Commander, Air Force Global Strike Command, and Vice Admiral Johnny Wolfe, USN, Director, Strategic Systems Programs, both of the Department of Defense.

PROTECTING CONSUMERS’ POCKETBOOKS

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on Economic Policy concluded a hearing to examine protecting consumers’ pocketbooks, focusing on lowering food prices and combatting corporate price gouging and consolidation, including S.3803, to make price gouging unlawful, to expand the ability of the Federal Trade Commission to seek permanent injunctions and equitable relief, and S.3819, to direct the Federal Trade Commission to issue regulations to establish shrinkflation as an unfair or deceptive act or practice, after receiving testimony from Lindsay Owens, Groundwork Collaborative, E.J. Antoni, The Heritage Foundation, and Norbert J. Michel, Cato Institute Center for Monetary and Financial Alternatives, all of Washington, D.C.; Joe Maxwell, Farm Action, Mexico, Missouri; and Alap Vora, Concord Market, New York, New York, on behalf of Small Business Majority.

WATER SCARCITY

Committee on the Budget: Committee concluded a hearing to examine water scarcity in a changing climate, after receiving testimony from Tanya Trujillo, Water Policy Advisor and New Mexico Deputy State Engineer, Santa Fe; Adel Hagekhalil, The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, Fullerton; Kevin Richards, RB Ag, Madras, Oregon; Mike Castellano, Iowa State University, Ames; and Roger Pielke Jr., University of Colorado College of Arts and Sciences, Boulder.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee ordered favorably reported the following bills:

S. 4367, to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 4359, to amend the National Dam Safety Program Act to reauthorize that Act;

S. 3564, to amend title 40, United States Code, to include Indian Tribes among entities that may receive Federal surplus real property for certain purposes;

S. 3880, to amend the Federal Assets Sale and Transfer Act of 2016 to make improvements to that Act, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 4293, to designate the United States courthouse annex located at 310 South Main Street in London, Kentucky, as the “Eugene E. Siler, Jr. United States Courthouse Annex”; and

H.R. 4688, to direct the Administrator of General Services to sell the property known as the Webster

School, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

REUSE AND RECYCLING

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Federal programs for the circular economy, focusing on state and local perspectives on efforts to improve reuse and recycling, after receiving testimony from Elizabeth S. Biser, North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality, Raleigh; Susan Fife-Ferris, Seattle Public Utilities, Seattle, Washington; and Cody Marshall, The Recycling Partnership, Washington, D.C.

FAMILY FIRST PREVENTION SERVICES ACT

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Family First Prevention Services Act, focusing on successes, roadblocks, and opportunities for improvement, after receiving testimony from Rebecca Jones Gaston, Commissioner, Administration on Children, Youth and Families, Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services; David Reed, Indiana Department of Child Services, Indianapolis; JooYeun Chang, Doris Duke Foundation, New York, New York; and Laurie Tapozada, Cranston, Rhode Island.

EMERGENCY POWERS OVERSIGHT

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine restoring Congressional oversight over emergency powers, focusing on exploring options to reform the National Emergencies Act, after receiving testimony from Elizabeth Goitein, New York University School of Law Brennan Center for Justice, Satya Thallam, Foundation for American Innovation, and Gene Healy, Cato Institute, all of Washington, D.C.

MINING HEALTH AND SAFETY

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Subcommittee on Employment and Workplace Safety concluded a hearing to examine new standards and practices in mining, focusing on health and safety, after receiving testimony from Cindy Barnes, Managing Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security, Government Accountability Office; Drew Harris, University of Virginia, Charlottesville; Cecil E. Roberts, United Mine Workers of America, Triangle, Virginia; and Steven Schafrik, University of Kentucky, Lexington.

PUBLIC SAFETY AND JUSTICE RESOURCES

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine public safety and justice resources in Native communities, after receiving testimony from Bryan Newland, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Indian Affairs; Patrice H. Kunesh, Commissioner of the Administration for Native Americans, and Deputy Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services for Native Affairs, Administration for Children and Families; and Allison Randall, Principal Deputy Director, Office on Violence Against Women, Department of Justice.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Michelle Williams Court, Anne Hwang, and Cynthia Valenzuela Dixon, each to be a United States District Judge for the Central District of California, Sarah Netburn, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, and Stacey D. Neumann, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maine, who was introduced by Senator King, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 3772, to amend the Small Business Act to require that plain writing statements regarding the solicitation of subcontractors be included in certain subcontracting plans;

S. 3971, to amend the Small Business Act to require reporting on additional information with respect to small business concerns owned and controlled by women, qualified HUBZone small business concerns, and small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

H.R. 7987, to require plain language and the inclusion of key words in covered notices that are clear, concise, and accessible to small business concerns; and

An original bill entitled, “The STEP Modernization Act of 2024”.

BUSINESS MEETING

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee ordered favorably reported an original bill entitled, “Intelligence Authorization Act for FY2025”.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 27 public bills, H.R. 8489–8515; and 4 resolutions, H.J. Res. 152; and H. Res. 1250–1252, were introduced.

Pages H3483–84

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages H3485–86

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 7189, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a national congenital heart disease research, surveillance, and awareness program, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 118–517);

H.R. 7208, to reauthorize the Traumatic Brain Injury program, with an amendment (H. Rept. 118–518);

H.R. 7224, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Stop, Observe, Ask, and Respond to Health and Wellness Training Program (H. Rept. 118–519); and

H.R. 6829, to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize and support the creation and dissemination of cardiomyopathy education, awareness, and risk assessment materials and resources to identify more at-risk families, to authorize research and surveillance activities relating to cardiomyopathy, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 118–520).

Page H3482

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Edwards to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Page H3403

Recess: The House recessed at 11:27 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon.

Page H3412

Financial Innovation and Technology for the 21st Century Act: The House passed H.R. 4763, to provide for a system of regulation of digital assets by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission, by a recorded vote of 279 ayes to 136 noes, Roll No. 226.

Pages H3414–18, H3419–56, H3462–63

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118–33, modified by the amendment printed in part A of H. Rept. 118–516, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole, in lieu of the amendments in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committees on Agriculture and Financial Services now printed in the bill.

Pages H3432–58

Agreed to:

Pettersen amendment (No. 2 printed in part B of H. Rept. 118–516) that clarifies the application of the Bank Secrecy Act to digital asset and digital commodity entities and requires a GAO study on risks posed by centralized intermediaries that are primarily located in foreign jurisdictions without regulatory requirements similar to those of the Bank Secrecy Act;

Pages H3456–57

Norman amendment (No. 3 printed in part B of H. Rept. 118–516) that requires a study on the impact of digital asset registrants owned by foreign adversaries (by a recorded vote of 411 ayes with none voting “no”, Roll No. 224); and

Pages H3457–59, H3461–62

Perry amendment (No. 4 printed in part B of H. Rept. 118–516) that adds a sense of Congress to the end of title V that nothing in this Act or any amendment made by this Act should be interpreted to authorize any entity to regulate any commodity, other than a digital commodity, on any spot market (by a recorded vote of 225 ayes to 191 noes, Roll No. 225).

Pages H3459–60, H3462

Rejected:

Caesar amendment (No. 1 printed in part B of H. Rept. 118–516) that sought to change the new crowdfunding exemption from \$75 million to \$5 million (by a recorded vote of 204 ayes to 209 noes, Roll No. 223).

Pages H3460–61

H. Res. 1243, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 4763), (H.R. 5403), and (H.R. 192) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 204 ayes to 203 noes, Roll No. 222, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 205 yeas to 203 nays, Roll No. 221. During the course of debate on H. Res. 1243, exception was taken to certain words used and a demand was made to have the words taken down. After review, the Chair ruled that the words were in violation of the spirit of debate. Without objection the words were stricken from the Record.

Page H3417

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow, May 23rd.

Page H3463

Senate Referral: S.J. Res. 58 was held at the desk.

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page.

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and five recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H3418, H3418–19, H3460–61, H3461–62, H3462 and H3462–63.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:21 p.m.

Committee Meetings

NUTRITIOUS FOODS IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (SNAP)

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “Nutritious Foods in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs held a budget hearing on the Department of State. Testimony was heard from Antony Blinken, Secretary, Department of State.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 8070, the “Servicemember Quality of Life Improvement and National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2025”. H.R. 8070 was ordered reported, as amended.

BIG LABOR LIES: EXPOSING UNION TACTICS TO UNDERMINE FREE AND FAIR ELECTIONS

Committee on Education and Workforce: Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions held a hearing entitled “Big Labor Lies: Exposing Union Tactics to Undermine Free and Fair Elections”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Communications and Technology held a hearing on a Legislative Proposal to Sunset Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

CHECK UP: EXAMINING FDA REGULATION OF DRUGS, BIOLOGICS, AND DEVICES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled “Check Up: Examining FDA Regulation of Drugs, Biologics, and Devices”. Testimony was heard from the following Department of Health and Human Services officials: Patrizia Cavazzoni, M.D., Director, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, U.S. Food and Drug Administration; Peter Marks, M.D., Director, Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research, U.S. Food and

Drug Administration; and Jeff Shuren, M.D., Director, Center for Devices and Radiological Health, U.S. Food and Drug Administration.

GREEN BUILDING POLICIES: JEOPARDIZING THE AMERICAN DREAM OF HOMEOWNERSHIP

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy, Climate, and Grid Security held a hearing entitled “Green Building Policies: Jeopardizing the American Dream of Homeownership”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

PHA OVERSIGHT: HOW SCANDALS AND MISMANAGEMENT HARM RESIDENTS AND TAXPAYERS

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance held a hearing entitled “PHA Oversight: How Scandals and Mismanagement Harm Residents and Taxpayers”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 8437, to provide for congressional oversight of proposed changes to arms sales to Israel; H.R. 8315, to amend the Export Control Reform Act of 2018 to prevent foreign adversaries from exploiting United States artificial intelligence and other enabling technologies, and for other purposes; and H. Res. 616, expressing support for the people of Afghanistan, condemning the Taliban’s assault on human rights and the specific targeting of women, girls, and members of religious and ethnic minorities, and expressing support for any Afghans who assisted in the United States mission in Afghanistan. H.R. 8437, H.R. 8315, and H. Res. 616 were ordered reported, as amended.

THE STATE OF AMERICAN DIPLOMACY IN 2024: GLOBAL INSTABILITY, BUDGET CHALLENGES, AND GREAT POWER COMPETITION

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The State of American Diplomacy in 2024: Global Instability, Budget Challenges, and Great Power Competition”. Testimony was heard from Antony Blinken, Secretary, Department of State.

ADVANCING INNOVATION (AI): HARNESSING ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TO DEFEND AND SECURE THE HOMELAND

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Advancing Innovation (AI): Harnessing Artificial Intelligence to Defend and Secure

the Homeland”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

HEARING ON THE WEAPONIZATION OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Committee on the Judiciary: Select Subcommittee on the Weaponization of the Federal Government held a hearing entitled “Hearing on the Weaponization of the Federal Government”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 1398, the “Protect America’s Innovation and Economic Security from CCP Act”; H.R. 7909, the “Violence Against Women by Illegal Aliens Act”; and H.R. 8296, the “GAO Database Modernization Act”. H.R. 8296, H.R. 1398, H.R. 7909 were ordered reported, as amended.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water, Wildlife and Fisheries held a hearing on H.R. 7776, the “Help Hoover Dam Act”; H.R. 7872, the “Colorado River Salinity Control Fix Act”; H.R. 7938, the “Klamath Basin Water Agreement Support Act of 2024”; and H.R. 8263, the “Rural Jobs and Hydropower Expansion Act”. Testimony was heard from David Palumbo, Deputy Commissioner, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior; and public witnesses.

EXAMINING THE PRESIDENT’S FY 2025 BUDGET REQUEST FOR THE UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY AND THE OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing entitled “Examining the President’s FY 2025 Budget Request for the United States Geological Survey and the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement”. Testimony was heard from David Applegate, Director, U.S. Geological Survey, Department of the Interior; and Sharon Buccino, Principal Deputy Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior.

OVERSIGHT OF OUR NATION’S LARGEST EMPLOYER: REVIEWING THE U.S. OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT, PT. II

Committee on Oversight and Accountability: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Oversight of Our Nation’s Largest Employer: Reviewing the U.S. Office of Personnel Management, Pt. II”. Testimony was heard from Robert H. Shriver III, Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management.

A HEARING WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ALLERGY AND INFECTIOUS DISEASES SENIOR SCIENTIFIC ADVISOR, DR. DAVID MORENS

Committee on Oversight and Accountability: Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Pandemic held a hearing entitled “A Hearing with the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases Senior Scientific Advisor, Dr. David Morens”. Testimony was heard from David Morens, M.D., Senior Scientific Advisor, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services.

CHECK UP: EXAMINING FDA REGULATION OF DRUGS, BIOLOGICS, AND DEVICES

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Check Up: Examining FDA Regulation of Drugs, Biologics, and Devices”. Testimony was heard from Laurie Locascio, Under Secretary of Commerce for Standards and Technology, and Director, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce.

BURDENSOME REGULATIONS: EXAMINING THE BIDEN ADMINISTRATION’S FAILURE TO CONSIDER SMALL BUSINESSES

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Burdensome Regulations: Examining the Biden Administration’s Failure to Consider Small Businesses”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a business meeting on documents protected under Internal Revenue Code section 6103. The motion to submit materials to the U.S. House of Representatives documents protected under Internal Revenue Code Section 6103 was agreed to. Part of this meeting was closed.

Joint Meetings

BUSINESS MEETING

Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies—2024: Committee ordered favorably reported the designation of Senator Klobuchar as Chair, the designation of the 2025 Inaugural site, and approved the 2025 Inaugural budget.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 23, 2024

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2025 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and for the National Science Foundation, 9:30 a.m., SD-192.

Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2025 for the National Institutes of Health, 10 a.m., SD-124.

Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2025 for Indian Country, 10:30 a.m., SD-138.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine the front lines of the fentanyl crisis, focusing on supporting communities and combating addiction through prevention and treatment, 10 a.m., SD-215.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: business meeting to consider S. 3679, to reauthorize the Dr. Lorna Breen Health Care Provider Protection Act, S. 3765, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children program, S. 4351, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain poison control programs, S. 3775, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the BOLD Infrastructure for Alzheimer's Act, S. 4325, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the program relating to lifespan respite care, S. 3757, to reauthorize the congenital heart disease research, surveillance, and awareness program of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, S. 4045, to require a study on public health impacts as a consequence of the February 3, 2023, train derailment in East Palestine, Ohio, the nomination of Stephen H. Ravas, of Maryland, to be Inspector General, Corporation for National and Community Service, and other pending calendar business, 10 a.m., SD-430.

Special Committee on Aging: to hold hearings to examine the Older Americans Act, focusing on the local impact of the law and the upcoming reauthorization, 9:30 a.m., SD-106.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Full Committee, business meeting on legislation on the Farm, Food, and National Security Act of 2024, 11 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, markup on the Subcommittee on Legislative

Branch Appropriations Bill, FY 2025, 8:30 a.m., 2362-B Rayburn.

Full Committee, markup on the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2025, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Breaking Up Health Care Monopolies: Examining the Budgetary Effects of Health Care Consolidation", 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Education and Workforce, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Calling for Accountability: Stopping Antisemitic College Chaos", 9:45 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Innovation, Data, and Commerce, markup on legislation on the American Privacy Rights Act; H.R. 7891, the "Kids Online Safety Act"; and H.R. 8449, the "AM Radio for Every Vehicle Act", 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on the Middle East, North Africa, and Central Asia, hearing entitled "Fiscal Year 2025 Budget Request for Near Eastern Affairs", 10:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on House Administration, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 8281, the "Safeguard American Voter Eligibility Act"; H.R. 8399, the "Preventing Foreign Interference in American Elections Act"; H.R. 7640, the "No Foreign Persons Administering Our Elections Act"; H.R. 4544, the "No Federal Funds for Ballot Harvesting Act"; and H.R. 4317, to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require States to submit a report to the Election Assistance Commission that includes information with respect to the voter list maintenance activities of the State, and for other purposes, 10:30 a.m., 1310 Longworth.

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Oversight of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives", 10 a.m. 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, hearing entitled "Examining the President's FY 2025 Budget Request for the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement, and the Office of Natural Resources Revenue", 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Accountability, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Oversight of the Department of Energy", 9 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, hearing entitled "Review of Fiscal Year 2025 Maritime Transportation Budget Requests, Pt 2: The Coast Guard", 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled "on The Collapse of Private Practice: Examining the Challenges Facing Independent Medicine", 9 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Thursday, May 23

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Melissa Griffin Dalton, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force, post-cloture, and vote on confirmation thereon at 11 a.m.

At 2 p.m., Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 4361, Border Act.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, May 23

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 192—To prohibit individuals who are not citizens of the United States from voting in elections in the District of Columbia. Consideration of H.R. 5403—CBDC Anti-Surveillance State Act.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E545
 Burgess, Michael C., Tex., E548
 Connolly, Gerald E., Va., E546
 Fallon, Pat, Tex., E545
 Finstad, Brad, Minn., E548, E550
 Fitzpatrick, Brian K., Pa., E543, E544, E546, E550
 Foster, Bill, Ill., E543, E544, E547, E550
 Frankel, Lois, Fla., E548

Gallego, Ruben, Ariz., E547
 Graves, Garret, La., E543
 Hill, J. French, Ark., E547
 LaMalfa, Doug, Calif., E546, E549
 Langworthy, Nicholas A., N.Y., E544
 Latta, Robert E., Ohio, E549
 McBath, Lucy, Ga., E545
 McHenry, Patrick T., N.C., E546
 Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia,
 E549

Panetta, Jimmy, Calif., E544
 Ruppersberger, C.A. Dutch, Md., E550
 Schneider, Bradley Scott, Ill., E547
 Sewell, Terri A., Ala., E543
 Spanberger, Abigail Davis, Va., E548
 Tlaib, Rashida, Mich., E548
 Weber, Randy K., Sr., Tex., E548
 Wilson, Joe, S.C., E550
 Yakym, Rudy, III, Ind., E545



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.