

NO. 79

JOURNAL
OF THE
SENATE
OF THE
STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA



REGULAR SESSION BEGINNING TUESDAY, JANUARY 14, 2025

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

Wednesday, June 10, 2026
(Statewide Session)

~~Indicates Matter Stricken~~

Indicates New Matter

The Senate assembled at 12:00 Noon, the hour to which it stood adjourned, and was called to order by the PRESIDENT.

A quorum being present, the proceedings were opened with a devotion by the Chaplain as follows:

Hosea 6:1

Hoping for repentance, Hosea declared to his people: “ ‘Come, let us return to the Lord.’ ”

Good friends, let us pray: O loving and most glorious Lord, Your faithful servants here in the Senate of South Carolina continue diligently facing tasks and striving to wrap things up on behalf of the people they serve. So we fervently pray today that by Your grace, dear God, You will indeed strengthen and bless each and every one of these Senators and staff members. May they together find all of the energy and stamina they each need to continue tackling the tasks before them, doing everything possible to make life better for every South Carolinian. And as always, Lord, continue to be with our women and men in uniform serving in so many, many places around the globe, often in settings that are truly unsettling. Embrace all of us, Gracious Lord, in Your unfailing love. Amen.

The PRESIDENT called for Petitions, Memorials, Presentments of Grand Juries and such like papers.

Motion Adopted

On motion of Senator PEELER, the Senate agreed that if and when the Senate stands adjourned today, it will adjourn to meet at the call of the PRESIDENT.

REMARKS

ADDENDUM TO THE JOURNAL

The following remarks by Senator GOLDFINCH were ordered printed in the Journal of March 17, 2026:

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

Remarks By Senator GOLDFINCH

Thank you, Mr. PRESIDENT. And thank you Senators for joining me today. Many of you heard about the terrorist attack recently at Old Dominion. Lieutenant Colonel Brandon Shaw was shot and killed. He was killed March 12, 2026. He enlisted in the Army in 2003, attended Old Dominion, received his commission in 2007 and eventually went on to fly Apaches, supporting Operation Iraqi Freedom, Enduring Freedom and Atlantic Resolve. He logged more than 1200 hours -- 600 combat hours before he went on to teach ROTC at his old alma mater which is where he was killed. He leaves behind a spouse and a young child and I think it's totally appropriate for us to keep him but also his family, his children and his cadets whom he loved and was dedicated to so much in our thoughts and our prayers.

We should also remember the cadets that so bravely served that day and killed the terrorist -- by the way with a knife -- killed the terrorist with a knife in the classroom. So please join me in thinking of these folks, remembering these folks and praying for these folks. Mr. PRESIDENT, maybe it's appropriate to stand for a moment of silence.

On motion of Senator SUTTON, with unanimous consent, the remarks of Senator GOLDFINCH were ordered printed in the Journal.

ADDENDUM TO THE JOURNAL

The following remarks by Senator HUTTO were ordered printed in the Journal of April 21, 2026:

Remarks by Senator HUTTO

I am not going to take long. As my colleague said, let's not sugarcoat the problem on South Carolina farms. I grew up on a farm, and I know how tough it can be. We have all dealt with weather challenges over time, but this year the challenges facing farmers are different.

The price of diesel, the price of fertilizer and the prices at which farmers can sell their crops are being driven by decisions coming out of Washington, D.C. Those decisions come from the executive branch in Washington, which has imposed tariffs on these products and drawn us into conflicts that have driven up the cost of diesel and fertilizer.

So again, let's not sugarcoat it.

On motion of Senator OTT, with unanimous consent, the remarks of Senator HUTTO were ordered printed in the Journal.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

ADDENDUM TO THE JOURNAL

The following remarks by Senator WALKER were ordered printed in the Journal of April 28, 2026:

Remarks by Senator WALKER

Thank You, Mr. PRESIDENT, I'll be brief. Members of the Senate, like many of you this past weekend, I was at home with my family when I heard the news of the third assassination attempt on the life of our President. I thought to myself as I'm listening to the news, here we go again and regardless of political or party affiliation, I thought about just the litany of people who have been the victims of political violence over the past year or so I thought about the President obviously. I thought about Charlie Kirk. I thought about Minnesota state legislator Melissa Hortman and her husband and I also thought about the Governor of Pennsylvania, Governor Shapiro, his home was fire bombed.

And for some people, they have accepted this as the new normal or they have given into resignation and they believe there is nothing we can do about it. Well, I beg to differ. I think there is something that we can do about it and in fact, there is a Bill we have right now that is on the Contested Calendar, but it is Bill S. 99. For some people, the Bill is viewed or called a Hate Crime Bill. I am of the opinion that is somewhat of my optic or short-sighted view -- because that Bill does more than address crimes perpetrated against someone based on amenable characteristics, it also includes crimes motivated by politician animists.

Now, would S. 99 have prevented what happened to President Trump and others? No. We can't guarantee it prevents future crimes. We have the death penalty in South Carolina, that has not stopped people from committing murders. We have pretty draconian drug trafficking laws in South Carolina and that have not stopped people from engaging in drug trafficking. I also know that laws -- they also reflect more rise and the values of a society and of a state and it is my hope that this Body at some point will find the temerity and find the courage to take up S. 99, bring it to the floor for debate and I'm hoping that we send a message to all South Carolinians that not only do we not tolerate violence against individuals immutable characteristics such as based on race, gender and the like, but also we do not tolerate and will not stand for violence that is motivate by politician animist. Thank you Mr. PRESIDENT.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

On motion of Senator MATTHEWS, with unanimous consent, the remarks of Senator WALKER were ordered printed in the Journal.

ADDENDUM TO THE JOURNAL

The following remarks by Senator HUTTO were ordered printed in the Journal of April 29, 2026:

Remarks by Senator HUTTO

Most of us, if not all of us, know that well-dressed, true gentleman from Barnwell, Representative Lonnie Hosey. What you might not know about Representative Hosey is this -- we are naming a highway after him as the Lonnie Hosey Purple Heart Highway.

Mr. Hosey is a proud Marine who was wounded while fighting in Vietnam. When the enemy swept over the battlefield, he was wounded and was left for dead. He was behind enemy lines until later in the day, when United States forces were able to retake that piece of ground, and Representative Hosey was found alive. He went through a good bit of recuperation in military hospitals before he could come back to the United States and eventually become a member of the South Carolina House of Representatives, where he serves with us now.

The many individuals for whom we name roads have great importance in our State and communities, but I wanted to share what a true American hero Lonnie Hosey is.

On motion of Senator JACKSON, with unanimous consent, the remarks of Senator HUTTO were ordered printed in the Journal.

ADDENDUM TO THE JOURNAL

The following remarks by Senator CAMPSSEN were ordered printed in the Journal of April 29, 2026:

Remarks by Senator CAMPSSEN

Today, I am going to address the Battle of Sullivan's Island. I have shared with you all and placed on your desks a document that my friend, Doug McIntyre, recently published on January 18, 2026. I think it is the most thorough treatment of what was happening on the north end of Sullivan's Island during the Battle of Sullivan's Island, which occurred from June 18 - June 28, 1776. We call June 28 Carolina Day in commemoration of this great battle that we won, one of the most decisive victories of the Revolutionary War.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

It is focused in my hometown, the Isle of Palms, where I was born and raised. Breach Inlet is an inlet between the Isle of Palms and Sullivan's Island to the south, and that is where the battle was fought. It occurred just six days before the Declaration of Independence -- and impacted its signing -- and it is the sixth largest battle in the history of the Revolutionary War. Twelve thousand British and American soldiers participated in this engagement. I think very few people understand the magnitude of this battle. It was the first defeat of a joint attack by the British Navy and the British Army in the history of Great Britain. It was the first defeat of the British Navy in over 100 years. It defeated both the British Navy in Charleston Harbor and also marines who landed on the Isle of Palms -- we called it Long Island back then -- in order to try to destroy Fort Sullivan from the rear.

In 1775, the Patriots had taken control of Charleston, which was the center of government in South Carolina and the fourth largest city in the colonies. In June of 1776, the British sailed an armada of sixty ships -- including twelve ships of war under the command of Sir Peter Parker -- and British regulars under the command of Major General Henry Clinton. The Continental Congress had appointed America's most experienced military officer, Major General Charles Lee, to command the Southern Department and defend Charleston against the armada.

At the south end of Sullivan's Island, on Charleston Harbor, Colonel William Moultrie commanded a hastily built, incomplete fort made from palmetto logs and sand. It was named Fort Sullivan. This is where we get the Palmetto Tree on our state flag, and it is also where we get the gorget. A lot of people call it a half-moon, but it is not a half-moon, it is a gorget on our flag. A gorget is what a soldier would wear in that era over his neck to protect it from being slashed or decapitated with a sword. So, remember that: gorget. The efficiency of the palmetto log and sand fort at the south end of Sullivan's Island was in grave doubt, but it was all they had to work with, and it proved to be a very effective defensive measure.

Meanwhile, Colonel William "Danger" Thompson, who was from Calhoun County, and his backcountry militia were commissioned to defend Fort Sullivan's rear in anticipation of amphibious landings from Long Island (the Isle of Palms) at the north end of Sullivan's Island. If either General Moultrie or Colonel Thompson had failed to repel the British assault on Sullivan's Island at this nascent stage of the Revolution, the Battle of Sullivan's Island would have been lost, and we would probably be British subjects today.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

On June 28, 1776, General Moultrie and his men, with limited ammunition, defended their partially built palmetto log and sand fort from a day-long bombardment by nine British warships. Several British ships foundered on the bar upon which Fort Sumter was subsequently constructed in the late 19th century. More than two hundred British sailors were killed or wounded. One British ship, the HMS Actaeon, was lost. It was the first defeat of the British Navy in over one hundred years. It is why we have the Palmetto Tree and the gorget on our state flag. Meanwhile, fifty-four British vessels -- including three ships of war -- supported ten days of amphibious maneuvers, landings and skirmishes on and around Long Island (the Isle of Palms). It led to a decisive British defeat on June 28. Colonel Thompson's regiment of seven hundred eighty men, wearing caps emblazoned with the words "Liberty or Death," repelled Clinton's army of three thousand British regulars. The British battle plan was to wade across Breach Inlet from Long Island onto the north end of Sullivan's Island. They miscalculated the depth of the inlet and instead had to cross the inlet aboard flat boats. This gave the Patriots a clear field of fire and strategic advantage. The British could not fire their muskets during the crossing and were sitting ducks. Thompson's regiment, armed with Kentucky long rifles that were accurate to three hundred yards versus British muskets accurate to just eighty yards, capitalized upon this weakness. The Patriots delivered withering fire during the crossing and the landing. The Patriots were also supported by one eighteen-pound cannon and two six-pound cannons strategically located beyond the range of British cannon fire, but close enough to lay waste to the British flat boats as they crossed Breach Inlet. If Thompson's brigade had failed to defend the north end of Sullivan's Island, or Moultrie's regiment had failed to defeat the British Navy in Charleston Harbor at Fort Sullivan, Charleston would have certainly fallen into British hands, and the nascent Revolution in the colonies may very well have been lost.

We had another ally in this battle, and it was mother nature. It is not just the bravery of our men and the tactical maneuvers their leaders employed that carried the day -- mother nature was also on our side. The following are quotes from British troops, who wore woolen uniforms for ten days while fighting in late June on the Isle of Palms and Sullivan's Island: "Not a breath of air stirring, thick cobwebs . . . every hundred yards a swamp with putrid standing water . . . full of alligators . . . and no place entirely free from rattlesnakes." "Living like beasts of the field, lying five nights in the midst of putrid marsh up to the ankles in filth and water." "Millions of mosquitoes, a greater plague than there can be in

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

Hell itself.” We had a great ally in mother nature with regard to this battle. The Battle of Sullivan’s Island is one of many examples of how God, in His providence, has blessed this State and this Nation more than any other in history. I pray that daily we earn that blessing -- that we prove ourselves insightful, prudent and worthy stewards of this great State of South Carolina and these great United States of America. Thank you.

On motion of Senator KIMBRELL, with unanimous consent, the remarks of Senator CAMPSSEN were ordered printed in the Journal.

ADDENDUM TO THE JOURNAL

The following remarks by Senator HUTTO were ordered printed in the Journal of May 5, 2026:

Remarks by Senator HUTTO

As we continue our celebration of SC 250, I would like to highlight the Battle of Orangeburg that led to the Battle of Eutaw Springs.

In July of 1781, British forces of roughly 1,500 troops arrived in Orangeburg. The Patriot cavalry under Francis Marion and John Ervin circled Orangeburg, and the British forces deployed back around the brick courthouse, which was later burned.

On July 12, General Nathanael Greene arrived with additional Patriot forces, including those led by Thomas Sumter. Greene’s forces also included Henry “Light-Horse Harry” Lee and William Washington. No battle took place, but the Patriot and British armies continued to maneuver in the Lowcountry of South Carolina. Greene moved his army to camp on the High Hills of Santee, near present-day Poinsett State Park, to allow his forces to rest.

Greene’s forces moved on September 5, to camp near Fort Motte in present-day Calhoun County. On September 7, they moved to Burdell Plantation near Vance, approximately seven miles from Eutaw Springs. Troops under Captain Wade Hampton, General Francis Marion and General Andrew Pickens were present at this encampment.

On the day of the battle, September 8, 1781, the Patriot army began marching toward Eutaw Springs. The British were out early that morning digging up yams when they recognized that an American scouting party was advancing on them. The Americans moved forward, captured about 400 British soldiers and marched on toward Eutaw Springs. They attacked the British early that morning and initially drove them from the battlefield, capturing many prisoners and supplies. The British fell back

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

and rallied around a brick house where fighting continued for hours.

The British position was badly weakened, and during the night they abandoned Eutaw Springs and withdrew toward Charleston, taking fire along the way to Moncks Corner.

Neither side gained a clear tactical victory, but the battle is considered the last major engagement of the Revolutionary War in South Carolina. It demonstrated that British forces could no longer hold the interior of South Carolina and left them largely confined to Charleston for the remainder of the war. The Battle of Yorktown came three weeks later and Cornwallis surrendered to Washington in October, two months after the Battle of Eutaw Springs.

My family's farm is only about five miles from Burdell Plantation, where they camped the day before the battle. The battlefield itself is only about ten miles away. Family lore has it that my ancestors were actually fighting along with Francis Marion. In 1970, for the tricentennial of this state, I, as a 12-year-old Eagle Scout, had the honor of laying the wreath at the Battle of Eutaw Springs.

On motion of Senator MARTIN, with unanimous consent, the remarks of Senator HUTTO were ordered printed in the Journal.

ADDENDUM TO THE JOURNAL

The following remarks by Senator MARTIN were ordered printed in the Journal of May 7, 2026:

Remarks by Senator MARTIN

Thank you, Mr. PRESIDENT, members of the Senate, I want to talk about data centers. We have NorthMark data center in Spartanburg that has been discussed. It came claiming to be below 50-megawatt threshold, but they are now requesting over 400-megawatts. Today I received an article from my constituent that was published in the Post & Courier, reporting that they estimate an average water usage of 459,000 to 581,000 gallons per day. Senator CAMPSER, this is 2000 times the daily residential customer use. So, right now before they expand, it is basically the same usage as 2000 households. Bear in mind, they told the folks back home who were paying attention to the data center and updating our Facebook groups that their water use would be a closed-loop system.

How do you discharge up to 66,000 gallons a day into our storm water systems when you are in a closed-loop system? I am hearing it is closed-loop but, like I said at this podium during budget, what concerns me and all of our constituents is being told one thing then they want to come in

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

and do the bait and switch. We are seeing this happen all over. Now, Union County is about to face this, Senator PEELER, Senator VERDIN and Senator CROMER. I believe the Union County Council is working towards putting a stop to it. The data centers come in soft like this is going to be great, we will be good neighbors, have minimal power usage and generate our own power. Then they want to expand and use gas turbines for power. Gas turbines are not quiet. All of the noise studies that have been done are moot.

So, this is why I came to the podium today. This is what I and many other Senators are discussing. We want growth and jobs, but we have to protect ourselves and our constituents from this growing data center onslaught. Mr. PRESIDENT, I ask that the members of the Senate stay focused back home and monitor what is happening when somebody introduces a project that is supposed to be simple and benign. We need to fact check and make sure that we get all the facts down here. I, along with my colleagues in the Senate, will continue to focus on obtaining full disclosure from the data centers coming into our communities. Thank you.

On motion of Senator CORBIN, with unanimous consent, the remarks of Senator MARTIN were ordered printed in the Journal.

ADDENDUM TO THE JOURNAL

The following remarks by Senator GARRETT were ordered printed in the Journal of May 12, 2026:

Remarks by Senator GARRETT

Mr. PRESIDENT, thank you. It is with profound sadness that I rise today to recognize a tragic loss in the City of Greenwood. On May 11, 2026, in what is ordinarily a quiet and peaceful community, one of our brave law enforcement officers, one of our heroes in blue, lost his life in the line of duty.

During an active pursuit of individuals who chose to drive through downtown Greenwood recklessly firing shots and endangering innocent lives, this officer responded as he always had with courage, commitment and an unwavering sense of duty. While attempting to apprehend the assailants, he was struck head-on by their vehicle and killed.

He was a good, kind and decent man. He was only thirty-one years old. A devoted husband to his wife, Allyson, and a loving father to their two-year-old child. His life was defined by service to his country, to his

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

state, to his city and to every one of us who depends on the men and women who wear the badge.

This is why we back the blue. Because they stand between danger and safety. Because they run toward the very threats the rest of us run from. Because they protect our lives at the cost of their own.

Today, our hearts and our prayers are with his family. We ask God to bring comfort, strength and peace to every person who is grieving this unimaginable loss. In moments like these, we lean on faith, on community and on one another. I am reminded of Psalm 34:18: "The Lord is close to the brokenhearted and saves those who are crushed in spirit."

Mr. PRESIDENT, I ask that we stand for a moment of silence in honor of Officer D.J. Keller, whose service and sacrifice will never be forgotten.

On motion of Senator YOUNG, with unanimous consent, the remarks of Senator GARRETT were ordered printed in the Journal.

ADDENDUM TO THE JOURNAL

The following remarks by Senator MATTHEWS were ordered printed in the Journal of May 12, 2026:

Remarks by Senator MATTHEWS

Thank you Mr. PRESIDENT. The Robert Smalls ceremony will be tomorrow morning at 9:30 a.m. here at the State House. For the next three days, I'd like to make sure that each of you know about the accomplishments of Mr. Smalls.

Today I rise to recognize him as one of the most remarkable figures in South Carolina's history. Robert Smalls, of Beaufort, was born into slavery in 1839. Mr. Smalls would go on to become a legislator and a member of the United States Congress. His life is a testament to courage, intelligence and determination in extraordinary diversity. At just 23 years old, Robert Smalls carried out one of the boldest attacks of the Civil War. While serving aboard the Confederate transport ship in the Charleston Harbor, Smalls and several other enslaved crew members seized the vessel after the white officers went ashore for an evening of fun. In the early morning hours, Smalls disguised himself as the captain to avoid detection and successfully guided the ship past Fort Sumter and other Confederate ships before surrendering the ship to the Navy. That act required extraordinary courage. Had they been discovered, the consequences would almost certainly have been death. Instead, Robert

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

Smalls changed his own future and contributed meaningfully to the Union cause during the Civil War. His knowledge of Charleston Harbor later helped provide valuable intelligence to Union forces, and he eventually became the pilot of a Union ship, the USS Keoku. He became the very first black man to be promoted to Captain -- although never a commissioned officer.

Robert Small's story reminds us that heroism is not defined by circumstances or status. It is defined by the willingness to act when the moment demands courage. Thank you.

On motion of Senator WALKER, with unanimous consent, the remarks of Senator MATTHEWS were ordered printed in the Journal.

ADDENDUM TO THE JOURNAL

The following remarks by Senator MASSEY were ordered printed in the Journal of May 12, 2026:

Remarks by Senator MASSEY

Thank you, Mr. PRESIDENT. Senators, this is the *sine die* Resolution and I don't know that it needs a whole lot of explanation. But my understanding is the House made one amendment to it and that would allow the General Assembly in the *sine die* period, which would be after Thursday, to consider congressional redistricting and to receive any conference reports, if necessary, to deal with congressional redistricting. I think, Mr. PRESIDENT, that is the only amendment that the House put on the Resolution. So that is really what's before us. And I know there are some amendments that Senators have to propose. Those will obviously come up. I want to give my thoughts on this before we get to those amendments, and also understand procedurally -- I think it's important, Mr. PRESIDENT, for everybody to understand -- the *sine die* of course requires a two-thirds vote, but because of the posture it's in, whenever we get to the last amendment that's up there, that vote could very well send the *sine die* back. There may not be an up or down vote on the *sine die* itself because of that posture. Make sure everybody understands that. If there are amendments, if the last amendment up gets adopted, it's going back, okay? There will not be a separate vote on the Resolution itself. So, I want everybody to understand that and make sure we know what amendments are up there and especially whichever one is last. Because if the last amendment receives a two-thirds vote, it's gone, okay? Just to make sure everybody understands what we're dealing with here.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

Last week was a pretty interesting week for me. I had never had the privilege of speaking with the President of the United States until last week, and it really was, it was a privilege. I enjoyed the conversation; it was a very good conversation. The President of the United States gave me more time in a phone call than I could have expected. It was a good phone call. It was very gracious. And I won't relay all of it. But there are some things that I want to talk about. Because, you know, the President told me, he said, "Look, I hope you can help us out." He said, "But I understand you've got to do what you're comfortable with, you've got to do what you think is right." He said, "But these people," talking about the Democrats in Washington, he said, "These people are crazy." Yes sir, I agree with you. He told me, "These people hate me." And I think, Mr. President, that's obvious. There's no question about that. There is a lot of hatred in Washington. There's a lot of hatred in the world. And he's certainly the recipient of a lot of that; there is no question there. The President doesn't want the Democrats to win the majority of the House of Representatives; I don't either. I would hope that the home team could retain the majority. And I would also hope that if the home team retains the majority, that they'll actually do something productive with it. Over the last year and a half, I suspect if we look back at what they've done with the majority, I don't know that anybody in here could name more than one piece of legislation they passed. And no matter how big and beautiful it was, there is a whole lot more that they've left on the table. And that, to me, is disappointing. To have a majority that doesn't do anything with it. I will say, however, that if the Democrats do win control of United States House of Representatives, it will not be because of South Carolina. I'm going to talk a little bit more about that later. It won't be because of South Carolina. And I am curious what they could actually do if they even won it. They're not going to have the ability to pass anything. If anything, I think what they would probably do is just remind people of what they have done and what they would do if they were given larger control. But I want to talk some, Mr. PRESIDENT, about my concerns regarding this proposal. I'm not here to persuade anybody. I'm not here to advocate for any position. My purpose in speaking today is really about explaining why I have arrived at the position that I've arrived at.

You know, what really got this conversation started was the U.S. Supreme Court opinion week before last, in *Louisiana vs. Callais*. And that opinion sparked a lot of conversation and it led to a number of states, especially across the southeast, looking at their congressional maps. And that resulted in a lot of attention on South Carolina about our

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

congressional maps. And because of that opinion, the conclusion from a lot of people is that our maps are unconstitutional, and we must change them. We must change them to be compliant with the Constitution. The President asked me to look at our map in light of that opinion. The Governor has asked us to look at our maps in light of that opinion. I think those are reasonable requests. I think in the light of the Supreme Court opinion we absolutely should look at our map, and we did. Mr. PRESIDENT, we've looked extensively at it. We've had conversations with attorneys who have represented the Senate in the past, just a couple of years ago, when we got approval in the U.S. Supreme Court of our map. We have looked at that issue -- and I think it's important that everybody understand this -- our map is perfectly constitutional right now. We are not Louisiana. We are not Alabama. We are not Mississippi. Our map is not unconstitutional. The *Louisiana vs. Callais* opinion does not apply to South Carolina, because South Carolina does not have a Section 2 district. South Carolina used to have a Section 2 district, 30 years ago, but it does not have a Section 2 district today because the population has changed. And the result of that is that we do not have a Section 2, we do not have a majority minority district. Our districts are perfectly constitutional. The U.S. Supreme Court told us that in 2024, and I know what I've heard is that challenge was dealing with the 1st, it was not dealing with the 6th. And indeed, it did focus primarily on the 1st. However, at the core of that challenge was that the General Assembly had impermissibly moved people from the 1st into the 6th and from the 6th into the 1st. You can't talk about the 1st without the 6th, right? They go together. If one is constitutional, so is the other. If the 1st is constitutional, so is the 6th. We do not have a racial gerrymander, and I know that surprises a lot of people. We don't. We do not have a racial gerrymander in our map; we do have a partisan gerrymander. And there are a number of us who worked to that effort in 2021 to create that. Senator CAMPSEN and I had the displeasure of being deposed for hours and even having to testify in U.S. District Court on that issue. And look, we based our current map on partisan numbers. We were trying to maximize Republican seats, and I'm not shy about saying it. That's what we did, right? We tried to maximize our seats and effectively what we were trying to do is shore up the 1st district for a Republican candidate. And this is the way we did it. We created a 6-1 map. Mr. PRESIDENT, we did it before everybody else did it. So, our map, the 6th district, is not unconstitutional. There is frankly no real argument that it is unconstitutional. Because if you read the *Louisiana* opinion and you read *Alexander*, which was ours, if you read those two opinions -- in fact in

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

the *Louisiana* opinion they even reference *Alexander* as the basis of their opinion -- if you read those two opinions, you know that our districts are perfectly constitutional.

Now, that in itself doesn't end the question. You still have the political question of whether we should go beyond 6-1. I think ultimately, that's what the question is before us today. Now I've got a number of concerns about this. I don't want to take all day with it, but I do want to explain my concerns here. The first is, you know, of course trying to go to 7-0, I think is extremely risky from a political standpoint. I think at best, you're going to get 6-1, and you may even go 5-2. I've told the press a number of times, I think if you get cute with this, you could end up in a 5-2 scenario. I don't want to go 5-2. I don't want Hakeem Jeffries as Speaker of the House. I think the best chance that South Carolina has to prevent that from happening is with our current map. Because we know what we're going to get. We don't know what we're going to get on the other side. What we've had -- different proposals -- the numbers keep changing, the numbers are not reliable; we don't know what the numbers are in reality. What I do know is that we're 6-1 today. And if we want to maximize our chances, we know what we've got. And if we start tinkering with this, my concern is that we could make this a whole lot worse.

I've told a lot of people when they've asked me about this, that we looked at all of our different ways to maximize things. We couldn't come up with 7-0. The map that's been proposed is closer to 7-0 than anything I've seen. We didn't think about that. Now I'll tell you the reason we didn't think about that. Because the map that's been proposed, every map that I have seen, destroys something that has always been extremely important when the General Assembly has looked at drawing maps. And that is, preserving communities of interest. This proposal blows that up. This proposal has Clemson and Columbia in the same congressional district. This proposal does real and extreme damage to York County. It just flat-out does. York and Lancaster go together. When you split York and Lancaster, you're going to do damage to Lancaster and to York, because right now York and Lancaster anchor the 5th district. Splitting them up divides a traditional and historic community of interest. But it does more than that. Because the proposal that's out there splits York County itself. It takes Fort Mill out of York County, takes it out of the 5th, and puts it into the 6th. That is a real problem as well. That changes the anchor in that district. It changes that community of interest. Those people who have, for so long, banded together to advocate for federal policy changes are going to be split, their strength is diminished, that

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

district is weakened; those things that South Carolina has traditionally relied on to advocate for federal policy are diminished because of that change. And there's no question about that. It sends a lot of that over into Greenville and Pickens Counties, which if you are in York or Lancaster County, has a significant impact on your ability to impact your Congressperson -- to influence those elections. It may very well be to the point that where York has anchored a congressional district for decades it may no longer have that. That is a real problem. They didn't consider that because that wasn't their concern. As South Carolinians, however, we should consider that. This district, this map, puts Myrtle Beach in the same district with Charleston. Y'all, Myrtle Beach and Charleston are not the same. They are not the same culturally; they are not the same economically; they don't have the same needs, they don't have the same issues that rise to the level of federal intervention. They are very different and when you put them together, the result of that is going to be to diminish either the influence that Myrtle Beach has or the influence that Charleston has. Putting Myrtle Beach in the same district with the port is a problem, y'all. Separating Myrtle Beach from Florence is a problem in the Pee Dee. Myrtle Beach and Florence go together. They complement each other. Florence and Lancaster do not. When they were drawing this map, they didn't consider those things. Those things weren't important to them, and I understand it and I think their concern is important. It is absolutely important. But there are other concerns that you have to look at. There is no way that we would have come up with a map that just blows up those traditional and historic communities of interest. I think that's something that is very important. It should be important for us.

I also think doing this, y'all, doing this is going to tick some people off. I'm not concerned about ticking off Democrats. That doesn't bother me. I do that every day standing right here. I will talk about that in a little bit too. What I am concerned about is how will this be received by people in the middle? Look, I think we get lost on this sometimes. Everybody in South Carolina is not a rabid partisan like I am. Everybody in South Carolina is not a rabid partisan like we are. Most people in South Carolina think we're freaking crazy. They do. And I know that, you know that, but when you look at primary turnout, we're at ten, twelve, maybe in a presidential year we get up to twenty, like that's the percentage turnout of those who've registered to vote. Most people are not partisan. Most people are in the middle and they can go back and forth. Now South Carolina, most South Carolinians are conservative. That doesn't mean they always vote for Republicans, but they are conservative, and I think

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

when you do something like this, there is going to be an impact. I also think that one of the side effects of this is, very candidly, you're going to motivate Black turnout. And there will be repercussions for that. There will be down-ballot repercussions for that. This will have an effect on state House races; it will have an effect on county council races. Y'all remember the state House races had some very narrowly -- so did we, right? So did we, gentlemen, but the state House has even more narrowly decided races. This will have an impact on them. There will be Republican losses in the State House of Representatives because of this. There will be Republican losses on county council because of this. It will have that effect. They didn't consider that. That wasn't their concern, and I understand that, but it is a concern that I have.

Here is another concern that I have that I'm really having a difficult time getting around. We already have ballots that have been cast. But it's not just any ballots, y'all. We have active-duty military that are serving around the world that have already submitted their ballots. Now, they may be in some pretty harmless places like maybe Germany, South Korea sometimes. You've probably got some people who are on a battleship or are flying missions over the desert who have already cast their ballots. The effect of this is to discard those ballots. That's tough for me. If you change the primary dates, some of those people will not be able to vote. Because they're going to be in different places. They're going to get shipped around. Who knows where they are going to be in two months. Some of those people, some of those active-duty military who have already cast ballots, will not be able to cast a ballot. That is a problem. It should be a problem. I'm very concerned about that. There are lots of other absentee ballots that have already been cast, both from overseas voters, but even domestically. We're already within this time period where the Election Commission has been mailing out absentee ballots to your eighty-five-year-old neighbor who prefers to vote by absentee because our law allows it. There are ballots that may not have been received but are in the mail. These ballots will be discarded, at least from their congressional races depending on what decisions we make on that. That is troubling to me. I also think it's important to recognize there are logistical difficulties for the Election Commission to hold two statewide races in the summer. And we just passed a Bill -- what -- last week, two weeks ago, to try to make uniform special elections that would have the first special elections be in August. The proposal that's been talked about in the House would be to have -- first off, splitting the primaries, which I think is a terrible idea. If you are a congressional candidate, you know this is a terrible idea. It is going to result in a much

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

diminished turnout. It is going to result in confusion among voters, because as much as this is a surprise to us, most people ain't listening to us. Most people are living their lives. They ain't got time to watch this comedy show. Many people are going to be confused by having two sets of primaries, if that's what the General Assembly elects to do. We've got logistical issues with school start dates in August. There are a number of logistical issues -- we're not even going to talk about how much money it's going to cost -- but I do think those are things that matter. They're things that we need to consider. Those are things that have not been considered before, but they will absolutely have an impact on South Carolinians.

I said earlier that if the U.S. House goes to a Democratic majority, it won't be because of South Carolina. That's because we are already heavily gerrymandered. We are the most gerrymandered Republican state in the country already, and we did that intentionally. There have been celebrated changes in Florida over the last week. Those celebrated changes in Florida get them to where we are now. Yesterday, the U.S. Supreme Court allowed Alabama to use a map that it had passed but had previously been stopped by the courts. Yesterday, they allowed Alabama to use this map that they passed before. Alabama also has seven congressional districts. That map would allow Alabama to use a 6-1 map. The U.S. Supreme Court decision yesterday allowed Alabama to do what we have already done.

Now, those are all important reasons, but there are other reasons. There are other things that I think are actually bigger concerns. Mr. PRESIDENT, South Carolina has always punched above its weight in Washington. Some of those people are represented in portraits hanging in this chamber. We have always had the ability to punch above our weight and deliver. And I'm not just talking about earmarks or monetary requests, but we have had the ability to influence national, if not international policy from South Carolina. You look right over here-- Jimmy Byrnes. A lot of people don't know who that is; actually, I think Jimmy Byrnes is one of the most impactful and influential South Carolinians in history -- what he was able to do in the United States Congress, what he was able to do in the Senate. Jimmy Byrnes effectively ran the country in World War II, because President Roosevelt was focused on the war. Jimmy Byrnes got his start in the district that I represent. We have always punched above our weight -- the gentleman in the corner over here, the gentleman above him. Floyd Spence is in here too. He got -- Senator Setzler bumped him out. We've always punched above our weight. And we've been able to do that -- and this is

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

important -- we've been able to punch above our weight regardless of the administration. Regardless of who the President is, regardless of who occupies the White House, South Carolina has been able to deliver. Not just for South Carolina, but for the country and the world. We have had that influence. Doing this will absolutely diminish that influence. It just will. And everybody knows it. Everybody in here, everybody who's familiar with the process, we understand what's going to happen here. Look y'all, regardless of who the President is, regardless of who's in charge, there has to be somebody in South Carolina who can make a phone call and somebody at the White House will answer it. If we don't have that, South Carolinians are the ones that are going to suffer because of it. Whether we're talking about the state as a whole, or individually, South Carolinians will suffer if we don't have influence, regardless of who's in the White House. I believe -- I'm convinced -- this map diminishes that influence.

I also believe that our state is stronger with vibrant parties. I think we, as a whole, are stronger when we have a clash of ideas. I think that's true at the national level, I think it's true at the state level. We are stronger when we have a clash of ideas and we can discuss those policy goals. I will tell my Republican friends, Republicans are stronger when the Democrat Party is vibrant and viable. We are. Competition makes you better, y'all. We know it in the economic sector. It also happens in the political sector. Competition makes you better. Now, part of that I think allows us to display just how wacky some of their ideas are. And frankly, we don't have to do it to them, they can do it to themselves. But more than that, though, it sharpens our skills, it makes our ideas stronger, it makes our policies better, it makes South Carolina better in the long run if we allow for that debate to occur. A legitimate opponent will make a competitor better every time. I've heard it argued -- I've seen it argued -- on social media, people have told me this, that this is what you are supposed to do with power. This is what you're supposed to do with a supermajority. You're supposed to punish your opponents. Really? Is that how it's supposed to work? Is that how it's supposed to work here? I know that's how it works in some other places around the world, but is that how it's supposed to work here? You know, to most people in the country I think this is the perfect example of just how much elected officials have lost their way. Too many people in power just want to do whatever it takes to stay in power. They'll do whatever it takes to keep it. But I ask, to what end? What do you do with it when you've attained it? I believe the legitimate use of power in this context is to make people safer; to ensure they have the decisions to guide their own lives, to offer

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

opportunities for success. You know, this whole outdated idea of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. I don't seek power to punish. I want it to uplift. And I think we have been extremely successful here in the Senate and in the General Assembly in doing just that over the last several years, of advancing those goals. We have, I think, Mr. PRESIDENT, we have used our power effectively, and appropriately. Now I know there are a number of my Democratic colleagues who don't think that's the case; they don't agree with me on that. They think that we have been heavy-handed. They think that we have come down too hard on them. I promise you it could have been a whole lot worse. I've tried very hard -- and I've said this publicly and privately -- I don't want to be Washington; I don't want the Senate to be the House of Representatives. It could be. But I've tried to make it not that way. And others have tried to make it not that way. And I get it, I mean I think a lot of our Democratic Senators or House members think that we have been too heavy-handed, and I get it -- if you're not in the majority, you don't get to set the agenda and you don't get the things that you want. I understand. It also means that you lose a lot of things you don't want to lose on. I understand that too. Mr. PRESIDENT, I suspect that over the last several years that statewide, if you gave the Democrats an opportunity to take out one legislator from the House or the Senate, I suspect I'm at the top of the list. And I think I've earned that. And that's okay. That's alright. But I think we need to use the power that we've been entrusted with in a legitimate manner, and we have been extremely successful at advancing a number of conservative goals in that effort.

I don't think you accomplish those goals by stamping out the opposition and not giving them a voice. Crushing the minority opposition is not a demonstration of strength, it's an admission of fear and a show of weakness, and I don't think it's successful in the long-term anyway. If you tell children, heck even adults, if you tell them, "Don't go in that room, there is something harmful in that room, don't go in there," what they gon' do? They are all opening the door, aren't they? So are we. Everybody does it. It's human nature. If you're told not to do something, you're going to do it. If you're told not to watch this television show, you're going to watch it. If you're told not to listen to this song, you're going to listen to it. If I tell my daughter don't get on social media, she's going to do it because I told her not to. That is human nature. I would say also that if you crush the opposition, if you stamp them out, if you don't allow their voice to be heard, people will listen even more intently. They will listen more closely. The majority will give credibility to minority voices by trying to crush it. We will make people in the middle,

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

those who are not rabid partisans, they will be more receptive to arguments that they are not receptive to now because we've told them they shouldn't even hear it. Because that's how humans work. Trying to silence a voice -- which is effectively what this does -- right? That's effectively what this does. Trying to silence a voice is going to result in people wanting to hear that voice. That is especially the case here, where that minority voice consistently represents 40 to 45 percent of the electorate. Trying to stamp out that voice will cause more people to pay attention to it. And those of us in power who try to do that to the minority will give more credibility to it. It is a self-defeating effort. There are many historical examples of this. Y'all know what I'm saying is true, but there are historical examples of it. The French Revolution began with some legitimate public complaints and it quickly went out of control. Robespierre, who ignited the fire, ultimately determined that in order to save the republic, he had to pursue policies that were antithetical to the republic. So began the Reign of Terror. Now, we know how that ended, at least I hope we know how that ended. We've done a really crappy job these days of teaching history and civics. You know last week and this week -- if you have a high school student you know this -- this is the time of the year when they're taking the end of course exams. You know the end of course exam that we always do the worst on? We take end of course tests on sciences, on English, on math, all these things. You know, the end of course test that South Carolina students always do the worst on? U.S. History and the Constitution. We are failing our children in that regard, y'all. And that I suspect that if we ask -- and this is not U.S. History or the Constitution -- but if you ask high school seniors in South Carolina "Who was Robespierre?" you're going to get blank looks. But Robespierre is extremely important for us to understand who we are, how we got here, what we should be, and more importantly, what we should not be.

Y'all, I didn't sign up for parliament, and I don't want to be in parliament. I don't like that the Congress, over the last 125 years or so, has effectively relinquished its legislative authority to the executive, whomever that executive is. I think it's bad for the separation of powers, it's bad for the country, it is something that, as a huge fan -- and I don't want to get the senator from Charleston worked up here -- as a huge fan of James Madison, it is antithetical to his creation. My default position on government is Madison was probably right. Whatever the issue is, my default position is Madison was probably right. Didn't mean he didn't do some bad things in his life, didn't mean he's right about everything, but on matters of government, Madison's probably right. You have to prove

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

to me that he wasn't. The separation of powers may actually be the most important governmental doctrine that has been created in the history of man. It is that important. And what the Congress has done to relinquish their authority to the executive is terrible. And we all see the results of that. There's another important principle that is enshrined in the Constitution. That has been whittled away some as well. This one should be important to all of us. Another brilliant creation, and that is of federalism and the sovereignty of the states. I don't want to be a participant in further eroding federalism and further diminishing the essential role of states. This issue, like so many others, is by design and writ of the Constitution, exclusively reserved to the states and the people of the states' elected representatives. And so it should be. The states are not mere political subdivisions of the federal government. The states are not here to take orders and direction. The states are sovereign, independent creatures. Those sovereign, independent creatures willingly relinquished certain powers and authority to gain certain specified cohesive protections. They did not relinquish more than what is explicitly written. They did not expect to gain more than that which is explicitly written. And with the portrait of Calhoun behind me, I cannot in good conscience surrender this authority that has been preserved to, for and by the states and merely take orders from those who are not in South Carolina. Especially from those whose concern on this issue, while understandable -- I absolutely understand what the President's concern is here, I understand what the President's issue is here, I don't disagree with that -- but there are other concerns that we have to consider. Those concerns have not been considered at all with the proposal that we have. Those concerns affect South Carolina and South Carolinians, and it is up to us to consider those things. If we don't consider those concerns of South Carolina, there is no one left. We are the last line. I have too much southern blood in me to surrender. Indeed, as some of you will recognize, "It is my heritage to stand erect, proud and unafraid; to think and act for myself, enjoy the benefits of my creations, to face the whole world boldly, and say, 'I am a free American.'" That's what I try to accomplish today.

Nikita Khrushchev reportedly said, "We will bury you from within." It was a recognition that it was extremely unlikely that anybody could ever conquer the United States from outside, that we would always join together and defend ourselves and that we would be triumphant in that defense. But he thought there was a fatal flaw. He thought that the American system itself was contradictory, that it couldn't last, that the contradictions of capitalism that create class struggles and economic

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

inequality would be the downfall. That it would lead to uprisings and we would destroy ourselves. Look around, ladies and gentlemen. Maybe he was right. Maybe the way to conquer the United States of America is not externally. Maybe it is to incite internal troubles and to have us turn on ourselves. Maybe it includes declaring your neighbors, your political opponents, as enemies of the state. And rather than having a public debate of ideas and allowing the public to decide, maybe it means just putting the boot down on the minority. I hear those who say they would do it to you. We've all heard that. If the Democrats were in power and they had the opportunity, they'd do it to you. Maybe, I don't know. We've seen that in other places. I would hope that wouldn't be the case, but I'm not naive. My larger question though: Is that the way it should happen? They'd do it to you, so you should do it to them? Do unto others as you believe they would do unto you? Is that it? Is that what we teach our children? Does it only apply to children? Does it not apply to adults? I don't remember that being the context in the Gospel of Matthew, and I don't think the Messiah meant it as something only to apply to children, but how we interact with each other. I think you do what you know to be right. Sometimes you'll get taken advantage of, but you should do it anyway. You should do it because it's right. Not because you might win because of it. Not because it may hurt an opponent. You should do it because it's right. And I believe that good and decent people, those people who make up this state and this country, they will determine right from wrong. And they'll respond accordingly. Even if that means at the ballot box. Now, I understand that sometimes it doesn't work out that way. It doesn't work out the way you want it to. It doesn't work out to be the way that you believe is the right way and we become frustrated with that. Ladies and gentlemen, I understand that there are likely consequences for me personally standing here right now and taking the position that I'm in. I understand that. I'm comfortable with that. I may not like it, but I'm comfortable with it. I've got to look in the mirror. My conscience is clear on this one, y'all. I've had a number of people who, some of you have come up to me, "Hey how you doing? I know you're taking a beating." Yeah, it's part of the gig. I've had people call me, ask me, "Hey, how's this going? I know you're taking a beating." Yeah, I mean that's true. That's not fun. But it's part of it. I've had people say, "Look, I know this is a hard one for you." And I've taken a lot of hits, but this one isn't hard. This isn't hard at all. There are some hard ones that come up. This one isn't hard for me, because I know what the right thing to do is. My conscience is clear on it, regardless of what the result may be. In fact, I had a conversation with the Deputy Chief of Staff this

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

morning. He asked me what was going to happen. I said I don't know, because I haven't counted votes. I haven't counted votes at all. Some of you have told me what you're thinking, but I haven't counted votes. I don't know where the votes are. I don't know what's going to happen in a little bit when we get there. Many of y'all have called to tell me that you've been getting a lot of pressure from the White House over the weekend, but I don't know what the vote count is. This is, as I've told many of you privately, and I think I've even said it publicly to the press, this is every Senator for himself or herself. You've got to do what you think is right. You've got to make the best decision for South Carolina that you can make. Now, I will tell you there are consequences for that, right? There are consequences either way, frankly. And I think we all need to recognize that going in. You know, I said I got too much southern in my blood. I've got too much resistance in my heritage. I've had a number of people who've called me over the last several days and said, "Hey I've got this friend in the White House" or "I've got this friend in this group that's involved in this," and they've been calling, they've been asking, "How do we get to Massey?" Every one of these people have told me that their response was, "Well, you don't try to bully him." I got too much red in my neck for that to happen. And it has the exact opposite effect on me. I'll say, to their credit, they haven't done that to me. They've all been very nice to me. They've been very cordial. They've let me know what their position is and maybe that changes after today. I don't know. But I recognize that's a possibility, if not a likelihood, and I'm comfortable with that because my conscience is clear.

Mr. PRESIDENT, we've all heard the story of, after those men suffered through the sweltering heat in Philadelphia in the summer of 1787, when they finally emerge in September, they come out and there's this story -- it may be apocryphal -- I don't know if it's legit or not. We've all heard the story that when they emerge, when Mr. Franklin emerges, very old at this point -- he was probably the oldest of all the delegates -- he emerges and a woman approaches him and said, "Well, Dr. Franklin, what have you wrought?" His response, as we all know, "A republic, if you can keep it." If you can keep it. All the forces, every external force, sometimes internal forces, all the forces are working to pull it apart. If you can keep it. Maybe Khrushchev was right. Maybe we become convinced that the only way to preserve the republic is to implement policies that are contrary to the founding ideas of the republic. Maybe we turn on ourselves. Maybe -- 250 years in -- maybe we can't keep it. I really hope that's not the case, but maybe it is. But if that's to happen -- if we're going to further erode those institutions, if we're going to further

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

erode those essential governmental protections, if we're going to lose this radical idea of a nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal, a nation that in its Constitution guarantees to each state a republican form of government, to ensure the debate of ideas -- if that's going to happen, Mr. PRESIDENT, by God, it is not going to be because I surrendered it. I'm voting no.

On motion of Senator CAMPSEN, with unanimous consent, the remarks of Senator MASSEY were ordered printed in the Journal.

ADDENDUM TO THE JOURNAL

The following remarks by Senator SABB were ordered printed in the Journal of May 13, 2026:

Remarks by Senator SABB

Thank you, Mr. PRESIDENT. Thank you, members. I really appreciate Senator HEMBREE -- just a really great story that he told. My story will probably not be in the same vein but hopefully just as interesting.

This morning, members, we had an extraordinary experience here on the State House grounds where we ceremonially began, or shall I say continued, an incredible process to recognize an incredible South Carolinian. Before I make a couple of comments relative to the gentleman who we are honoring, let me just say thank you to Marsha Adams and the Department of Administration, to our very own Mike Shealy, all of those commission members, Senator Gerald Malloy, who is heading up the fundraising aspects of it, and of course, members of the House and members of the Senate. So, I want to share this moment.

Today, I rise to recognize the extraordinary public service of Robert Smalls and the lasting impact that he had on South Carolina during Reconstruction. Senator MATTHEWS talked of Robert Smalls yesterday, and I would like to cover briefly another aspect of his extraordinary life. I think we both know, or many of us know, that following the Civil War, Smalls returned to Beaufort not simply as a war hero, but as a leader determined to help rebuild his community and expand opportunity for others.

Robert Smalls believed deeply in the importance of education, civic participation and economic opportunity. In 1868, he served as a delegate to the convention that drafted South Carolina's new constitution, where he advocated strongly for public education. At a time when many formerly enslaved people had been denied even the basic right to

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

literacy, Smalls understood that education was essential to freedom and advancement.

His commitment to service continued throughout his political career. He served in the South Carolina House of Representatives, later in the South Carolina Senate and eventually represented South Carolina in the United States Congress for five terms between 1875 and 1887. Through each role, Smalls advocated for equal rights, economic opportunity and a broader participation in American democracy.

What makes his story especially powerful is that Robert Smalls did not allow hardship to define who he was. He transformed adversity into leadership; he moved from enslavement to elected office within a single generation. Extraordinary by all measures and almost impossible to comprehend in its historical context. His legacy continues to remind us all that public service matters most when it is rooted in the belief that every person deserves opportunity and dignity.

I conclude by saying, I am so proud of all of the persons who participated in the groundbreaking ceremony this morning. For me, it was extremely moving and encouraging. I went to New York either last year or the year before, and I saw *Hamilton* and I immediately thought about Senator CAMPSEN. I saw two plays, I saw *Hamilton* and I saw *The Lion King*. And what was remarkable is that when I went in to watch *The Lion King* with my wife, we both had a great time and the singing was extraordinary. There's just nothing like Broadway, and so we just felt good. Then my wife and I went to see *Hamilton* and I came out of there feeling like I've not done enough, like there is more work for me to do -- just inspired to do something greater. I think I might have even called Senator CAMPSEN and told him that he's got to go see *Hamilton*, and I think he told me he had seen it already, but I said, "You've got to see it on Broadway."

My point is that what we experienced this morning and how we're going to recognize Robert Smalls is another one of those situations and circumstances where, when you look at it, it just really makes you want to do more. Thank you, Mr. PRESIDENT.

On motion of Senator DEVINE, with unanimous consent, the remarks of Senator SABB were ordered printed in the Journal.

ADDENDUM TO THE JOURNAL

The following remarks by Senator CLIMER were ordered printed in the Journal of May 13, 2026:

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

Remarks by Senator CLIMER

Senators, I want to take a moment to relay a personal anecdote on the Bill before us. I've heard a few times from opponents of this legislation that we're attempting to solve a problem that doesn't exist, and I wanted to come up here today to comprehensively refute that notion, through my own personal experience.

A couple of years ago, Senator KIMBRELL had a Bill that would prohibit financial institutions from essentially discriminating against their clientele on the basis of political opinion, religious belief, firearm ownership and other such subjects.

In my financial advisory business, we've worked with a couple of different large firms over the years. We're currently with LPL Financial; we previously have been with two of the largest banks in the country. At that time, I was with one of those large national banks, and I co-sponsored Senator KIMBRELL's legislation.

Shortly after I co-sponsored it, I got an e-mail from one of the bank's compliance officers asking if we could discuss this matter. I told him, "No, we are not going to discuss this matter. That's a question of public policy. Your purview over me begins and ends with my responsibilities as a financial advisor. I am not having this conversation with you. Don't ever ask me about a public policy position. That's none of your business."

They were not satisfied with that answer. So, I got another e-mail, and it kept going higher and higher and higher up the chain of command at this large bank, with greater and greater intimidation from the senior leadership at this bank. And finally, it culminated in a hastily called zoom meeting, with a very senior executive at this large firm, who I, at the time, believed convened the meeting for the purposes of separating my firm from theirs. I thought they were going to terminate the business relationship -- in essence, attempt to fire us, me and my team.

I had warned the team several times that I thought this might be coming. And indeed, it came. And in this zoom meeting, we started off with our normal, "How are you doing?" pleasantries, and I quickly said, "You know, before we go too far into this subject matter, I just want to raise the point that whether a legislator votes for or against a Bill, co-sponsors or does not co-sponsor a Bill, introduces or does not introduce a Bill, that is categorically an official act. And if -- and I'm not saying you're going to do this -- but if someone were to condition employment, or compensation, or the like, on the commission of categorically a public act, well that would be extortion after a public official. And I know you're not going down that road, but I just wanted to raise that at the outset of our conversation to make sure that you weren't going down that road,

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

and want you to know I'm not going down that road with you." And the zoom meeting ended about ten seconds later.

I wanted to share this with you so that you would know, from someone you work with, this is what those large banks want to do. This is how they want to treat their customers. This is their desired outcome. They want to be able to discriminate against us on the basis of our political beliefs. They want to be able to discriminate against us on the basis of whether we own guns, or whether you're in the firearms industry. It is fundamentally un-American, and we must pass this legislation! Thank you, Mr. PRESIDENT.

On motion of Senator MARTIN, with unanimous consent, the remarks of Senator CLIMER were ordered printed in the Journal.

ADDENDUM TO THE JOURNAL

The following remarks by Senator BENNETT were ordered printed in the Journal of May 14, 2026:

Remarks by Senator BENNETT

Thank you, Mr. PRESIDENT, and good morning members. I stand here with maybe the final 250th recognition, or at least of the regular legislative session. As we stand here on the final day, or what I thought was going to be the final day -- I thought it was appropriate that we discuss the British's last day in South Carolina. On December 14, 1782, the British evacuated Charleston. For South Carolina, this was not merely the end of an occupation, it was vindication; it was the moment when the last major British foothold in the south finally slipped away, and the long struggle for independence, sacrifice and self-government came into full view along the Cooper and Ashley Rivers.

Today, when Americans think of the Revolutionary War, often times their minds drift northward to Lexington, Concord, Saratoga and Yorktown. Yet, historians now widely acknowledge the truth that South Carolinians have long known. The American Revolution may have begun in Massachusetts, but it was won in South Carolina. Nowhere was that struggle more bitter, more personal or more consequential than right here. By the time the British evacuated Charleston in 1782, the State had endured nearly every imaginable hardship. Charleston had fallen in 1780, and what remains, or at least remained, the largest single surrender of American troops until the Civil War. Thousands were captured, families were divided, plantations were burned, neighbors became enemies -- South Carolina quite literally descended into a civil war

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

within the Revolution itself. And yet, even after Charleston fell, the spirit of resistance did not. Francis Marion, Thomas Sumter, Andrew Pickens, Henry “Light Horse Harry” Lee and the countless unnamed militia men waged a relentless war of attrition against the British and loyalist forces across swamps, rivers and back country roads, as we have heard through stories that we have all shared with one another over the past several months. The British expected South Carolina to return gratefully to the Crown. Instead, they found a people who became harder to subdue the longer they occupied them. In fact, one British officer reportedly lamented that controlling South Carolina was like holding a wolf by the ears. Why? Because South Carolina had developed something deeper than opposition to a particular tax or policy. They had developed a culture of resistance to distant power imposing its will on local communities. The southern campaign hardened that instinct. Men here watched royal officials dictate terms from afar. They watched outside authorities attempt to reorder local government, commerce, property--even the personal allegiances. They saw what happened when decisions affecting their homes and their families were made by people insulated from the consequences of those decisions. And after years of occupation and confiscation, military rule and coercion, South Carolinians emerged with a deeply rooted suspicion of concentrated power whether exercised by a king an ocean away or later by any far-removed central authority convinced it knew better than the people closest to the matter at hand.

The spirit became part of the political DNA of the south, not hostility to union, not rejection of a national purpose, but a persistent belief that free people govern best when government remains closest and most accountable to them. Even after the victory of Yorktown in October of 1781, the British still occupied Charleston for more than a year. Why? Because Charleston mattered. It was one of the wealthiest and most strategically important ports in North America, and the British did not want to surrender it lightly. So, when evacuation finally came in December of 1782, it was a moment of extraordinary symbolism. Charlestonians awoke that December morning, not to the thunder of battle, but to the site of British sails preparing to disappear beyond the harbor. An image that many surely believed they might never live to see. British troops boarded ships and departed Charleston Harbor while General Nathaniel Green and patriot forces prepared to reenter the city. Imagine that scene. The same harbor through which British power had flowed now witnessing its retreat. One fascinating detail often overlooked is that the evacuation was not only military, it was human in nature. Thousands of loyalists fled with the British, many never to return.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

Equally significant, thousands of formally enslaved people also departed with British forces because the Crown had promised freedom to those who oppose the patriots and aided the British cause. That reality reminds us that the Revolution was not simple. It was noble in its ideals, yes, but deeply complicated in its human consequences.

Another intriguing fact -- many years afterward, Charlestonians celebrated December 14th as Victory Day. Parades, speeches, military displays, church bells and public commemorations marked the occasion. In many ways, it was Charleston's own Independence Day. And perhaps it should be again. Because the evacuation of Charleston represented more than military success. It represented endurance. South Carolina suffered immensely during the Revolution. Some estimates suggest more battles and skirmishes occurred in this State than anywhere else in the colonies. Homes were destroyed. Commerce collapsed. Entire communities were scarred for generations. Yet, from those hardships emerged something enduring, that fierce commitment to self-government, local liberty and independence from a distant authority. There is a reason the spirit of liberty took such deep root here. South Carolinians had paid deeply for it, and that sacrifice mattered not only for our State but for the Nation itself. Had the British succeeded in pacifying the south, had they fully subdued South Carolina and secured the Carolinas and Georgia, the Revolution may well have failed. The southern campaign drained British resources, shattered British assumptions and ultimately helped set the stage for Yorktown and the final victory. Yet in many respects, Charleston's evacuation was the final acknowledgment that the American experiment would survive. But it also left behind a permanent warning woven into the character of South Carolina. Again, concentrated power, no matter how confident in its righteousness, should never become too comfortable, assuming obedience from free people miles away.

Today, as we remember this extraordinary moment, we should do so not merely with nostalgia, but with gratitude, gratitude for those who endured occupation, for those who fought in the swamps and the fields few Americans today could name, for those who sacrifice fortunes, comfort, safety, and in many cases their lives, and perhaps most importantly, gratitude that they believe liberty was worth the cost because history teaches us something important about freedom. It is rarely preserved by those seeking ease. It is preserved by those willing to endure hardship and defense of principal. South Carolina's role in the Revolution stands as an enduring proof of that truth. So, thank you -- thank you all -- for participating in these remembrances, and may we

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

always remain worthy stewards of the liberty that they secured. Thank you, Mr. PRESIDENT.

On motion of Senator STUBBS, with unanimous consent, the remarks of Senator BENNETT were ordered printed in the Journal.

ADDENDUM TO THE JOURNAL

The following remarks by Senator OTT were ordered printed in the Journal of May 14, 2026:

Remarks by Senator OTT

Thank you, Mr. PRESIDENT. Throughout the year and as we head up to our country's 250th birthday, we have had different Senators come to the podium to give us history lessons about South Carolina. It has been very enjoyable, and I certainly appreciated everyone doing that.

I appreciate the opportunity now to speak to you about Robert Smalls and the impact he had on South Carolina's history, as we honor his legacy and life with the installation of a monument on the State House grounds. In preparing remarks, I began to think back to a former Senator from Lancaster County, Senator Gregory, who really put Robert Smalls front and center for me.

I had heard about Robert Smalls, but I had never really read his story. Senator Gregory recommended to members of the Senate, and to me personally, that I read "Be Free or Die", the story of the life of Robert Smalls. I recommend that each of you, if you want to enjoy a good read about a true South Carolina hero, read "Be Free or Die".

Today, I want to reflect on the enduring legacy of Robert Smalls and why his story remains so important to South Carolina and to our nation. Robert Smalls' life represents resilience, patriotism, leadership and an unwavering belief in the promise of America -- all things that I think we should be reminded of today and always -- even during periods when that promise was denied to many.

One of the most remarkable moments in his life came after the Civil War. Many stories are told about what he did before and during the war, but one of the most remarkable moments came when Robert Smalls purchased the Beaufort home of Mr. Henry McKee, the man who had once enslaved him.

That moment in history symbolized more than just personal success. It reflected the transformational possibilities that emerged during Reconstruction, when formerly enslaved individuals began building

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

businesses, purchasing property, participating in government and helping reshape the future of the South.

Robert Smalls also became a symbol of civic leadership within Beaufort's Black community. He supported local businesses, worked to expand opportunities for freedmen and remained active in community and church life throughout his career. He continuously demonstrated what leadership rooted in service and perseverance could accomplish, even when times were hard.

Though many of the achievements of Reconstruction were later undermined by segregation and the rewriting of much of that era's history, the legacy of Robert Smalls endured and continues to endure today.

Today, Beaufort is home to the Reconstruction Era National Historical Park, established in part to preserve and share stories like his with future generations.

Robert Smalls' story belongs to South Carolina. It belongs to American history. It belongs to us. And it deserves to be remembered because it reminds us that courage, perseverance and service to others have not only the power to change lives, but the course of an entire nation. Thank you, Mr. PRESIDENT.

On motion of Senator MATTHEWS, with unanimous consent, the remarks of Senator OTT were ordered printed in the Journal.

ADDENDUM TO THE JOURNAL

The following remarks by Senator BENNETT were ordered printed in the Journal of May 14, 2026:

Remarks by Senator BENNETT

Thank you, Mr. PRESIDENT. No, this is not my annual tax discussion. I think we've had enough of that this year, right, Mr. Chairman? In all seriousness, I would like to just take a couple of minutes before we end up here today to talk about something that is not necessarily comfortable. It is not a happy thing. I want to bring your attention to a Bill that -- and by the way -- let me first say this is a contested Bill that we did not take up this year. My point here is not to challenge that -- the contesting of that Bill. I understand that people have reasons for that, that's not the purpose of this. The purpose is to just bring the attention that hopefully at some point in the future we can deal with it.

So, on page 15 -- it is Bill S.455 -- it is a Bill by Senator ADAMS, Senator GARRETT and myself. And it has to do with creating the

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

specific offense of strangulation in South Carolina. And the reason that I bring this to you is I would like to first of all tell you real quickly what that does. It basically defines strangulation, creates an offense -- creates an aggravated strangulation, it requires some victim notification but allows some tools for law enforcement to deal with domestic violence. And the reason that this is important is that oftentimes these types of injuries are invisible. People don't see them. There is a gap in that existing law that people aren't able to be charged at a higher level. But probably most importantly, there is research out there that shows that people who are victims of strangulation are 750% more likely to be killed or murdered by that person at a later date. It's typically in a domestic violence situation.

I bring that to your attention because I would like to tell you a story, and I'm not going to use the names of people in the story because I haven't asked them for that. I will tell you, however, that they are upstanding members of our community -- very engaged in our community -- and have been for years. Their daughters and my daughters went to school together, grew up together. And one of their daughters was, I guess I have to use the word allegedly at this point, because there has been no trial, but one of those daughters was allegedly murdered by her husband and strangled -- was how that occurred. To make that even worse, she was pregnant at the time. So that individual took two lives. He was arrested, which is good, certainly, but certainly after the fact. His trial was supposed to start in just a few days, May 29, 2026, is the trial date. That gentleman has now fled the country. He's been apprehended in Italy, which doesn't have an extradition situation with us. So, I don't know how that's going to play out. We'll figure it out as it goes. I think that fleeing probably takes the alleged component out that I dictated.

But my point, my point to this it, and luckily, that did not happen here in South Carolina -- you know, the fact that that perpetrator fled to another country after a heinous, heinous crime that took two lives -- that's not our problem. That's the state of Texas' problem. That's where those occurred. But it certainly reverberates in our State and in my community. We have got to do something about domestic violence, and this is one of those issues that I think is critically important for us to look at -- this strangulation piece.

Now, again, I understand there are concerns any time that we start talking about violent crimes like this. There are extenuating circumstances of the rights that we have to be careful of to make sure that we don't trample; you know, felony convictions result, as you all know, in stripping of gun rights. Those sorts of things. But I also think

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

that those are issues we can work through if we're able to get to it, and talk about it, and find out where the pinch points are but we've got to start protecting people better when they can't be protected on their own and give law enforcement and our prosecutors the tools to take those heinous people off the streets before their crimes become even more heinous.

So, I appreciate the time. I'm sorry to bring the room down in the final minutes of our session this year. But I appreciate your time. I appreciate all of you -- the work that we all did together this year -- different components. Some of us worked more with others, and some of us didn't get a chance to work that close with each other. I look forward to next year, and hopefully this is one of those things that we can get across the finish line. Thank you, Mr. PRESIDENT.

On motion of Senator ZELL, with unanimous consent, the remarks of Senator BENNETT were ordered printed in the Journal.

ADDENDUM TO THE JOURNAL

The following remarks by Senator JOHNSON were ordered printed in the Journal of May 21, 2026:

Remarks by Senator JOHNSON

Thank you, Mr. PRESIDENT. Earlier today, I distributed to everyone a draft of my proposed changes to the congressional maps. I have also, within the last few minutes, distributed the breakdown numbers for everyone to review.

What you are seeing on the screen is simply an overlay. The map as passed by the House is outlined in the dark red lines, and the new map is reflected by the various colored districts you see.

I want to explain how I arrived at my map and how it came into creation. Two or three weeks ago, like many members of the Senate, I was contacted by the White House and asked what my position was on the potential remapping and redistricting. I voiced the concerns I had with the map originally proposed by the House, and I stated that I was willing to work with them to fix it.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is that fix. This is a map that, in my opinion, addresses those concerns -- a map that was drawn and provided through negotiations with the White House.

One important thing this map does, which I think you will notice, is that it puts Representative Clyburn back in the 6th District unopposed. It

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

does not put him in the same district as Joe Wilson, which the House-drawn map does; it places him in his own district, the 6th.

Additionally, what I wanted and what I requested from the White House was to reunite Fort Mill. When we talk about communities of interest, everyone's district is a community of interest. If you live in Columbia, that is a community of interest. Greenville is a community of interest. You may disagree, but where I live is a community of interest as well. We are separated by the river, which runs from the west side of our area out of North Carolina all the way to the southern end, hitting Lancaster County before it goes south. To live in Fort Mill means you have North Carolina to your north and a river to your south. There is nowhere else to go; you have to take a bridge or enter into another state to leave. It is a unique community, and what I wanted to do was keep as much of it in the 5th Congressional District as possible. That is what I asked the White House to do, and that is the map you see before you.

I believed it was important that we have this map and this opportunity. When you look at the breakdowns, it still ensures that all seven districts have a statistical advantage for a Republican victory. I realize that may not be what everyone wants, but that is what this map achieves. I believe this map reflects the support of the White House, it has my full support and I thank you, Mr. PRESIDENT.

On motion of Senator JACKSON, with unanimous consent, the remarks of Senator JOHNSON were ordered printed in the Journal.

ADDENDUM TO THE JOURNAL

The following remarks by Senator CAMPSSEN were ordered printed in the Journal of May 23, 2026:

Remarks by Senator CAMPSSEN

It is critically important that this Body recognize the role we have to play here -- a very important role. Under the Elections Clause of the U.S. Constitution, and a corollary provision in our state constitution, we are the ones who control elections. We are the ones who decide whether we will do reapportionment and when we will do it. If we abdicate that responsibility to another entity, we do our State and our citizens a great disservice.

It would also be a great disservice to discard a congressional map that members of this Body spent significant time developing. We fought very hard, all the way to the United States Supreme Court, and we won. We set a precedent. The case is *Alexander v. South Carolina State*

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

Conference of the NAACP, and our current congressional plan is that precedent. To simply throw that away, after spending millions of dollars to defend it, leaves us exposed to litigation. We could be sued and the court could strike the new plan down. In fact, there is no question in my mind that our state supreme court will strike this down because there is a process that must be followed to do reapportionment properly. It took us more than six months to do it right.

We learned only recently that the presentation made to the House Judiciary Committee explaining the new plan was seven minutes long. Seven minutes. I spent hundreds of hours -- easily 700 or more -- doing reapportionment the right way. This is doing it the wrong way. We had one Judiciary Committee meeting on this plan in the Senate, and we did not even have a map in front of us. There were no VTDS, no granular data. We could not understand the maps at even the most basic level. We still do not. Why? Because normally our cartographer works with us over a six-month period, as was done previously. This time, nothing.

I also want to note how difficult this will be in practical terms. Using the 2020 census, which is already outdated due to significant population growth, approximately two million South Carolinians will be placed in new congressional districts. Two million, affecting 1.4 million registered voters across some 900 precincts. To get all of this right in a matter of days is not a realistic expectation. Many have already cast absentee and military ballots, and we are going to have in person voting in three days. Why am I convinced the state supreme court will strike this down? It will be because of the process and the outcome as well. I want to read from the concurring opinion of Chief Justice Kittredge and Justice Hill, issued in League of Women Voters of South Carolina v. Alexander. In that case, our current congressional plan was upheld. Justice James was the primary author of the majority opinion, but what follows is from the Kittredge and Hill concurrence: "I have no hesitation in concurring with the majority opinion . . . I do not, however, read the Court's decision as creating a categorical rule that all future claims of excessive partisan gerrymandering are beyond judicial review. I construe today's decision as cautious judicial deference, not indifference. It remains conceivable that a future challenge may present more fully developed constitutional violations with a discernable nexus to manageable judicial standards, thereby warranting judicial intervention."

And in a footnote, Justice Kittredge noted: "To its credit, the South Carolina Legislature has drawn our congressional district lines to virtually ensure the current minority political party has representation in Congress, unlike some other states."

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

Well, we are about to get like other states. We are about to upset that very cautious judicial deference. My greatest concern all along has been this -- we have a signed, sealed and delivered, constitutionally sound congressional plan, one that is unassailable, and we are on the verge of discarding it in favor of something that cannot withstand legal scrutiny. I implore you -- do not throw our congressional plan away.

On motion of Senator CASH, with unanimous consent, the remarks of Senator CAMPSEN were ordered printed in the Journal.

ADDENDUM TO THE JOURNAL

The following remarks by Senator CASH were ordered printed in the Journal of May 26, 2026:

Remarks by Senator CASH

Thank you Mr. PRESIDENT. I come to the well today to explain why I and a number of others can no longer support this effort to move the date of our congressional elections to August, while also redrawing congressional maps. I come as one who has cast at least five votes since last Wednesday to move H. 5683 forward. But I can no longer support the passage of this Bill for one simple reason -- South Carolina citizens are going to the polls today, and neither my conscience nor my common sense will allow me to stop an election that is already underway.

For me, the practical deadline for passing this Bill was yesterday, Memorial Day. But because of the rules that we operate under, the earliest we could pass this Bill would be tomorrow or perhaps even Thursday, two or three days into the voting process. Also, there are one hundred thirty nine amendments on the desk, and if we were to amend this Bill in any way, even to correct a mistake, the House would then have to reconvene and vote again, pushing the passage of the Bill even farther out. The deadline has passed; voting has begun; it is time to conclude the matter.

Now, I know there is going to be a lot of anger and frustration that we did not get the job done. I get it. Many of us are also frustrated and disappointed at what is a very unsatisfying outcome, but we need to face it, the time clock for getting this done ran out when the time clock for in person voting started at 8:30 this morning. As of noon today, over 26,000 votes have already been cast, which is over twice as many votes as were cast in the entire first day of early voting in 2024. I realize that there are many, who in good faith, believe that we should forge ahead and pass this Bill anyway and let the courts determine whether it is legitimate to

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

change an election date and redraw maps even after voting has begun. Obviously, I disagree. But one thing I think we can agree on is that we are at a pivotal point in this process. Fellow South Carolinians, the men and women in this Chamber take our responsibilities seriously. We are acutely aware of both the importance and urgency of this matter, and the strong feelings that exist on both sides of this redistricting debate.

I am on the Judiciary Committee and last Wednesday we listened to six hours of public testimony. So, for the sake of those who are engaged in this issue, for the sake of those who want further understanding and clarity, I want to give a brief review of how we got to this point. On April 29, the Supreme Court of the United States handed down the *Callais* decision, which prohibits racially-based gerrymandering. This was the catalyst for the effort to redraw South Carolina congressional maps. About a week later, on May 7, H. 5683 was filed in the South Carolina House to postpone congressional elections and redraw the maps. About a week after that, on May 13, H. 5683 passed the House Judiciary Committee. This was now two weeks after the *Callais* decision. The next day, Thursday, May 14, was the last day of our regular legislative session. When the legislature adjourned at 5:00 p.m., Governor McMaster immediately called us back into extraordinary session. The House debated the Bill and it eventually got second reading on May 19, and then third reading on Wednesday, May 20, and sent the Bill to the Senate. On that very same day the full Senate Judiciary Committee met at 2:00 p.m. and took public testimony well into the evening. It should be noted the Senate moved expeditiously, bypassing completely the normal subcommittee process and going straight to full committee. It should also be noted, however, that the Judiciary Committee heard from every single person who showed up to testify on H. 5683. In fact, the Chairman of Judiciary, Senator RANKIN held the sign-up for testimony open until 5:00 p.m. to ensure that everybody who wanted to be heard was heard. Judiciary passed the Bill Wednesday night and the Senate convened at noon on Thursday, May 21, to take up the Bill. Now, this was the point at which the Senate rules dictated the pace at which the Bill could proceed. Because H. 5683 is a redistricting Bill, Senate Rule 15 required it to be under debate for two days before a motion to cloture debate could be made, effectively making Saturday the earliest possible day to vote on the Bill and get what is called “second reading.” The only way to get around Rule 15 was to vote by a two-thirds majority to suspend the rule. On Thursday, the same day the full Senate got the Bill, Senator GROOMS gave notice of his intention to make a motion to suspend Rule 15. That would allow the Bill to move forward a day faster.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

In that regard, please understand that Senate Rule 43 requires a one day notice before the motion to suspend Rule 15 can be made. So on Friday, May 22, Senator GROOMS made the motion to suspend Rule 15 and speed the process up. This motion was made on two separate occasions, but it required a two-thirds majority, and we were five votes short of suspending the rule. So, on Saturday, May 23, after the Bill had been under debate for two days, a cloture motion was passed to bring debate to a close and then the Bill received a favorable second reading. Absent the suspension of Rule 15, that was the fastest that the Senate could obtain a second reading. The Senate then adjourned to meet on Tuesday, while allowing perfunctory session to continue on Sunday and Monday and counting those as statewide legislative days. And you might wonder, why did we do that? Because once again, Rule 15 required that the Bill be under debate for two more days before a motion to cloture debate could take place in the third reading process. The cloture motion is the motion we would shortly be voting on. If the motion was successful, then following cloture each of the forty-six Senators are allowed a total of up to one hour each to speak on any amendments. Furthermore, all amendments must be disposed before a final third reading vote can take place. Because of the time all of that will take, a conservative estimate is sometime on Wednesday before the speaking and voting can be completed. At which point we will be completing the second day of early voting, when tens and tens of thousands of votes have been cast by our constituents going to the polls.

So, in summary, without the necessary votes to suspend the rules, the fastest that the Senate could pass H. 5683, which it received one week ago on May 20, would be Wednesday, May 27. That's the fastest it could be done. I understand the anger and frustration that we could not pass a redistricting Bill any faster, but the rule of law is a bedrock principle of our Constitutional Republic, and I will emphasize, it is also a bedrock principle of conservatism. Now someone might say, "Y'all should have done redistricting back in January", and then we wouldn't be in this mess." Again, I get it. But as I said earlier, the catalyst for this current Bill was the Supreme Court decision handed down on April 29th.

I understand the Senate is going to get blamed for this failure, but the calendar and the rules would not allow a Bill that was received on the floor on Thursday, May 21, to be passed any faster than tomorrow, Wednesday, May 27. Which brings us to the pivotal moment of whether you believe it is wise, whether you believe it is right, whether you can in good conscience and by common sense reasoning, pass a Bill that

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

changes the election date and redraws the maps, when voting is already underway.

We're in the South, so I want to digress for a moment and talk about a football game to illustrate my point. Imagine if you will, two power house football teams that have a scheduled game. And yet one team has decided that they want to reschedule the game to a different date and play a different school. And so the school administration tries to make that happen in a compressed time period, with game day drawing near. Meanwhile, word of a possible game change gets out. Fans are wondering what's going on. But also in the meantime, all the routine preparations are taking place, which involve a lot of people and a lot of work. Now, everyone knows that if the game is called off, even the day before the game, people will adjust accordingly, although not without a lot of wasted time and effort. But can anyone imagine the administration finally making the deal to reschedule the game date and the opponent after the fans are in their seats, after the game has already started? Would that make sense to anyone, is that reasonable, is there any precedent for handling a football game that way once it has begun?

Yesterday was Memorial Day, a solemn day of remembering the ultimate sacrifice made by some so that all can enjoy the blessings of liberty. It is a fitting time at which to have this debate, to ponder the choice that is before us, because we know by long experience that a free and fair election is not some insignificant event that we should take for granted. It is an essential element in the fabric of our Constitutional Republic. I will close by saying this. I have looked, and I have had staff do some research. As far as I can tell, there is no historical precedent for a legislature to change the date of an election and redraw the maps once the voting has begun. No precedent, not in the history of South Carolina, not in any state. Many of us, myself included, do not want to be a party to creating such a precedent. Thank you, Mr. PRESIDENT. I will be voting "No" on cloture.

On motion of Senator CASH, with unanimous consent, the remarks of Senator JACKSON were ordered printed in the Journal.

ADDENDUM TO THE JOURNAL

The following remarks by Senator CHAPLIN were ordered printed in the Journal of May 26, 2026:

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

Remarks by Senator CHAPLIN

Mr. PRESIDENT, I am here for our daily "250th Moment" in the South Carolina Senate. Sitting at my desk these past few weeks listening to you all talk and listening to other members speak, we have heard eloquent stories of battles, of Patriots versus Loyalists going back and forth, and of British troops versus Continentals. This really had me thinking about what exactly was going on in my home area -- what was going on around my district at that time.

Society Hill, which was founded in 1736, is one of the oldest towns in South Carolina. It is not as old as Camden, but it is still relatively old. What was going on there? I started doing some research on it, and something became quite clear. Being located in that portion of the backcountry of South Carolina, the American Revolution was not as clear-cut as it was across the rest of the State and the rest of the colonies. Back there, it was truly a brother-versus-brother war. Individuals and households split apart, going against each other for what one side saw as patriotism and the other side clearly saw as treason. Neither side was able to forgive the other. They also took this opportunity to get vengeance on their neighbors for past wrongs where they felt they had been slighted. It was truly a civil war taking place in the backcountry, in Darlington and Marlboro counties.

One of the stories I want to tell you all today is the murder of Colonel Abel Kolb. You see, the Colonel was under the command of Francis Marion, working all throughout the Upper Pee Dee. The area he covered was Marlboro, Marion, Darlington Counties and that Upper Pee Dee Chesterfield district. Now, during this time, when people think about the "Swamp Fox," they think about Mel Gibson's, *The Patriot* -- men running around in the woods doing as they pleased and harassing Redcoats every opportunity they got. But that was truly not the case. The areas were divided up into certain commands, and the Pee Dee region, for the most part, fell under the jurisdiction of the Swamp Fox, while the Upper Pee Dee fell under Colonel Abel Kolb. Well, even back then, in the beginning of our country's birth, there were a lot of political squabbles going on -- people posturing, trying to get the better of each other and trying to get ahead. There was a captain who sent a letter to Colonel Kolb directing him to send forth troops to assist him in a command under Thomas Sumter. Thomas Sumter technically outranked the Swamp Fox, Francis Marion; one was a brigadier general and the other was a lieutenant general, if memory serves. Well, there was this big squabble going back and forth. The captain could not tell the colonel what to do, but the captain had orders from a lieutenant general. In the

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

midst of this confusion, while Colonel Abel Kolb ended up being correct in his decision not to send his men, several of his troops slunk off to participate in the fight anyway. Because of this, the Colonel saw that his commission was coming to an end; he had made too many enemies during this dispute. So, during that campaigning season, he proceeded to go out and root out as many of the Tories in his area as he could. It was a hard-fought, long campaign extending throughout Marlboro County and modern Darlington County. Believe it or not, most of the fighting took place in the winter, not in the spring.

In late April, he returned home. He returned to his house on the Pee Dee River, located right outside of Society Hill, accompanied by two of his men. On the night of April 27, 1781, about 40 Tories – Pee Dee men who were born, raised and spent their entire lives in the Pee Dee region -- met in Marion. They proceeded to ride hard for some twenty-odd miles up the Pee Dee River to Society Hill. There, they surrounded Colonel Kolb in his home, demanding his surrender. Colonel Kolb came out to give up his sword. At this point, the historical accounts of what happened get a little strange. Some stories say that as he was coming out to surrender his sword, he was shot and killed instantly. Others say that the Tories allowed everyone to come out, burned the house down, and then shot and killed him along with his two men in front of his wife and two daughters. But what is known from multiple records -- including accounts from his daughters who witnessed this with their own eyes -- is that before the night was over, even though their father had surrendered, turned over his sword and decided he was going to leave the conflict as all good gentlemen were supposed to do under the rules of war, he was still killed directly in front of them. His house was still torched right before their eyes, leaving their mother a widow and his two daughters homeless. Why? Because this was truly a backcountry war of brother versus brother, neighbor versus neighbor.

It was not as clean, and it was not as tied up in a bow, as it was in the rest of the country, or as it was in Charleston and Camden where lines of red and blue faced each other. In the Pee Dee region, it was truly murderers being masked by soldiers. I just wanted to share that with you today. Our American Revolution is not nearly as clean as it is often portrayed in the history books. Thank you.

On motion of Senator GRAHAM, with unanimous consent, the remarks of Senator CHAPLIN were ordered printed in the Journal.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

Motion Adopted

On motion of Senator PEELER, the Senate agreed to stand adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 12:05 P.M., on motion of Senator MASSEY, the Senate adjourned to meet at the call of the PRESIDENT.

* * *