



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 170

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2024

No. 21

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable RAPHAEL G. WARNOCK, a Senator from the State of Georgia.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, we sing about the glory of Your Name. May we live lives that will tell our Nation and world how glorious You are. Thank You for Your promises, for they refresh us each day. We are grateful for Your promises to supply all our needs, to guard our hearts with Your peace, and to keep us from stumbling or slipping as we strive to walk on the road of integrity.

Bless our Senators. Use them to contribute to the forces for harmony and goodness in our Nation and world. Give them the wisdom to make decisions that will glorify You. May they seek to serve rather than be served, following Your example of humility and sacrifice.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mrs. MURRAY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, February 6, 2024.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable RAPHAEL G. WARNOCK, a Senator from the State of Georgia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATTY MURRAY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WARNOCK thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Kurt Campbell, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Secretary of State.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday, Iran-backed terrorists carried out another deadly attack on a base that houses U.S. personnel in Syria. The Iran-backed Houthis continue to

threaten U.S. vessels and international shipping in the Red Sea.

Three days after President Biden directed strikes in response to the killing of three U.S. soldiers in Jordan, Iran and its proxies are demonstrating that their particular calculus has not changed.

The President said on Friday that our adversaries should know that "if you harm an American, we will respond." Well, by their actions, our adversaries are turning the President's words back around. They are essentially saying: We will attack America at times and places of our choosing.

Iran and the expendable terrorists it trades for American blood are demonstrably undeterred, and they are hardly the only ones. For 3 years, America's adversaries have luxuriated in a world that no longer takes us at our word. Embarrassing retreat from Afghanistan, fawning climate diplomacy with our top strategic competitor, failure to take Putin seriously until it was too late, and fears of escalation that delayed lethal aid to Ukraine at every turn—for 3 years, America's foreign policy has been defined by hesitation, half measures, and self-deterrence. President Biden has dug our credibility—the value of America's word—into a hole.

Meanwhile, our adversaries are aligning and coordinating to an unprecedented degree. As America gives our allies and partners reasons to doubt our resolve, Russia and China are engaged in a "friendship without limits." The contrast couldn't be starker.

But it doesn't have to be this way. Take it from practitioners who know that better than anyone. For example, just yesterday, former National Security Advisor retired Lieutenant General H.R. McMaster had this to say:

The abandonment of Kyiv would be a gift to the Moscow-Tehran-Beijing-Pyongyang axis of aggressors. Allies and partners would lose trust in America as those aggressors are emboldened. The result could be cascading

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S401

conflicts even more costly than the interconnected wars in Ukraine and across the Middle East.

Of course, General McMaster was the National Security Advisor to President Trump.

Former Secretary of State Mike Pompeo, in the Trump administration, put it this way, after his recent visit to Ukraine:

It will be far more costly and dangerous if Putin wins.

Another former National Security Advisor, Robert O'Brien, also with the previous administration, expressed his support for supplemental security assistance to Israel, Taiwan, and Ukraine, saying simply:

The free world has been attacked, and we're the arsenal of democracy.

It is in America's direct interest to take growing threats seriously, to invest even more urgently in our capabilities to meet them, and to support our allies and partners on the frontlines.

The reality of hard power competition simply does not wait for the President or Congress to take it seriously. Either we confront challenges we face with clear strategic and firm resolve or we lose. Around the world, 21st-century autocrats and medieval theocrats will continue to challenge the U.S.-led order that has underpinned global peace and prosperity for generations, and their proxies will continue to target American personnel and American interests with lethal force.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The majority leader is recognized.

SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, well, the Sun may be shining outside, but today is a gloomy day here in the U.S. Senate.

Last night, Members of the other side of the aisle met to decide whether they were going to side with the American people or obey the wishes of former President Trump and his friend Vladimir Putin.

While I was not party to that meeting, the reports that came out of it were disturbing, to say the least. After months of good-faith negotiations, after months of giving Republicans many of the things they asked for, Leader McConnell and the Republican conference are ready to kill the national security supplemental package, even with the border provisions they so fervently demanded.

Those reports are disturbing because this is a good bill, a bipartisan bill that will address the problems at the border directly, expeditiously, seriously.

And don't take my word for it, just ask the conservative editorial page of the Wall Street Journal that called this "a border bill worth passing" or the president of the National Border Patrol Council—who rarely sides with Democrats—who called this bill "far better than the status quo" or the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which called this package "a commonsense measure" and warned that "Congress cannot afford to ignore these problems any longer."

So last night's reports coming from the Republican conference meeting are alarming because they represent a dramatic transformation in Republican thought. In October, Republicans objected to President Biden's national security supplemental request, telling the world they could not consider it without, in Leader McConnell's words, "something credible on the border." He said his conference would give "this supplemental request a serious look and probably recommend some changes as well." That was October 22, 2023.

Since then, Senators on both sides of the aisle have conducted intense, good-faith negotiations to try and find a way forward on the border. We thought we were close in December, but some on the other side did not want to be "jammed" by the Christmas holiday so we gave them more time.

Senator Graham reasoned that a delay was necessary and thought that President Biden "should get involved in border/immigration negotiations." Well, President Biden did get involved, and he gave Senator Graham more time that he asked for. And yet again yesterday, he asked for more time once again.

In December, Senator Fischer accused Democrats of not wanting to address border security, saying that "my democratic colleagues support [border] security for Taiwan, they support [border] security for Ukraine, and they support [border] security for Israel. But what they won't support is basic border security for the United States of America. We are told that our own border security is not related to the national security supplemental? That's absurd."

That is what she said. "That's absurd" not to have border security in the bill, in December. Well, yesterday, she said she would refuse to even debate a bill that addressed our national security and border security—not even a debate.

The entire process has been quite a roller coaster. And it is not just my Senate colleagues who keep moving the goalposts. In November, Speaker Johnson said that "with our appropriations bills for Ukraine funding, for example, we're going to marry that with border security. These two things are going to be handled together because we believe it's a top priority."

But when former President Trump said he didn't want Republicans to solve the border problem, that he wanted it as a campaign issue, Speaker

Johnson did a 180-degree about-face and obediently and obeisantly changed his tune.

Now, I understand politics. I understand electoral strategy. But for more than a year, Members on the other side of the aisle have been wailing that the border was an emergency situation; that the country was in urgent crisis.

As the senior Senator from Wyoming said, "This crisis requires swift, serious, and substantive action," or like the senior Senator from Texas said, "This current crisis cries out for a solution" and "nobody believes the status quo is acceptable."

How about the words of Speaker Johnson just 1 month ago. Just 1 month ago, he said that the time to act on the border is yesterday.

This morning, Republicans are singing a new tune. Suddenly, this crisis is not so urgent. Suddenly, we need to take even more time before we address this crisis. One hard-right Republican Member of the House even ridiculously suggested that we wait until after November. This morning, a member of the Republican leadership who had recently called for swift action now says that action must wait until after the next election.

Give me a break.

Today, this is the new Republican line on the border: It is an emergency, but it can wait 12 months or until the end of time.

What utter bunk.

A cynic might suggest that this request for more time was a political ploy. But maybe we should take the Republicans at their word. Maybe we should take them at their word when they say: There is absolutely no reason to agree to policies that will further enable Joe Biden. Or when they say: Let me tell you, I am not willing to do too damn much right now to help a Democrat.

That is why this is a gloomy day. That is why the Republican Party is being thrown into disrepute by many of its own members back in their States.

Some Republicans will claim they have not had enough time to read the bill. Some Republicans will claim that they want an amendment process. Some will claim that they want guarantees their amendments will be accepted. Some Republicans will claim we need more time for debate and consideration. My guess is, they will ultimately want 10 to 12 months.

Finally, some Republicans will claim that we should separate—new tune—separate border solutions from funding for Ukraine.

I would like to address each of those claims right here, right now. For those who claim they have not had enough time to read the bill, on January 25, 10 Republican Senators wrote me a letter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, January 25, 2024.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER SCHUMER: On January 18, 2023, you stated on the Senate floor that “we need to do something to fix the situation at the border.” We agree. The crisis at our nation’s southern border is unprecedented. It’s the worst it’s ever been in our country’s history.

You also said that “it is my goal for the Senate to move forward to the national security supplemental as soon as possible.” We anticipate that legislation to address the crisis at our southern border will be in that supplemental.

It is crucial that we ensure border legislation is passed correctly, not just quickly. We must fully understand what is in the bill, how the Biden administration will implement the bill, and how it will impact our states and local communities. Therefore, we request the following:

Seventy-two hours to elapse between the text of the full national security supplemental bill being made public and the first vote on the legislation in the Senate. This will allow Senators to review the legislation fully.

Cabinet Secretaries and other administration officials charged with the bill’s implementation be made available to answer questions in an all-Senators meeting. This will allow all Senators to ask questions and learn how this will impact their state.

We believe this legislative effort can lead to a secure, safe, and operational border. For that to happen, however, we must have the opportunity to ensure the legislation does just that.

Sincerely,

PETE RICKETTS,
BILL CASSIDY, M.D.,
JOHN BARRASSO,
TOM COTTON,
JONI K. ERNST,
MARKWAYNE MULLIN,
JAMES E. RISCH,
LINDSEY O. GRAHAM,
DAN SULLIVAN,
ROGER F. WICKER,
U.S. Senators.

Mr. SCHUMER. In that letter Senators RICKETTS, BARRASSO, CASSIDY, COTTON, ERNST, GRAHAM, MULLIN, SULLIVAN, RISCH, and WICKER asked one thing of me before the first vote on legislation. They asked for 72 hours to read the bill. We met that request. The bill was posted at 6:45 p.m. Sunday, February 4. If they want until 6:45 tomorrow evening, that is fine with me. Actually, I will even offer to delay that vote until sometime on Thursday to give even more time for Senators to make up their minds.

But I suspect they won’t accept even that offer because they really don’t want more time. They are just using it as an excuse. In fact, it will surprise no one that some of the signers of that letter actually did not wait 72 hours before they rejected the bill. Senator COTTON declared his opposition after 16 hours and 48 minutes, less than 25 percent of the requested time. Senator RISCH took a little longer—an additional 15 minutes—to read the bill before announcing his opposition. Clearly, this wasn’t about having 72 hours. That is OK. I can recognize when Senators grandstand. But this—this—is no time for grandstanding. This is a time for serious people to work together to solve serious problems.

Mr. President, Senators are elected to vote, not to be afraid, run away, make excuses, when it comes to voting on the tough issues. Senators are elected to debate and deliberate, not just to say no when a former President instructs them to. We were sent here to make laws, not just to make speeches.

If my colleagues want more time, fine—fine. All they have to do is vote yes tomorrow. That will mean the Senate will have up to 30 hours of debate before we lay down the motion to proceed. Again, I want to be clear. The vote tomorrow is not about the substance of the bill. No one is being asked to take a position on the supplemental tomorrow. The only thing a “yes” vote would allow is for the Senate simply to begin to consider, discuss, and debate the vitally important issues before us now. And we will have plenty of time to do so because we will stay here in session as long as it takes.

That brings me to the Republican’s second claim. They want an amendment process. Well, during my time as majority leader, I presided over more amendment votes than the Senate held in all 4 years of the Trump administration. I would like to remind my colleagues about Senate procedure. If you want a chance to amend a bill, it turns out you actually need to get on the bill first. Voting no says no amendments. Further, once we are on the bill, you still possess the power to kill the entire bill if the amendment process is not to your liking. You can hold out for your amendments. You can hold out if you want to reread the bill again and again. And you can hold out if your amendments fail.

But our Republican colleagues—we know this—really don’t want any of those things. And when they won’t, they forfeit their ability to address the border situation at all. When they vote no, they forfeit their ability to address the border situation at all.

So I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote yes on the bill so we can discuss amendments, timing, and any other issues. The issues in Ukraine, in Israel, humanitarian aid, the South Pacific, and the border are urgent. So many of my colleagues have said they are urgent. Well, let’s vote. It is urgent. We spent months talking and debating. It is time to vote. Make no mistake about it. A “no” vote says: I never want to move forward on the border, not with amendments, not without amendments, not now, not later. We must move forward. We cannot wait any longer. We have waited long enough.

Now, for my Republican colleagues who say that we need more time to debate and consider the bill and “I don’t want to be jammed,” I have a question. In September, you told us we cannot provide support to the people in Ukraine without addressing the border crisis. In December, you told us that leaving for Christmas break was more important than solving the border crisis. Now, in February, you are telling

us you need more time. So the question I would like answered and that the American people want an answer to is this: What date would work, my Republican friends? If you don’t want to solve the border crisis and fight Putin today or tomorrow, when do you want it? Would Saturday the 24th of February be a good day for you, the day that marks the second anniversary of Putin’s invasion of Ukraine, so it can have symbolic value? And since that falls on a weekend, maybe we could vote on Monday the 26. Just let me know. We can schedule it. We have other options. You just have to tell us what day would work.

We can change the schedule, but we are voting to move to proceed Wednesday night or if you want the extra day, Thursday. Would you be willing to address those tough issues in March, in April, in June, in July?

Mr. President, I suppose I won’t get a response because it seems the only date Republicans seem to care about is November 5, election day. We all know what is going on here. Donald Trump would rather keep the chaos at the border so he can exploit it on the campaign trail instead of letting the Senate do the right thing and fix it. He would rather let Ukraine suffer on the battlefield instead of being tough on Putin. And instead of standing up to Donald Trump, Senate Republicans are ready to kill our best chance at fixing the border and ready to vote down this aid package for Ukraine in order to put what they think is their party’s political interest above the interest of the country.

It is my hope, but not my expectation, that my friends across the aisle will resist the former President’s exhortations and do what is right. That is why the Senate will move forward with our vote tomorrow. If Senators vote yes, we have options—more time to debate, an opportunity to consider amendments. If Senators vote no, those Senators should have to explain why they are ready to let the border emergency—which they so decried—why would they let it continue? We have had 4 months—4 months—of dithering and delay. Tomorrow, the American people will find out whether Senators seek border security and oppose Russian expansionism or whether they stand with former President Trump in support of the chaos and Vladimir Putin.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Republican whip.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, an early report suggests that the Biden administration may have set yet another record at our southern border—and not the good kind. If this early report is accurate, the number of migrant encounters at our southern border in January is the highest January number ever recorded. That, of course, would follow December's recordbreaking number of migrant encounters, which was a staggering 309,034. That is not only the highest December number ever recorded but the highest number for any month ever recorded. Before that, of course, there was September's record-breaking number, and the list goes on.

The Biden administration has presided over a truly unprecedented crisis at our Nation's border. We have had 3 years of recordbreaking illegal immigration under the Biden administration. Fiscal year 2021 saw a record-breaking 1,734,686 migrant encounters at our southern border. Then fiscal year 2022 broke that record, and then fiscal year 2023 broke that record. They didn't break that 2021 record by a small margin, either. Fiscal year 2023 exceeded fiscal year 2021 by a staggering 740,000-plus encounters. If the current trajectory continues, it is likely that fiscal year 2024 will break the record yet again.

All told, since President Biden took office, there have been more than 7 million—million—migrant encounters at our southwest border, and that is just counting the individuals who were stopped by Customs and Border Protection. Since January 2021, when President Biden took office, there have been more than 1.7 million known “got-aways,” and those are individuals the Border Patrol saw but was unable to apprehend. We have no idea how many unknown—unknown—“got-aways” there have been over the same period.

I could keep throwing out numbers all day, but needless to say, my point is this: The situation at our southern border is a disaster, it is unprecedented, and it is untenable. We have to get this crisis under control.

I am thankful for Senator LANKFORD's efforts to address the chaos at our southern border. Senator LANKFORD has spent months now working to develop serious border security reform, and his work has further highlighted the ways the Biden administration has invited illegal immigration and undermined security at our Nation's border.

The worst border crisis on record will be a defining feature of President Biden's legacy, in addition to the high cost of inflation imposed on American families and the weakening of America's standing on the world's stage.

IRAN

Mr. President, I also want to take a moment to comment on Friday's strikes against the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps and Iran's proxies in Iraq and Syria.

Last week, I called on the President to take decisive action in response to

the more than 165 attacks against U.S. forces in Iraq, Syria, Jordan, and in the Red Sea, including the tragic death of three soldiers in Jordan. The President's half-measures had failed, with deadly consequences, and a forceful response was overdue. The President must continue to take the necessary measures to protect our troops abroad and to maintain freedom of navigation in the Red Sea.

I specifically would like to commend the men and women of the 28th Bomb Wing, which is based in South Dakota at Ellsworth Air Force Base but now has a contingent of about 250 airmen operating out of Dyess Air Force Base while our airfield is closed.

The 28th Bomb Wing not only participated in Friday's strike against 85 targets, but it did so flying what is known as a CONUS-to-CONUS mission—that is, taking off from American soil, hitting overseas targets, and returning to base in a single, marathon flight.

This ability to generate combat power that can strike anywhere on the map is a testament to the professionalism of the 28th Bomb Wing's aircrews and maintainers, and it also underscores the importance of preserving this capability now and well into the future so that we can deter threats and hold adversaries accountable. Global reach anytime, anyplace.

The B-21 bomber, which was unveiled last year and is set to make Ellsworth its first home for Main Operating Base 1 later this decade, will begin a new era of American airpower, but until that sixth-generation bomber is fielded, we need to continue full support for programs like the B-1 bomber. I will continue to do everything I can here in Congress to support both the B-21 and the B-1 missions and the men and women who are behind their success.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Washington.

SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, we recently released the text of the supplemental. This bill is about our national security, it is about our national credibility, and it is about our future. That is why Democrats have been glued to the table, negotiating in good faith every step of the way, because the stakes could not be higher.

On Sunday, we rolled out a bipartisan, compromise package with \$60 billion in aid for Ukraine, \$14.1 billion in security assistance for Israel, \$4.8 billion to support our allies in the Indo-Pacific, \$10 billion for humanitarian assistance, \$20 billion for operational needs at the border, and more.

Now, I want to be clear, this is not the bill I would have written on my own. It is compromise legislation that came out of negotiations between Senate Democrats and Senate Republicans. As I have said before, I never believed that we should condition emergency aid for our allies on unrelated partisan priorities, but Republicans demanded that. They insisted we needed not just Executive action at the border or new resources but policy changes. So my colleagues—the junior Senator from Connecticut and the senior Senator from Arizona—worked around the clock, and now we have a bipartisan set of proposals, just as our Republican colleagues demanded.

Now, before I say anything else, this will not be the last word on immigration reform. I will keep fighting—and I know many of us will—day in and day out until we deliver on comprehensive immigration reform that creates a pathway to citizenship for the more than 11 million undocumented immigrants living in America and makes our system work better and more fairly. I know we need to finally pass the Dream Act. We need an immigration system that creates new pathways for legal status, eliminates dysfunction and backlogs, and recognizes that immigrants do make America great.

Immigrants are not just crucial to our economy—although they absolutely are—they enrich our communities and strengthen the fabric of our country in countless ways. And we should, of course, be inviting the world's brightest minds and hardest workers to make America home. That will always remain a North Star for me as we push to make our system work better and meet new needs as more folks come to our country, fleeing persecution and seeking opportunity.

We also have to address the root causes of migration in a way that promotes stability and mutual economic prosperity for everyone.

The bipartisan compromise before us does not accomplish all of that. Border policy and immigration reform is a very tough issue, and in a divided government, compromise is required. So what we have in front of us is a tailored package aimed at addressing some of the challenges before us and one that can win passage in both Chambers.

I am not thrilled with several of the provisions, but there are some important steps forward in it, like a quarter of a million new family and work visas over the next 5 years and pathways to citizenship for the brave Afghans who worked alongside our servicemembers during the war in Afghanistan.

The bill would help speed up the processing of asylum claims, ensure for the very first time that everyone gets a written explanation of their asylum decision, and provide an important downpayment on new resources to clear the backlog.

It would provide immediate work permits for folks who pass through the

asylum screenings so they can provide for their families and build a life in our country.

The bill enshrines for the first time a legal right to representation for all asylum seekers in expedited removal, and, especially important to me, it provides legal counsel for the youngest kids who arrive at our borders without a parent, seeking relief in the United States.

It protects the President's parole authority—another means of preventing chaos at our borders.

It helps ensure that documented Dreamers, the children of H-1B visa holders, are not deported.

It provides critical new resources—a 75-percent boost—for our cities and our States and organizations around the country to provide lifesaving support to migrants who are already here.

It also includes funding to help resettle refugees fleeing Putin's war and other horrific conflicts across the globe.

It has significant new investments to not just detect and stop fentanyl at our borders but to stop the chemicals used to create it way up the supply chain.

So this bill does leave a lot to be desired, but it is a compromise bill. It takes really important steps to get urgently needed aid to our allies and innocent civilians, and it was crafted to win bipartisan support.

I will be voting for this package because American leadership is on the line here and because aid to our allies, including in Ukraine, and humanitarian aid to Gaza cannot wait a moment longer.

I have tremendous appreciation for the tireless effort my Democratic colleagues put into negotiating away some of the worst and most partisan proposals. I am not new to brokering deals here in the Senate, and I understand that in negotiations, you don't always get what you want. In fact, you never do. But I also know that after a bill passes, you don't stop pushing for the progress you want to see, and that will be the case here. But when it comes to the bill before us, there is no reason—none whatsoever—for further drama or delay or partisanship.

Funding for Ukraine, Israel, and the Indo-Pacific all have overwhelming bipartisan support, and Senate and House Republicans alike were some of the loudest voices calling for changes to border policy in the first place. So despite the flurry of statements from Republicans we have seen in the past 24 hours, rushing to judgment, I hope they will join us in moving the very steps that they demanded.

After all, if Republicans kill this deal without even voting, throwing out border policies that they demanded—that they demanded—throwing their Senate colleagues under the bus, and throwing in the towel to dictators like Putin, how are they going to have any sort of credibility on addressing the border?

They won't. The American people will rightly see it for the kind of naked partisan politics people cannot stand.

We have a bill here that is serious. It is bipartisan, and it is urgently needed by our allies, especially Ukraine. If we do not fully meet this moment and soon, we are going to leave families living in a more dangerous world—a world where dictators like Putin trample democracies without consequences; a world where civilians who are caught in crossfire have less hope of getting basic aid, food, water, medical care; and a world where allies don't trust our promises and adversaries don't heed our warnings.

That is unacceptable to me, and I urge our colleagues to join me in passing this bill through the Senate and in pressing the House to vote on this bill without any further delay.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PADILLA). The Senator from Maryland.

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

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask consent that I be permitted to finish my remarks before the scheduled vote.

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

NOMINATION OF KURT CAMPBELL

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak in support of the nomination of Kurt Campbell to be Deputy Secretary of State.

The Deputy Secretary of State is one of the most critical roles at the Department of State. The Deputy Secretary serves as a key adviser to the Secretary, advancing top national security priorities, and serves as one of our top diplomats around the world.

To that end, Mr. Campbell's distinguished career provides him with the experience to excel in this position. It includes service in the Navy, in the State Department, the Defense Department, and the private sector. Mr. Campbell brings more than two decades of service in various leaderships, including as Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs and Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Asian and Pacific Affairs.

He has the expertise to help navigate the Department and our Nation through complex global challenges. Having a confirmed Deputy Secretary of State is paramount as we work to support our allies and build resilient partnerships, and respond to crises and deescalate tensions and conflict around the world—from Europe, where maintaining unity and support for Ukraine is more critical than ever; to addressing challenges in the Indo-Pacific, with the dynamic reaction between Beijing and Taipei; to the Middle East, where we must prevent further escalation and work toward the release of hostages and avoid the humanitarian crisis.

These require the full diplomatic force of our Nation. At this critical moment, the State Department's role in leadership is more important than ever. I don't have to remind my colleagues of all the challenges we have around the world. We need a full diplomatic corps there to represent the United States' interests, and it is critically important that we have Mr. Campbell confirmed as Deputy Secretary of State.

I want to take a moment to acknowledge the exceptional leadership of Ambassador Victoria Nuland, who has been serving in an acting capacity since last year. She is among our Nation's finest diplomats, and we have been lucky to have someone of her experience step into this role in the interim.

I must state that I have had many dealings with Ambassador Nuland. She has always been very direct with us. She has always been an incredibly talented diplomat representing our Nation, and we thank her for being willing to take on this extraordinary position during this critical time.

But it is in our national interest to have a Senate-confirmed official serving in our Nation's top national security post. Mr. Campbell is among the most experienced and most capable officials to be nominated to this position.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to support cloture of Mr. Campbell's nomination and to confirm him without delay.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 486, Kurt Campbell, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Secretary of State.

Charles E. Schumer, Benjamin L. Cardin, Alex Padilla, Tammy Baldwin, Jeff Merkley, Mazie Hirono, Tim Kaine, Richard Blumenthal, Tina Smith, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Jack Reed, Margaret Wood Hassan, Richard J. Durbin, Chris Van Hollen, Christopher A. Coons, Jeanne Shaheen, Christopher Murphy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Kurt Campbell, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Secretary of State, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator

from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN), the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS), and the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 90, nays 5, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 35 Ex.]

YEAS—90

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Padilla
Bennet	Graham	Paul
Blackburn	Grassley	Peters
Blumenthal	Hagerty	Reed
Booker	Hassan	Ricketts
Boozman	Heinrich	Risch
Britt	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Brown	Hirono	Rounds
Budd	Hoeben	Rubio
Butler	Hyde-Smith	Schatz
Cantwell	Johnson	Schmitt
Capito	Kaine	Schumer
Cardin	Kelly	Scott (SC)
Carper	King	Shaheen
Casey	Klobuchar	Sinema
Cassidy	Lankford	Smith
Collins	Lee	Stabenow
Coons	Luján	Sullivan
Cornyn	Manchin	Tester
Cortez Masto	Markey	Thune
Cotton	Marshall	Tillis
Cramer	McConnell	Van Hollen
Crapo	Menendez	Warner
Cruz	Merkley	Warnock
Daines	Moran	Warren
Duckworth	Mullin	Welch
Durbin	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Ernst	Murphy	Wicker
Fetterman	Murray	Wyden
Fischer	Ossoff	Young

NAYS—5

Hawley	Scott (FL)	Vance
Kennedy	Tuberville	

NOT VOTING—5

Barrasso	Lummis	Sanders
Braun	Romney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). On this vote, the yeas are 90, the nays are 5.

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I would ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to complete my remarks before the scheduled recess.

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

SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, this is unbelievable. Like, I can't believe this is happening. We were all here. This wasn't a dream. This really happened.

Republicans all stood up and said that they wanted a bipartisan bill to fix the border. The border is a priority. The border is a crisis.

We delivered a bipartisan bill to fix the border with the Republican Senator appointed by the Republican caucus to cut the deal. And within 24 hours, before the ink was even dry, Republican Senators decided they don't want a bipartisan bill to fix the border. They want to pretend they never asked for a bipartisan border bill because what they actually want is chaos because that is what Donald Trump says he wants. What the hell just happened?

Here is what happened—because the facts are just the facts. In October, Republicans refused to support funding for Ukraine. They voted against stopping Putin from making Kyiv a Russian city, not because they opposed

Ukraine funding, they said, no, because they demanded that Ukraine funding be paired with bipartisan border reforms.

Democrats took them at their word. America took Republicans at their word that these two things had to be combined. Republicans appointed a lead negotiator—one of their most conservative Members, a serious legislator—Senator LANKFORD, an unquestioned border hawk.

I represented the Democratic caucus in those negotiations. Now, I will be honest with you, a lot of my friends told me that I was crazy. They told me that I was hopelessly naive, that Republicans are never going to agree to a bipartisan bill to fix the border. This is just a setup. You shouldn't go into the negotiating room. It is a trap. But I did because, you know what, I am an optimist, maybe a hopeless optimist.

I still believe that when people say things in this body, they mean what they say. And I do believe that the border is a mess. It is too chaotic. We can't handle 10,000 people crossing on some days.

And I believe the asylum system is broken, and my constituents, whether they be right or left, believe the asylum system is broken. It shouldn't take 10 years to process an asylum claim, especially when the majority of those asylum claims are ultimately rejected.

And so I went into the room skeptical that we could get a deal but sincere because my party actually wants to fix the problem at the border, and we are willing to reach out across the aisle and find a compromise in order to do it.

And so we met for months every day. We took Thanksgiving off. We took Christmas off. But that was it because Republicans told us that they wanted a bipartisan border deal. We met every Saturday, every Sunday. We worked straight through the holidays because we saw an opportunity to cut through the politics, to get a bipartisan agreement done, to finally start fixing the border.

We saw that opportunity because Republican Senators told the country that if we could find an agreement with their appointed negotiator on border policy, that they would support it, and they would support funding for Ukraine.

And against the odds, we made the deal. We actually achieved the compromise. And here is just a snapshot of what it does: It allows the President to close portions of the border on those days when 10,000 people are crossing, to funnel people who are applying for asylum in a much more orderly manner, to make sure that you don't have those chaotic scenes that we have watched on the news.

It reforms the asylum system, a comprehensive reform, so that it doesn't take 10 years to get your asylum claim adjudicated; it will take months. And it screens individuals so that no longer

are we going to let people into the country who don't have a likely positive claim of asylum.

It allows more people to come into the country legally. We expand visas so that folks can find nonasylum pathways to come to the country or reunite with family or to work. It speaks to our values by making sure that the most vulnerable people who come to the country, like young, unaccompanied kids have an advocate standing next to them when they are making their case for an asylum claim.

It honors the commitment we made to our Afghan partners by allowing those individuals who are in the country today to have a pathway to citizenship. And it speaks to the nightmare in many cities where you have immigrants who can't work on the streets and in homeless shelters. It makes sure that we get more immediate work permits to individuals who do have legitimate claims for asylum.

This bill is not comprehensive immigration reform, but it would fix the crisis at the border. It would immediately give the President tools to start better managing the border.

We released the text of the bill on Sunday night at 7 p.m., the first serious bipartisan compromise on border policy in a decade, a breakthrough, a real chance for this Nation to come together on an issue—immigration—that too often divides us. And within 24 hours, by 7 p.m. Monday night, almost every single Senate Republican, including the Senate Republicans who set us on the mission 4 months ago, declared that they wouldn't support it. For some of them, it didn't even take that long.

When the text of the bill came out, Senator LEE tweeted that "it's 370 pages long. Time to start reading." Three minutes later, he tweeted again that "no self-respecting Senator should vote for this bill." That is either record time for reading a 370-page bill or, more likely, Senator LEE didn't even open the PDF.

What happened? How did Senate Republicans tell us they wanted a bipartisan bill only to end up opposing the very bill that they asked for?

Well, here is the simple truth, and there is no way around this: Republicans don't want to fix the border. They want the border to remain chaotic. They want the asylum system to remain broken because Republicans in this country don't view the border as a problem to fix anymore. They view it as a problem that needs to be exploited.

Senate Republicans have been pretty unapologetic about just wanting to keep this issue open as an election issue. Less than 24 hours after the text came out, one Senator launched killtheborderbill.com, a website to fundraise for his campaign. Senator BARRASSO said today that he can't support the bill; that Americans should just go to the upcoming election to solve the border crisis.

Maybe I am a sucker. Maybe I should be mad at myself, but, yes, I believed that there were enough Senate Republicans of good faith who would actually support Senator LANKFORD's sincere efforts to work to achieve a bipartisan fix, but I was wrong.

Senator LANKFORD doesn't matter. What his colleagues have put him through is unforgiveable. Senator MCCONNELL doesn't matter. The migrants and regular Americans who are getting screwed by a broken immigration system and a broken border don't matter. There is only one person who matters to Republicans, and his name is Donald Trump.

Donald Trump made it clear last month. He told Republicans they should oppose any bipartisan bill to fix the border, and he meant it. To Trump it didn't matter at all what the policy, what the substance was. His only advice was kill any bipartisan bill. Why? Because President Trump wants to win an election, and if the border is fixed by a bipartisan bill, then that hurts his reelection chances.

Trump wants chaos at the border because it helps him personally. He asked Republicans to back him, and nearly every single Senator did exactly that less than 48 hours after introduction of this bill.

This country should be outraged. Regular people out there don't think this is a game. They don't think that the only thing that matters is Donald Trump's election odds. They do think the border is broken.

They have spent the last 40 years hearing about how the border is a problem, but they don't see any action from Congress. They are sick of this, and they want the two parties to come together to fix the problem. And they are going to be furious to find out that when Republicans here had the chance to support a bipartisan bill that they requested, that they asked for, almost every single Senate Republican opposed that bill because Donald Trump wants to keep the chaos.

There used to be a difference between House Republicans and Senate Republicans. I used to explain this fact to my constituents all the time. I defended my Senate Republican colleagues. I explained how Trump doesn't control the Senate Republican caucus like he controls the House, but I don't think that is true any longer.

I think this conference is just as big a mess as the conference in the House. And that is terrible for the border, which will remain a wreck because Republicans have just chosen to keep it that way. That is terrible for Ukraine, which will soon be overrun by Russia because Republicans have chosen to leave it undefended.

And that is terrible for America because the one group of Republicans who used to be able to exercise original thought and independent judgment now just seems to be another subsidiary of the Trump campaign.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:56 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. LUJÁN).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

VOTE ON CAMPBELL NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Campbell nomination?

Ms. WARREN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN), and the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS).

The result was announced—yeas 92, nays 5, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 36 Ex.]

YEAS—92

Baldwin	Graham	Paul
Bennet	Grassley	Peters
Blackburn	Hagerty	Reed
Blumenthal	Hassan	Ricketts
Booker	Heinrich	Risch
Boozman	Hickenlooper	Romney
Britt	Hirono	Rosen
Brown	Hoeven	Rounds
Budd	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Butler	Johnson	Schatz
Cantwell	Kaine	Schmitt
Capito	Kelly	Schumer
Cardin	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Carper	King	Shaheen
Casey	Klobuchar	Sinema
Cassidy	Lankford	Smith
Collins	Lee	Stabenow
Coons	Luján	Sullivan
Cornyn	Manchin	Tester
Cortez Masto	Markey	Thune
Cotton	Marshall	Tillis
Cramer	McConnell	Van Hollen
Crapo	Menendez	Warner
Cruz	Merkley	Warnock
Daines	Moran	Warren
Duckworth	Mullin	Welch
Durbin	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Ernst	Murphy	Wicker
Fetterman	Murray	Wyden
Fischer	Ossoff	Young
Gillibrand	Padilla	

NAYS—5

Hawley	Scott (FL)	Vance
Sanders	Tuberville	

NOT VOTING—3

Barrasso	Braun	Lummis
----------	-------	--------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented

under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 473, Amy M. Baggio, of Oregon, to be United States District Judge for the District of Oregon.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Brian Schatz, Mazie Hirono, Tina Smith, Gary C. Peters, Amy Klobuchar, Raphael G. Warnock, Catherine Cortez Masto, Alex Padilla, Mark R. Warner, Tim Kaine, Sheldon Whitehouse, Martin Heinrich, Christopher A. Coons, Margaret Wood Hassan, Peter Welch.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Amy M. Baggio, of Oregon, to be United States District Judge for the District of Oregon, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN), and the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 37 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Hassan	Peters
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Booker	Hirono	Sanders
Brown	Kaine	Schatz
Butler	Kelly	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Sinema
Carper	Luján	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warnock
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Fetterman	Murray	Welch
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Graham	Padilla	Wyden

NAYS—43

Blackburn	Hagerty	Romney
Boozman	Hawley	Rounds
Britt	Hoeven	Rubio
Budd	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Capito	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Marshall	Tillis
Crapo	McConnell	Tuberville
Cruz	Moran	Vance
Daines	Mullin	Wicker
Ernst	Paul	Young
Fischer	Ricketts	
Grassley	Risch	

NOT VOTING—3

Barrasso	Braun	Lummis
----------	-------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WELCH). On this vote, the yeas are 54, the nays are 43.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Amy M. Baggio, of Oregon, to be United States District Judge for the District of Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, on Sunday night of this last weekend, three of our colleagues released the much anticipated text of what has come to be known as a bipartisan border deal. In fact, this was negotiated by three main principal Senators here in the Senate: Senator JAMES LANKFORD from Oklahoma, Senator SINEMA from Arizona, Senator CHRIS MURPHY from Connecticut, along with the Biden administration.

I want to express my gratitude to Senator LANKFORD, for our part, for the time and effort he has invested in this process. I know of no one who has worked harder in good faith to try to come up with a solution to our broken border.

I know, like all of our colleagues on this side of the aisle, he is outraged by the Biden administration's failure to secure the border, and he is eager to find a way to change the policies which will provide that security.

And I think our Democratic colleagues finally realize that the status quo on the border is a huge political liability. Well, what Senator LANKFORD hoped to deliver through this process, unfortunately, has become increasingly clear that it has not been attainable. Notwithstanding his best efforts, this proposal is not what the country needs, wants, or deserves, and I would be happy to explain why.

Given the fact we are operating in divided government, any successful reform requires bipartisan support. As I said, Senator LANKFORD worked in good faith with Senator MURPHY and Senator SINEMA, who also worked in good faith, as well as the White House to craft this agreement.

But I am disappointed that the White House has refused to budge on policy changes that would lead to significant improvements; by that I mean reduction in the flow of migrants across the southern border.

For example, this proposal doesn't place significant limits on parole authority. Now, just by way of a footnote here, parole authority means that the Biden administration has been releasing people who come to the border even if they don't claim asylum; and it is, frankly, just a population management tool. They are released into the interior of the country, given a 2-year permit and a work permit.

So no matter what we do on the front end in terms of asylum reform or the process to deal with this exploitation of the gaps in our asylum system, the Biden administration could still parole as many people as they wanted to under this proposal.

As a matter of fact, no changes were made at all to the fact that the Biden administration is releasing up to 30,000 migrants from four countries each month, presuming or assuming that they actually should be released into the country without any claim of asylum or anything else. Just letting them come and stay and work.

This is a huge magnet—a huge magnet—to people coming from those four countries, and that is 360,000 migrants a year. And that is just the tip of the iceberg. This bill also does not end what has come to be known euphemistically as catch-and-release, and it actually creates a new system under which migrants who might express an intent to apply for asylum must be released from custody even before an initial screening interview is completed.

Just to take a look back, I think it was in 2005 when then-Secretary Michael Chertoff came and testified in front of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and he noticed an uptick in the number of Brazilians that were coming across the border. What he testified to under oath is they realized that the only way you would provide the deterrence that would prevent people from coming illegally into the country is to detain them.

In other words, don't catch-and-release them; catch-and-detain them. Determine whether they have a legitimate claim, and if they did not, then return them to their country of origin. That actually provided the kind of deterrence that addressed that problem at that time, and that kind of deterrence is missing in this proposal.

And as I said, it actually creates a new system that can be exploited by the people who continue to get rich smuggling migrants to the United States from around the world, the same criminal organizations that are also involved in smuggling drugs into the United States.

And the only way you avoid catch-and-release and you provide catch-and-detain is, you need more detention space. And this proposal does not provide adequate detention space and assures that migrants will continue to be released into the interior of the country. Again, a huge magnet, or in the terminology that the Border Patrol has taught me, he calls this a pull factor. The push factors are the reasons the people want to leave their home country: violence, poverty, desire for a better life. We all understand that. But what the pull factor is, is the perception that there are no consequences to coming illegally.

Legal immigration has been one of the biggest blessings for this country that we have ever received because almost a million people a year are naturalized. They go through the system the right way. They take the citizenship test. They go through the background check, and then they become American citizens like you and I. That is an unmitigated blessing, in my opin-

ion. Illegal immigration—or outsourcing our immigration policy to drug and criminal cartels—is a disaster.

Well, this proposal also does not make a meaningful investment in enforcement resources to actually remove people who don't have the legal authorization to stay in the United States. That is a job ordinarily performed by Immigration and Customs Enforcement, or ICE. So if people can come to the country, can be released either on parole or released while they are awaiting the decision on their asylum claims, and there is no mechanism to make sure that they are repatriated to their home country if they don't qualify to stay, then they are going to continue to come, which is the reason why we have seen roughly 7 million migrants come to the United States and stay over the last 3 years.

In other words, this proposal does not fix the single biggest policy failures that have contributed to this crisis. I believe this is the responsibility, again, of the Biden administration, which has done everything they can to handcuff their negotiators and to fail to meet the requirements of what a proposal would look like that would actually make things better or would actually work.

I have said from the beginning that I would only support an agreement or proposal that would make significant policy changes and change—by that, I mean reduce—the influx of humanity coming across the border, and this proposal does not meet that requirement.

But this is, while disappointing, it is not entirely surprising. After all, President Biden is the leader of an open-borders administration that has ushered in the largest border crisis our country has ever seen. The only reason I think President Biden all of a sudden took an interest in the border is because he saw the approaching election and his plummeting poll numbers.

Since President Biden took office 3 years ago, U.S. Customs and Border Protection has encountered more than 7 million migrants—I mentioned that a moment ago—7 million in 3 years. And that doesn't even count the 1.7 million “got-aways.” “Got-aways” are people who are seen, although not detained, on cameras and other sensors and who are intentionally evading law enforcement. You can only imagine what they are up to, and I assure you, it is no good.

But we have seen, under President Biden, nearly double the number of illegal crossings that we saw during the entire 8 years President Obama was in office.

Now, to be clear, Congress has not dramatically changed immigration laws in the interim that caused this dramatic increase in migration under President Biden. Under President Trump, the laws were essentially the same, and there was no crisis of such epic proportions. This fiasco is a direct result of the policies and the actions of the Biden administration. The President created what, in effect, is a high-

powered magnet for illegal immigration.

The problem isn't just that more migrants than ever are crossing into the United States, it is also that more migrants than ever are being released into the United States.

The Biden administration has gone to great lengths to ensure that people who cross the border illegally can stay here. It is really, if you think about it, an insult to the people who follow the law and immigrate legally. They wait patiently in line. They play by the rules. And in the meantime, the Biden administration is waving through millions of migrants who are violating those rules and who are not waiting in line. Instead of detain and deport, this administration has focused all of its energy on catch-and-release.

Last month, Secretary Mayorkas told Border Patrol Agents that more than 85 percent of migrants who were caught crossing the border were being released. Now, this is from a man whose responsibility it is to enforce our immigration laws, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and he admitted to Border Patrol Agents that 85 percent who were caught crossing the border illegally were simply released.

Again, this is not a major shift in immigration policy. The Congress hasn't tied President Biden's hands or restricted his ability to detain and deport illegal immigrants. President Biden was dealt the exact same hand as his recent predecessors when it comes to enforcement authorities, but he has simply refused to use them, which is what gets to the root of the problem here: The White House really doesn't want a solution; it wants political cover.

President's Biden mishandling of the border has landed him in red ink in the polls. He is looking at the upcoming election, and he needs to change his posture and the appearance that he looks like he is actually taking this seriously for the first time in 3 years, but I have no expectation that this will lead to any sort of meaningful shift in enforcement.

Congress can pass all the laws that we want, but it is the executive branch, the President of the United States, that enforces those laws. And when they are not enforced, under our system, unfortunately, there is not much recourse. After all, if Joe Biden really wanted to fix the border breakdown, he could have done so at any point in the last 3 years. He could have used existing authorities to hold lawbreakers accountable and provide deterrence, which would have mitigated the flow of humanity across our border.

Instead, he created new incentives, new pull factors, from parole to the CBP One app. Now, President Biden has finally realized that this is such a liability that 9 months before the next election, he has decided he wants to change his position—at least publicly. But I can tell you, we are not interested in being complicit in a PR stunt.

We are interested in actually securing the border and deterring illegal immigration.

So, on Wednesday, when we vote on whether to proceed to the proposal, along with aid to Ukraine, Israel, and the Indo-Pacific, I will vote no on the motion to proceed.

To be clear, this is not no; this is not now. In other words, when cloture "fails," which is the technical procedural term, it means we need to continue to discuss this and to work it out and come up with a better solution.

But fixing this bill really requires us to go back to the drawing board and for the administration to accept some of the border enforcement proposals that we have called for, like ending catch-and-release.

Voting for this proposal, some 300 pages of technical immigration law changes, 3 days after it was released is really a bad joke. There is just no way, given the complexity of the subject matter, that Senators can do their due diligence and really understand what the impact of this proposal will be.

Now, I have spent most of my career in the Senate on the Immigration Subcommittee. And obviously coming from a border state, we are at ground zero when it comes to this crisis. But many of our colleagues have not steeped themselves in the complexities of immigration law, and we need time—all of us need time—in order to do our due diligence to understand both the intended and the potential unintended consequences.

In the 3 years since President Biden took office, the security situation at the southern border has dramatically deteriorated. I think at last count there were about 170 individuals on the Terrorist Watchlist that were detained at the border. We have no idea—and the Biden administration can't tell you—how many more individuals on the Terrorist Watchlist were among those 1.7 million "got-aways."

In the years I have been representing Texas in the Senate, there have been many ups and downs in migration levels at the border. There have been surges, some caused by events beyond our borders, others triggered by policies from the occupant of the White House. There have also been drops in migration levels, some caused by events like the pandemic, others a result of stricter policies that have actually deterred illegal immigration.

In the countless conversations I have had with folks along the Texas-Mexico border, everyone has shared the same sentiment: They have never ever seen it as bad as it is now. Law enforcement, local elected officials, NGOs—nongovernmental organizations—and private property owners agree: This is unprecedented and unsustainable. We need a major policy shift, not a figleaf. We need a major policy shift to address the Biden administration's many failures, and we need a change of behavior, not just in the policy but in actually enforcing the laws that Congress has passed.

Because our colleagues have—and the Biden administration in particular has—refused to budge on policy changes that would actually force his administration to apply the law to deter illegal immigration, I cannot support it as written.

But now, as I said, the majority leader, the Senator from New York, has teed up a process that would force us to vote on this massive bill totaling, I think the last count, \$112 billion, including this border provision, just 3 days after the full text has been released. At this point, Senator SCHUMER has given our colleagues a binary choice: Take it or leave it. For me, the choice is obvious. I will not vote just no; I will vote not now.

We need to continue this process. We need to see a change in behavior. We need to see a change in real policies that will prevent and deter this fast humanitarian and public safety crisis occurring at our border under President Biden's open border policies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

ENERGY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, with me today are two of my colleagues from my office, Mr. James Shea and Mr. Parker Loy. I want to thank them both for their good work.

Energy suicide, that is what I want to talk about: energy suicide. President Biden is committing energy suicide for America. Regrettably—and I mean that—regrettably, too many times in the past 3 years and on too many issues we have seen President Biden act as a sock puppet for a faction of neosocialist Americans who don't like our country, who think our country was wicked when it was founded and that it is even more wicked today. And this faction, which President Biden has supported far too often, thinks our country must be torn down and rebuilt, and, of course, they want to be the ones to rebuild it.

Now this faction has turned its sights, with the help of President Biden, on America's hard-fought energy independence. President Biden just aided this faction in destroying America's energy independence and committing energy suicide by declaring a moratorium on new liquefied natural gas terminals in America. Apparently, President Biden's new policy is to give up our own oil and gas and buy the energy we need from countries that hate us. So those countries that hate us will have more money to buy weapons to try to kill us. Stupidity. Stupidity should hurt more. Now, I realize you can't fix stupid, but you can vote it out.

America's ability to be energy independent is one of our greatest strengths. We are a big country. We are a big, wide, open, diverse, sometimes dysfunctional, imperfect, but essentially good country. This is a country that is filled with oil and natural gas and coal and uranium and plutonium. It is filled with rare Earth minerals. It

is filled with roaring rivers and just about everything else you need to power this economy, to help families live the American dream, and we even have a little bit leftover to help our friends. American ingenuity did that. Now, Louisiana is a big part of the equation, and we are very, very proud to be a leader in energy production.

Not every country is as blessed as America. Our friends in Europe, for example, were relying on Russian oil and gas for their energy when Putin invaded Ukraine and then cut off their supply. This paralyzed many European leaders. They didn't know how they were going to run their businesses. They didn't know how they were going to heat their homes. They were totally dependent on Vladimir Putin and Russia. Fortunately, they had a friend. They had a friend in the United States of America, and we helped them out, and we kept their businesses running, and we kept their homes heated. And do you know how we did it? Do you know what we did it with? American liquefied natural gas. American liquefied natural gas.

Energy independence. One way to look at it: Energy independence is America's jackpot lottery ticket. Now, we have worked hard for it, but it is our jackpot lottery ticket. But for some reason, President Biden wants to light our winning numbers on fire. He is committing energy suicide. Did I mention that?

At every turn—at every turn—the Biden administration has taken steps to make it more difficult, more expensive, and sometimes flatout impossible to produce, transport, and sell the energy products we need to power this great country. These foolish policies—the latest of which is a moratorium on LNG—these foolish policies are killing American jobs. They are killing American jobs. They are driving up energy prices. They are jeopardizing our national security. And it needs to stop.

Natural gas is the latest victim. President Biden's Department of Energy recently announced that it was issuing a "pause"—a "pause"; that is Washington-speak—a "pause" on all new and pending permits for liquefied natural gas export projects. Can you believe that?

Liquefied natural gas—it is not complicated. America helped invent it. You just take natural gas in its gaseous form and you cool it, turn it into a liquid, put it on a ship, and you can send it all over the world. That is how we kept Europe open after Putin cut off Europe's oil and natural gas. It was a lifeline for our allies in Europe. It was a lifeline for many of our friends in West Asia.

President Biden, before this moratorium, promised our allies in Europe that they could count on us for their LNG needs, and now President Biden has chosen to stab America's LNG producers and our allies in the back—not in the front, in the back—by prohibiting the development of new LNG export permits.

This decision is going to kill dozens—dozens—of multibillion-dollar new terminal projects, including a project in Louisiana that we call Calcasieu Pass 2—\$20 billion down the drain. Calcasieu Pass 2—a private project, a private sector project—cost \$20 billion. It was set to be the largest LNG export terminal in the United States. It would have brought thousands of good jobs to Louisiana and to America. It would have produced energy to keep this country safe, to keep this country warm, and to help our friends. But President Biden has put all those jobs and the terminal itself in jeopardy. Why? Politics. To appease that neosocialist faction that I talked about who doesn't even like our country. Why?

But, you know, the ironic thing about this—the whack jobs who talked the President into this said: Well, we want you to help the environment.

Attacking the natural gas industry actually hurts the environment. You don't have to be an astrophysicist to figure that out. Natural gas is cleaner than coal. Natural gas is cleaner than cow chips. Natural gas is cleaner than wood. That is what millions—billions of our world's citizens are going to use if they don't have access to natural gas.

As a result of natural gas—natural gas drove a 32-percent reduction in American carbon emissions. We reduced our carbon emissions by 32 percent from 2005 to 2019, and we did it with natural gas. Also, at the same time, we helped families pay half as much to heat their homes. We cut the price of the energy needs of the average American, and we created 1.4 million new jobs. The whole world wins, not loses. The whole world wins—including the economy—when Americans produce natural gas. But President Biden is going to pause all that success because some meathead activist on TikTok doesn't like natural gas. Give me a break.

The President's LNG ruling is foolish. It demonstrates world-beating vacuity and deep, profound stupidity. It is also the most recent of many actions—I say regrettably, and I mean it—it is also the most recent of many actions that President Biden has taken to undermine America's energy security.

Before he even took office—remember the campaign?—before he even took office, President Biden said—this is what he told the American people: "I guarantee you. I guarantee you. We're going to end fossil fuel."

"I guarantee you. . . . We're going to end fossil fuel."

Since his very first day in office, he has tried to do that, no matter how much it hurts Louisianians, no matter how much it hurts our allies and our friends, no matter how much it hurts the American people. Let me just give you a few examples.

On his first day, the first day he was President, President Biden blocked the Keystone XL Pipeline. It would have

made transporting crude oil from our friends in Canada safer and cleaner. It would have been good for the environment. President Biden's Department of Energy reported that canceling—his own Department said this, for God's sake—President Biden's Department of Energy said, after he made this decision, that canceling the Keystone XL Pipeline cost 59,000 American jobs, resulted in an economic loss of \$1.3 billion.

Stupidity should hurt more.

Next, the Biden administration blocked all oil and natural gas drilling on Federal lands. He cut off 25 percent of America's drilling rights.

Then he placed restrictive emission caps on American coal and natural gas power plants that would force them to invest in costly new equipment or switch to hydrogen.

Then, just recently, he canceled seven oil and gas drilling leases, ending future drilling on 10 million acres—not 10,000 acres but 10 million acres—of land in northern Alaska.

Then he approved just three offshore drilling leases—the fewest number of offshore drilling sites approved by any President since leasing began in America.

Now, he is not just killing fossil fuels. He told us he was going to do it, and, by God, he is doing it. But he is not just killing fossil fuel projects; he is killing projects that are essential for wind and for solar too.

Wind and solar energy and the electric cars that President Biden wants Americans to drive all rely on batteries. Duh—that is why they call them electric. Those batteries require rare Earth minerals: cobalt, silver, copper, nickel. You can't just go to the Piggly Wiggly and buy those things; you have to mine them. We can mine those minerals in the United States, but once again, the Biden administration wants Louisianians and Americans to rely on countries that hate us for these minerals instead of mining for them at home.

For example, President Biden recently announced a ban on all copper and nickel mining in Minnesota's boundary waters—all of them. The Biden administration's EPA also proposed a rule that would allow Governors, blue State Governors—I am looking at you, California; I am looking at you, Illinois; I am looking at you, New York—that would allow blue State Governors to block rare Earth mining permits in their States. In fact, America's only cobalt mine closed on President Biden's watch.

Foolish political energy policies make life harder for Louisiana and American families. Electric prices are already up 23 percent nationwide since President Biden took office, and that is just a fact. Look it up. Go to Google. Let me say that again. Electricity prices are up 23 percent on average nationwide since President Biden took office. Gas prices are up 32 percent. They come down some, thank God, but they are still up 32 percent.

While Louisianans struggle under President Biden's energy- and job-killing policies, our adversaries can't stop winning.

Let's take Iran. Iran's oil imports are at a 5-year high. The Ayatollah in Iran—this guy made enough money to resume funding terrorist attacks on American bases. He is doing it all over the world. Do you know why? Because President Biden lets him. We have sanctions on Iran; the President will not enforce them.

Venezuela. Let's take Venezuela, another enemy of our country. Venezuela's oil imports increased 12 percent in 2023. Do you know why? President Biden took the sanctions off of them.

China is probably the biggest winner of them all. Even when President Biden tries to help the American people afford his surging energy costs, China wins. China wins.

I will give you an example. The Biden administration allowed a Chinese-owned company to buy up fuel from our strategic natural petroleum reserve. We have a strategic natural petroleum reserve. We buy up oil, millions of barrels. We store that oil underground in case we need it, in case we can't get oil from anywhere else. It is our energy savings account. Well, President Biden decided to sell some. He decided to sell it. Do you know whom he sold it to? China. China.

It was a move so foolish that the House and the Senate, which usually can't agree on the fact that the sky is blue, both passed bills to prevent China from ever tapping into our petroleum reserve again. You can't make this stuff up, folks.

Energy independence keeps America safe; it keeps America strong; it keeps America prosperous.

Louisianans—I don't know about other States, but I suspect other Americans believe like Louisianans. Louisianans do not want to rely upon the whims of our adversaries to keep our country running.

We cannot let President Biden commit energy suicide—we can't—to appease the radical left, the "loonwing," of his party.

So I ask my colleagues to join me in pushing back against President Biden's anti-energy agenda and his moratorium on liquefied natural gas. Why? Because stupidity should hurt more.

I yield the floor to my good friend from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 543

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I rise today to ask unanimous consent that the Senate adopt our resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Governors of the individual States have a constitutional right to repel the dangerous and ongoing invasion across the U.S. southern border.

Joe Biden has the power to secure our borders. Instead, he has chosen to break the law, resulting in the worst border crisis in American history.

Frankly, I don't know how the President sleeps at night knowing that 300 young Americans will die today from fentanyl poisoning; 300 yesterday, 300 tomorrow. Three hundred thousand people have died from fentanyl poisoning since he took office.

Along with that, there are terrorists, Chinese communist nationals, cartels. And worse, they are all living in the interior of our country.

Since our Commander in Chief won't stop this historic crisis, an invasion declaration, as defined by the U.S. Constitution, allows Congress to recognize each State's right to secure their own borders. Where Joe Biden fails to put Americans' safety first, our resolution acknowledges each State's right to secure their borders themselves, as leaders like Texas Governor Greg Abbott have. The cartels and the CCP should not have more operational control of our borders than we do.

We have reviewed the big picture here. Let's take a closer look. I think the first question we all ask is, Is this an invasion? Well, to have an invasion, you have to have invaders. And as we try to understand what the Constitution means, it is good to go back to some of those Founding Fathers when they defined what they thought were "invaders."

It is interesting that James Madison called pirates and barbarians invaders. And just like the barbarians of Madison's time, today's cartels and terrorists are those invaders acting like pirates of the day.

So then let's talk about is this an invasion? Do we have an invasion on our southern border? You know, I tried to think what analogies I could give of what it was like when I visited the southern border. But we are here in DC, so I will kind of paint a picture of what I think it would look like if this invasion were occurring right here in DC.

If you could imagine with me what it would look like if there were 10,000 ships coming up the Potomac River over the last 3 years—10,000 ships, each with 1,000 people from over 180 different nations; 10,000 ships, 1,000 people from 180 different nations. Let's pretend they come up the Potomac River and they lay anchor right out here at the Wharf and those people slowly get off one at a time. The way I would envision this is one of those ships is full of known terrorists and Chinese nationals. There would be 80 ships with aliens of interest—people from countries that wish harm to America. There would be 200 ships anchored out here where people would hop off the ship and just disappear into the night—200 ships with 1,000 people on it disappearing into the night, and we have no idea who they are or where they are. There would be another 200 ships—200 ships with 1,000 people—that President Biden would give parole to, just say: You are fine. We don't care what reason you are here for, here is your parole slip. And then sprinkled in amongst these ships are criminals, murderers, rapists, thugs,

drug traffickers, human traffickers, and thieves. Does that sound like an invasion to you?

Next, why do we need to declare this an invasion? Well, what our resolution does is give State Governors more powers to defend themselves. If the Federal Government is not doing their job, then it would make sense that the Governors would have the right to defend themselves, to defend the people of their States.

Let me explain a little bit further. I am a physician; I am not an attorney, definitely not a constitutional lawyer. But fortunately for all of us, the Constitution was written, for the most part, by common people just like us so that common people like us could read it and understand it.

So what does the Constitution say about an invasion? Remember, everybody up here swore an oath to defend that Constitution. Members of Congress, the White House, the President, we have all sworn an oath to uphold the Constitution.

This is what the Constitution says in article IV, section 4: It promises that the Federal Government "shall protect each [State] against Invasion." This is a constitutional law that the Federal Government shall protect each State against invasion.

Now, we have already established that the Federal Government has not done its job with this invasion of 10 million people that has already occurred. I don't think anyone can argue that point out there.

But, fortunately, our forefathers anticipated such an incidence that someday we would have a President who didn't love this country, didn't recognize that we have a sovereign border, and would indeed allow some 10 million people illegally across our border, so they have in the Constitution from article I, section 10, clause 3: The States have sovereign interest in protecting their borders.

So if the Federal Government doesn't do its job, the States have the ability—the constitutional right—to protect their borders.

This is the last point I will make from the Constitution, and maybe this is a little tricky, but the Constitution goes on to say in clause 3 of section 10 of article I:

No State shall, without the Consent of the Congress . . . engage in War, unless actually invaded.

Let me say that again:

No State shall, without the Consent of Congress . . . engage in War, unless actually invaded.

That is why we are here today. The Senate needs to declare that our southern border has actually been invaded to empower the Governor of Texas to protect his people.

Look, this invasion has occurred. We have established that. To say otherwise, to say this is not an invasion, I think, would be a false statement for anybody.

The President has not done his constitutional duty. We have established

that. Thus, we must invoke and concur with the Governor of Texas that an actual invasion has occurred. And the Governor of Texas, Governor Abbott, has not just a moral responsibility but the constitutional right to invoke his power and authority to do everything in his capability to protect the good people of Texas.

I commend and compliment Operation Lone Star. They have come up with more than 35,000 felony charges. They have seized over 450 million lethal doses of fentanyl. Again, 450 million lethal doses of fentanyl—that is enough to kill every man, woman, and child in America more than once.

That is why I am here today, to lend my support and my hope that the entire unanimous consent and support of the Senate would be with the Governor of Texas and the good people of Texas.

Mr. President, as in legislative session, and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 543, which is at the desk. I further ask the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from California.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, these past 2 weeks have given the American people a clear window into the Republican mind when it comes to immigration. They can't decide if immigration reform is the responsibility of Congress or if it is the responsibility of the President. They can't decide if the border is in crisis or if they would rather wait until after the election to talk about it or try to do something about it.

Today, in this resolution, they are doubling down on declaring an "invasion" and vilifying immigrants, while preventing the Federal Government from keeping order on the border.

My first message to my Republican colleagues here today is this: Make up your mind. Do you want to get serious about immigration reform or not?

They can't do it, and these past few weeks we saw why. Republicans believe that fear of our border translates into turnout at the ballot box. And because they believe that a narrative of chaos and fear would help Donald Trump in November, they are saying the quiet part out loud. They are saying it. They are repeating it. They are amplifying it on social media.

It is the same reason that they can greet Secretary Mayorkas at the negotiation table during these supplemental negotiations with one hand, while with their other hand they file baseless impeachment articles against him.

Today's resolution is just as unserious as it was the last time that they brought it up.

Let's put aside, for a moment, the obvious constitutional concerns, put aside, for a moment, and discuss what giving immigration powers to Governors would look like.

Colleagues, the fact is, you don't even have to imagine. Let's look at what is happening in Texas. Governor Abbott has shown us the cruelty and lawlessness of what it would lead to: unconstitutional legislation to terrorize immigrants in Texas, putting them at risk of racial profiling and civil rights violations; razor-lined buoys that have pushed asylum seekers and their families, including small children—nursing babies, colleagues, nursing babies—into dangerous waters with deadly consequences—you want to know why we talk about humanity; this is happening—and razor wire along the border that prevents Federal officials from doing their job of securing the border; State governments preventing Federal officials from doing their job.

Is that what you want? For the self-proclaimed party of law and order, Republicans are acting like anything but.

Now, let's not lose sight of the very real danger of this kind of action and this kind of rhetoric. The idea that immigrants are invading has radicalized people in our country to perpetuate terrible violence in the not so distant past, including the 2019 shooting in an El Paso Walmart, where a White nationalist murdered 23 people, Hispanic families who were back-to-school shopping.

My colleague from Kansas asked something about being able to sleep at night. Since that day, I have not been able to sleep as well at night for fear of the same happening in my community, to my family.

Now, I agree that the asylum system is outdated and in need of modernization. We must have a border that is more secure and more orderly and humane. But there is absolutely not an invasion happening, as our Republican colleagues have tried to portray. People arriving at our borders are seeking protection for themselves and their families, seeking refuge from violence and political persecution from oppressive regimes, exercising their legal right to seek asylum—a legal right to seek asylum that we established back in World War II.

Today's resolution would represent a fundamental disregard for the Constitution and the rule of law, and it would undoubtedly lead to more cruelty at the border and throughout the country, for that matter, not just at the border. It is for that reason that I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, I am proud today to join my colleague Dr. MARSHALL on the floor to support the State of Texas in their efforts to secure the disaster at the southern border.

I have been there many times. I would challenge my Democratic colleagues: How many times have you been to the southern border in Texas to see this disaster?

Right now, the Biden administration is actively trying to stop the State of Texas from protecting their and our border. Meanwhile, Democrats are telling the press that they want to fix the border crisis that President Biden has created. It has taken 3 years. But they say that the Republicans won't let them. That is not true.

The Biden administration is suing Texas and destroying barriers at the border actively, every day. The taxpayers have already paid for the wall—the extension of the wall that was stopped after President Trump stepped down a few years ago. President Biden refuses to build a wall.

He is pushing a bill on us that actually sets aside money it already appropriated for the wall and allows him to postpone new construction indefinitely. There is no plan. This is what they call a border bill. I call it a border giveaway.

Joe Biden is selling off the border for pennies on the dollar that the taxpayers have already paid for. It is online. You can go online and buy, in an auction, the wall and razor wire that is sitting on the ground mostly in Arizona, and you can buy it for 10 cents on the dollar.

He is actively destroying our southern border. This is something from the worst nightmares of our Founding Fathers: a President who is more concerned about other people's borders and not ours.

Now, about half of the American southern border is also the southern border of Texas. There is an old saying that the Constitution is not a suicide pact. The Federal Government cannot—I repeat, cannot—force Texas to let itself be invaded and destroyed.

Article IV, section 4 of the Constitution promises that the Federal Government shall protect every State from invasion. In fact, the Declaration of Independence accused King George of exposing the colonies "to all the Dangers of Invasion."

Article I, section 10 of the Constitution explicitly says that a State may engage in war without the consent of Congress if "actually invaded, or in such imminent Danger as will not admit of delay."

Now, let's look at the facts. At least 10,000 people a day, on several months, have been coming across our border, averaging 7,500 a day. The Biden administration admits to releasing 85 percent of that 7,500 a day into our country—85 percent are released into the country. This is in addition to the 2 million illegal immigrants that we have lost track of in the past 3 years.

More than 100,000 Americans are dying every year because of drugs, which a lot have come across our southern border—and getting worse. That is more than we lost in the Vietnam war, and that was a very long war.

Drugs, gangs, and even terrorists are flooding—are flooding—our border. We don't know who they are. Can there be any doubt that the Founding Fathers would consider this an invasion?

The population of our country at the founding was about 4 million people, at the beginning, 248 years ago. The population has grown, obviously. We have had more than 8 million illegal crossings since Joe Biden took office—8 million. The sheer scale of this is unlike anything that any of us have ever seen.

So it should be clear. The facts and the Constitution are both on the State of Texas's side, and Texas has every right to protect the people in its State and our country.

I am confident that the Supreme Court will uphold the Constitution on this ruling, but the real solution is not relying on a court ruling. The real solution is for President Joe Biden to stop destroying the border and put a stop to what is happening.

Stop cutting the wire. Stop suing our border States. Stop selling off the wall. Stop pretending to want a border bill that we know won't work. Stop encouraging. Stop encouraging the invasion. He is personally doing that from the White House. Stop encouraging the invasion of our country, which is costing American lives every single day.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Missouri.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1199

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, last week, the executives of some of the largest tech companies in the United States came before the U.S. Senate. And the world got to see, with all too vivid detail, just what these companies and these executives are doing to our children. And I say "children" advisedly. I am talking about 12- and 13- and 14- and 15-year-old kids on these platforms—on Facebook, on Instagram, on SNAP—who are exposed to the most outrageous, unbelievable, grotesque, and vivid child sex abuse material known to mankind: images of exploitation, solicitations by pedophiles.

It is unbelievable, indescribable material. And these platforms are absolutely awash with it. And we saw it last week. We heard the testimony. It was so bad that Mark Zuckerberg, the founder and CEO of Meta, actually felt forced to apologize to the parents there in the room and the parents across this country who have lost their children to suicide, whose children have suffered extraordinary harm because of the sex

abuse material, the exploitative content that is all over Meta, that is all over these platforms.

And oh, by the way, they are making an astounding profit. These companies are the most profitable companies in the world. They are the biggest companies in the history of the world. Facebook's share prices actually went up the day after Zuckerberg's testimony. It is unbelievable. Here they are making money hand over fist on destroying America's children.

The numbers tell the tale. Think of this: In 2014, there were 1.1 million reports of child sex abuse material online that year. That in itself is an incredible number—a million reports—but look at this: By 2022, that number had risen to 32 million reports of child sex abuse material—child porn, child exploitation, solicitations. In just in 1 year, there were 32 million reports. That is just the images that are actually being reported. Those are just the ones we know about. We know from the testimony of the tech executives, we know from the reporting of news agencies, we know from the investigations that have been done, we know from the parents, that these platforms are absolutely littered with, awash with, overrun with this material, and because of that, children are literally dying.

Is it any coincidence that since the introduction of the smartphone and the ubiquity of these platforms in the hands of young people, that suicide rates and mental health crises have skyrocketed in this country?

Oh, the platforms know, by the way. They absolutely know. A whistleblower testified before the U.S. Senate committee earlier this past year. He worked as a senior executive at Meta—that is Facebook. He knows Mark Zuckerberg personally. He was hired by Zuckerberg personally. He reported in part to Zuckerberg. Here is the thing, though: He had a teenage daughter. Yes, he had a teenage daughter who created an Instagram account, went online, and then told her father, this executive: Dad, you won't believe what I am seeing online. You won't believe what is happening to me online.

So he looked into it, as any father would, and then he began to compile the data that he could find based on Instagram's own internal metrics, based on their user data and information. Here is a piece, just a piece, of what he found: that 37 percent of Instagram users between the ages of 13 and 15—let me say that again—37 percent of Instagram users between the ages of 13 and 15 had experienced unwanted nudity on the platform in the past 7 days.

Let me just spell this out for you. It is largely, overwhelmingly young, teenage girls, young women, who are bombarded with—bombarded with—the most unbelievable pictures, content, conduct as soon as they get onto these platforms.

Twenty-four percent of Instagram users between the ages of 13 and 15 had

received unwanted sexual advances in just the last 7 days, had been propositioned in 7 days.

Seventeen percent of Instagram users in that same age range—young teenagers—had encountered self-harm content—how to commit suicide—within the last 7 days.

These are Instagram's own numbers. These were given to us by the whistleblower who, as an executive at Instagram, told Mark Zuckerberg about it. What did Mr. Zuckerberg do? Nothing. Absolutely nothing.

Consider another case. Here is a picture of a young girl, 13 years old, named Issa. Issa doesn't actually exist. The New Mexico attorney general has launched an investigation into Meta—that is Facebook and Instagram—and their investigators created this profile.

As you can see from the picture, she looks incredibly young. The profile picture information lists her as 13 years old. What happens as soon as she gets on the Meta platforms? As soon as she gets on the Meta platforms—this is all in court documents, by the way. Read it for yourself. It is horrifying. What happened was she was instantly added to a chat room with known pedophiles. What happened was her account was instantly bombarded with sexual material from older men. What happened was she was instantly sent multiple images of child sex abuse material over and over and over and over.

Oh, and the tech executives—they know all about it, and they are not doing a thing about it. Why? Because they are not accountable.

Here is the bottom line: This is the only industry in the country that can make a product that will literally kill you, and if it does, you can't do anything about it. If it kills your child, you can't do anything about it. If it harms you, you can't do anything about it. Think about this for a second. In this country, if a Coca-Cola manufacturer makes a bottle that explodes in your hands, you can sue them. If the drug company makes drugs that are full of adulterated products that cause harms that are not disclosed that kill people, you can sue them. If an automobile company makes cars that explode, you can sue them. Not these companies. No, not these companies. These companies have a special immunity from suit. How do they get that? Why, it was given to them. By whom? By this body. This body, almost 30 years ago, gave these powerful corporations total blanket immunity. They cannot be held responsible. They make products that kill; they cannot be held responsible.

That is why we are here today. The Senate Judiciary Committee has heard testimony over and over again. We have written bills. We marked them up.

The bill that I want the Senate to address today is one that has passed the Senate Judiciary Committee—get this—unanimously. Unanimously. Every Democrat. Every Republican. What does it do? Simple: It allows victims to have their day in court. It

gives victims of these tech platforms the same right that victims of some car company or drug manufacturer or other product maker would have: the right to get into court; the basic American right to be heard; the right to hold accountable the most powerful corporations in the history of this Nation. That is what this bill does. I am proud to cosponsor it. I am proud that it received unanimous support in the committee.

Mr. President, I will just say this: We have had hearings and hearings and hearings. We have had talks until there is no more talk to be done. It is time for Congress to act.

Mr. Zuckerberg's apology is nice, but that is not going to help the victims of child sex abuse. What will help the victims of child sex abuse is the right to hold these companies accountable.

It is time for Congress to act because, let's be honest, Congress helped create the problem. Do you want to know why there is sex abuse content overwhelming the internet? Because Congress enabled it. Congress did. Congress did. And the refusal now to allow victims to have their basic rights in court is allowing that child sex exploitation to continue and continue and continue. It is time to break the cycle.

After Zuckerberg and the others came before the committee, after they apologized, I said now it is time for Congress to act. Let's take the work we have done, and let's put it on the floor. Let's act. Let's see where we are. Let's do something for victims. Let's right the wrongs that this body has helped create, and let's give victims the right to be heard.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 69, S. 1199; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WYDEN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I very much share the stated goals of the STOP CSAM Act. Child sexual abuse material is a toxic plague on the internet. There are real victims who need real support and criminals who must be hunted down and locked up.

I take a back seat to no one when it comes to helping kids and punishing predators. However, this bill would weaken the single strongest technology that now protects children and families—that's strong encryption. It will make it easier to punish sites that use encryption to secure private conversations and personal devices. While STOP CSAM's sponsors have argued that the bill does not target encryption, the bill explicitly allows courts to punish com-

panies that offer strong encryption. It also would encourage scanning of content on user's phones or computers before information is sent over the internet, which has the same consequences as breaking encryption.

Weakening encryption is probably the single biggest gift that you can give to the predators and the monsters who want to stalk and spy on kids. Sexual predators will have a far easier time stealing and extorting photographs of children, tracking their phones, and spying on their private messages once encryption is breached.

Doing so threatens the privacy and security of every single law-abiding American.

I also think it is surprising that the Senator is asking to pass this bill at the very same time its sponsor is reportedly circulating an updated version of the bill with a number of changes. Although that new version of the legislation has not been made public, it certainly would be a mistake to pass legislation that apparently is still in the process of being revised.

Mr. President, what this is all about is talking about doing something effective or actually taking effective action. I have proposed doing just that. We ought to focus on giving law enforcement officials the tools they need to find and prosecute criminals responsible for exploiting kids and spreading these vile materials online. That way, we can help keep kids from becoming victims in the first place.

Let me also say that we can do this if Members support my bipartisan Invest in Child Safety Act. The bill directs \$5 billion in mandatory funding to do three things which would ensure that we have an effective response for families and parents: one, give law enforcement agencies the tools and personnel they need to catch the predators who are creating and spreading CSAM; two, fund community-based programs to prevent at-risk kids from becoming victims in the first place; three, invest in programs to support survivors of abuse.

Any legislation that doesn't include these pieces is missing the point; therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, there you have it. There are the Big Tech talking points. The problem is that they are entirely false. I have the bill text in front of me—the bill text that, again, passed unanimously out of the Senate Judiciary Committee—that explicitly exempts encryption technology: page 184, lines 15 and following; page 185, lines 1 through 18. You can read it for yourself—explicitly exempts. That is not true at all. It is flatly false.

I have been on this floor over and over and over again on this issue, and every time, we are told: Not today. Not this. A little more of that. Maybe if it were more bipartisan.

This has unanimous support from the Judiciary Committee. Unanimous. Every Republican. Every Democrat.

And we all know the truth here: that until victims can get into court and have the rights and dignity of every other American challenging any other company, this will not change.

Congress created this problem. Congress created it by giving the most powerful companies in the world a sweetheart deal that they still have to this day.

It is an easy choice: Are you with the corporations or are you with the American people? Are you with the big companies or are you with the child victims? That is the choice.

I would just say to those who continue to support 230 with no exceptions, no exemptions, no reform, no recognition of the incredible danger it has unleashed for children, that they are on an island.

This state of affairs cannot continue. It cannot continue to be that if Big Tech sells products that kill kids, they cannot be held responsible.

It cannot continue to be that only these companies, the most powerful companies in the world, get a pass that nobody else gets, because nobody should get it.

I am committed to coming to this floor and forcing votes as long as it takes—as long as it takes—until we get justice for victims, until they are heard, and until these companies are finally held accountable.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I would ask unanimous consent to briefly respond to what my colleague has just repeated.

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

Mr. WYDEN. And then I would ask unanimous consent for 5 minutes to speak in favor of a very talented jurist in Oregon, who will be voted on shortly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, first, with respect to my response to our colleague from Missouri, let me be clear on a point that technologists are clear on. This bill would weaken the strongest technology that protects children and families online: strong encryption. And this bill explicitly allows courts to punish companies that offer strong encryption. That is right at the center of my objection.

NOMINATION OF AMY M. BAGGIO

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today, the Senate will vote to confirm Amy M. Baggio to the U.S. District Court for the District of Oregon.

Judge Baggio received her B.A., cum laude, from Wake Forest University and her J.D. from Lewis & Clark Law School. After law school, she became a public defender in Portland, where she represented clients in State court.

From 2002 to 2012, she served in the Office of the Federal Public Defender for the District of Oregon in Portland. She handled both trials and appeals in that role, representing her clients in Federal district court and before the Ninth Circuit. In 2012, Judge Baggio opened a solo practice in Portland, where she worked until 2019. During her time as a litigator, she tried 12 cases to verdict, including 8 jury trials.

In 2019, Judge Baggio was appointed to the Oregon State Circuit Court in Multnomah County by then-Governor Kate Brown. Judge Baggio was subsequently elected to the position in 2020. Over the past 5 years, she has handled civil, criminal, and family law matters, and she has presided over more than 40 trials.

The American Bar Association unanimously rated Judge Baggio “well qualified” to serve on the District of Oregon. She has deep ties to Oregon and enjoys the strong support of both of her home State Senators, Mr. WYDEN and Mr. MERKLEY. Her extensive litigation background and experience as a State court judge will serve her well on the Federal bench.

When Senator WYDEN introduced Judge Baggio at her confirmation hearing, he noted that she has never had a party before her file a request for a different judge, a testament to her fairness. I strongly support this nominee, and I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting her nomination.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am going to move now to my brief remarks with respect to our judge from Oregon. I come to the floor today to reiterate my strong support for Judge Amy Baggio’s nomination to serve on the U.S. District Court for the District of Oregon.

Judge Baggio has a proven track record as both a jurist and a litigator. She spent a decade as a public defender; and in her career on the bench, she has presided over hundreds of civil and criminal matters and handled 42 trials, half of which were jury trials.

And I note, because Members have been asking with respect to her values in terms of prosecuting and dealing with cases and her attitude towards criminals, in one case the judge sentenced a man to many more years for first-degree sexual abuse than anyone had thought was even being discussed, certainly longer than was sought by defense counsel. So it is a testament to Judge Baggio’s fairness and professionalism that during her career as a judge, she has never once had a party file a request for a different judge.

In addition to being fair, she has consistently demonstrated an ability to make thoughtful decisions that protect communities and their values.

I urge my colleagues—and I gather that we will be going to the vote now—to support a very dedicated public servant—and I emphasize that—a public servant who has got a real track record as a public defender and in her career on the bench.

I urge my colleagues to support Judge Amy Baggio.

VOTE ON BAGGIO NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Baggio nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant executive clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) and the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS).

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 38 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Hassan	Peters
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Booker	Hirono	Sanders
Brown	Kaine	Schatz
Butler	Kelly	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Sinema
Carper	Luján	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warnock
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Fetterman	Murray	Welch
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Graham	Padilla	Wyden

NAYS—44

Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hagerty	Romney
Braun	Hawley	Rounds
Britt	Hoeven	Rubio
Budd	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Capito	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Marshall	Tillis
Crapo	McConnell	Tuberville
Cruz	Moran	Vance
Daines	Mullin	Wicker
Ernst	Paul	Young
Fischer	Ricketts	

NOT VOTING—2

Barrasso	Lummis
----------	--------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PADILLA). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be notified immediately of the Senate’s action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, in December, President Zelenskyy came here to Congress. He came to us because he is fighting for his country’s future and for his citizens’ lives. This supplemental spending bill, the portion for Ukraine, will fulfill our commitments to our allies, defend democracy, and save innocent lives.

Let’s be absolutely clear about that. Ukrainian civilians will live or die based on what we decide to do here in the Senate, in this Chamber. Are we

going to ignore the requests, the pleas, the cries for help from our fellow champions of democracy in Ukraine?

President Zelenskyy has told us that Ukrainians will continue to fight with or without us. By that, he did not mean that they don’t need us. No, they need us more than ever. With our help, they have pushed back against the Russian invaders. Without our help, they will run out of ammunition to hold back the Russians.

Our White House has conveyed this message:

We are out of money—and nearly out of time.

That is our government speaking. Our White House has warned us that “while our allies around the world have stepped up to do more, U.S. support is critical and cannot be replicated by others.”

Putin himself told us the deadly stakes. He said:

[Ukraine] will only have a week to live when the ammunition runs out.

And Ukrainians are running out of ammunition.

Now, the United States could choose to stop funding, but the Ukrainians can’t choose to stop fighting—nor would any of us if war came to our hometowns. If you had to defend your home, if you had to defend your family knowing that, if you stopped fighting, that death would fall from the sky as bombs and rockets obliterated your communities; that as Russian soldiers marched down your quiet street, your neighbors would be tortured, raped, your children stolen, your family executed, would you stop fighting even if you ran out of ammunition?

And those actions are what Russia has already done in the cities and towns they ran over in Ukraine. We know it will continue to happen if they run over other cities.

So the Ukrainian people really are fighting for their lives, and we are here debating whether we are going to abandon them. This is a conversation I can’t believe we are having. I can’t believe, with all of the foreign engagements we have been involved in, that when a fellow Republic which has repeatedly pushed hard to be out from under Russia’s thumb, which had the Orange Revolution, which threw a President out of their country who wanted to betray them, who are now fighting in the streets against this Russian invasion—I can’t believe we are having this conversation here in the Senate with so many colleagues ready to abandon Ukraine.

But this is certainly a critical debate. Ukraine is not some regional conflict on a faraway map. Putin himself put it this way in October. He said:

This is not a territorial conflict or even the establishment of a regional geopolitical balance.

He continued, and he said:

The question is much broader and more fundamental: We are talking about the principles on which the new world order will be based.

That is Putin. And what are the principles that Putin champions in that new world order? Well, we know what they are: the end of freedom of speech; the end of freedom of assembly; the end of freedom of religion; the end of citizens, through the integrity of democratic elections, choosing their own leaders and their own futures.

And there is another principle that is very much embedded with Putin, and that is the continuation of vile crimes against humanity—of rape, torture, and execution.

And Putin is not the only authoritarian in the world with this set of principles. We have got the Ayatollah in Iran to Xi Jinping in China who share his vision, who have closed ranks behind him in this fight, this fight in which they evade sanctions, legitimize tyranny, undermine the precious values of human rights, freedom, and democracy.

They are watching the United States very closely. They are watching to see if Senators in this Chamber are going to vote to abandon Ukraine. They are going to see if Senators in this Chamber are going to abandon our partnership and alliance with NATO in support of the people and the republic in Ukraine. They are watching to see if they can outlast our fickle political attention span. They are watching to see if they can invade their neighboring countries, execute the citizens in that country, and take over those adjacent nations, all for more power and more profit.

It is so important that democracy stand shoulder to shoulder in this fight. We know that is what we need to do. That is how we won the Cold War. And before that, it is how we won World War II when we defeated another axis of authoritarians bent on repression and conquest.

It was in 1940. Germany and Italy signed a pact to support each other. Back then, many Americans believed that we could stay out of war in Eastern Europe by hiding behind the slogan of “America First.” And then the bombs fell on Pearl Harbor.

The war in Europe then, like the war in Europe today, isn’t some regional conflict that we can ignore, not some regional conflict that doesn’t affect us. It is a universal struggle about whether people in Ukraine and here in the United States have the right to live in freedom and peace or whether repressive authoritarians can conquer democracies.

And the authoritarians in Europe and Asia then, like the authoritarians in Europe and Asia today, were dictators who viewed democracy as a threat—a threat to their power, a threat that must be destroyed. Dictators do not stop. Dictators must be stopped.

Putin has ruled Russia for a quarter of a century, and he wants even more time to continue his establishment of those principles against freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of assembly, the principles of crushing

dissent. Putin has ruled with total and merciless control and power, and he wants even more power. What makes us think that ceding some of Ukraine will be enough to placate him?

We have seen this story before. The last time the world naively tried to placate a murderous madman was when British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain went to Munich in 1938. In Munich, Chamberlain told Hitler, like some colleagues in this Chamber today want to say to Putin, that he could have a slice of an adjacent country—in that case, Czechoslovakia—and England would look the other way and declare “peace in our time.” But that appeasement of Hitler didn’t produce “peace in our time.” Instead, that appeasement encouraged his appetite, made him stronger, set the stage for the unimaginable horrors of World War II.

Appeasing Putin today is as wrong strategically and morally as appeasing Hitler was 86 years ago. Think of the lives we could have saved and the incalculable destruction we could have prevented had we stopped Hitler in 1938.

Well, we have that same question before us right now. Every student of history, every student of politics, if they could go back in time, would tell Chamberlain: Do not appease Hitler. That will not work.

For the same reason, every student of history and politics today is telling us: Don’t appease Putin.

Appeasing Putin would be a mistake of the same magnitude, one that future historians will condemn as the megamistake of the 21st century.

We must say here in this Chamber—we must say no to another Munich moment. We must say no to appeasement. We must say no to the Neville Chamberlains of our time.

Some of my colleagues asked the question: Can we afford to defend democracy?

Munich and Pearl Harbor teach us we cannot afford not to defend democracy. A threat to democracy anywhere is a threat to democracy everywhere.

Experts estimate that Putin is spending some 30 percent, and possibly quite more, of his government budget to fight this war. We here in the United States, we are spending 1.5 percent of our government budget to support Ukraine. That is pennies on the dollar. A penny and a half of our Federal budget, that is all we are asking.

The Ukrainians are fighting and giving with their lives and their injuries to save their democracy. All they are asking of us: 1.5 percent of our Federal budget.

We are not putting Americans in harm’s way in the process. We are just being asked for 1.5 percent of our government budget. But that 1.5 percent, that is so important. It is that 1.5 percent combined with the European partnership that is supporting the people in Ukraine. It is those pennies, that 1.5 percent, that is ensuring that Ukrain-

ian soldiers don’t run out of artillery shells. It is those pennies, that 1.5 percent, so that Ukrainian soldiers won’t run out of air defenses. It is those pennies that will ensure Ukrainian soldiers will not run out of ammunition.

If Putin conquers Ukraine like Hitler conquered Czechoslovakia, if he sees the United States will not stand with this democratic ally, where will his attention turn next? Where will his attention turn to his next project? He is a frustrated KGB agent who saw the dissolution of the USSR, the Soviet Union, as the biggest calamity of his life, and he wants to do everything in his power to take back as much as he possibly can in his lifetime. That is his mission.

So anyone who thinks you can appease Putin the way Chamberlain tried to appease Hitler, you are just wrong. Imagine the costs when Russian tanks roll up to the border of Poland or Estonia or Latvia or Finland. All NATO members are sworn by a treaty to defend each other, and that includes not just our money but our soldiers.

It makes so much sense to stand with Ukraine today and stop Putin in Ukraine rather than to hand over Ukraine and then defend the rest of Europe from his aggression that will surely follow.

And think about the message that we are sending to China regarding Taiwan. China is watching this very closely. China says: If Putin can outlast the United States and Europe in Ukraine, well, we can certainly outlast them when we attack Taiwan.

So standing with Ukraine today is the right stance if you want to deter China from attacking Taiwan tomorrow. We could have stopped Hitler in 1938, just like we can stop Putin today.

This is a war between democracy and authoritarianism, and this Senate floor, the battlefield, is right here, right now, this week. The decisions that we make this week about funding Ukraine may be the most consequential of our careers. The United States, in this fight, is the only truly indispensable nation.

If we are leaders of the free world, if we are the last best hope for democracy, then we have to actually be that hope for democracy. We have to heed the lessons of history. We have to stop dictators like Putin in their tracks, and we need to do it now.

When President Zelenskyy was here before Congress in 2022, he said:

This struggle will define in what world our children and grandchildren will live, and then their children and grandchildren. It will define whether it will be a democracy of Ukrainians and for Americans—for all.

He continued:

This battle cannot be frozen or postponed. It cannot be ignored.

My friends, defending Ukraine is not some charitable operation where we can decide to give a little more or a little less and feel good about it. Defending Ukraine is global and national security.

Putin and his authoritarian allies want to show the world that democracies don't work. We here in the U.S. Senate, need to show the world that democracies do work. The Senate should debate the supplemental security spending for Ukraine this week in this Chamber; the Senate should vote on this supplemental security for Ukraine this week in this Chamber; and this Senate should pass this emergency funding supplemental for Ukraine here in this Chamber this week for Ukraine's democracy and for our own.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KELLY). The Senator from Oregon.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 480, Nicole Shampaine, for the rank of Ambassador during her tenure of service as United States Representative to the Organization of the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons; that the Senate vote on the nomination without intervening action or debate; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon table; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Nicole Shampaine, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, for the rank of Ambassador during her tenure of service as United States Representative to the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, will the Senate advise and consent to the Shampaine nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

REMEMBERING JEAN CARNAHAN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I was saddened to learn last week of the passing of a trailblazing former member of our Senate family. Senator Jean Carnahan was the first woman ever to represent Missouri in the U.S. Senate.

She was appointed to the Senate in December 2000, after her husband, then-Missouri Governor Mel Carnahan, lost

his life in an airplane crash in the closing weeks of his Senate campaign. The Carnahans' eldest son Randy and Chris Sifford, a longtime political aide to the Governor, also perished in the plane crash.

It was too late to remove Governor Carnahan's name from the ballot so 1 week before the election. Missouri's acting Governor announced that he would appoint Jean Carnahan to serve in her late husband's place should the people of Missouri elect Governor Carnahan posthumously.

In her first remarks in the Senate, Senator Carnahan told her new colleagues, "I know I did not come to the U.S. Senate in the same way you did. I did not have a long-term, personal commitment to a campaign. My name has never been on a ballot. On election night there was no victory celebration. You are here because of your win; I am here because of my loss. But we are all here to do the work of this great nation."

The first Senator to greet her after she took her oath of office was someone who also knew the searing pain of losing a spouse and child. As Senator Carnahan later recalled, then-Senator Joe Biden assured Missouri's new Senator that she could endure her crushing loss. He also shared with her the same advice that had been given to him when he was elected to the Senate shortly after his wife Neilia and baby daughter Naomi were killed in a car crash.

His advice was, "Lose yourself in the work." In fact, as President Biden remarked last week after Senator Carnahan died, "she found herself" serving the people of her State in this Senate.

She was elected as a Member of the first 50/50, evenly divided Senate. The 2 years she served were some of the most tragic and turbulent in our Nation's history. They included the 9/11 terrorist attacks on America, the start of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, and the anthrax attack on the Senate.

In a time of growing political division and acrimony, Senator Carnahan was a quiet but determined consensus seeker and a practical politician. She joined the Centrist Coalition, a bipartisan group of Senators. She focused on national security, conditions for members of the military, and military families. And she was part of the first congressional delegation to Afghanistan after the 9/11 terrorist attacks.

While she had never held public office before, Jean Carnahan was not new to politics and public service; she had been serving the people of Missouri her entire adult life. She was born Jean Carpenter and grew up in a working-class section of Washington, DC. Her father was a plumber, and her mother was a hairdresser. She met her future husband, the son of a Missouri Congressman, when they were both 15 years old. They met first at church and a few days later at Anacostia High School, where they were seated next to each other.

On their second date, he told her that he was going to marry her, and he was going to move back to Missouri to run for Congress. They married 5 years later. The following year, Jean Carnahan graduated from George Washington University with a degree in business and public administration, the first member of her family to graduate from high school or college.

True to his word, Mel Carnahan returned to Missouri and was elected to Congress, representing the Bootheel area of southeastern Missouri. He would go on to serve two terms as a popular Missouri Governor.

In their early campaigns, Jean Carnahan was her husband's speechwriter and press secretary, and she was always his best and closest political confidante. She made the position of first lady of Missouri a full-time job and developed her own slate of child- and family-centered causes. She advocated successfully for establishing daycare centers at workplaces. Her focus on childhood immunizations helped boost Missouri's childhood immunization rate from 49th in the Nation to tenth. She also led a successful effort to renovate Missouri's Governor's mansion. She also was a gifted writer, author of seven books.

Weeks before the end of her time in the Senate, in another cruel twist of fate, a different plane crash claimed the lives of another beloved member of this Senate, Senator Paul Wellstone, along with his wife Sheila, their daughter Marcia, three campaign staffers, and the plane's two pilots. In the dark days that followed, no one was a greater support to the devastated Wellstone staff than Senator Carnahan and her staff.

In 2002, Senator Carnahan ran in a special election to serve the remainder of what would have been her husband's 6-year term. She lost in a razor-thin vote.

In her final remarks on this floor, she thanked the people of Missouri for allowing three generations of Carnahans to serve their State. She also had some wise words of advice to the Senators that served with her and those who would follow her. I think her parting words are even more important today. Senator Carnahan implored us "[W]hen my colleagues think on the role of government, seek a balance. Seek a balance between one that does everything and one that does nothing. And where there is talk of war, let there be the free and open debate that becomes our great Nation. And when there are judges to be appointed, let them be selected for their temperament and jurisprudence and not for political ideology that satisfies a special interest group."

She continued "When we lay out our energy and environment policy, let it not be for short-term gain but for the well-being of our grandchildren and the survival of our planet. And when my colleagues speak of leaving no child behind, let that not be a mantra but a

mission, fervent and funded. When health care is thought about, the health care needs of children, family, and seniors—and I hope that will be often—I urge my colleagues to lay aside partisanship and heed the plight of the hurting and the helpless in our society.”

We would all do well to heed her thoughtful counsel.

Loretta and I offer our sincere condolences to all those who are mourning her passing and especially to her family: her daughter Robin, Missouri's former secretary of state and the current head of the Federal General Services Administration, her sons Tom and Russ, a former Missouri Congressman, and her five grandchildren.

Senator Jean Carnahan was an immensely strong and brave woman who made history and made this Senate, our Nation, and her beloved State of Missouri better. She will be missed.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is still available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications that have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such an annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Washington, DC.

Hon. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 23-73, concerning the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of the Netherlands for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$150 million. We will issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale upon delivery of this letter to your office.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. HURSCH,
Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 23-73

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of the Netherlands.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment* \$140 million.

Other \$10 million.

Total \$150 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE): Up to three hundred eighty-six (386) Hellfire Air-to-Ground Missiles, AGM-114R2.

Non-MDE: Also included is U.S. Army Aviation and Missile Command (AMCOM) Security Assistance Management Directorate (SAMD) technical assistance; Tactical Aviation and Ground Munitions (TAGM) Project Office technical assistance; non-standard books, publications, and other Hellfire publications; integration support; and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Army (NE-B-YAY, NE-B-YAZ).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: NE-B-WFV.

(vi) Sales Commission. Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None known at this time.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: February 2, 2024.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

The Netherlands—Hellfire Missiles

The Government of the Netherlands has requested to buy up to three hundred eighty-six (386) Hellfire Air-to-Ground Missiles, AGM-114R2. Also included is U.S. Army Aviation and Missile Command (AMCOM) Security Assistance Management Directorate (SAMD) technical assistance; Tactical Aviation and Ground Munitions (TAGM) Project Office technical assistance; non-standard books, publications, and other Hellfire publications; integration support; and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated total cost is \$150 million.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy goals and national security objectives of the United States by improving the security of a NATO Ally that is a force for political stability and economic progress in Europe.

The proposed sale will improve the Netherlands' capability to strengthen its homeland defense and deter regional threats. This will contribute to its military goals of updating capability while further enhancing interoperability with the United States and other allies. The Netherlands will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be Lockheed Martin Corporation in Orlando, FL. The purchaser typically requests offsets. Any offset agreement will be defined in negotiations between the purchaser and the contractor(s).

Implementation of this proposed sale will require U.S. Government or contractor representatives to travel to the Netherlands for program management reviews to support the program.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 23-73

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The AGM-114R2 Hellfire Missile is used against heavy and light armored targets,

thin skinned vehicles, urban structures, bunkers, caves, and personnel. The missile is Inertial Measurement Unit (IMU) based, with a variable delay fuse, and improved safety and reliability.

2. The highest level of classification of defense articles, components, and services included in this potential sale is SECRET.

3. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures that might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

4. A determination has been made that the Government of the Netherlands can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

5. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to the Government of the Netherlands.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications that have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such an annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Washington, DC.

Hon. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) or the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 23-89, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of the Netherlands for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$908 million. We will issue a news release to notify the public or this proposed sale upon delivery of this letter to your office.

Sincerely,

MIKE MILLER
(For James A. Hursch, Director).
Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 23-89

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of the Netherlands.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment* \$351 million.

Other \$557 million.

Total \$908 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

One hundred twenty (120) AGM-158B/B-2 Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missiles with Extended Range (JASSM-ER) All-Up-Rounds.

Fifteen (15) AGM-158 Inert JASSMs with Test Instrumentation Kits.

Two (2) AGM-158 JASSM Separation Test Vehicles.

One (1) AGM-158 Instrumented Test Vehicle.

Two (2) JASSM Jettison Test Vehicles.

Non-MDE: Also included are AGM-158 JASSM Dummy Air Training Missiles (DATM) and containers; KGV-135A encryption devices; test and integration equipment and support; spare parts, consumables, accessories, and repair and return support; munitions support and support equipment; classified and unclassified publications and technical documentation; Contractor Logistics Support (CLS); transportation support; personnel training and training equipment; studies and surveys; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (NE-D-YAI)

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc.: Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None known at this time.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: February 5, 2024.

* as defined in Section 47

(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

The Netherlands—Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missiles with Extended Range

The Government of the Netherlands has requested to buy one hundred twenty (120) AGM-158B/B-2 Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missiles with Extended Range (JASSM-ER) All-Up-Rounds; fifteen (15) AGM-158 Inert JASSMs with Test Instrumentation Kits; two (2) AGM-158 JASSM Separation Test Vehicles; one (1) AGM-158 Instrumented Test Vehicle; and two (2) JASSM Jettison Test Vehicles. Also included are AGM-158 JASSM Dummy Air Training Missiles (DATM) and containers; KGV-135A encryption devices; test and integration equipment and support; spare parts, consumables, accessories, and repair and return support; munitions support and support equipment; classified and unclassified publications and technical documentation; Contractor Logistics Support (CLS); transportation support; personnel training and training equipment; studies and surveys; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated total cost is \$908 million.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy goals and national security objectives of the United States by improving the security of a NATO Ally that is a force for political stability and economic progress in Europe.

The proposed sale will improve the Netherlands' capability to meet current and future threats by increasing its airborne, long-range, precision-strike combat capability. The Netherlands will use these systems to

defend NATO Allies and deter aggression. The Netherlands will have no difficulty absorbing these articles and services into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be Lockheed Martin Missiles and Fire Control, Orlando, FL. The purchaser typically requests offsets. Any offset agreement will be defined in negotiations between the purchaser and the contractor.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government or contractor representatives to the Netherlands.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 23-89

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The AGM-158B Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missile with Extended Range (JASSM-ER) All-Up-Round is a low-observable, highly-survivable, subsonic cruise missile designed to penetrate next-generation air defense systems enroute to target. The JASSM-ER is designed to kill hard, medium-hardened, soft, and area type targets. The extended range over the baseline was obtained by going from a turbo jet to a turbofan engine and by reconfiguring the fuel tanks for added capacity.

The AGM-158B-2 system capabilities include all the capabilities of the AGM-158B. The AGM-158B-2 configuration will have different internal components to address multiple obsolescence issues as well as sub-component updates to position for M-Code and other potential upgrades.

2. The KGV-135A is a high-speed, general purpose encryptor/decryptor module used for wide-band data encryption.

3. The highest level of classification of defense articles, components, and services included in this potential sale is SECRET.

4. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures that might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

5. A determination has been made that the Netherlands can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

6. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to the Netherlands.

TRIBUTE TO RICK FUSON

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Rick Fuson, who is retiring after 40 years of devoted work for the Indiana Pacers.

Rick Fuson is a lifelong Hoosier. He was born in Indianapolis and attended Indiana University, where he played football and earned his degree in political science. Rick began working for the Pacers organization in 1984 as director of special events, and he rose steadily through the ranks. He was pro-

moted to executive senior vice president of Pacers Sports and Entertainment in 2001, chief operating officer in 2008, and president and CEO in 2014.

During his 40 years with the Pacers, Rick has played a vital role not just in reshaping the Pacers organization, but in revitalizing downtown Indianapolis. He helped oversee the construction of a new arena, now known as Gainbridge Fieldhouse. And he promoted it not only as the home of the Indiana Pacers, but as a multipurpose venue that could bring considerable economic opportunities to the Hoosier State.

His roles as a longtime executive board member of the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce, Visit Indy, the Downtown Indy, Inc., and many other organizations have put him at the center of the capital city's evolution into a global center for live sports and entertainment, arts and culture, and business.

In retirement, Rick and his wife Karen hope to spend more time with their children and grandchildren. It is my honor to thank Mr. Fuson for his tireless devotion to the Indiana Pacers and the city of Indianapolis.

REMEMBERING RAYMOND JACOBY

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, I would like to recognize the recent passing, and honor the life of an extraordinary Vermonter, Raymond "Ray" Bradley Jacoby. Ray touched the lives of many in our State, and his presence in his community will be deeply missed.

Ray dedicated much of his professional career to volunteerism and non-profit service. Ray was the executive director of the Chittenden County United Way in Burlington, VT, for 10 years in the 1970s and 80s. In this role, he worked to make financial stability, healthcare, and affordable education accessible to everyone, coordinating with community partners to provide crucial assistance to Chittenden County residents.

Throughout his life, Ray was also a devoted attendee, employee, and supporter of YMCA summer camps. As a young boy, he attended YMCA camps across New England. Later in his life, he served in nearly every camp position, from counselor-in-training to camp director. After his retirement from the United Way, he worked with YMCA Camp Abnaki in North Hero, VT, for years. He helped the camp to raise funds and provide support to the staff to ensure campers had the best experience possible every summer.

Ray will be remembered by many for his contributions to his community, commitment to his work, and devotion to his family. It is with both great sadness and honor that I celebrate the life of Raymond Jacoby and extend my deepest condolences to his family and loved ones. His impact on Vermonters will never be forgotten.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING THE NEW BERN
AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

• Mr. BUDD. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the New Bern Area Chamber of Commerce on its 125th anniversary.

Since its founding in 1899, the New Bern Area Chamber of Commerce has played a vital role in promoting small businesses, tourism, and all that New Bern has to offer.

New Bern has a rich history as North Carolina's second oldest town. It once served as the first capital of our great state. New Bern is also widely known as the birthplace of Pepsi-Cola. The community boasts a thriving downtown with vibrant restaurants and small businesses. It is a true gem in Eastern North Carolina thanks to the continual efforts of organizations like the New Bern Area Chamber of Commerce.

As a small business owner and member of the United States Senate Committee on Small Business, I know that chambers of commerce are one of the greatest assets to smaller towns and rural communities. I appreciate the efforts that President & CEO Kevin Roberts and his entire team make daily to help ensure New Bern continues to thrive.

Mr. President, please join me in congratulating the New Bern Area Chamber on their 125th anniversary. I can say with certainty that this organization will remain a pillar in the community for decades to come.●

125TH ANNIVERSARY OF
NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY

• Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Northeastern University, on the occasion of its 125th anniversary.

Northeastern University began as the Boston YMCA Evening Institute for Young Men in 1898, established to meet the industry's emergent need for skilled workers in the vocational trades. Today, Northeastern is a global research university and a recognized leader in experiential lifelong learning that integrates real-world experience with education, research, and innovation. Launched over a century ago, Northeastern's signature cooperative education—co-op—model now spans every continent and more than 3,500 employer partners where students work, study, and research.

With an R1 Carnegie classification, the university's research enterprise, focused broadly on the domains of health, security, and sustainability, as well as cutting-edge fields like artificial intelligence and robotics, wireless technology, and the life sciences, has quintupled during the past 15 years and pushed the bounds of scientific discovery. Since 2011, Northeastern has embarked on an ambitious expansion across the United States, Canada, and

the United Kingdom. Today, Northeastern's global university system comprises 13 sites, making it the only U.S. research university with comprehensive campuses on both coasts and a leader in preparing graduates with global experience.

The university's success extends beyond learning and discovery to intercollegiate athletics, as reflected, most recently, by the Huskies' sweep of the 2023 men's and women's Beanpot ice hockey tournaments for a record sixth time.

Northeastern counts a long and proud tradition of partnership with the Nation's armed forces that includes a U.S. Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps—ROTC—unit, extensive collaboration in defense and homeland security research, and a nationally recognized student veterans organization dedicated to helping returning veterans transition to higher education and achieve professional career success.

On the 125th anniversary of its founding, the university's investments in entrepreneurship, women's empowerment, civic engagement, public art, and sustainability have made an extraordinary contribution to the economic and social fabric of the city of Boston, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the United States, and the world. They are a credit to the nearly 300,000 Northeastern alumni living, working, and making a difference in communities around the globe.

On the occasion of this milestone, I am proud to recognize Northeastern University.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mrs. Stringer, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:05 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 443. An act to direct the Secretary of Labor to train certain employees of Department of Labor how to effectively detect and assist law enforcement in preventing human trafficking during the course of their official duties, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1240. An act to transfer administrative jurisdiction of certain Federal lands from the Army Corps of Engineers to the Bu-

reau of Indian Affairs, to take such lands into trust for the Winnebago Tribe of Nebraska, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2882. An act to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2997. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to Mesa County, Colorado, certain Federal land in Colorado, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4051. An act to direct the Secretary of Commerce to establish a task force regarding shark depredation, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4385. An act to extend authorization of the Reclamation States Emergency Drought Relief Act of 1991.

H.R. 5009. An act to reauthorize wildlife habitat and conservation programs, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 1238(b)(3) of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (22 U.S.C. 7002), as amended, and the order of the House of January 9, 2023, the Speaker appoints the following individual on the part of the House of Representatives to the United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission for a term expiring on December 31, 2025: Mr. Cliff Simms of Birmingham, Alabama.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 1238(b)(3) of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2001 (22 U.S.C. 7002), as amended, the Minority Leader appoints the following individual to the United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission: Mr. Jonathan Nicholas Stivers of Falls Church, Virginia.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 1238(b)(3) of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2001 (22 U.S.C. 7002), the Minority Leader appoints the following member to the United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission: Mr. Leland Miller of Alexandria, Virginia. As previously agreed, because of the change in Congress and the presumed statutory intent of the Commission, I am appointing Mr. Miller on behalf of the Speaker.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 443. An act to direct the Secretary of Labor to train certain employees of Department of Labor how to effectively detect and assist law enforcement in preventing human trafficking during the course of their official duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 1240. An act to transfer administrative jurisdiction of certain Federal lands from the Army Corps of Engineers to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, to take such lands into trust for the Winnebago Tribe of Nebraska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H.R. 2997. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to Mesa County, Colorado, certain Federal land in Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 4051. An act to direct the Secretary of Commerce to establish a task force regarding shark depredation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 4385. An act to extend authorization of the Reclamation States Emergency Drought Relief Act of 1991; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 5009. An act to reauthorize wildlife habitat and conservation programs, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. PETERS, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 292. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 24355 Creekside Road in Santa Clarita, California, as the "William L. Reynolds Post Office Building".

H.R. 996. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3901 MacArthur Blvd., in New Orleans, Louisiana, as the "Dr. Rudy Lombard Post Office".

S. 2143. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 320 South 2nd Avenue in Sioux Falls, South Dakota, as the "Staff Sergeant Robb Lura Roling Post Office Building".

S. 2274. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 112 Wyoming Street in Shoshoni, Wyoming, as the "Dessie A. Bebout Post Office".

H.R. 2379. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 616 East Main Street in St. Charles, Illinois, as the "Veterans of the Vietnam War Memorial Post Office".

S. 2717. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 231 North Franklin Street in Greensburg, Indiana, as the "Brigadier General John T. Wilder Post Office".

S. 3267. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 410 Dakota Avenue South in Huron, South Dakota, as the "First Lieutenant Thomas Michael Martin Post Office Building".

S. 3357. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5120 Derry Street in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, as the "Hettie Simmons Love Post Office Building".

S. 3419. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1765 Camp Hill Bypass in Camp Hill, Pennsylvania, as the "John Charles Traub Post Office".

S. 3639. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2075 West Stadium Boulevard in Ann Arbor, Michigan, as the "Robert Hayden Post Office".

S. 3640. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 155 South Main Street in Mount Clemens, Michigan, as the "Lieutenant Colonel Alexander Jefferson Post Office".

H.R. 3944. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 120 West Church Street in Mount Vernon, Georgia, as the "Second Lieutenant Patrick Palmer Calhoun Post Office".

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. HAGERTY, and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 3735. A bill to prohibit the Securities and Exchange Commission from finalizing, implementing, or enforcing a proposed rule with respect to conflicts of interest associated with the use of predictive data analytics by broker-dealers and investment advisers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 3736. A bill to strengthen Federal data collection regarding the teacher and principal workforce; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 3737. A bill to direct the Attorney General to conduct a study on animal cruelty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. VANCE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. SMITH, Mr. PETERS, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 3738. A bill to reauthorize the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 3739. A bill to establish due process requirements for the investigation of intercollegiate athletics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CASSIDY, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 3740. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to reauthorize the residential substance use disorder treatment program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. SCHMITT, Mrs. HYDESMITH, Mr. RISCH, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 3741. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services from restricting funding for pregnancy centers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 3742. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish a community college and career training grant program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. SMITH, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. BUTLER, and Mr. WELCH):

S. 3743. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat transfers of appreciated property to certain tax-exempt organizations the same as transfers of appreciated property to political organizations; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MARSHALL:

S. Res. 543. A resolution to express the sense of the Senate regarding the constitutional right of State Governors to repel the dangerous ongoing invasion across the United States southern border; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. DAINES, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. WARREN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BENNET, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. THUNE, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. KELLY):

S. Res. 544. A resolution designating the week beginning February 5, 2024, as "National Tribal Colleges and Universities Week"; considered and agreed to.

S. Res. 544. A resolution designating the week beginning February 5, 2024, as "National Tribal Colleges and Universities Week"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 109

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 109, a bill to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to prohibit lifetime or annual limits on dental coverage under the Children's Health Insurance Program, and to require wraparound coverage of dental services for certain children under such program.

S. 133

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SCHMITT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 133, a bill to extend the National Alzheimer's Project.

S. 140

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 140, a bill to combat organized crime involving the illegal acquisition of retail goods for the purpose of selling those illegally obtained goods through physical and online retail marketplaces.

S. 270

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 270, a bill to improve protections for meatpacking workers, and for other purposes.

S. 502

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 502, a bill to amend the Animal Health Protection Act with respect to the importation of live dogs, and for other purposes.

S. 793

At the request of Mr. LUJÁN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 793, a bill to amend title XVIII of

Social Security Act to add physical therapists to the list of providers allowed to utilize locum tenens arrangements under Medicare.

S. 995

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 995, a bill to promote democracy in Venezuela, and for other purposes.

S. 1064

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 1064, a bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to carry out a national project to prevent and cure Parkinson's, to be known as the National Parkinson's Project, and for other purposes.

S. 1069

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1069, a bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to prohibit the manufacture, processing, use, and distribution in commerce of commercial asbestos and mixtures and articles containing commercial asbestos, and for other purposes.

S. 1156

At the request of Mr. HICKENLOOPER, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1156, a bill to establish an Office of Native American Affairs within the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 1266

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1266, a bill to amend titles 10 and 38, United State Code, to improve benefits and services for surviving spouses, and for other purposes.

S. 1307

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1307, a bill to ensure that students in schools have a right to read, and for other purposes.

S. 1795

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1795, a bill to modify the criteria for recognition of accrediting agencies or associations for institutions of higher education.

S. 2311

At the request of Mr. PADILLA, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. BUTLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2311, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 2028 Olympic and Paralympic Games in Los Angeles, California.

S. 2327

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms.

SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2327, a bill to provide support for nationals of Afghanistan who supported the United States mission in Afghanistan, adequate vetting for parolees from Afghanistan, adjustment of status for eligible individuals, and special immigrant status for at-risk Afghan allies and relatives of certain members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 2372

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2372, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to streamline enrollment under the Medicaid program of certain providers across State lines, and for other purposes.

S. 2459

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2459, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure appropriate supervision requirements for outpatient physical therapy and outpatient occupational therapy, and for other purposes.

S. 2614

At the request of Mr. LUJÁN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2614, a bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to expand the provision of farmer-led technical assistance, and for other purposes.

S. 2700

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2700, a bill to amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to require investment advisers for passively managed funds to arrange for pass-through voting of proxies for certain securities, and for other purposes.

S. 2839

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2839, a bill to clarify the maximum hiring target for new air traffic controllers, and for other purposes.

S. 3068

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3068, a bill to require each enterprise to include on the Uniform Residential Loan Application a disclaimer to increase awareness of the direct and guaranteed home loan programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 3073

At the request of Mr. FETTERMAN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms.

HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3073, a bill to modify the public transportation emergency relief program, and for other purposes.

S. 3162

At the request of Mr. LUJÁN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3162, a bill to improve the requirement for the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology to establish testbeds to support the development and testing of trustworthy artificial intelligence systems and to improve interagency coordination in development of such testbeds, and for other purposes.

S. 3226

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3226, a bill to require the Secretary of Labor to establish an offshore wind career training grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 3235

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3235, a bill to require a strategy to counter the role of the People's Republic of China in evasion of sanctions imposed by the United States with respect to Iran, and for other purposes.

S. 3305

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3305, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to minimum participation standards for pension plans and qualified trusts.

S. 3367

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3367, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate tax loopholes that allow billionaires to defer tax indefinitely through planning strategies such as "buy, borrow, die", to modify over 30 tax provisions so that billionaires are required to pay taxes annually, and for other purposes.

S. 3502

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3502, a bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to prevent consumer reporting agencies from furnishing consumer reports under certain circumstances, and for other purposes.

S. 3574

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3574, a bill to amend chapter 3 of title 36, United States Code, to

designate the mastodon as the national fossil of the United States.

S. 3598

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of Florida, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3598, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a comprehensive standard for timing between referrals and appointments for care from the Department of Veterans Affairs and to submit a report with respect to that standard, and for other purposes.

S. 3636

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3636, a bill to require the Director of the Office of Personnel Management to establish a pilot program to identify and refer veterans for potential employment with Federal land management agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 3666

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3666, a bill to amend the Agricultural Foreign Investment Disclosure Act of 1978 to establish an additional reporting requirement, and for other purposes.

S. 3704

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3704, a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to allow the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to approve or deny applications for the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of facilities to export or import natural gas, and for other purposes.

S. 3713

At the request of Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3713, a bill to prohibit the Federal Government from conducting, funding, approving, or otherwise supporting any research involving human fetal tissue that is obtained pursuant to an induced abortion, and to prohibit the solicitation or knowing acquisition, receipt, or acceptance of a donation of such tissue.

S. 3714

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from California (Ms. BUTLER) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 3714, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to require the President to set a minimum annual goal for the number of refugees to be admitted, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 45

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 45, a joint resolution

proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

S.J. RES. 58

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 58, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Energy relating to "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Consumer Furnaces".

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 3736. A bill to strengthen Federal data collection regarding the teacher and principal workforce; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3736

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Strengthening Educator Workforce Data Act".

SEC. 2. CIVIL RIGHTS DATA COLLECTION ON THE EDUCATOR WORKFORCE.

(a) MANDATORY EDUCATOR WORKFORCE DATA COLLECTION.—In carrying out the civil rights data collection required under section 203(c)(1) of the Department of Education Organization Act (20 U.S.C. 3413(c)(1)), the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights of the Department shall, as part of the data collection, collect and publish the data described in subsection (b) on the educator workforce with respect to teachers and principals.

(b) METRICS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A civil rights data collection described in subsection (a) shall include the following metrics from each local educational agency and public elementary school or secondary school that is required to respond to such data collection:

(A) PRINCIPAL DATA.—For each local educational agency, the following data regarding principals employed at public elementary schools and secondary schools served by the local educational agency:

(i) The number of full-time principals employed.

(ii) Including the year of the data collection—

(I) the median number of years of principal experience of full-time principals employed; and

(II) the years of experience of the full-time principals employed, based on the following categories:

(aa) Less than 1 year of principal experience.

(bb) At least 1 year but less than 3 years of principal experience.

(cc) At least 3 years but less than 7 years of principal experience.

(dd) At least 7 years but less than 15 years of principal experience.

(ee) 15 or more years of principal experience.

(B) TEACHER DATA.—For each local educational agency and public elementary school or secondary school, the following data regarding teachers employed at all public elementary schools and secondary schools served by a local educational agency, and each such school, respectively:

(i) The number of full-time teachers employed.

(ii) Including the year of the data collection, but excluding student teaching and similar teaching preparation experiences—

(I) the median number of years of teaching experience of full-time teachers employed; and

(II) the years of experience of the full-time teachers employed, based on the following categories:

(aa) Less than 1 year of teaching experience.

(bb) At least 1 year but less than 2 years of teaching experience.

(cc) At least 2 years but less than 5 years of teaching experience.

(dd) At least 5 years but less than 10 years of teaching experience.

(ee) At least 10 years but less than 20 years of teaching experience.

(ff) 20 or more years of teaching experience.

(iii) The number of full-time teachers employed who meet all State licensing and certification requirements.

(iv) The number of full-time teachers employed who do not meet all State licensing and certification requirements.

(v) The numbers of full-time teachers employed who meet all State license, certificate, and endorsement requirements in each of the following:

(I) Mathematics.

(II) Science.

(III) English as a second language.

(IV) Special education.

(2) DISAGGREGATION AND CROSS-TABULATION.—The Secretary shall collect the data described in paragraph (1) in a manner that allows the disaggregation and cross-tabulation of each data category (including each subcategory) described in such paragraph by race, ethnicity, and sex, subject to subsection (d).

(c) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) SPECIAL REPORT.—Upon the conclusion of each civil rights data collection that includes the data required under subsection (b), the Secretary, acting through the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights of the Department, shall prepare a special report regarding the educator workforce.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) be accessible through the website of the Office for Civil Rights of the Department;

(B) include information on—

(i) for each State, the total number of principals in the educator workforce, as calculated in the most recent civil rights data collection that includes the data required under subsection (b), based on a summary of the data collected in accordance with this section; and

(ii) for each State, the total number of teachers in the educator workforce, as calculated in such data collection, based on a summary of the data collected in accordance with this section; and

(C) for each category described in subparagraph (B), present in an easily accessible manner, such as through percentages or a graph or other visual representation, the—

(i) disaggregated results based on race, ethnicity, and sex; and

(ii) the disaggregated results based on the years of experience categories under subparagraph (A)(i)(II) or (B)(i)(II) of subsection (b)(1), as applicable.

(3) ACCESS TO DATA.—The Secretary shall make the underlying data used for the report under paragraph (1) accessible to the public through the website of the Office for Civil Rights of the Department.

(d) DATA PRIVACY.—In carrying out data collection, disaggregation, cross-tabulation, and reporting in accordance with this section and under section 203(c)(1) of the Department of Education Organization Act (20 U.S.C. 3413(c)(1)), the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights of the Department shall coordinate with the Chief Privacy Officer of the Department to ensure that teacher and principal privacy is protected and that individually identifiable information about teachers and principals remains confidential.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ESEA DEFINITIONS.—The terms “Department”, “elementary school”, “local educational agency”, “secondary school”, and “State” have the meanings given such terms in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(2) TEACHER.—The term “teacher” means an individual employed as a teacher, including a preschool teacher, at a public elementary school or secondary school.

(f) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall apply with respect to each civil rights data collection required under section 203(c)(1) of the Department of Education Organization Act that begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 543—TO EXPRESS THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT OF STATE GOVERNORS TO REPEL THE DANGEROUS ONGOING INVASION ACROSS THE UNITED STATES SOUTHERN BORDER

Mr. MARSHALL submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 543

Whereas during a 2019 Democratic presidential primary debate, President Biden called for “all those people seeking asylum” to “immediately surge to the border”;

Whereas during a 2019 Democratic presidential primary debate, President Biden raised his hand when candidates were asked if their health plans will provide coverage for illegal immigrants;

Whereas during a 2020 Democratic presidential primary debate, President Biden pledged support for “sanctuary cities” when he stated that illegal immigrants arrested by local police should not be turned over to Federal immigration authorities;

Whereas on January 20, 2021, one of President Biden’s first actions as President was sending proposed legislation, the U.S. Citizenship Act, to Congress, which would provide a path to citizenship for an estimated 10,000,000 to 12,000,000 illegal immigrants who are currently residing in the United States;

Whereas, on January 20, 2021, President Biden issued a “Proclamation on the Termination Of Emergency With Respect To The Southern Border Of The United States And Redirection Of Funds Diverted To Border Wall Construction”, which halted construction of physical barriers along the international border between the United States and Mexico;

Whereas President Biden later terminated existing border wall construction contracts and failed to obligate more than \$1,000,000,000 that Congress had lawfully appropriated for border wall construction;

Whereas on January 20, 2021, President Biden halted enrollments in the Migrant Protection Protocols policy, which is commonly known as the “Remain in Mexico” program;

Whereas on February 6, 2021, Secretary of State Antony Blinken suspended and terminated the asylum cooperative agreements with the Governments of El Salvador, of Guatemala, and of Honduras;

Whereas in March 2022, the Department of Homeland Security began implementing the interim final rule titled “Procedures for Credible Fear Screening and Consideration of Asylum, Withholding of Removal, and CAT Protection Claims by Asylum Officers” which authorizes U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services to consider the asylum applications of individuals subject to expedited removal and violates the law enacted by Congress that requires asylum seekers to offer evidence to persuade a judge in an immigration court;

Whereas in August 2022, the Department of Homeland Security terminated the Migrant Protection Protocols (commonly known as the “Remain in Mexico” policy), which required aliens with pending asylum claims to wait in Mexico;

Whereas, during fiscal year 2023, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement executed 142,580 removals, which is significantly lower than the 226,000 to 410,000 removals that occurred every fiscal year between fiscal years 2008 through 2020;

Whereas, during fiscal year 2021, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement—

(1) arrested 48 percent fewer convicted criminals than had been arrested during the prior fiscal year;

(2) deported 63 percent fewer criminals than had been deported in the prior fiscal year; and

(3) issued 56 percent fewer “detainer requests” to local authorities than had been issued in the prior fiscal year;

Whereas, during fiscal year 2023, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement arrested 74,000 aliens with pending charges or convictions, which is fewer than the more than 138,000 arrests of such aliens during fiscal year 2018;

Whereas, during fiscal year 2023, U.S. Customs and Border Protection made more than 2,400,000 apprehensions of illegal immigrants along the international border between the United States and Mexico, which is the highest level ever recorded;

Whereas, on April 1, 2022, President Biden announced the termination of a public health policy used to expel potentially infected illegal immigrants during the COVID-19 pandemic (commonly known as the “title 42 policy”);

Whereas, on September 30, 2021, the Secretary of Homeland Security, Alejandro Mayorkas, issued a memorandum titled “Guidelines for the Enforcement of Civil Immigration Law”, which stated that an alien’s illegal status in the United States should not be the sole basis of an enforcement action and prioritized for apprehension and removal aliens who are a threat to national security, public safety, or border security;

Whereas, on October 12, 2021, Secretary Mayorkas issued a memorandum titled “Worksite Enforcement: The Strategy to Protect the American Labor Market, the Conditions of the American Worksite, and the Dignity of the Individual”, which included Department-wide guidance to cease mass worksite operations, among other instructions;

Whereas, on October 27, 2021, Secretary Mayorkas issued a memorandum titled “Guidelines for Enforcement Actions in or Near Protected Areas”, which listed numerous protected areas where the enforcement of Federal immigration law should not occur;

Whereas, in December 2023, U.S. Customs and Border Protection encountered 302,034 illegal immigrants along the international border between the United States and Mexico, which is the highest number of such encounters ever recorded in a single month;

Whereas President Biden’s fiscal year 2023 budget request aims to shift the Department of Homeland Security’s border management away from enforcement and toward “effectively managing irregular migration along the Southwest border”;

Whereas in November 2022, Texas Governor Greg Abbott—

(1) declared a state of invasion at the southern border; and

(2) increased security at the border to protect the state of Texas by invoking—

(A) section 10 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States; and

(B) the invasion clauses in the Texas Constitution;

Whereas in March 2023, at a hearing of the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, U.S. Border Patrol Chief Raul Ortiz told lawmakers that the Department of Homeland Security did not have operational control of the border;

Whereas in March 2023, at a hearing of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, Secretary of Homeland Security Alejandro Mayorkas stated that he does not use the statutory definition of operational control under section 2(b) of the Secure Fence Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-367; 8 U.S.C. 1701 note) when asked if the Department of Homeland Security had operational control of the border;

Whereas on January 6, 2023, the Biden Administration abused its parole authority under section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(5)) to create a new parole program for nationals of Cuba, Haiti, Nicaragua, and Venezuela;

Whereas on April 27, 2023, the Biden Administration further abused its parole authority by creating a new family reunification parole process, which grants parole to entire categories of aliens rather than granting parole on a case-by-case basis, as required under such section 212(d)(5);

Whereas the Biden Administration created a parole with conditions policy authorizing U.S. Border Patrol agents to release aliens through parole before they are given a Notice to Appear or entered into removal proceedings;

Whereas the Biden Administration has expanded the use of the CBP One app, allowing tens of thousands of aliens to enter the United States unlawfully to hide the mass immigration surge following the termination of the order of suspension issued by the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention under section 362 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 265) as a result of the public health emergency relating to the COVID-19 pandemic (commonly known as the “title 42 order”);

Whereas drug cartels are receiving an estimated \$13,000,000,000 each year from their human smuggling operations across the southern border of the United States, which represents an enormous increase from the estimated \$500,000,000 the drug cartels received in 2018 from such operations;

Whereas during fiscal year 2023, according to the non-detained docket, an estimated 6,200,000 illegal aliens were at large in the United States, including more than 400,000 known criminal aliens;

Whereas the estimated fiscal burden of illegal immigration on taxpayers in fiscal year 2023 is estimated to be \$150,700,000,000, which is a massive increase from the estimated fiscal burden of \$116,000,000,000 during fiscal year 2017.

Whereas tax payments from illegal aliens are equal to approximately 1/3 of the costs incurred by government entities in the United States on their behalf;

Whereas during fiscal year 2022, total Federal justice enforcement expenditures as a result of illegal immigration were \$25,100,000,000 and total Federal welfare program expenditures for illegal aliens were \$11,600,000,000;

Whereas in April 2023, the Biden Administration proposed a plan to expand healthcare access for aliens granted deferred action pursuant to the final rule submitted by the Department of Homeland Security titled “Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals” (87 Fed. Reg. 53152 (August 30, 2022)), further encouraging illegal aliens to enter the United States;

Whereas on May 3 2023, the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security issued a report titled “Intensifying Conditions at the Southwest Border Are Negatively Impacting CBP and ICE Employees’ Health and Morale”;

Whereas in June 2023, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives opened an investigation into Secretary of Homeland Security Mayorkas for dereliction of duty;

Whereas in June 2023, an estimated 16,800,000 illegal aliens resided in the United States, which represents an increase of an estimated 16 percent during the first 2 years of the Biden presidency;

Whereas on June 30, 2023, U.S. Customs and Border Protection announced the expansion of available CBP One appointments to 1,450 per day;

Whereas U.S. Customs and Border Protection has apprehended illegal immigrants from Mexico, Guatemala, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Cuba, Haiti, Brazil, other Central and Latin American nations, Turkey, India, Russia, and other nations outside of the Western Hemisphere;

Whereas U.S. Customs and Border Protection has apprehended 169 people during fiscal year 2023 along the international border between the United States and Mexico who are listed on the Federal Bureau of Investigations’ terrorist screening database;

Whereas, U.S. Customs and Border Protection arrested more than 15,627 illegal aliens during fiscal year 2023 who have been convicted of 1 or more crimes in the United States or abroad, including—

- (1) 284 convicted sexual criminals;
- (2) 29 who were convicted of homicide or manslaughter;
- (3) 307 who were convicted of illegal weapons possession, transport, or trafficking;
- (4) 864 who were convicted of burglary, robbery, larceny, theft, or fraud; and
- (5) 1,254 who were convicted of assault, battery, or domestic violence;

Whereas, during fiscal year 2023, U.S. Customs and Border Protection seized—

- (1) 27,000 pounds of fentanyl;
- (2) 1,500 pounds of heroin;
- (3) 1,000 pounds of methamphetamine;
- (4) 81,100 pounds of cocaine; and
- (5) 7,800 pounds of ketamine;

Whereas, provisional data from the National Center for Health Statistics of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates that there were 107,622 drug overdose deaths in the United States during 2021, an increase of nearly 15 percent from the estimated 93,655 deaths in 2020, with overdose deaths involving opioids increasing from an estimated 70,029 in 2020 to an estimated 80,816

in 2021, and overdose deaths from synthetic opioids (primarily fentanyl), psychostimulants (such as methamphetamine), and cocaine also increasing during 2021.

Whereas clause 1 of section 10 of article I of the United States Constitution states, in part, “No State shall, without the Consent of Congress . . . engage in War, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent Danger as will not admit of delay.”;

Whereas section 4 of article IV of the United States Constitution states, in part, “The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government, and shall protect each of them against Invasion”;

Whereas, in the context of known security concerns due to a lack of proper vetting processes and systems, and in conjunction with how the mass unlawful movement of people across the border of the United States directly empowers and enriches cartels and transnational gangs, the totality of such activity constitutes an invasion;

Whereas, on October 26, 2021, Arizona State Representative Jake Hoffman sent a letter to Arizona Attorney General Mark Brnovich requesting a formal legal opinion determining whether President Biden has violated his obligations to protect Arizona from invasion under section 4 of article IV of the United States Constitution; and

Whereas, on February 7, 2022, Arizona Attorney General Mark Brnovich issued a formal legal opinion, which states, in part—

- (1) “The on-the-ground violence and lawlessness at Arizona’s border caused by cartels and gangs is extensive, well-documented, and persistent. It can satisfy the definition of ‘actually invaded’ and ‘invasion’ under the U.S. Constitution.”; and
- (2) “Arizona retains the independent authority under the State Self-Defense Clause to defend itself when actually invaded.”; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate finds that—

(1) President Biden’s dereliction of duty and failure to take care that the laws be faithfully executed at our southern border has directly put the citizens of all 50 States in danger and has resulted in loss of life;

(2) the violent activity and smuggling of drugs, humans, guns, and other illicit goods carried out by drug cartels and transnational criminal organizations, and the crossing of the international border between legal ports of entry by significant numbers of individuals contrary to the laws of the United States, meet the definitions of—

(A) “actually invaded” under clause 3 of section 10 of article I of the United States Constitution; and

(B) “invasion” under section 4 of article IV of the United States Constitution; and

(3) Governors of all 50 States possess the authority and power as Commander-in-Chief of their respective States to repel the invasion described in paragraph (2).

SENATE RESOLUTION 544—DESIGNATING THE WEEK BEGINNING FEBRUARY 5, 2024, AS “NATIONAL TRIBAL COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES WEEK”

Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. DAINES, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. WARREN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BENNET, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. THUNE, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. FISCHER,

and Mr. KELLY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 544

Whereas there are 34 Tribal Colleges and Universities operating on more than 90 campuses in 15 States;

Whereas Tribal Colleges and Universities are tribally chartered or federally chartered institutions of higher education and therefore have a unique relationship with the Federal Government;

Whereas Tribal Colleges and Universities serve students from more than 230 federally recognized Indian tribes;

Whereas Tribal Colleges and Universities offer students access to knowledge and skills grounded in cultural traditions and values, including indigenous languages, which—

- (1) enhances Indian communities; and
- (2) enriches the United States as a nation;

Whereas Tribal Colleges and Universities provide access to high-quality postsecondary educational opportunities for—

- (1) American Indians;
- (2) Alaska Natives; and
- (3) other individuals that live in some of the most isolated and economically depressed areas in the United States;

Whereas Tribal Colleges and Universities are accredited institutions of higher education that prepare students to succeed in the global and highly competitive workforce;

Whereas Tribal Colleges and Universities have open enrollment policies, and approximately 13 percent of the students at Tribal Colleges and Universities are non-Indian individuals; and

Whereas the collective mission and the considerable achievements of Tribal Colleges and Universities deserve national recognition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week beginning February 5, 2024, as “National Tribal Colleges and Universities Week”; and

(2) calls on the people of the United States and interested groups to observe National Tribal Colleges and Universities Week with appropriate activities and programs to demonstrate support for Tribal Colleges and Universities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1387. Mr. KAINÉ (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. REED, Ms. BUTLER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BENNET, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. OSSOFF, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1386 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Mr. SCHUMER) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 815, to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements relating to the eligibility of veterans to receive reimbursement for emergency treatment furnished through the Veterans Community Care program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1387. Mr. KAINÉ (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. REED, Ms. BUTLER,

Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BENNET, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. OSSOFF, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1386 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Mr. SCHUMER) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 815, to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements relating to the eligibility of veterans to receive reimbursement for emergency treatment furnished through the Veterans Community Care program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 42, beginning on line 12, strike "Provided further," and all that follows through "United States:" on line 16.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I have one request for committee to meet during today's session of the Senate. It has the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committee is authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

The Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 6, 2024 at 3:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

NATIONAL TRIBAL COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES WEEK

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 544, which is at the desk.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 544) designating the week beginning February 5, 2024, as "National Tribal Colleges and Universities Week".

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MERKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 544) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2024

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 12 noon on Wednesday, February 7; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 30, H.R. 815.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned until the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:49 p.m., stands adjourned until Wednesday, February 7, 2024, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. JAMES D. BURK
COL. ANDREW L. LANDERS
COL. BILL A. SOLIZ
COL. YOLONDA R. SUMMONS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. CRAIG M. HUNTER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. DEAN A. PRESTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. MICHAEL K MORENI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. VIVEK KSHETRAPAL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. CARLOS E. GORBEA

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. NICK I. BROWN
COL. SHANNON M. BROWN
COL. TAMARA L. GCAMPBELL

COL. JAMES W. LIVELY
COL. SAMUEL L. MEYER
COL. MICHAEL R. NAKONIECZNY
COL. RALPH J. RIZZO, JR.
COL. DOUGLAS C. SANDERS
COL. MATTHEW W. TRACY

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO SERVE AS THE DIRECTOR OF THE COAST GUARD RESERVE IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 309(B):

To be rear admiral (lower half)

TIFFANY G. DANKO

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

DEBRA L. SIMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

PETER S. JOO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

AGATHA C. GRAVES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MARK D. JOHNSON
JOHN PAUL F. MINTZ

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be major

BRANDON D. HOWARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 716:

To be major

THOMAS P. GALLAGHER, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 7064:

To be lieutenant colonel

JEFFREY A. BANKS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

JONATHAN C. YOUNG

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 605:

To be lieutenant commander

DONNY L. JAMES II

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 6, 2024:

THE JUDICIARY

AMY M. BAGGIO, OF OREGON, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

NICOLE SHAMPAIN, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, FOR THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR DURING HER TENURE OF SERVICE AS UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE TO THE ORGANIZATION FOR THE PROHIBITION OF CHEMICAL WEAPONS.

KURT CAMPBELL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF STATE.