



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 170

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 22, 2024

No. 89

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable PETER WELCH, a Senator from the State of Vermont.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, this day we give You our lives, for without You, we are like dust in the wind. Shield us from disgrace as You surround us with Your protection, mercy, and love. Remind us that disgrace comes to those who seek to deceive others.

Lord, sustain our lawmakers, show them the right plans, point them to the right path, and lead them to the right destination. Continue to keep them from stumbling or slipping, so that one day they will stand in Your presence with great joy.

We pray in Your sovereign Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U. S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 22, 2024.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable PETER WELCH, a Sen-

ator from the State of Vermont, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATTY MURRAY,
President pro tempore.

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 4381

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk that is due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4381) to protect an individual's ability to access contraceptives and to engage in contraception and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide contraceptives, contraception, and information related to contraception.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I would object to further proceeding.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BORDER ACT OF 2024—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 397, S. 4361.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 397, S. 4361, a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for border security and combatting fentanyl for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

DONALD TRUMP

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I would like to begin with a few words about Donald Trump's dangerous post last night on Truth Social. What Donald Trump said, falsely suggesting his political opponents are out to kill him, is beyond the pale and is the stuff that leads to political violence. Donald Trump seems to have no consideration for the sanctity and peacefulness and further functioning of our democracy.

Everyone who was here on January 6 should immediately see what he is doing—what Donald Trump is doing—using conspiracy theories to spin the hard right into a frenzy, and it is despicable for Members of Congress to spread Donald Trump's lies. This is how people get killed, how the seeds of political violence are sowed, and how people lose faith in this democracy. Donald Trump has no regard for that. He would basically rip up parts of our democracy for what he thinks is his own personal gain.

Let's speak truthfully. What the FBI did was follow standard practice. They worked with the Secret Service at Mar-a-Lago ahead of time to coordinate how to carry out a search warrant. Donald Trump wasn't even in Florida but instead in New Jersey on the day of the search.

So this idea that his political opponents are out to kill him is absurd. Every single Member of the House and Senate, Democrat and Republican, should condemn Donald Trump's outlandish and dangerous statement. It

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S3819

should be the easiest thing they do today.

If words like Donald Trump's are not fiercely condemned, we are only begging for something far worse to happen to our democracy down the line. We cannot let this man, Donald Trump, or anybody else throw these kinds of matches to light flames that could burn our democracy. It is just horrible. I can't believe that someone would do something like that.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now on judges, a much better note, today, the Senate reaches a significant milestone: 200 judges confirmed to lifetime appointments under President Biden and this very proud Democratic majority: 200 judges who are restoring balance in excellence to our courts, 200 judges who are increasing the diversity and dynamism of our judiciary, 200 judges who are committed to applying the law fairly, impartially, equally. Of those 200 judges—I am so proud—127 are women; 125 are people of color, both traditionally underrepresented demographics on the bench. We are making our courts look more like America. It is not just going to be male White partners in fancy law firms. It is much more diverse, and the bench is better for it. It is something we can all be proud of.

Mr. President, 127 women, 125 people of color, over twice as many women, and more than three times as many people of color have been confirmed under the last administration. We have confirmed more Black judges, more Latino judges, more Asian-American judges. We confirmed the first Muslim-American man and woman on the bench, the first Navajo Federal judge, the first Black woman to serve on the Supreme Court, of course, Justice Ketanji Brown Jackson.

We have confirmed more judges who have served as public defenders and civil rights lawyers and consumer lawyers and immigration lawyers and labor lawyers; again, not just partners of big law firms. We have confirmed more judges, in other words, who embody the very ideal of America, a place where the rule of law is protected, where the rights of all are honored, and where everyone—everyone—gets a fair shake.

I commend Chairman DURBIN. I commend the Judiciary Committee for their great work processing judges in and out of our committee. I commend President Biden for nominating so many of these people and working with our Senate colleagues as to who would be best from their States and regions.

Senate Democrats are very proud of our record. We are proud of our judges, and we will keep going.

BORDER ACT OF 2024

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on the border, well, tomorrow, Senators face

an important decision: Will both sides come together to advance a bipartisan border security bill or will partisanship get in the way yet again?

Three months ago, Donald Trump told his Republican allies to block the strongest bipartisan border security bill Congress has seen in a generation. Luckily, we are trying again tomorrow, and I hope this time Republicans join us to achieve a different outcome.

The only way—the only way—we are going to fix the border is through bipartisan legislation, just like the one both sides spent months negotiating a few months ago and which we are taking up again tomorrow. We don't expect every Democrat or every Republican to support this bill. It wasn't designed that way. It wasn't designed to get all the votes of one party, which then almost inevitably means you get none of the votes from the other side. It was intended to be a compromise that could pass and become law.

We know there are disagreements, as there always are, about the best way to proceed on the border. But that is precisely why I have emphasized from day one, we need to have strong border support if we hope to get border done.

Unlike H.R. 2, a very partisan bill, the bipartisan border bill was written with the goal of getting 60 votes in the Senate, with support from both Republicans and Democrats. It had input from both Republicans and Democrats. H.R. 2 can't claim that. If anything is political, it is H.R. 2. It didn't receive a single Democratic vote in the Senate because Democrats weren't consulted. It didn't even get the full support of Senate Republicans. H.R. 2 was the definition of political theater, one side sitting in a room by itself writing what it wanted not even thinking of how you pass a bill.

Our bill, however, is what a serious attempt at border reform looks like. Now, most people might not remember, but a few months ago, there was a lot of bipartisan interest in getting our border bill passed before Donald Trump killed it in its tracks. Our Republican colleagues—including the Republican leader—was adamant. We needed to get border security done as part of the national security supplemental. This is what the Republican leader said right before our bill was released:

I think this is the ideal time to do it.

He then added, Leader MCCONNELL added:

This is a unique opportunity where divided government has given us an opportunity to get an outcome.

These aren't the words of someone who thinks our efforts were political theater. These are the words of someone who thinks we were close to reaching a breakthrough, and he wasn't alone. My friend from South Carolina also said that.

To those who think that if President Trump wins . . . that we can get a better deal, you won't.

He added:

This moment will pass. Do not let it pass.

Republican Senator from South Carolina.

So let's be perfectly clear: Our bipartisan border bill represented a real chance—in fact, the best chance in decades—to act on border security, to make a law, not just to make a political point.

Importantly, the bill would have made huge strides toward cracking down on the scourge of fentanyl. It would have given billions for DEA, for DHS to hire officers to focus exclusively on drugs and billions for state-of-the-art equipment to detect the flow of drugs at border crossings and ports.

And some of my Democratic colleagues will be talking about that, at 12:30, at an event, how this bill really does more than anything we have done thus far, and we have worked hard on it to deal with the scourge of fentanyl. So, today, my Democratic colleagues will shine a spotlight on the immense good this bill will do to protect our country from the free flow of this dangerous drug, fentanyl.

If you told me a year ago that this was the kind of bill we had before us, I would have been certain Republicans would have helped enact this bill into law. By any objective measure, it is strong, necessary.

And one final note, the last time we came close here was 2013 when we passed comprehensive immigration reform. We did it bipartisan. It was the only way to do it. I and my late friend, good friend, John McCain had a Gang of 8—four Democrats, four Republicans. We got, I believe it was, 69 votes on the floor of the Senate. Unfortunately, the House didn't pass it.

But it is just a lesson to all of us. Bipartisanship is the only way to go. H.R. 2 is not the least bit bipartisan. Our bill was completely bipartisan.

So, tomorrow, we are going to lay out a clear choice. Tomorrow, we will see who is serious about actually wanting to fix the border and who prefers to merely talk about fixing the border.

FARM BILL

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now on the farm bill, tomorrow, House Republicans will mark up their partisan farm bill that, frankly, completely misses the mark.

The farm bill should support the farmers who grow our food. It should protect our land. It should invest in jobs for rural communities big and small to rebuild their economies. The farm bill should provide lifesaving hunger assistance for the millions of Americans who rely on programs like SNAP, and it should extend SNAP benefits to our friends in Puerto Rico who have been excluded from this program for decades, and it will expand it to them.

It is sad to see that rather than working together to get a serious farm bill passed, House Republicans are playing games and pushing a one-sided, insufficient partisan bill.

Senate Democrats, on the other hand, have released a farm bill proposal that maintains a bipartisan coalition and invests in all of the areas I mention. So I commend Chair STABENOW for her work.

Let me be clear: A purely partisan farm bill that departs from the long-standing spirit of bipartisanship has no future in the Senate. And, unfortunately, I might add, it seems to be where this House—the Republican House leadership and party—always goes. They always retreat to a corner of partisanship. They are not interested in improving the lives of American people. They are just interested in scoring political points to a narrow group back home, the MAGA group that seems to have such power in the party.

So I hope that doesn't happen on the farm bill. It has always been bipartisan. House Republicans, come on. Wake up. Do you want to help our farmers? Work together with Democrats and pass a bipartisan bill.

RIGHT TO CONTRACEPTION ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on contraceptives, yesterday, we began the process for the Senate to consider the Right to Contraception Act led by Senators MARKEY and HIRONO in June.

Now, more than ever, contraception is a critical piece of protecting women's reproductive freedoms, standing as nothing short of a vital lifeline for millions of American women across the country.

Senate Democrats are committed to restoring women's freedoms and will fight to protect access to contraception and other reproductive freedoms that are essential safeguards for millions of women to control their own lives, their futures, and their bodies.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

RUSSIA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, last week, just days after President Orban rolled out the red carpet in Budapest for President Xi, the Chinese dictator rolled out a red carpet in Beijing for Vladimir Putin. The "friendship without limits" struck between America's

greatest strategic adversaries will now endure "for generations to come." And it appears to be rooted in a shared myth about the nature of world conflicts and a victim complex that would be laughable if it didn't carry such grave consequences for Western peace and security.

At last week's summit, Russia and China together accused the United States of threatening the world's strategic balance, as if it is Washington rather than Beijing or Moscow trying to redraw borders by force or to disrupt global order.

Well, if you are looking for the government that has doubled its nuclear arsenal in 3 years, you will find it in Beijing, not Washington. In fact, Americans' own strategic deterrent continues to suffer from chronic neglect. And the Biden administration continues to submit defense budgets that fail to keep up with inflation, much less with the growing threat posed by the PRC.

And if you are looking for the regime recklessly developing an insanely provocative and destabilizing nuclear weapon to deploy in space, you will find that one in Moscow.

The world's leading authoritarians never seem to let the facts get in the way. But economic and military realities matter enormously to the future of fledgling democracies and developing nations who are vulnerable to their economic coercion and thuggish political intimidation.

The challenge to Western peace and security is not confined to the Taiwan Straits and the trenches of Ukraine. Chinese debt traps and Russian security forces are expanding malign influence from Central America to Central Asia to Africa and to our own Western Hemisphere.

Russia's efforts to strangle democracy and wrestle free societies back under its control are perhaps most glaring along the borders of Europe.

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, the unshackled nations have largely chosen freedom and worked to build democratic governments and societies oriented squarely to the West. And the neo-Soviet imperialists in the Kremlin see that as a threat.

Leaders in Washington are prone to forget how fragile our own experiment in democracy was during its earliest days and how precious are the safeguards our Founders enshrined in our government to protect the minority from the excesses of authoritarianism of majority rule.

Sometimes, of course, politicians in Washington even flirt with the idea of tearing down these safeguards of democracies to deny the minority any meaningful power.

Fortunately, there is still a bipartisan firewall in the Senate against this sort of shortsighted radicalism. But for nascent, vulnerable democracies, such safeguards face even graver threats. And in Georgia, a parliamentary majority's quest for power

is threatening to suffocate the nation's civil society and unravel the guardrails of its democracy.

In an attempt to consolidate its hold on government, the Georgian Dream Party would stamp out the Euro-Atlantic aspirations of the Georgian people.

And while the political opposition is large, it is chronically divided against itself. Despite their feckless party leaders, thousands of Georgians have taken to the streets to protest. Their desire for self-determination and freedom from Russian coercion is obvious. Four in five Georgians tell pollsters they want a distinctly European future.

They believe that planting themselves firmly in the West, among democratic nations where the rule of law prevails, is in their best interest.

Whether Georgia looks East or West matters to the United States. Standing with free people resisting the aggression of tyrants like Putin or Xi is in our own interests. This is true of Taiwan and Ukraine, Estonia, and Japan.

And it is true of Georgia. The Georgian people deserve the right to write their own future, not have it dictated to them by Moscow's preferred party chiefs.

And why is it that Russians obsess over controlling Georgia's future? It is about more than acting out Putin's neo-imperialist fantasy. Geography matters. For millennia, Georgia and its Black Sea coast stood at the crossroads of the civilized world. It is a key transit point for critical resources. And today, along with Armenia, it sits as a tantalizing link in the land bridge between authoritarian partners in Moscow and Tehran.

The people of Georgia have a long history of enduring conflict and conquest. They have a long tradition of resilience and a rich culture to be proud of. And they know there is a difference between bending to Russia and turning to the West.

So, like friends of the Georgian people across the West, I am hopeful this moment will be one which can take yet more pride, as a moment when the opposition to Russian coercion puts petty differences aside and stands united.

Of course, this must also be a moment for Georgia's ruling party to recognize the costs of ignoring their people's will in order to fulfill Putin's whims and to stop short of shredding their relationship with the West.

I hope those in power in Tbilisi will put sovereignty over subjugation and withdraw the coercive "Russia law" from parliament.

ENERGY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, now on another matter, last Thursday, the Biden administration announced its plan to sacrifice yet another source of affordable, reliable American energy on the altar of climate activism.

After years of freezes and bans on onshore and offshore oil and gas leasing,

the administration's latest attempt to appease Democrats' radical base is a ban on new coal leasing in the Powder River Basin of Wyoming and Montana.

This region is responsible for producing nearly half of the Nation's coal. Last year alone, the basin created more than 250 million tons of coal and employs more than 4,000 people. Shutting off development will result in lost jobs and millions of dollars of lost revenue for Montana and Wyoming.

The sting of the administration's War on Coal is one Kentuckians know all too well. And working families across the country are already struggling with persistent inflation. Energy prices alone have risen more than 40 percent since President Biden took office.

But Washington Democrats' radicalism may have finally stretched their own party to a breaking point. In fact, the Biden administration's war on affordable, reliable American energy has proven so radically harmful to consumers, workers, and our global competitiveness that it is facing bipartisan opposition right here in the Senate.

Just yesterday, a bipartisan majority passed Senator CRUZ's resolution disapproving of the Department of Energy's new rule to effectively ban affordable natural gas home furnaces.

This rule would significantly increase the existing efficiency standard and effectively ban the sale of more affordable home heating furnaces that don't meet it. By one estimate, this rule will heap as much as \$4 billion in new costs onto consumers who already can't afford the high cost of the Biden economy.

The American people have suffered enough, from Bidenomics to the Green New Deal. I am glad a majority of the Senate agrees it is time to slam the brakes on the administration's assault on gas appliances. And I am thankful to my colleague Senator CRUZ for bringing attention to this madness.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Angela M. Martinez, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 8369

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the State of Israel is facing the deadliest threat to its existence in a generation.

To its south, Israel is waging a war of survival against Hamas terrorists, who slaughtered 1,200 Israelis and abducted more than 250 men, women, and children. To its north, Hezbollah—the most armed terrorist organization in the world—is menacing Israeli towns and forcing tens of thousands to flee their homes. Just last month, Iran launched more than 300 ballistic missiles and attack drones at Israel—for the first time attacking the Jewish State from Iranian territory. Outlaw rebels and brigands in Yemen are also firing missiles and drones at Israeli and allied shipping, to include U.S. naval vessels.

As Israel is under siege at home, it is also under diplomatic assault abroad from Hamas's proxies at the United Nations, the International Criminal Court, and even American college campuses.

Joe Biden's allies on Capitol Hill have grown increasingly hostile as well. The majority leader and the former Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, called for the removal of Binyamin Netanyahu from power. The majority leader said that Israel needs new elections. I think New York may need new elections.

Senator BERNIE SANDERS said we should not send "another nickel for Netanyahu," while Congresswoman ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ supports a bill that would strip the tax-exempt status of pro-Israel charities.

That is bad enough, but, unfortunately, instead of backing our Israeli friends to the hilt in this moment of maximum danger, the Biden administration has sanctioned Israelis, condemned its military, and second-guessed it, while trying to undermine its democratically elected leader.

Two weeks ago, Joe Biden went a step further, halting the shipment of bombs and precision-guided bomb kits that Israel needs to limit civilian casualties and destroy Hamas strongholds inside of Rafah and, for that matter, to free hostages, including American citizens.

The President also announced that he will withhold additional offensive weapons to Israel if Israel targets Hamas in Rafah, as if there were much difference between offensive and defensive weapons when Israel is surrounded on all sides by mortal enemies.

Joe Biden is instituting a de facto arms embargo on Israel that will save Hamas. The reason appears to be simple: He wants to appease a small minority of pro-Hamas voters in his own party in critical swing States he believes are necessary for his reelection.

That is why I have partnered with Congressman KEN CALVERT to pass the Israel Security Assistance Support Act, which would reverse Joe Biden's arms embargo on our ally. This legislation simply requires the prompt delivery of all weapons shipments approved by Congress. It also withholds pay from any Department of State or Defense bureaucrat who withholds vital military aid from Israel.

Earlier last week, the House did its part and passed the Israel Security Assistance Support Act with a bipartisan majority that included over a dozen Democrats. Now it is the Senate's turn.

Therefore, Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 398, H.R. 8369. I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. In my capacity as Senator from Vermont, I object.

Mr. COTTON. I regret that the Democrats will not allow this bill to come up for a vote, which, again, would simply ensure that aid that Congress has approved is delivered promptly to Israel in the middle of a shooting war of survival—a bill that, I would remind everyone, passed the House of Representatives with a bipartisan majority.

The time is now to reverse Joe Biden's de facto arms embargo on Israel.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican whip.

STUDENT LOAN DEBT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, last month, President Biden announced yet another student loan giveaway. Among other things, this latest scheme would waive accrued and capitalized interest for certain borrowers and, staggeringly, provide significant loan forgiveness for three-quarters of a million borrowers with an average household income—get this—of \$312,976.

That is right. President Biden's latest reckless expenditure of taxpayer dollars would go, in part, to providing loan forgiveness to three-quarters of a million borrowers with an average household income above \$300,000.

All told, the President's latest student loan giveaway will cost nearly \$150 billion. That is on top of the \$475 billion in loan forgiveness the President announced last summer.

That scheme, which the administration dubbed the Saving on a Valuable Education Plan, will implement de facto loan forgiveness on a massive scale by creating a system in which the majority of future Federal borrowers will never fully repay their student loans.

The Department of Education estimated that borrowers with only undergraduate debt enrolled in the SAVE Program can, on average, expect to pay back just \$6,121 for each \$10,000 that they borrow. That amounts to the Federal Government taking on, on average, almost 40 percent of the cost of these borrowers' student loans.

There are so many problems with the President's plan it is difficult to even know where to begin.

First, there is the staggering cost of these and other Biden administration student loan programs. The Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget,

where the President's own Treasury Secretary used to sit on the board, had this to say:

Including the Biden administration's new student debt cancellation plan, we estimate all recent student debt cancellation policies will cost a combined \$870 billion to \$1.4 trillion. That's more than all federal spending on higher education over the nation's entire history.

That, again, is a quote from the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget.

Let me just repeat that last line:

That's more than all federal spending on higher education over the nation's entire history.

And "the vast majority of this debt cancellation," the committee goes on, "was put in place through executive actions under President Biden."

So the staggering cost of President Biden's giveaways is one major problem, especially when you consider another major problem, which is that the President's giveaways will do nothing to fix the actual problem, which is the cost of higher education. In fact, they could very well make things worse.

For one, there is reason to fear that his student loan giveaways could actually encourage colleges to raise their prices. And, of course, the President's giveaways will do nothing to encourage students to only borrow what they can afford. Indeed, there is a good chance students will increase their borrowing as a result of the President's plans.

President Biden's student loan schemes will cost a massive amount of money, while doing nothing to solve higher education costs.

But the problems don't end there. To start with, there is the question of whether or not what the President is doing is even lawful. Last summer, the Supreme Court struck down the President's original student loan forgiveness plan because the President lacked the statutory authority to forgive student loans, and there is reason to wonder whether his SAVE Plan or these latest measures could be struck down in the courts as well.

Of course, on top of all of these issues, there is also the fundamental issue, and that is the unfairness of asking taxpayers who never went to college or worked hard to pay off the full balance of their student loans or who worked their way through school to avoid a heavy loan burden or who covered the costs of their education by enlisting in the military and risking their lives for their country to shoulder the massive cost of all this loan forgiveness. Why should someone who never went to college be taking on the burden of loan forgiveness for borrowers making in excess of \$300,000 a year?

Then, of course, there is the troubling message sent to students when we teach them that they can expect to be bailed out for the debt they take on, even though they agreed to repay it.

I could go on.

The President announced his first student loan forgiveness scheme 2

months before the 2022 congressional elections. I don't think there is a coincidence about that, and I suspect it is no coincidence that he expects to implement his latest student loan giveaway this fall before the 2024 election.

Last week, I joined Senator CASSIDY and Congresswoman FOXX on a bicameral letter to the Secretary of Education, urging him to withdraw this latest plan. But, unfortunately, I suspect that the President and his administration won't be withdrawing anything that they think could win them a few votes in November. So the American people will, once again, have to endure yet another disastrous Biden administration spending plan.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). The Senator from Vermont.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 8369

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, I was in the Chair and objected in my capacity as the Senator from Vermont to the unanimous consent request of the Senator from Arkansas. I would like now to have an opportunity to explain the basis of that.

First, the Senator from Arkansas essentially said that President Biden is appeasing pro-Hamas voters in imposing an arms embargo on Israel and, also in that assertion, suggesting that President Biden is not fully supportive, as he has been throughout his political life, to Israel.

Let me start by saying what I believe represents the unanimous points of view of this U.S. Senate, and that is that the attack by Hamas on Israel, the taking of hostages, the sexual assaults, the murder of so many innocent Israelis are condemned by each and every one of us. No one condemns it more than President Biden, who went to Israel on his own to show his solidarity and empathy for what happened to the Israeli people.

Second, I believe that every Member of the U.S. Senate supports the Jewish, democratic State of Israel.

Third, while the Senator from Arkansas suggested an "arms embargo," the U.S. Congress—without my support, by the way, for reasons I will explain—has sent billions of dollars in aid with the supplemental appropriations bill.

The fact that the President is raising questions about how best to secure the long-term status of Israel as a Jewish and democratic State in the context of this conflict in Gaza is in no way a suggestion of lack of support.

There is serious debate within Israel about the war plan that is being prosecuted by the Netanyahu government. In fact, a member of the war cabinet has indicated that he will leave the war cabinet if, in fact, the Prime Minister does not come up with a plan for what happens after the cessation of hostilities in Gaza.

Is there going to be an occupation by Israel? Is there going to be a joint Arab force that will be peacekeeping? Will there be an effort to constitute a Pales-

tinian Government that has the support of its people?

None of these plans envision Hamas having a role, and they can't have a role. But the President is asking responsible questions that are being asked by seriously engaged military, political, and security folks in Israel.

So to suggest that the President is raising questions because he is looking over the horizon and saying that adding to the 35,000 casualties in Gaza—half or more women and children—to suggest that the President, when he says Israel should not invade Rafah because of the catastrophic consequences of more humanitarian losses, to suggest that when the President says 2,000-pound bombs that would be dropped on the most densely populated couple of square miles in the world, without massive civilian casualties, is not showing support for Israel, I dispute that. I disagree with that.

This effort requires judgment, and the President has been given authority by this Congress to send arms to Israel. He has made a decision that 2,000-pound bombs should not be included in that. And he is not alone. There are many in Israel raising the question about the wisdom of how this war is being prosecuted.

We know that in order for there to be peace between Israel and the Palestinians, we must have a two-state solution. That is not just the policy of the Biden administration; it has been the policy of the Obama administration, the Bush administrations, and the Carter administration. Two states for two people where the respective rights of those people for self-governance and the renunciation of violence toward one another has got to be the long-term goal.

We have a situation right now where our ally Israel—and the current government Israel—disagrees with that two-state solution approach. And, in fact, the Netanyahu government position is that there should be one state.

And what we are seeing right now is the escalation of violence by extreme settlers in the West Bank that is causing more instability. So the President, as our Commander in Chief, must be given some latitude about how best to distribute whatever munitions have been authorized by the U.S. Congress. And in the President's judgment, 2,000-pound bombs to Rafah are the wrong munitions at the very wrong time.

All of us have enormous heartbreak for what has happened to those Israelis and their families, to those Palestinians in Gaza who are being used by the vicious Hamas as human shields. But the President is committed, as I am committed—as I believe all of us are committed—to peace and security in the Middle East, and we believe—most of us—that that requires a two-state solution where there is an independent, democratic Palestinian state—self-governing, respectful of Israel's security—and where there is an Israeli state that reciprocates toward the Palestinians in Gaza and in the West Bank.

And it is for those reasons, Mr. President, that I stood in opposition and objected to the unanimous consent request of my colleague from Arkansas.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask consent that I be allowed to complete these remarks before the rollcall begins.

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

JUDICIAL CONFIRMATIONS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, over the past 3 years, something profound has happened on the floor of the U.S. Senate. We have been building one of the most important accomplishments of the Biden-Harris administration: the confirmation of highly qualified, independent, evenhanded judges to the Federal bench.

Today, the Senate will confirm the 200th lifetime judge since President Biden took office. This is an extraordinary slate of judges, who are ruling with reason and restraint. These judges respect the rule of law; adhere to precedent; and, above all, answer only to the Constitution.

I have served on the Senate Judiciary Committee for more than two decades, including as chair for the past 3 years. During that time, I have been called on to evaluate and vote on over 1,000 judicial nominees that the committee has considered and have been brought to the Senate floor. In my opinion, the record is clear: President Biden's nominees to the Federal bench represent the best in our judiciary. They are highly qualified. Not a single one of these nominees—these 200—have failed to be found “qualified” or “well qualified” by the American Bar Association. That is a departure from the previous administration's record.

I have heard some of my Republican colleagues extolling the quality of those nominees in the previous administration as compared to those of President Biden, so I want to set the record straight as clearly as I can. For each judicial nominee that comes before the Senate, the American Bar Association conducts a nonpartisan peer review that ranks their qualifications. The qualifications are based on integrity, professional competence, and judicial temperament.

During the Trump administration, Senate Republicans confirmed eight Trump nominees whom the American Bar Association found unqualified to serve on the Federal bench. Compare that to President Biden's record. Under this administration, not one of the 200 judges we have confirmed received an unqualified rating—not one. When there was a suggestion that one might receive that rating and they asked me whether we should move forward, I said: The answer is clearly no.

So when I hear some of my Republican colleagues reminisce about the former President's nominees, I have to wonder: Which ones are they talking

about? Are they talking about several nominees who had never tried a case? How about the district court nominee in the previous administration who challenged the legal basis for both surrogacy and in vitro fertilization or the Sixth Circuit nominee who likened abortion to slavery? And who could forget the Ninth Circuit nominee in the previous administration whose colleagues called him “arrogant, lazy, an ideologue, and lacking in knowledge of the day-to-day practice of law.”

Yet some Republican Senators have relied on increasingly absurd criticisms in an attempt to criticize President Biden's nominees. In a new low, some of my Republican colleagues have gone so far as to falsely claim that a historic nominee, who would be the first Muslim American to serve on the Federal appellate court, is anti-Semitic and anti-law enforcement. As I have said previously, these bigoted attacks are false and should not stand.

Something that stands out about President Biden's nominees, aside from their qualifications and integrity to the rule of law, is the professional and demographic diversity they bring to the bench. We have made history, confirming more Black women to the Federal circuit courts than all prior Presidents combined. Of course, we have confirmed the first ever Black woman to serve on the Supreme Court: Justice Ketanji Brown Jackson. And we have confirmed historic numbers of Asian American, Latino, and LGBTQ judges.

As we celebrate Asian American and Pacific Islander Heritage Month, I want to take a moment to recognize that President Biden has appointed more AAPI judges than any previous President. This includes several “firsts” to the Federal bench: the first ever Asian-American judge in the Third and Seventh Circuits, the first South Asian judge on the Ninth Circuit, and the first Asian-American judge in Virginia.

Beyond this demographic diversity, there is recordbreaking professional diversity. In the past 3 years, we have confirmed more public defenders as circuit judges than all prior Presidents combined. In addition, we have confirmed State court judges, Federal magistrates, bankruptcy judges, and prosecutors who have made significant contributions to this country's justice system. We have confirmed jurists with experience protecting the rights of voters, the rights of workers, civil rights, women's rights, and LGBTQ rights.

Another notable aspect of this record is that the vast majority—nearly 90 percent—of these confirmations have been bipartisan—nearly 90 percent. This includes over three-quarters of the appellate nominees.

In addition, I want to thank a number of my Republican colleagues who have worked in good faith with the White House, with me, and with the committee to fill vacancies in their States. This focus on qualified, consensus nominees will go a long way to-

ward restoring trust and faith in our judiciary.

The American people deserve Federal judges who not only look like America but understand the American experience from every angle. We have accomplished this during the longest evenly divided Senate in history and now with a narrow majority. We celebrate these 200 judges, but we should not stop here. We will continue elevating jurists who are qualified, principled, and committed above all to protecting the Constitution. The American people deserve nothing less.

Mr. President, let me close by saying it has been an honor to serve as chairman of the committee, but our success in bringing these nominees to the floor really belongs to the members of the committee—10 Democrats and 10 Republicans. Those Democrats in particular have dutifully come to the committee hearings and to the votes and waited patiently for the opportunity to vote and bring these nominees to the floor. We wouldn't be here without them. I salute them and their dedication to the rule of law and our responsibility on the Judiciary Committee.

NOMINATION OF ANGELA M. MARTINEZ

Mr. President, today, the Senate will vote to confirm Judge Angela Martinez to the U.S. District Court for the District of Arizona.

Born in Tucson, AZ, Judge Martinez received both her B.A. and J.D. from the University of Arizona.

After clerking for the late Judge John M. Rolle on the U.S. District Court for the District of Arizona, Judge Martinez began her legal career in private practice as an associate at Lewis and Roca, LLP, where she litigated employment and commercial matters. She then joined the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Arizona, where she represented the United States in illegal immigration prosecutions, alien and drug smuggling offenses, and hostage taking and international kidnapping cases. She later returned to private practice as an associate at Farhang & Medcoff PLLC before serving as a law clerk for Judge Jennifer G. Zippas on the U.S. District Court for the District of Arizona. Judge Martinez returned to the U.S. attorney's office for nearly a decade before she was appointed to serve as a U.S. magistrate judge on the same district to which she is nominated.

The American Bar Association unanimously rated Judge Martinez “well qualified,” and she has the strong support of her home State Senators, Ms. SINEMA and Mr. KELLY. Judge Martinez's deep ties to the Arizona legal community, combined with her courtroom experience, will make her well-positioned to serve on the Federal bench with distinction.

I thank my colleagues for supporting her nomination.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, this is an amazing moment in the history of the Senate and of all Senates because in just a few moments, the Senate will confirm Angela Martinez to be a district judge for the District of Arizona. Judge Martinez will be the 200th Federal judge under the Biden administration and this Democratic majority. Reaching 200 judges is a major milestone.

Simply put, our 200 judges comprise the most diverse slate of judicial nominations under any President in American history. Our Federal judiciary is now far more balanced, far more diverse, far more experienced than it was just a few years before President Biden took office.

I am so proud of the 200 judges. Mr. President, 127 are women, and 125 are people of color. That is a majority of the judges—more than a majority. Over 60 percent are women. Two-thirds women, two-thirds people of color; 58 Black judges, 37 Black women judges—each a record; 36 Hispanic judges, 33 Asian American Pacific Island judges—also a record. It is amazing.

Also, there is not just demographic diversity but professional diversity. It is not just a lot of White male partners in big fancy law firms anymore; it is people who are public defenders, civil rights lawyers, labor lawyers, immigration lawyers, consumer lawyers. We have so much greater diversity on the bench, and that is so good for America because the bench, the powerful Federal judiciary filled with lifetime appointments, should reflect America. It has taken too long to get to this point. We still have more ground to make up, but we are getting there, and we are so proud of it. And, of course, the first Black woman to serve on the Supreme Court, Justice Ketanji Brown Jackson.

Ever since I have gotten on the Judiciary Committee, it has been my goal to diversify the bench. The judges I have chosen in New York have been like that for over two decades. But now, under the Biden administration and under the great leadership of Chairman DURBIN and his Judiciary Committee, we have really moved forward.

I want to give special consideration—because she works full time on this—to my nominations director—we work so closely with the White House—and that is Catalina Tam, who has been so important and so dedicated behind the scenes in getting these judges confirmed.

This is a really fine day for America. When you look at all the trouble and all the things swirling around, and then you realize so many fine people who never would have even had access to the Federal bench are getting on the

bench, it gives you faith in the future of this great country.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON MARTINEZ NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Martinez nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 28, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 177 Ex.]

YEAS—66

Baldwin	Hassan	Peters
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Risch
Booker	Hirono	Romney
Brown	Hoeben	Rosen
Butler	Kaine	Sanders
Cantwell	Kelly	Schatz
Capito	King	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Lankford	Sinema
Casey	Lujan	Smith
Cassidy	Lummis	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Tillis
Coons	Marshall	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	McConnell	Warner
Cramer	Merkley	Warnock
Crapo	Moran	Warren
Duckworth	Murkowski	Welch
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Fetterman	Murray	Wicker
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Wyden
Graham	Padilla	Young

NAYS—28

Barrasso	Ernst	Rubio
Blackburn	Fischer	Schmitt
Boozman	Grassley	Scott (FL)
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Scott (SC)
Britt	Johnson	Sullivan
Budd	Kennedy	Thune
Cornyn	Lee	Tuberville
Cotton	Paul	Vance
Cruz	Ricketts	
Daines	Rounds	

NOT VOTING—6

Hagerty	Manchin	Mullin
Hawley	Menendez	Tester

The nomination was confirmed. (Mr. OSSOFF assumed the Chair.)

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 571, Dena M. Coggins, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of California.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Richard Blumenthal, Laphonza R. Butler, Alex Padilla, Tim Kaine, Margaret Wood Hassan, Christopher Murphy, Peter Welch, Tammy Duckworth, Tammy Baldwin, Christopher A. Coons, Tina Smith, John W. Hickenlooper, Chris Van Hollen, Mark Kelly.

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

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

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 178 Ex.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—44

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

NOT VOTING—6

Hagerty	Manchin	Mullin
Hawley	Menendez	Tester

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 44.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dena M. Coggins, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

ISRAEL

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, last week, on May 14, our friend and ally Israel celebrated its 76th Independence Day.

As we all know, Israel was founded in the wake of the Holocaust to give the Jewish people a homeland that would allow them to return to their ancestral land that they had been forcibly removed from.

I am proud—very proud—that the United States was the first country to recognize Israel; and since then, we have been steadfast allies that support one another through times both prosperous and challenging.

However, this year's Israeli Independence Day came during a time of great turmoil, as Israel battles terrorist forces that have ruthlessly waged war against them since October 7.

We join them as they mourn the loss of over 1,200 Israelis killed in that initial attack and pray for the safe return of the hostages still kept in captivity by Hamas.

In an alarming development, this longstanding U.S.-Israel relationship is now becoming unnecessarily strained by President Biden's quest to appease those in his party who do not support the State of Israel, a bastion of democracy and freedom in the Middle East.

The October 7 attack marks the most horrific attack Israel has suffered since its founding and the deadliest day for the Jewish people since the Holocaust. So how did we get to this point?

The common refrain for those opposed to Israel now has been to call for cease-fire now. We have seen it all across our college campuses. And we saw President Biden clap along to these demands, again, as he delivered a commencement address just this past weekend.

And what is even more mind-boggling is that those who are protesting, who are they demanding a cease-fire from? I haven't heard a single campus protest group call for Hamas to lay down its arms or call for Hamas to release the hostages.

Why? Why? Because they want Israel to stop fighting, because they want Israel to stop defending itself, and because they want Israel to lose. We cannot forget the fact that a cease-fire was in place on October 7, and that cease-fire was broken by Hamas as they deliberately attacked innocent civilians in the most brutal and barbaric ways.

So let's not forget that some of these communities, the border towns in Israel that were attacked by Hamas, were some of the most ardent supporters in Israel for the Palestinian people.

They were some of the biggest advocates for peace. Yet despite the reality, here in the United States, our colleges have become embroiled in controversy over this and play host to anti-Israel and anti-Semitic protests that ultimately stopped Jewish students from attending class and even led a rabbi at Columbia University to recommend Jewish students return home for their own safety.

These protesters demand that Israel drop their weapons, yet refuse to acknowledge that Hamas is the instigator of the war. But we now know what Hamas' entire plan was: to minimize any chance of peace in the region, to attack Israel's most peace-promoting citizens in the most brutal of fashions, especially, and most dangerously and horrifyingly, toward Israeli women.

To undermine the incredible progress that had been made possible through President Trump's Abraham Accords, to stop an emerging normalization deal with Saudi Arabia, and to conduct an attack on Israel so horrific that Israel had no other choice but to respond.

In what world would we ever expect a country to be attacked in such a brutal fashion and not fight to defend itself? It is important to note that the chaos and instability benefits one bad actor above all else, and that is the Iranian regime.

Without Iran's help, both financially and militarily, Hamas would not have been able to execute their terrorist attacks on the Israelis. Iran has further supported Hamas's efforts by launching over 300 projectiles at Israel on April 13. And lest we forget, it was an Iranian-made drone that killed three American soldiers in Jordan on January 29.

We must recognize that the deep ties between Hamas and Iran and their common goal of destroying Israel and bringing harm to the United States and our citizens. Calls for a cease-fire only embolden Hamas and their stated aim to repeat the October 7 attacks a second, third, and fourth time. Israel must defend itself, and they must root out the evil that is Hamas.

So earlier this week, we learned that the International Criminal Court would seek arrest warrants for leaders of Hamas and Israel for war crimes.

It is simply shocking to me that the ICC would seek to establish a delusional level of equivalency between the actions of Israel and the actions of Hamas. I have seen the footage of the attacks on Israeli and American citizens that occurred on October 7, and it is clear that Hamas is the real criminal involved in this conflict.

Hamas continues to show no regard for its own people, spending billions of dollars on over 300 miles of tunnel sys-

tem, but yet they are refusing to allow their Palestinian citizens to shelter there; and they continue to use hospitals, schools, places of worship for military purposes, knowingly placing citizens in harm's way.

While Israel was founded on the principle of promoting development for the benefit of all of its inhabitants, Hamas's only mission is to destroy Israel. The differences between their founding principles, their leadership, and their actions could not be any more different. And it is abhorrent that the ICC would attempt to argue otherwise.

In these times of instability, you would hope that the President of the United States would display strength. Instead, President Biden has decided to play politics by placing a hold on security assistance that this Congress most recently approved.

This is just the latest foreign policy blunder from an administration plagued by weakness on the international stage. Shortly after this policy of withholding weapons was announced, Hamas steps away from the negotiations on the safe return of the hostages.

It seems like a pretty big coincidence to me. Hamas is still holding American hostages captive; although, I wonder how many of these hostages are still alive, as we discovered—I think it was last week, four bodies were discovered.

And President Biden should be doing everything within his power to bring home those American hostages. Instead, he is publicly withholding weapons from our ally and giving their adversary cover.

When President Biden took office, he pledged ironclad support for Israel, but now he is publicly backing down from that promise.

He is projecting to our allies and our adversaries that the U.S. promises' can be subject to political pressure.

To further underscore the administration's lack of responsibility, my EPW committee came across something very disturbing this week in our ongoing oversight of President Biden's so-called Inflation Reduction Act. You might wonder what EPW or the IRA have to do with Israel in their battle against terrorists. But we discovered that the Climate Justice Alliance, a group that received \$50 million from the Biden administration in December, openly denies Israel's right to exist and actively supports the horrific actions of Hamas. They even promote graphics that glorify the bulldozers used by Hamas on October 7.

It is despicable that the EPA is sending millions of dollars through the IRA to a group that perpetrates hatred and violence under the guise of fighting climate change and this administration would allow U.S. taxpayers' dollars to fund these anti-Semitic activities.

There is no doubt that the last 7 months have been an incredibly difficult time for the people of Israel and Jewish Americans here at home. Never,

never in my life, never would I have ever expected to hear and see the anti-Semitic discourse that I see being conducted on our own land, our own American shores, and the violence and intimidation towards the Jewish community.

Together we must condemn the rise of anti-Semitism and make clear that this hatred has no home in our country and in our world.

My Republican colleagues and I will continue to display our unwavering support for Israel and push for the assistance that they need to ensure their survival and victory in this fight, as allies do have needs, particularly in this time of need.

So with that, I yield the floor to my friend from North Dakota, Senator HOEVEN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I am pleased to join my colleague from West Virginia and others who you will be hearing from—next, our colleague from Nebraska—in regard to our absolutely ironclad support for Israel and why it is so important that we stand and we stand strongly with our friend and ally Israel.

On October 7, Hamas committed appalling atrocities against Jews in Southern Israel. I went to Israel one month later to show my support for our close ally during this very dark hour, and I am still today very proud to stand with Israel.

But I am very concerned about the Biden administration holding up weapons that need to be delivered to Israel. That is why I have cosponsored two important pieces of legislation requiring the President to expedite delivery of defensive aid to Israel: first, Senator COTTON's Israel Security Assistance Support Act and then the assistance support act that Senator CRUZ put forward as well; that is the Assuring Resupply of Munitions Act, or ARM Act.

Congress has moved decisively to support Israel, and these bills make crystal clear—there is no doubt about it—our desire that Israel receive our support without hesitation. We said that October 7 can never happen again, but if we say “never again,” we should mean it. If we truly mean “never again,” then the only path forward is for Israel to win the war—to win the war.

And that is why it is so important that we give Israel the tools it needs to win the war as soon as possible. Destroying Hamas means allowing Israel to reestablish security for its people. Destroying Hamas also means it can no longer terrorize and repress the people of Gaza. If we are concerned about the lives of Jews and Gazans, the sooner Hamas is defeated the better. The sooner Hamas is completely defeated, the better.

Putting limits on military assistance only means prolonging a conflict that Israel must win, and it means greater loss of life among both Israelis and Gazans.

Delaying or halting military aid also sends the wrong message to both our allies and our adversaries. Our allies, like Israel, rightly wonder whether U.S. promises will be kept when times get tough. Our adversaries, like Hamas and Iran, wonder if they can manipulate us into failure. When we hesitate to keep our promises and give our enemies the chance to regroup, we incentivize the very behavior that we must oppose.

We have to wipe out terrorism. We have to work with our allies—not just Israel but all of our allies—to wipe out terrorism.

If Hamas survives, it will certainly seize more hostages in the future. That is what Hamas does. If Hamas survives, it will keep using innocent civilians as shields. Think about that: using innocent citizens as their shields. If Hamas survives, it will see October 7 as a triumph rather than a disaster.

The administration may believe that pausing military assistance will save lives or limit suffering, but it will only sow the seeds of future conflict. There is no substitute—there is no substitute—for victory over Hamas.

Congress has provided the resources to support our ally Israel, and I call upon the administration to keep our promises, to act according to the will of the American people, and to accept nothing less than the complete defeat of Hamas.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, this weekend, President Biden called for an immediate cease-fire in Gaza. What the President didn't acknowledge is that Israel and Gaza were not in a state of war until October 7, when Hamas broke a cease-fire. They stormed Israel's borders, and they raped, tortured, and killed innocent civilians.

Far-left, pro-Hamas activists are painting Hamas as freedom fighters that want to liberate their fellow Palestinians. Nothing could be further from the truth. Hamas uses innocent civilians—anyone from babies to the elderly—as human shields. They shelter themselves in schools and in hospitals. They have no regard for human life or dignity, not for Israelis and not for Palestinians.

Members of Hamas film themselves laughing as they maim and murder innocent people. They use sexual assault as a weapon of war. These are no freedom fighters; they are terrorists.

We saw a sobering example of that this weekend. The Israeli military recovered the bodies of four hostages who were captured, abused, and murdered by Hamas. They found them lying in a tunnel in Gaza. These included the body of Shani Louk, a young woman Hamas captured at the Nova music festival on October 7. She and the other hostages ran from the armed terrorists, who were killing people to their left and to their right, but Hamas caught

up with them. They sexually assaulted and maimed Shani before they murdered her.

This weekend, the Israeli military returned the mutilated body of a young daughter to her grieving parents. These are not the deeds of freedom fighters. These are the deeds of terrorists.

There are still over 100 hostages being held in Gaza, many of whom are believed to be dead. Eight of those hostages are Americans, three of whom are dead as well—three Americans.

When President Biden calls for a cease-fire—one neither party has agreed to yet—he is just calling for Israel to surrender. He is emboldening Hamas and abandoning the dozens of people still being abused by these terrorists. He is equivocating because of political pressure.

President Biden must stop sacrificing a moral backbone for political gain. You don't negotiate with terrorists. Hamas is using hostages as political pawns, and no amount of diplomacy is going to change that.

The Biden administration should not be telling Israel's democratically elected government what they must do. Israel must make those decisions to protect their people and protect their country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. RICKETTS. Madam President, I rise today to join my colleagues in expressing my complete support for the State of Israel and the war against Hamas terrorists.

There was a cease-fire in place prior to October 7. Hamas broke that cease-fire. Hamas attacked Israel and murdered over 1,200 Israelis and Americans. They also took hundreds of hostages, including Americans as well.

Hamas is responsible for every death on October 7 and every death since that day. They need to surrender. Hamas must surrender.

If Hamas surrenders and releases the hostages, aid can freely flow into Gaza to support the Gazans. Instead, Hamas continues to prosecute this war. In fact, after October 7, they said they would continue to do atrocities like October 7, if given the chance. They will continue to try to destroy Israel. They will continue to murder Israeli citizens.

They just don't chant “Death to Israel.” They chant “Death to America” as well.

Terror groups like Hamas and Hezbollah represent an existential threat to Israel. They have repeatedly declared their intention to wipe Israel off the map.

Israel has the right and the obligation to destroy the terrorist group Hamas. They must have the ability to defend themselves. And they will be doing the world a favor by destroying Hamas.

We need to support Israel and their efforts to do just that. Part of that support means pushing back on anti-Semitic organizations, like the United

Nations or the International Criminal Court, that attack Israel's legitimacy and their sovereignty.

The International Criminal Court's ludicrous decision to apply for arrest warrants for Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu and Israel's defense chief is the most recent example of their anti-Semitism. This outrageous decision not only emboldens terrorists around the world but creates problems for us here in the United States as well.

In the statement, the ICC prosecutor describes crimes that have been committed on "the territory of Israel and the State of Palestine." That is exactly backward. He should have said "the State of Israel and the territories of Palestine." But that was intentional.

It is a continuation of the rampant anti-Semitism in these organizations, like the ICC and the U.N. It is designed to delegitimize the State of Israel.

And the crazy thing is, the ICC's action, in itself, is illegitimate. It lacks legal basis. Under its own charter, the ICC is banned from moving forward with prosecutions unless the relevant government is unwilling or unable to police themselves.

The ICC knows Israel has a robust and independent judiciary. The ICC knows and has admitted that Israel has trained lawyers who advise commanders and a robust system intended to ensure compliance with international humanitarian law. By moving forward with these arrest warrants, the ICC is calling Israel's laws, government, and democracy illegitimate. It is wrong.

There is no moral equivalency between the State of Israel, democracy, and the terrorist organization Hamas. There is no moral equivalency between Hamas's terrorist actions and atrocities on October 7 and Israel's right to defend itself and to take action to destroy that terrorist organization.

Hamas terrorists have shot unarmed civilians, dismembered soldiers, raped women, and massacred children. Meanwhile, Israel has fought its war while taking great pains to avoid unnecessary civilian casualties.

We need to be supporting Israel in its mission, not undermining the Israeli Government. It is in our interest to do so.

Neither Israel nor the United States are members of the ICC. Both countries are outside of the ICC's jurisdiction. Yet the ICC is going after Israel anyway. America should take note. If the ICC can violate Israel's sovereignty, it can violate America's sovereignty.

The ICC needs to face the consequences of its anti-Israel policies. While it is good that President Biden has condemned the arrest warrants as "outrageous," Israel needs more than words. It needs actions.

Last month, my Republican colleagues and I sent a letter to the ICC with a warning: If the ICC moved forward with arrest warrants for Israelis, we would push to end all American support for this disgraceful organization.

We are here today to tell President Biden one simple thing: If your commitment to Israel is really ironclad, as you say, you will join us in holding these anti-Semitic organizations accountable. Let's sanction the ICC's employees and associates and prevent them from coming to the United States. Let's work with our allies to ensure that they refuse to honor the ICC's indictments against either Israel or the United States. Let's truly demonstrate our ironclad support and stand with our ally Israel in its hour of need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BUDD. Today is the 229th day of captivity for eight American citizens held hostage in Gaza by the terrorist organization Hamas—229 days of being deprived of food, water, and medical care; 229 days of being subjected to unbearable violence, abuse, and psychological torture by Hamas terrorists; 229 days that mothers and fathers—many of whom I have met—and husbands and wives and brothers and sisters have had to live with the pain, the anguish, and the uncertainty of their loved ones' well-being. But if you flip on mainstream media tonight or if you watch the protests on college campuses or if you listen to the Biden White House, the conversation has been dominated by everything but securing the release of American hostages.

We have seen the prosecutor for the International Criminal Court seek arrest warrants of Israeli leaders as well as Hamas leaders. Equating the Israeli Prime Minister with Hamas terrorists is despicable, and it shows a complete lack of moral clarity.

We have read about the State of Qatar reportedly temporarily expelling Hamas leaders from Doha, only to reverse course and welcome them back later. To be clear, Qatar is hosting a brutal terrorist organization with American blood on their hands. This continued dithering and flip-flopping is not helping. Qatar must pressure Hamas leaders to release the hostages now or expel them from Doha. It is just that simple. To do anything less, my friends, is unbecoming of a major non-NATO ally.

When we look to the President of the United States, we continue to see weakness and a lack of moral clarity on this issue. In a total betrayal of our friend and ally, the Biden administration withheld lethal aid to Israel earlier this month. This signaled to Hamas that they can drag their feet and hold out because the so-called ironclad bond between the United States and Israel, in Biden's mind, is not so ironclad after all.

I know firsthand that Biden is overruling his national security team, and he is letting a few radical activists on his staff dictate foreign policy as American lives hang in the balance. At the end of day, there is nothing more important in U.S. foreign policy than protecting American citizens. The best

way we can bring the hostages home from Gaza is by increasing pressure on Hamas.

On the international stage, we need global bodies, like the ICC and the U.N., to grow a moral core, identify the evil being committed, and to rally the community of nations to pressure Hamas to release innocent hostages. We need the State of Qatar to end its straddling and doublespeak and to permanently expel Hamas leaders from Doha. Here at home, we need the Justice Department to file charges and hunt down every Hamas terrorist responsible for the murder of over 40 Americans on October 7 and the kidnapping of 8 who remain in captivity. We need the President of the United States to show strength and to show some moral leadership on this issue.

Friends, the line between good and evil in this conflict is crystal clear. President Biden needs to use every lever of national power to secure the hostages' freedom.

After 229 days, let's be united in working for the release of these eight hostages.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ROSEN). The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Madam President, to kind of continue on the theme of my good friend from North Carolina, apparently today or yesterday, the countries of Ireland, Spain, and Norway recognized a Palestinian State.

Here is my question: Who is in charge of the state? Who is running the place? What are its boundaries? Did you recognize Hamas being in charge of Gaza? Do you want to keep the PA as we know it now in the West Bank, as old and corrupt? What did you recognize?

These are allies, but they need to hear from a friend that what you did is reprehensible. You are rewarding terrorists.

On October 7, Hamas attacked the State of Israel and murdered 1,200 innocent people, put babies in ovens, raped women, set people on fire, and recorded it all. And your response is to create a Palestinian State? You are rewarding terrorists. The way a Palestinian State will be created, if ever, is through direct negotiations between the State of Israel and Palestinians, not a unilateral recognition of a Palestinian State after the largest terrorist attack against the Jewish people since the Holocaust.

To my friends in Ireland, Spain, and Norway, what you did was reward Hamas. Here is the message you are sending: Kill Jews, and you will get a reward.

Again, tell me about the state you just recognized. Who is in charge, and what are the boundaries? You can't answer those questions, but you went ahead and recognized the Palestinian State for political reasons.

The world has turned upside down.

Madam President, you have been a stalwart defender of Israel, and we appreciate it.

Here is what I would say: After October 7, Hamas is engaged in using the Palestinian people as human shields at a level I haven't seen in warfare. The response is to punish Israel, who is in a no-win situation. The battalions have to be destroyed. The tunnels are underground. Why do you need a 2,000-pound bomb? Because there are underground tunnels that only a major bomb will be able to destroy.

When it comes to civilian infrastructure, the destruction of it has been in large part because Hamas has used schools, mosques, and hospitals as military sites, putting all that infrastructure in jeopardy by militarizing it.

On top of all of that, the International Criminal Court has decided to issue an arrest warrant for the Prime Minister of Israel and the Defense Minister of Israel as well as Hamas leaders. Boy, has the world turned upside down.

To consider Israel like Russia—Putin had an arrest warrant issued because there is no rule of law in Russia. People fall out of windows who are opposition leaders. People get poisoned. There is no rule of law in Russia.

There is a robust legal system in Israel. It is probably the pride of the world. The most independent judiciary maybe on the planet lives and resides in Israel.

So Israel is not Russia, and the Prime Minister and the Defense Minister of Israel are not Hamas, but in the ICC world, they are all the same. That is despicable.

Here is what has happened: Apparently, a lot of legal experts, some well-known, famous people, advised the ICC that Israel needed to be charged—the State of Israel, the Prime Minister and the Defense Minister. They are legal experts under international law. I would not pay these people 5 cents given my undersigning of their own statute.

I, along with seven members—four Republicans and four Democrats—engaged the ICC weeks ago, arguing that for you to bring a charge against the State of Israel, you would have to believe that the judiciary in Israel is not independent and that Israel is not acting in good faith—they are acting in bad faith—when it comes to allegations against Israeli forces and policies of Israel. It is called complementarity.

Israel is not a member of the ICC, nor are we. In 2015, the ICC recognized the Palestinians as a state for ICC purposes even though they are not recognized by the U.N. Why they did that, I don't know. But they took over jurisdiction of this conflict, and where do we lie now?

On May 20, a couple of days ago, a representative of the ICC was supposed to land in Israel to set up a meeting between legal officials, government officials of the State of Israel and the prosecutor, Khan, next week.

The group that I was involved in urged the ICC to sit down and talk with Israel—called complementarity.

Under their own statute, the ICC cannot act unless the nation in question is unable or unwilling to proceed with an investigation or if the investigation is conducted in bad faith. There is no way you can find Israel is not acting in good faith when they were willing to meet you 2 days ago.

So here is what happened: We were misled and lied to by the ICC.

This group thinks they have jurisdiction of the entire world; they are going to roam the globe and right wrongs. They were created to deal with voids where there is no rule of law or rogue states like Russia, where the rule of law has been destroyed, not come and second-guess robust democracies like Israel and the United States.

They threatened to come after our soldiers in Afghanistan years ago, and Senator ERNST, who was a member of the U.S. Army serving abroad. We objected to high heaven.

We have a very robust military legal system. We have a very independent judiciary. Israel has the most independent judiciary on the planet.

So they canceled the meeting. Israel called and said: When will you get here? The man in question for the ICC said: I have been told I can't come. And Israel heard about the arrest warrant on CNN. They had prerecorded this interview—Mr. Khan had—with a CNN reporter before the meeting.

Senator CARDIN has been awesome on this.

We are trying to get Israel to engage with the ICC, listen to their complaints, and see if we can move forward. They acted in bad faith. A meeting was set up, the man did not attend, and before Israel knew anything, they heard it on CNN.

So I am hoping that we can come together—and I want to applaud President Biden, Secretary of State Blinken, and Jake Sullivan for issuing strong statements condemning the actions of the ICC against the State of Israel.

Now it is time to impose sanctions not only to help our ally but also to help ourselves. I want everybody to know that if you deal with the ICC in this sham trial against Israel, you will never come to this country. Your visa will be revoked, and if you have assets here, they will be lost. You have to pick what I think is an abuse of the rule of law over doing business with America.

If we don't do that as a body, we are next. I have tried for months to find a way forward with my colleagues, who have been terrific, trying to find a way for Saudi and Israel to recognize each other, come up with a better deal for the Palestinians, to end this conflict in a permanent way.

In the middle of this sensitive moment, the ICC, in a very deceptive way, brings charges against the Prime Minister of Israel and the Defense Minister, who are in a fight for their lives. They are surrounded by Hezbollah, Hamas, and Iran.

Where was the ICC when the Iranians drug a young girl off the bus and beat

her to death? Where are they in North Korea? They pick Israel—a nation with one of the most robust, independent legal systems on the planet. They lied to eight U.S. Senators. They cannot get away with this. If you let them get away with this, then you are going to regret it.

So I look forward to working with Republicans and Democrats and the administration to send a clear signal: We are not going to sit on the sidelines while the rule of law is politicized, turned upside down, to the detriment of our allies and our own Nation.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Ms. ERNST. Madam President, first, I would like to thank the Senator from South Carolina. We know that normalization between Saudi Arabia and Israel is incredibly important, and the Senator from South Carolina has been knee-deep in efforts to bring those two nations together. I would like to thank him first for that.

America's promises mean something—or at least they should. President Biden has repeatedly promised that his commitment to Israel is ironclad, but revoking much needed military support for our closest Middle Eastern ally says otherwise.

Let's be clear: The Middle East—really, the entire world—right now is on fire, and the blame lies, in large part, on the shoulders of the administration. President Biden's weak leadership has consistently appeased our enemies and abandoned our allies.

This dangerous trend began with the disastrous withdrawal from Afghanistan, where he left behind Americans and Afghan allies to the mercies of Taliban rule. As a result, terrorists across the globe rejoice at Biden's decisions instead of trembling in fear of the United States as they once did and should.

Two weeks ago, I returned from Israel, where I advocated for the release of American hostages held captive by Iran-backed Hamas. I stood before Israeli officials, including Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu, and assured them that America has your back. Yet, as my words were still reverberating, the Biden administration sent a far different, far more damaging message to our ally: We are withholding key munitions.

Unbelievable and unconscionable.

Let's not miss that the very weapons that President Biden is withholding include kits that will convert bombs into precision-guided weapons—tools that would help Israel conduct very precise strikes against Hamas, thus reducing civilian casualties.

Mind you, reducing civilian casualties is the administration's stated goal when it comes to how the IDF prosecutes their rightful retaliation. Yet the Biden White House is withholding the very means Israel needs to accomplish this goal.

It is total hypocrisy, folks.

As Prime Minister Netanyahu said to me and to the world, the United States withholding these precision-guided capabilities will not stop Israel from defending itself.

But make no mistake, Biden's decision will make it harder for Israel to avoid civilian deaths. This, my friends, is a very, very grim reality.

In April, Congress, with my help, stood firmly with our ally by approving critical weapons support for Israel. Leading up to the passage of this bill, President Biden himself declared the aid to Israel was critical and called for "swift and decisive action" to ensure Israel had everything it needed to defend itself. Yet, now, when it is his time to act, Biden fails to do so.

Since October 7, Israel has faced existential, Iran-backed threats on every side. In the Gaza Strip, Hamas terrorists continue to attack our friend and hold dozens of hostages, including Americans—our American eight. Hezbollah forces continue to bomb northern Israel, forcing the evacuation of 60,000 Israelis. Houthis have also attacked dozens of ships crossing the Red Sea in order to strangle the Israeli economy. And, of course, Iran—the supporter of all of these terrorist groups—launched more than 300 projectiles against Israel last month in an unprecedented escalation, not to mention the attacks by Iranian proxies on our own servicemembers in the region. Three American servicemembers were killed at Tower 22 in Jordan. Let's not forget.

As Israel faces these dangers, we must give her the arms needed to fight and win—to destroy the Hamas terrorists that continue to hold our—our—fellow citizens hostage, the American eight.

What must not get lost in all the noise is that the decision to withhold weapons from Israel reeks of politics. The President is choosing to capitulate to an anti-Israel, pro-Hamas faction within his own party. He does so at his own peril and, more importantly, at the peril of countless lives.

President Biden, you have made your choice. You are choosing the side of Iran-backed Hamas terrorists who brutally rape women and burn children. You are choosing the side of anti-Semites who are ruining the lives of Jewish students across this country. You will live with the consequences of your choices and, most gravely, so will the American hostages and U.S. servicemembers being targeted by Iranian proxies every single day.

Republicans will not waver in our support for Israel and our Jewish friends. "Never again" is not just a slogan; it is a solemn vow, and in this pivotal moment, we will stand on the right side of history.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

BORDER ACT OF 2024

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, nearly every day, Republicans come to

this floor to tell us how much they care about the border and how much they believe in border security. Yet—and yet—when they have an opportunity to do something about it, they don't just balk; they run for the hills.

If you care about securing the border, then you actually have to pass legislation that secures the border. It doesn't secure itself by itself. Our statutes are outdated. Our Border Patrol doesn't have enough resources. You have to change the law. You have to put more resources on the border. That is what the bipartisan border security bill did. I regret the fact that all but four Republicans voted against it after they requested that we engage in a bipartisan process to develop that border security bill, after they demanded that we pass bipartisan border security legislation.

But because we believe that this issue is so important—because the American people believe that securing our border and compassionately treating those who arrive at our border is such an important issue—we are going to bring this bill back for another vote tomorrow. We are going to give Republicans a second chance to do what they say they want to do: work across the aisle in a bipartisan way to provide more resources to control our southwest border.

So I am glad to be on the floor today with a number of my colleagues who believe as I do; that this is the time to pass significant bipartisan legislation to secure our border, to reform our broken immigration system. It is what the American people want.

We should stop playing political games. Republicans should choose the security of this country ahead of their Presidential candidate's political prospects, and we have the opportunity to do that this week. So I am grateful to have so many of my colleagues on the floor.

I believe starting our remarks will be Senator KAINÉ.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINÉ. Madam President, I am thrilled to join my colleagues on the floor to talk about the importance of this border security bill, but I am also going to talk about my own naivete and admit to being a very naive Senator.

When I came to the Senate in 2013 with Senator MURPHY, one of the first things we did in June of my first year in the Senate was to pass a significant and bipartisan immigration reform bill. That immigration reform bill was comprehensive, including a \$40 billion-plus investment in border security. We passed it in a bipartisan way in this body with nearly 70 votes.

My naivete was this: Yes, there was a Republican House. When the bill went over there, having been a Governor and having watched how State legislatures worked, I assumed that the Republican House wouldn't just embrace our bill

but that they would do their own version of an immigration bill, and then we would sit down in a conference and hash out some middle ground. No. I was wrong. The Republican majority House decided to bottle the bill up in committee. They never took it up and never did their own bill. That was in 2013—the education of a naive Senator.

Years later, in 2018, during the Trump administration, when we had a Republican majority in this body, we dealt directly with President Trump. He wanted \$25 billion in border security over 10 years. We basically came up with an offer that was, Can you take yes for an answer?

I was part of an eight-member crew negotiating a bipartisan deal: protection for Dreamers and \$25 billion in border security—every penny Donald Trump asked for and not one penny less. He told us that he supported Dreamers. He told us that if the bill got to him, he would sign it. Because we had a Democratic House, if we could get it through this body, we would get it to President Trump's desk. But as soon as we rolled out the bill with eight Democrats and eight Republicans as cosponsors, President Trump did a 180, turn tail. He trashed the Dreamers. He said the bill was awful and encouraged Republicans to vote against it, and we couldn't get to the 60-vote margin.

So, for the second time, we did a bipartisan deal that was going to do good things and invest a whole lot in border security that was killed by President Trump and now this most recent effort.

I so applaud Senator MURPHY, Senator SINEMA, Senator LANKFORD, and others from the administration who worked on this deal, a bipartisan border security provision with other important provisions: the normalization of Afghan refugees. We have more in Virginia than almost any other State. There is really important work in this bill—bipartisan.

It is not lost on me how hard it is to do a deal where both the American Immigration Lawyers Association and the Border Patrol union, which tend to be quite opposite politically, take a look at a compromise and say: You know, this isn't perfect, but we need to do this.

I don't know of another issue where these two organizations have said: We need to do this. That was the needle that these Senators were able to thread after months and months and months of negotiation.

But just as in the first two instances, a significant effort to protect our border and make our country safer in a bipartisan way got shot down when President Trump came out and encouraged Republicans to oppose it. Even though they had been briefed on the negotiation every step of the way and supported it, as soon as President Trump said they should oppose it, folks turned tail and ran. President Trump was honest. I mean, I will give him this. He was honest about the reason.

He didn't say to oppose it because he didn't like clause A or clause C. He pretty much said: We don't want to fix this problem. We would rather raise heck about this problem and blame Joe Biden about this problem than fix this problem.

We are sent here to solve problems, and when we have a bipartisan solution that fits this narrow window where both left and right say it is the right step to take, we should do it. I am so glad that this is going to be up on the floor for a vote tomorrow. I look forward to joining my colleagues in supporting it. I urge others to do the same.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I am really pleased to be here on the floor with my colleagues who just want to get something done on the border. I mean, how long have we talked about this? Senator KAINE talked about 2013. I was here as well. It was an amazingly difficult piece of legislation to negotiate at the time, but it was comprehensive, and in the end, it was a big bipartisan vote in the U.S. Senate.

I agree with Senator KAINE. When it went to the House, we thought: OK. We put together this comprehensive bill that is not only border security, it is about how we manage and create a pathway to citizenship and address young people who have been here their whole lives—who have been here as juniors—and for agriculture jobs, which I work with all the time. Our farmers need ag labor and want to know there is a legal path to be able to have people work here. It covered everything. At that time, Republicans in the House didn't want to deal with it, didn't want to solve it.

So we have been down this road before, but I really did think, this time, in the context of the national security bill, the demand from Republican colleagues, that they wouldn't consider the supplemental security issues without a tough border bill. I said: OK, here we go.

We all know, there were major negotiations, months of negotiations. Senator MURPHY, Senator SINEMA, Senator LANKFORD—everybody was stretching and pushing and trying to get to a spot for something that would really, really make a difference.

They did, and the vast majority of us said OK, we are going to support it. But that was 105 days ago—105 days ago that Republican colleagues had a chance to solve the issue that they come to the floor to speak on every day. They keep coming to the floor every day saying: We need you to do something about the border. We need you to do something about the border.

Well, we offered a bipartisan bill—a tough bill—to do something about the border, and at the last minute, they said no.

I want to speak for a moment about one piece in here that is so important.

We think about the southern border, and there is certainly funding in here for the northern border. But one of the things that is in here I know our Presiding Officer cares deeply about as well, affects every part of the country—it certainly affects Michigan—is the capacity to stop the flow of deadly fentanyl. It is so important, and it is in this bill.

On April 2 the Justice Department announced the largest law enforcement seizure of fentanyl in the entire history of Michigan, April 2. Forty kilos of fentanyl were found—enough to kill every single Michigan resident.

On April 19, a Michigan medical examiner raised the alarm on what was quoted as a really bad patch of fentanyl in Michigan and warned the public that there had been 6 drug overdoses in 11 days, raising the flag of what was going on here. It only takes one pill to be able to cause a death.

These are just two headlines from last month in Michigan, and they do not come close to encapsulating the pain and the tragedy Michigan families have faced over the years due to drug overdoses.

So we have got to do more to combat the fentanyl crisis. This bill does that. This bill actually does that. We need to give the U.S. Customs and Border Protection the tools they need to stop the drug from crossing the border to combat the fentanyl crisis. This bill would invest in 2,400 more in Customs and Border Protection officers—desperately needed—and new innovative inspection equipment to decrease detection. We know there are all kinds of ways it is coming in, from tires in every part of a vehicle—every imaginable way it is coming in—and there is equipment that can detect that. We need that new innovative equipment at the border to help our agents.

Drug Enforcement Agency efforts to disrupt drug trafficking networks in Mexico, in this bill; enhanced lab analysis of fentanyl samples, in this bill; improve technology for autonomous capabilities, air assets, in this bill—in the bill we will be voting on tomorrow.

So when we hear colleagues talking about doing something about drug overdoses, about fentanyl, they have a chance tomorrow to vote to do that.

But it has been 105 days since Republicans were given the opportunity for a strong bipartisan bill that included fentanyl efforts, and 105 days ago they killed the bill.

We know why. We know why. It has been said over and over again: Donald Trump told them to. He called people, and he said: "We don't want to solve this. We want chaos. That is my middle name." Maybe it is his first name, I don't know. But chaos, chaos, chaos: "We want people to be afraid. We want chaos. We don't care if people are getting hurt or what is happening."

He actually was quoted as saying: "Please blame it on me." I want you to vote against it. "Please blame it on me," which we are more than happy to do because it was him. It was him.

We want to solve the challenges at the border. We know they are serious, and we want to give the Biden administration additional tools to solve them.

They want that. In every single budget since President Biden was elected—every single budget—he has asked for more resources to do the things in this bill. And folks have said no, no, no, no, no.

This legislation does what needs to be done. And as I said before, it was toughly negotiated in a bipartisan manner, and we appreciate that.

Let's be clear. This bill would significantly improve our Nation's security in a number of important ways. It would reform the broken asylum system so that decisions would be made more quickly on who should be allowed to remain in the country and who should be deported.

Those allowed to stay would be provided authorization to work so that they could take care of themselves and their families and fill crucial jobs in our economy while waiting for their cases to be resolved.

The legislation would create a new emergency authority that would allow the President of the United States to pause the processing of asylum claims of migrants who arrive between ports of entry when cases rise above a certain point.

It would expand legal pathways to citizenship and increase access to work authorizations—something that Republicans claim to support.

And those immigrants who serve in our military—who serve in our military—would gain quicker access to citizenship—something I think we can all agree they have earned.

People sometimes forget that Michigan, my home State, is a border State. This bill would provide up to \$100 million in grants to States and local and Tribal law enforcement agencies to secure the northern border, which is extremely important to me and the people I represent.

Republicans say they care about solving the challenges at the border. Their actions, unfortunately, show otherwise.

We stand ready to pass this legislation. We stand ready to strengthen our border security and to keep our communities safe. We are ready to do it. Let's go.

Tomorrow, our Republican colleagues will be given another chance to join us to pass this bipartisan bill, and I urge them to vote yes.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, for years, many of our colleagues have said on this Senate floor, they have said in committee hearing rooms, they have said on cable news shows that there is a crisis at our southern border. And they have been right.

Well, today, we actually have the opportunity to do something about it. Once again, we have bipartisan legislation before us that works to address

the challenges of a broken and decades-old immigration system.

Along with our other colleagues here this afternoon, I rise to urge all Members of the Senate to put aside politics, to do what I think we all believe to be the right thing, and to vote in favor of the bipartisan Border Act.

As a former chairman of the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, I know that we have tried to come together in Congress to fix our immigration system for about as long as I can remember, under Presidents and congressional leadership of both parties.

Our colleagues have oftentimes heard me say that bipartisan solutions are lasting solutions, and that is true. And in the case of fixing our Nation's immigration laws, that has never been more true.

Thanks to the tireless work of a Democrat from Connecticut, a Republican from Oklahoma, and an Independent from Arizona, along with members of their staffs, we have reached a bipartisan compromise on one of the toughest issues our country faces today.

I am proud to say that after 4 long months of negotiations between our three colleagues and members of the Biden administration, including the Secretary of Homeland Security, we have crafted the strongest border security bill in decades.

The legislation produced during these negotiations proved that bipartisanship is not just aspirational; it is ours for the grasp; it is ours for the taking. The legislation produced during these negotiations proves that bipartisanship is not just aspirational, but it is actually possible.

Yet despite all of this hard work and the countless hours our colleagues invested in hammering out this critical piece of legislation, many of our Republican colleagues rejected this same bill earlier this year, largely at the behest of Donald Trump.

I would like to quote again, as Senator STABENOW has, what Donald Trump said on his social media account earlier this year. This is a quote:

Republicans should stop wasting their time on immigration until after we elect more Senators and Congressmen/women in November. Dems are just playing games, have no intention of doing anything to solve this decades-old problem. We can pass great legislation after the Red Wave.

While Democrats, Republicans, and Independents negotiated in good faith, it was Donald Trump who decided he would rather attempt to sow chaos—chaos at the border, rather than to deal with it and to fix it.

It was also incredibly disappointing to see so many of our Republican colleagues, especially in the House, turn their backs on this bipartisan approach and play politics with our immigration policy. They chose to put Donald Trump first over what is best for our country.

Fixing the crisis at our southern border requires tough policy choices, but

it also gives us an opportunity to seek some wisdom from the Scripture. I believe we need to look no further than the New Testament's Matthew 25, where we find these words: When I was a stranger in your land, did you welcome me? That is what it says: When I was a stranger in your land, did you welcome me?

Many immigrants seeking refuge here oftentimes leave their home countries and brave horrible conditions at home in order to seek a better life in this country—a life of freedom and a life of opportunity.

We know all too well the factors that have contributed to the challenges at our border. Among them are a global pandemic, increased violence and criminal activity, the smuggling of illicit narcotics, and our Nation's own devastating addiction to illegal drugs, not to mention authoritarian government rule and poverty throughout the Southern Hemisphere. Those are just some of the root causes.

If we are serious about addressing the challenges of our immigration system, it is imperative that we focus on these root causes of migration.

The bipartisan Border Act before us would finally work to make our country safer by increasing resources and implementing policy changes both at the border and to our immigration system as a whole.

This legislation has numerous endorsements from some unlikely places, including the Border Patrol union and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

So today, we now have another opportunity to choose policy over politics, to choose principle over politics. Everyone on the Senate floor today knows that improving the security of our border is not just good policy; it is the right thing to do.

In fact, some 84 percent of all voters in this country believe that we should be prioritizing reforms to our immigration system rather than sticking to the status quo—84 percent.

As U.S. Senators, we are elected to serve our constituents, the American people, and we have an opportunity today to meet that responsibility by enacting the legislation that is before us. Our three Senate colleagues have proven that working together is possible, and now it is up to the rest of us to do the right thing.

Let's finish the job. Let's implement a lasting solution, and let's do it together.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I agree with my colleagues. We have a crisis at our southern border. And in New Hampshire, it is affecting us because there are too many deadly drugs flowing into our country and not enough technology and equipment and personnel to stop it.

So it is not every day that I agree with my Republican colleagues on an issue as big as the border, but on this one, I agree.

We needed to act. That is why a group of negotiators—Republicans were led by Senator LANKFORD; Democrats, by Senator MURPHY and Senator SINEMA. I appreciate the work that all three of them did. They rolled up their sleeves. They got to work. For months, they passed paper back and forth. They ironed out big and small details of the bill that we voted on, that is before us.

And the final agreement is the strictest—I think that is worth repeating. It is the strictest border security legislation that we have seen certainly since my time in the Senate. It is a historic agreement to supply the border with critical resources that are necessary to increase security, to stop the flow of illicit drugs, and to better protect all Americans.

Now, our Republican colleagues were for this bill until Donald Trump put his thumb on the scale and said: Don't fix the border. I want to campaign on it as a crisis.

And as we heard, he acknowledged that we should blame him for the fact that the border deal failed.

But, unfortunately, our colleagues walked away from the strictest border security deal that we have had in decades, all because Donald Trump told them to make it a campaign issue rather than do what is in the best interest of the country.

Now, we need to pass this bill because it includes more funding for identifying, tracking, and stopping fentanyl at the border. I don't know about all of our colleagues, but in my home State of New Hampshire, we have lost too many people because they have died from fentanyl overdoses. In the period from 2013 to 2023, New Hampshire lost 4,616 people from drug overdoses—4,616. The majority of those people died as the result of fentanyl. About 70 percent of those deaths were the result of fentanyl.

And anything—anything—we can do to cut down on the amount of fentanyl that is coming into the United States, we ought to be doing it. We know that fentanyl is moved across the U.S.-Mexico border in huge quantities, often in cars and trucks, and we know that it comes across—almost 100 percent—at our ports of entry. And they can't search every vehicle in every way, and that is why we need technology.

We need to be able to scan vehicles for drugs and other contraband. We need to make sure they can expand these capacities, which is why there is a provision in the bill to provide significant increases in funding for CBP to deploy more nonintrusive inspection technology that would more efficiently and effectively search for fentanyl and other drugs.

The bill also gives Immigration and Customs Enforcement increased funding to focus on counter-fentanyl investigations and enforcement, because we need more boots on the ground dedicated to finding fentanyl and other drugs and dedicated to holding those accountable who are bringing these deadly drugs into our country.

The danger of the continued fentanyl epidemic demands more action from Congress. We need more funding. We need more agents on our borders. And with this bill, we would do just that.

Now, New Hampshire doesn't border our southern border, but it does border Canada, which has the longest international border in the world—over 5,000 miles. New Hampshire has a very short piece of that, but there are many stretches of the border, particularly in New Hampshire, that are remote, that are sparsely populated, and, unlike many other borders, not militarized.

That means our northern border is vulnerable to exploitation. And we have a program that we have had in past budgets called Operation Stonegarden. It is in the Department of Homeland Security. So Senator PETERS, I know, knows that program. But it helps police departments, providing annual grants to help them, particularly in rural areas that are really struggling to fund normal operations, let alone responsibilities along the border. These are funds that allow police departments to pay overtime for officers to patrol the border along with the U.S. Border Patrol.

Sadly, on the northern border, most of those funds have been diverted to the southern border, and many of our agents who have patrolled the northern border have been diverted to the southern border. That is a challenge for States like New Hampshire and others, where we have large sections of that border that are rural, where, in parts of New Hampshire's border, we don't even have access to internet. So there are cameras on the border, but they can't pick up anything because we don't have a signal. But despite this program's importance, it has been underfunded for a number of years, leaving States without sufficient resources.

So one of the pieces that is in this legislation that we are going to vote on tomorrow is \$100 million, with 25 percent of it that would go to States that are not on the southwest border—States like New Hampshire—to make sure that our law enforcement is also supported and well funded.

So we have a lot to do with our border. Passing this bill tomorrow, getting our Republican colleagues to join us, would make a huge difference in addressing the challenges at our southern border. I hope that they will join us, that they will put aside the opposition from Donald Trump, and that they will do what is in the best interest of the country, not what is in the best interest of Donald Trump.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, tomorrow, the Senate will consider legislation that would send critical resources to secure our borders. This legislation was forged by serious bipartisan negotiations, but when it first came to the Senate floor this past February as part of a foreign aid package,

my Republican colleagues voted against it and blocked us from even having a debate on this most serious of issues.

They plan, unfortunately, to do the same tomorrow. They are, once again, refusing to even come to the table to help strengthen our border security and support lawful trade and travel that drives our economy.

This bill is not perfect. It is not comprehensive immigration reform. We must keep working toward a broader approach where we modernize immigration laws and address the immigration system as a whole. But we cannot let that hold us back from taking action right now to secure our borders. This legislation is a meaningful step in the right direction. It would address some of our most pressing challenges on the issue and tackle them head-on.

The bill would allow us to hire more than 2,000 CBP officers, addressing a critical shortage of frontline personnel who safeguard our national security at points of entry each and every day. It would provide \$2 billion for advanced screening technology. This would allow CBP to expand use of these tools, helping them to identify illegal cargo and stop dangerous drugs like fentanyl from reaching and poisoning our communities. Fentanyl overwhelmingly enters this country through our ports of entry.

This bill also aims to change the asylum application process, a priority that Congress has been unable to pass for decades.

Republicans in Congress certainly like to talk about the need to secure our borders, but they use this issue to stoke fear in our communities all across the country. But when you get a commonsense bill, like the bill that we have before us, to vote on—a bill that aims to address the problems they claim that they want to solve—they simply walk away.

They talk the talk, but they refuse to walk the walk. We need to walk the walk. And that is why Republicans walked away last February. They took orders from Donald Trump, when he told them to vote against this bipartisan legislation. They made it abundantly clear that Republicans would rather campaign on this issue than actually fix it. They would rather throw rocks than solve the problems facing our country. And, unfortunately, it looks like they are going to do it all again tomorrow.

Americans deserve better. Our communities deserve better. Our frontline personnel deserve better. The victims of the fentanyl crisis deserve better. Those fleeing often horrendous conditions in their home countries and seeking asylum on our southern border, they deserve better. And it is an absolute shame that my Republican colleagues have decided not to act, because these challenges are not going to go away on their own.

As chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, I have worked hard to

craft bipartisan bills and pass commonsense border security legislation in my committee. I have had the opportunity to work with key Senators on this issue, including Senators LANKFORD, SINEMA, and MURPHY, who helped broker this deal in the first place; and I am going to keep working with any Member of this Chamber who is willing to come together and find common ground and forge solutions to help our country. And I hope some Republicans join me.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam President, I rise today in support of securing our border and taking action to fix our broken immigration system.

Let's back up for a minute. Fixing our broken immigration system and securing our border has evaded Congress for decades. We have poured many hours and much ink into trying to solve the very real issues that we have, and we have come close. I was proud to advance the bipartisan Gang of 8 immigration reform that would have tightened border security, provided pathways to citizenship for those already here, and expanded work visas. I, along with many in this Chamber, also voted for a bipartisan bill that would have given a path to citizenship for the 1.8 million Dreamers who came to our country as children.

We nearly passed the Common Sense Plan, a bill that would have invested \$25 billion in border security and also provided a pathway to citizenship for our Dreamers. All of these efforts—every single one of them—died at the hands of congressional Republicans.

Recently, Democrats and Republicans came to the table, yet again, to find a path forward on border security and fixes to our immigration system. Together, my colleagues from both parties worked hard to find a bipartisan compromise, and they did. The result was a strong measure, even endorsed by the largest Border Patrol union, that curbs the flow of fentanyl from coming across our border, expedites our asylum process, and boosts border security. Then, many Republicans walked away again, apparently deciding that it was better politics not to secure our border.

And what hits closest to home for me and every family who has watched a loved one pass away from fentanyl poisoning or an overdose is that we have a real chance to disrupt the flow of these dangerous drugs into our communities.

In the 2-year period from 2021 to 2022, over 2,800 Wisconsinites died of an opioid-related overdose. In just 2 years, thousands of Wisconsin families lost a loved one and gained an empty seat at the dinner table.

I have heard from countless parents devastated by losing their child. One mother, Michelle, got a call one November morning in 2021 notifying her that her son Cade, a freshman at UW-Milwaukee, had passed away. The night

before, Cade had gone out with friends in his dorm. He took one pill that he thought was Percocet. It turned out to be 100 percent fentanyl.

Michelle told me earlier this year that Cade “had his entire life ahead of him. He was home from college the weekend before he died talking about changing his major to psychology and how he wanted to travel the world. He deserved to learn from his mistake, not die from it. He didn’t overdose from taking one pill. He was poisoned.”

That is the stark reality of fentanyl: One pill can kill. In 2020, over 85 percent of opioid deaths in Wisconsin were connected to a synthetic or manufactured opioid like fentanyl. We can and we must do more to stop illicit drugs from coming into our communities. We have that chance in front of us right now.

We are bringing this bill back up because this is what the American people are demanding. While Wisconsin is not on the southern border, we are impacted by the flow of fentanyl coming across that border, and Wisconsinites want action. This bipartisan border compromise is that action.

This legislation will invest in 100 new cutting-edge inspection machines that help detect fentanyl at our ports of entry. This bill would also strengthen border security with more than 2,400 new Customs and Border Protection officers at our southwest border and give the President new authority to shut down the border when the system is overwhelmed.

Not only would this compromise combat the fentanyl crisis, but this also gives us the opportunity to take on an immigration system that has been broken for decades. If passed, this bill would invest in asylum officers and immigration judges to expedite the process. We would also send more resources to help communities across this country struggling to provide critical services to newcomers and expedite work permits for people who are in this country and qualify so that newcomers can provide for their families and help us meet workforce demands for Wisconsin businesses and farms.

With communities across Wisconsin and the country receiving migrants, this bill would deliver the necessary resources so that our local boots on the ground can effectively welcome those legally entering this country and not stress their often-stretched budgets.

Many Republicans walked away from this deal that they negotiated more than 100 days ago because some would rather make this a campaign issue. Well, I, for one, would prefer to make a difference. Our constituents expect—frankly, they demand—that we come here and work in good faith and find compromise where possible.

Our colleagues found a compromise on immigration reform and securing our border. Is it perfect? No. Would it have been a huge step in the right direction? Yes. I, nor anyone else, got everything that they wanted. This bill is

a compromise, and there is more work to do. Even if we pass this bill, we must remain committed to fixing our immigration system, including creating a clear path to citizenship for immigrants already here, especially our Dreamers.

But in this instance, we cannot let the perfect be the enemy of the good. We cannot allow politics to win out over progress. We cannot allow the same old Washington games to stop us from saving lives. Right now, we have a chance to take a step in the right direction, a chance to do the right thing for moms like Michelle and every parent who has lost a child to fentanyl. Let’s do something together right now to secure our border, stop the flow of fentanyl, fix our broken immigration system, and make a real difference for Americans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I am honored to join my colleagues in this colloquy and to support this measure. We are nearing the end of the debate for today. We are nearing a vote tomorrow.

But the debate will continue, and we will have other votes. Whether this measure passes or not tomorrow, it is only the beginning of what we need to do. So that debate nationally and in this body will continue. And there will be votes on other steps that carry forward the effort that this bipartisan security act reflects.

But we must act. Everyone agrees that we must act to make our border more secure, to fix our broken immigration system, to find a path toward earned citizenship for millions—tens of millions—of undocumented people in this country who are paying taxes and playing by the rules and, of course, for the Dreamers and for people seeking visas so they can work here and fill jobs that otherwise will be vacant.

We often hear Republicans talk about the need to secure the border. I sit on the Judiciary Committee where it seems like my Republican colleagues want to talk and talk and talk about the border. Every hearing, every markup, regardless of our actual agenda, they want to talk. Republicans want to talk about the border so much that they sent us contrived Articles of Impeachment against a Cabinet Secretary for the first time in 150 years. More talk.

Politics is the reason that this body failed to pass this measure just months ago. So for Republican colleagues who now claim politics is the reason we are here—yes, their politics, their presumptive Presidential nominee saying that they should not vote for it because of the political advantage they would have from keeping it as an issue. They made clear that all they want to do about the border is talk and use it politically.

Democrats spent months negotiating with Republicans. I give great credit to

my colleagues, Senator MURPHY, Senator SINEMA, Senator LANKFORD, and others, who have worked on this issue over the years.

I remember well in 2013, the Judiciary Committee overwhelmingly approved a bipartisan measure that then was approved by an overwhelming bipartisan majority in this body, and it went to the House where it died, not because it was voted down but simply because it had no vote. The Speaker of the House refused to give it a vote.

We will have a vote tomorrow on a measure that falls way short of what that one did in 2013. We provided a path to earn citizenship for 11 million then-undocumented—for the Dreamers. We provided billions of dollars for border security. And we reformed visa and asylum programs, among other ways, by enabling more fairness in that asylum system.

This bill is the strongest measure in recent history. It was endorsed by the National Border Patrol Council and the union of Border Patrol agents.

Let’s be very clear-eyed. It was a tough compromise. It limited asylum claims in ways that many Democrats and I remain concerned about doing. But it includes some key Democratic priorities, including providing new pathways to citizenship for our Afghan at-risk allies, ensuring legal representation to vulnerable children under 13 attempting to navigate the immigration process on their own, and providing for new ways for family members to enter the United States legally for short stays to visit relatives and attend major life events. That is an issue I have worked with colleagues across the aisle for years as well as some of those other provisions.

These are key parts of the Democratic vision for immigration: fix our broken immigration system to continue growing our economy and maintain America’s international leadership at a time of severe global unrest.

It will be tough for my Republican colleagues to vote for this measure. It will be tough for many of us. But that is why we are here, and that is the measure of why it is a compromise. A lot of what is here, we would not choose to include.

Let me conclude by saying, Donald Trump wants to campaign on the border, not fix it. The question is whether my Republican colleagues are so beholden to him that they will follow that lead like lemmings off a cliff and, at the end of the day, take the country with them.

My Democratic colleagues and I are not giving up. To the Dreamers, we will keep faith with you. To the undocumented millions around the United States who are paying taxes, working hard, following all the rules, we will keep faith with you. To businesses that want more visas so they can have workers, skilled and others, we will keep faith with you. We will keep faith with America on this issue. We are not abandoning this effort. We are not going away.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The senior Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be permitted to speak prior to the scheduled vote: Myself for up to 5 minutes, Senator SCHUMER for up to 2 minutes, Senator MURPHY for up to 10 minutes, Senator BUTLER for up to 5 minutes.

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

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I rise today along with Senators MURPHY and BLUMENTHAL and so many others in support of bipartisan legislation to improve our immigration system.

As we face global and domestic threats, securing our borders and points of entry must be a top priority. As we have discussed, we had an opportunity in February to move forward in a bipartisan manner on broad and important reforms and security measures that Senators MURPHY, LANKFORD, and SINEMA spent months negotiating.

I will note that this legislation, as Senator BLUMENTHAL noted, included my bipartisan bill to keep our covenant with the thousands of Afghans living in the United States who fought shoulder to shoulder with our troops. It is a top priority of the VFW and top priority of the American Legion, a top priority of those who have served in Afghanistan. These were their interpreters. These were the ones that gathered their intelligence. And now 80,000 of them are in our country, living with a trapdoor under them, not knowing if they will be sent back to the Taliban. They are working, yes, but what they need is permanent status.

And that is what this bill that I have with Senator GRAHAM, with support, on the Afghan Adjustment Act. As cosponsors, there are Senators like Senator MULLIN and Senator WICKER, the ranking member of Armed Services, and Senator RISCH, the ranking on Foreign Relations. They are all on this bill.

When it comes to our borders, though, as we are talking about today, this comprehensive legislation would have invested in hiring more Border Patrol agents and immigration judges while giving law enforcement the tools and technologies they need to make a safe border—order at the border. It would have fixed our broken asylum system, providing 250,000 new employment and family visas.

Yes, Madam President, we have another opportunity to actually right this wrong and get this bipartisan bill done. Border security demands that we invest in both our southern and northern borders, which is something I like about this legislation, having lived in a State that borders Canada—the longest border in the world, America and Canada. A strong, secure northern border is critical for maintaining our trade relations, for maintaining the terror screening database.

And we have witnessed terrible instances of drug smuggling and human

trafficking. Last year, Border Patrol agents and sheriff deputies in Kittson County, MN, stopped a human smuggling attempt. That is why this legislation is so important.

And of key importance to me and I know you, Madam President, and the State of Wisconsin is fentanyl and the work that can be done if this bill passes. It not only gives the President emergency powers to shut down the border but also ensures that we take on fentanyl trafficking.

These pills are getting in the hands of schoolchildren. These pills are getting in the hands of people who have no idea that the pills they have are laced with fentanyl.

Fentanyl is the leading cause of death for Americans ages 18 to 45. Synthetic opioids like fentanyl kill more than 150 people a day, and a dose of just 2 milligrams—small enough to fit on the tip of a pencil—can be lethal.

These aren't just numbers. It is 22-year-old Alex Davis of West St. Paul, who died of a fentanyl overdose while he was a student at the University of North Dakota; 32-year-old Katie Flick from Erskine, MN, who was killed by a fake pill laced with fentanyl; Devin Norring from Hastings, who bought a Percocet over Snapchat that wasn't really a Percocet, laced with fentanyl. It killed him. He was only 19.

That is why we call on our colleagues to join us in support of the Border Act. This legislation, supported by Border Patrol agents, gives law enforcement officers significant funding and support to hire more officers and intercept fentanyl coming into our country.

I thank Senators LANKFORD, MURPHY, and SINEMA for their work on this bill. I thank Senator SCHUMER and Senator MCCONNELL for their leadership.

There is not controversy about this bill except on the political side. If you look at this from the viewpoint of Americans and what makes people safer and what will stop kids from dying because they take one pill and they don't know there is fentanyl in it, the answer is simple: Vote for this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, first, I want to thank Senator MURPHY for organizing this important floor block. I want to thank all of my colleagues who participated. I see Senator BLUMENTHAL, of course Senator KLOBUCHAR, and others who participated.

What we are talking about is the need to pass our bipartisan border bill to crack down on fentanyl entering our country. Every one of us in our States has talked to families who have lost loved ones because of fentanyl, particularly young people, and it breaks your hearts. Some of these family members didn't even know their loved ones had taken fentanyl and were dead within 24 hours—just gone. I have experienced that with some families.

So now we have a chance to do something with it in this bill. Tomorrow,

Senators face an important decision: Will both sides come together to advance a bipartisan border security bill or will partisanship get in the way yet again?

Three months ago, Donald Trump told his Republican allies to block the strongest bipartisan border bill Congress has seen in a generation—something that would have done a great deal to stop the flow of vicious fentanyl into the United States.

So we are trying again tomorrow because we hear about these families that Senator KLOBUCHAR mentioned, that I mentioned, that others have mentioned. We have to. And I hope this time our Republicans will join us to achieve a different outcome.

Unlike H.R. 2, a very partisan bill, this bipartisan bill was written with the goal of getting 60 votes in the Senate. It had input from both Republicans and Democrats. H.R. 2 can't claim that. It was totally put together by Republicans, got virtually no Democratic support. If anything is political, it is H.R. 2—has been used politically but never seriously to get something done.

So let's be perfectly clear. Our bipartisan border bill represents a real chance—in fact, the best chance in decades—to act on border security.

The bill would make huge strides towards cracking down on the scourge of fentanyl, deliver billions for the DEA, for DHS, to hire officers to focus exclusively on drugs, and billions—we now have state-of-the-art equipment that can detect the flow of drugs at the border. Why the heck aren't we allocating the money to pay for it instead of playing political games? We should be doing that right now.

I thank my Democratic colleagues who today are here highlighting how this bill does more than anything we have done thus far to deal with the scourge of fentanyl.

If you told me a year ago that this was the kind of bill that we had before us, that really cracked down on fentanyl, which we must fight, I would have thought we would have had a good chance, and we thought Republicans would have leapt at the opportunity to enact this bill into law. By objective measure, it is strong, it is necessary.

So, tomorrow, we are going to have a clear choice. Tomorrow, we will see who is serious about actually wanting to fix the border, who is serious about actually cracking down on fentanyl, and those who prefer to merely talk about it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, tomorrow, we are going to have a chance to come together, Republicans and Democrats, to be able to secure our border, make better sense of our immigration system. This is what the American people want us to do. They don't elect us to hold press conferences. They don't elect us to post on social media.

They don't elect us to argue. They elect us to solve problems.

To my great gladness, there are Republicans who are willing to solve these problems. Senator LANKFORD is one of them. Senator SINEMA, an Independent, Senator LANKFORD, and I sat in a room for 4 months, and we negotiated a bipartisan compromise—a compromise—that would allow us to get tougher on our southern border, to make sure that only the right people are coming into the United States, those that have a legitimate claim of asylum, those that are legitimately fleeing terror and torture. That would create a more compassionate, more effective, more efficient system of immigration.

We were engaged in this process because Republicans demanded it. Republicans said: We want you to pass bipartisan immigration reform. We want you to get to a result. We will vote for it if you achieve that result.

They selected Senator LANKFORD as the chosen negotiator.

We achieved that result. Senator MCCONNELL was in the room for those negotiations. It was endorsed by some of the most conservative outlets and organizations in the country, including the Chamber of Commerce, the Wall Street Journal, and the very conservative Border Patrol union. But it only got four Republican votes.

So I want to talk for just a minute about why that happened, what the bill does, and why it is important that we have another vote this week.

First, let's just talk briefly about what this bill does.

Probably first and most importantly, it fixes the broken immigration system, the asylum system in particular. Right now, you come to this country and apply for asylum, it takes sometimes as long as 10 years before you get your claim heard. That is not fair. That is not fair for the individual who is applying, but that is not fair for others who are waiting outside of the country to try to come to the United States. It is not fair for communities that ultimately have to house and provide services for all of those individuals who are waiting to apply for asylum. So this bill fixes that broken system. It takes that 5- or 10-year wait down to weeks or months.

This bill gives the President emergency authorities to close down portions of the border when crossings get too high. You can't handle 10,000 people a day at the border. We all know that, Republicans and Democrats. The American public knows that. They saw that chaos at the end of last year. This bill says the President, whether you are Republican or Democrat, has the emergency authority to close down the border during times of high crossings.

This bill makes significant investments in combating fentanyl. My colleagues have talked about the scourge of fentanyl, hundreds and hundreds of people dying in my State, thousands across this country. This bill invests

significant new resources in stopping the flow of drugs across our border. It is a \$20 billion investment overall. Much of that money is targeted toward fentanyl.

Then it just takes a bunch of commonsense steps to treat those who are coming to the United States in a more humane way. It says that if you are coming here and you have a legitimate claim of asylum, you should be able to work while your claim is being processed, that you should have a right to a lawyer during that process, that we should provide a little bit of money for young kids, for 8-year-olds to have representation. It provides a pathway to citizenship for certain really critical populations, including Afghans, including the children of H-2B holders.

Inside this bill are a number of really important reforms, and the system just makes more sense, it is more effective, it is more humane. But at the foundation of this bill is border security—making sure we have a border that is manageable, that is not chaotic.

I agree with my colleagues—this bill does not do everything we need to do to reform our broken immigration system. Of course I want a pathway to citizenship for people that are living in the shadows. I want to make sure that those kids who know nothing except for being Americans have a chance to stay here permanently. But this bill is a really important downpayment—a really important bipartisan downpayment on border security and immigration reform.

The question is, Why did it fail? Why did a bill that had the support of Senator LANKFORD, the appointed negotiator, and had the support of Senator MCCONNELL fail? And the answer is simple: Donald Trump told Republicans to kill the bill. Donald Trump told Republicans that their party would be better off if the border was a mess, if nothing passed, because more Republicans would get elected this November if there were scenes of chaos at the border. So even though you have a bipartisan border bill, kill it because politically it is better for Republicans if the border is a mess.

That is not my analysis; that is literally what Republicans have said on the record repeatedly. Senator MCCONNELL said it himself, said: Donald Trump told us to do nothing. Senator MCCONNELL didn't say: Donald Trump told us to write a better bill; he said: Donald Trump told Senate Republicans to do nothing.

So that is why we are here today, because the American public wants us to pass bipartisan border security legislation, Democrats want to pass bipartisan border security legislation, but as far as I can tell, Republicans do not because they want the border to be a mess.

We will see tomorrow. We will have another chance. If this is an emergency like Republicans say, then let's give it one more shot.

Let me end with this because I do think it is important to just explore

for a minute why keeping this issue of immigration unsolved, keeping the border chaotic, is so important to Republicans and in particular to Donald Trump. The reason is that making Americans afraid of each other, turning us against each other, is the centerpiece of Donald Trump's message and thus, for this election at least, the centerpiece of the Republican platform.

The idea is to keep the border broken, to keep the immigration system broken because it helps breed and maintain resentment towards immigrants, towards people that are different from you.

Just last month, Trump said this. He said: Immigrants are not human; they are animals.

I mean, if a major political figure said that 20 years ago, there would be, I think, Republicans and Democrats both standing up and condemning that kind of language. Donald Trump calls immigrants animals, says they are not human—he says it on a regular basis—and he is celebrated by Republicans.

I wish this weren't true. I wish it weren't a foundational aspect of modern republicanism to try to turn us against each other, to try to make us afraid of people who are coming to this country just to save their families' lives, but that is where we are. That is where we are. But that doesn't obviate us from the responsibility to govern.

So Republicans can complain that we are asking them to vote on a negotiated, bipartisan compromise, because it is inconvenient for them to vote against a bill that was endorsed by high-profile Senate Republicans and by high-profile conservative groups. It is inconvenient for them to vote against a bill that actually brings security to the border, that fixes the problem that they want to be fixed, but that is our job.

Our job is to come here and not just do press conferences, not just search for clicks online. Our job is to fix problems, and the broken border and our broken immigration system is a problem. This bill doesn't fix all of those problems, but it is the biggest fix we have had a chance to vote on in a generation.

So, yes, we need to vote on this again to give Republicans the chance to do the right thing, to choose the security of this country, to choose fixing a problem that they identify instead of choosing to try to gain some political advantage in this election, instead of choosing to continue to double down on this strategy of dividing Americans from each other. That is why we are voting tomorrow.

I am hopeful that Republicans and Democrats will come together to support this important, bipartisan border security legislation.

I yield the floor.

NOMINATION OF DENA M. COGGINS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, today, the Senate will vote to confirm Dena Coggins to the U.S. District

Court for the Eastern District of California.

Born in Sacramento, Judge Coggins received her B.S. from California State University, Sacramento, and her J.D. from the University of the Pacific McGeorge School of Law. She then entered private practice, where she worked on general litigation and family law matters. From 2013 to 2015, she worked as a deputy legal affairs secretary for then-Governor Jerry Brown. Judge Coggins later served as a supervising attorney and hearing officer at the California Victim Compensation Board and as an administrative law judge at the State of California's Office of Administrative Hearings. As an administrative law judge, she presided over more than 150 evidentiary hearings or trials that resulted in proposed or final decisions. Since 2021, Judge Coggins has served as a judge on the Superior Court of California in Sacramento County. In that role, she has handled assignments in both the criminal division and juvenile court. Judge Coggins has presided over approximately 100 juvenile dependency trials, and she has served as the presiding judge of the Juvenile Court since 2023.

The American Bar Association rated Judge Coggins as "well qualified" to serve on the Eastern District of California. She has deep ties to the district, and she enjoys the strong support of her home State Senators and the California legal community.

Judge Coggins's litigation background and her courtroom experience as an advocate, administrative law judge, and State court judge ensure that she will be an asset to the district court. I am proud to support her nomination, and I ask my colleagues to join me in my support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from California.

NOMINATION OF DENA M. COGGINS

Ms. BUTLER. Madam President, in just a few moments, this Chamber is going to consider the confirmation of Judge Dena Coggins to be U.S. judge for the Eastern District of California, and I would proudly want to rise and speak in support of her confirmation.

Before I begin, I do want to appreciate that Judge Coggins's family is watching proudly and eagerly the Senate floor today. Her mother, Cynthia Ambrose, Judge Coggins's son Elias and her daughter Elaya, who I met during their nominations hearing—I know they are excited about the opportunity today for their mother to continue her public service at the highest levels in one of the busiest districts in the State and in the country. And so I just want to take the time to thank Ms. Coggins's mother, Ms. Ambrose; Elias; and Elaya for supporting their mom, their daughter. She, indeed, is an incredible woman.

If confirmed, Judge Coggins will join the Federal bench at a critical moment for California's Eastern District. The Eastern District of California is currently seeing an average of 803 filings

for each judgeship on the court. That caseload level is the sixth highest in any Federal district in the country.

And given her remarkable track record serving Californians from all walks of life, I have the utmost certainty and confidence in Judge Coggins's readiness for this role. Her work ethic, integrity, and unwavering commitment to the rule of law make her an exceptional nominee to meet this moment with the urgency that it demands, and I am confident that she will be successful.

Born and raised in Sacramento, Judge Coggins has devoted her career to serving the community in which she was raised. She completed her undergraduate degree at California State University Sacramento, received her Juris Doctorate degree from the University of the Pacific McGeorge School of Law in Sacramento. Judge Coggins began her career in general litigation and family law, where she built a strong reputation as a skilled litigator with experience in both Federal and State court.

From 2015 to 2017, and again from 2018 to 2021, Judge Coggins served as an administrative law judge at the State of California's Office of Administrative Hearings. In this capacity, Judge Coggins presided over more than 150 evidentiary hearings and trials. She also served as supervising attorney and hearing officer for the California Victim Compensation Board, where she oversaw legal proceedings and ensured that victims of violent crimes receive the compensation and the support that they needed.

Since 2021, Judge Coggins has served in the Superior Court of California in Sacramento County. She has handled assignments in both the criminal division and the juvenile court. And since 2023, she has served as the presiding judge of the juvenile court, presiding over 100 juvenile dependency trials.

I will also note that if Judge Coggins is confirmed, she would be filling the seat currently held by Chief Judge Kimberly J. Mueller, who was the first woman to ever serve on the district court of California and for whom Judge Coggins served as an extern early in her legal career.

Judge Coggins is an experienced jurist who has seamlessly transitioned to and excelled in numerous roles on the State bench. The respect and reverence she has earned is validated by the overwhelming support she has received since her nomination, including a letter written by several of her colleagues at the State bench addressed to the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Speaking of her service on the juvenile court as a juvenile court judge, they said:

She is a humble and quiet leader, not seeking the spotlight or the fanfare, simply working day in and day out to improve the court. We know when she speaks, she has put considerable thought into her words and that her reasoning and judgment are sound.

They go on to say:

In the courtroom, she also demonstrates her steady and fair temperament. She is thorough and diligent. Judge Coggins is efficient with her time on the bench and has handled substantial caseloads. She analyzes issues in a careful and balanced manner and provides thoughtful, well-reasoned, and common-sense decisions. She is compassionate to all who appear before her and takes time to understand the impact each decision will have on them.

Judge Coggins is exactly the kind of jurist that we need in the Eastern District and has exactly the kind of experience California's Federal bench needs. Her legal intellect, her composure, her record as an effective, efficient, thoughtful jurist makes her a strong nominee.

And her appointment to the bench comes at a historic time. Just this morning, we marked the milestone of confirming President Biden's 200th appointment to the Federal judiciary, including 1 Supreme Court Justice, 42 Circuit Court judges, 155 District Court judges, and 2 judges to the U.S. Court of International Trade.

President Biden has nominated and the Senate has confirmed 126 non-White Federal judges, more than any President in history. The majority of these judges are women—127 exceptionally qualified jurists. Notably, the professional diversity of these confirmations are so remarkable and unprecedented, including public defenders and other legal backgrounds whose perspectives and experiences have not been fully represented on our Federal bench.

With this in mind, confirmation of Judge Coggins's nomination is a part of our broader work to strengthen our judicial system. So I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting her confirmation to the Eastern District of California.

I yield the floor.

VOLE ON COGGINS NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Coggins nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 179 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Baldwin	Blumenthal	Brown
Bennet	Booker	Butler

Cantwell	Hirono	Sanders
Cardin	Kaine	Schatz
Carper	Kelly	Schumer
Casey	King	Shaheen
Collins	Klobuchar	Smith
Coons	Lujan	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Markey	Tester
Duckworth	Merkley	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murphy	Warner
Fetterman	Murray	Warnock
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Warren
Graham	Padilla	Welch
Hassan	Peters	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Reed	Wyden
Hickenlooper	Rosen	

NAYS—44

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

NOT VOTING—6

Hagerty	Manchin	Mullin
Hawley	Menendez	Sinema

The nomination was confirmed.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 552, Melissa Griffin Dalton, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

Charles E. Schumer, Jack Reed, Richard J. Durbin, Tammy Duckworth, Tammy Baldwin, Catherine Cortez Masto, Brian Schatz, Cory A. Booker, Mark R. Warner, Patty Murray, Gary C. Peters, Elizabeth Warren, Margaret Wood Hassan, Jeanne Shaheen, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Angus S. King, Jr., Debbie Stabenow, John W. Hickenlooper.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Melissa Griffin Dalton, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), and the Senator

from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 180 Ex.]

YEAS—56

Baldwin	Heinrich	Rosen
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Rounds
Blumenthal	Hirono	Sanders
Booker	Hoeven	Schatz
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Butler	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	Kelly	Sinema
Cardin	King	Smith
Carper	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Casey	Lujan	Tester
Collins	Markey	Van Hollen
Coons	Moran	Warner
Cortez Masto	Murkowski	Warnock
Cramer	Murphy	Warren
Duckworth	Murray	Welch
Durbin	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Fetterman	Padilla	Wyden
Gillibrand	Peters	Young
Hassan	Reed	

NAYS—38

Barrasso	Ernst	Risch
Blackburn	Fischer	Romney
Boozman	Graham	Rubio
Braun	Grassley	Schmitt
Britt	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Budd	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Capito	Lankford	Sullivan
Cassidy	Lee	Thune
Cornyn	Lummis	Tillis
Cotton	Marshall	Tuberville
Crapo	McConnell	Vance
Cruz	Paul	Wicker
Daines	Ricketts	

NOT VOTING—6

Hagerty	Manchin	Merkley
Hawley	Menendez	Mullin

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). On this vote, the yeas are 56, the nays are 38.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Melissa Griffin Dalton, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. OSSOFF. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the confirmation on the Dalton nomination occur at 11 a.m. tomorrow, Thursday, May 23; further, that the cloture motion with respect to the motion to proceed to S. 4361 ripen at 2 p.m. tomorrow.

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

BORDER ACT OF 2024

Mr. OSSOFF. Madam President, for years, too many Democrats have been in denial about the national security risks at our southern border. And I have been critical of fellow Democrats who have failed to acknowledge these risks, who have failed to recognize that knowing and controlling who enters our territory is fundamental to our sovereignty and our national security.

But now the situation has changed. There are more than enough Democratic Senators ready and willing to pass a strong bipartisan border security bill—a border security bill coauthored by a conservative Republican Senator, Senator LANKFORD of Oklahoma, who has done extraordinary work in crafting this legislation; a bill that would surge enforcement resources to the southern border; that would tighten asylum standards; that would expedite the removal of those who abuse asylum to enter our country unlawfully; that would hire urgently needed Border Patrol officers and take the fight to the drug cartels flooding our communities with fentanyl.

This is a bipartisan bill to help defend the Nation against terrorists who would exploit weakness at our southern border to enter our country and kill Americans. And now it is Republican Senators who have already once blocked and this week are threatening again to block bipartisan border security legislation.

Why, the American people ask, would Republicans in Congress block border security legislation amidst a national security crisis?

The answer is simple. Asked recently on FOX News why Senate Republicans were blocking the Border Act, Senator LANKFORD, the Republican coauthor of the bill, put it very simply:

President Trump said: Don't fix anything during the Presidential election.

President Trump said: Don't fix anything during the Presidential election.

The former President would rather wield the border as an election issue than see Congress secure it, and Republicans in Congress appear to be falling in line even though it leaves the country at grave risk. I urge my Republican colleagues to reconsider their position.

Just as I have criticized Democrats who for years buried their heads in the sand about the threat at the southern border, just as I have criticized the Biden administration for its failures at the southern border, this is a time for Republican Senators to stand up to President Trump and say: No, we will not obey your command to leave the country at risk. Instead, we will do what is right for the Nation.

The threat of terrorism associated with unlawful entry at the southern border is real; it is pressing. If the Senate fails to pass border security legislation, refuses to tighten asylum standards, refuses to hire more Border Patrol officers, refuses to expedite the removal of those who abuse our asylum system to enter the country unlawfully, our Nation faces a grave national security risk.

The first vote we will take later this week on the Border Act will not even be a vote on the passage of the bill. It will be a vote on whether the Senate agrees to debate and consider amendments to the legislation. Senate Republicans think this bill is imperfect. If they want to offer amendments, they will have that opportunity.

I urge my Republican colleagues: Ignore the former President.

President Trump said: Don't fix anything during the Presidential election.

He is not your boss. He is not your constituent. We have an obligation to national security. The country is at risk. Let us debate the Border Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 696

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Madam President, it is great to hear my Democratic colleague come out against what is happening at the border. It is a disaster, and it is a national security threat.

Three weeks ago, two illegal immigrants attempted to break into the Marine base at Quantico in Virginia. Both individuals are Jordanian nationals who were apprehended by Customs and Border Protection at the southern border and released into the United States. One of them was allegedly on the Terrorist Watchlist.

Now, how did we get here? How did we get to the point where two people who entered the country illegally and were not screened or vetted tried to drive a truck onto a military base?

Let me say that again: These people are not being screened or vetted. We have no idea who these people are.

But here is what we do know about the people who have invaded our country: 25,000 Chinese nationals have entered our country since October 1, 2023; 184,000 Haitians have entered under Joe Biden's mass parole program; along with 101,000 Venezuelans, 91,000 Cubans, and 75,000 Nicaraguans. And this doesn't count the 76,000 Afghans who came here after Joe Biden's disastrous withdrawal from Afghanistan.

As I have repeatedly said, I have no problem with legal immigration, nor do my Republican colleagues. America is the land of freedom and opportunity. If people want to come here legally, we will welcome them; but we cannot—we cannot—have terrorists crossing our borders unverified. Ask the FBI.

Beyond the safety concerns, we simply cannot afford to support the 11 million illegal immigrants who have illegally crossed our borders in the past 3½ years. I don't know if Joe Biden missed the memo, but, folks, we are dead broke—dead broke—yet we are shelling out hundreds of billions of dollars to support these 11 million illegal immigrants, and this does not count the millions of what we call “got-aways.” Obviously, if they can come across and not be apprehended, why in the world would they go somewhere and run from the Border Patrol? It is because they are criminals.

A recent report from the House Committee on Homeland Security estimated the southern border surge is costing the American taxpayers about \$450 billion a year. You got that right. It is costing the American taxpayers \$450 billion a year. After 10 years, we are looking at a \$5 trillion bill. In

terms of actual benefits, it is estimated that illegals receive \$42 billion in welfare annually, \$68 billion in education, and \$7 billion in healthcare. We are spending hundreds of billions of dollars to support all of these people. The American taxpayers simply cannot afford it.

So why are Joe Biden and the globalist Democrats allowing this to happen? Why is this going on?

It is simply because Democrats care more about keeping power than they do about safety and protecting the American taxpayer and the American citizen. A New York Congressman confirmed this. She said that she welcomes illegal immigration because it helps with redistricting.

The President and his progressive left Democratic Party know that the more people they can get into this country, the longer they will stay in power—by increasing the population in the blue districts. It is a simple fact.

But enough is enough. Too many American lives have been lost due to the blatant disregard of U.S. law by the Biden administration. It is time elected officials fulfilled their obligation and the oath of office, starting with protecting the country from all enemies, foreign and domestic. This bill, the Border Act of 2024 that SCHUMER is forcing us to vote on, is basically an absolute joke.

By the way, President Trump has never told me—and I talk to him weekly. He has never said one word about the border. I don't know where my colleague from Georgia got this information, but it is false. If he had told anybody, he would have told me.

This bill, the Border Act of 2024, doesn't even have the word “security” in the title. That is because this bill will only make the crisis at the southern border worse. It is a border invasion bill; it is not a border bill. It is a border giveaway paid for by the American taxpayers in the trillions of dollars.

It also weakens the power of the President by suggesting the President close the border only when Customs and Border Protection has apprehended 4,000 illegal immigrants a day. Yes, you heard that—a day. So we are going to pass a bill that is going to allow 4,000 people to come here a day. That is insane. The last time I checked, the Commander in Chief already has full authority to secure the border. There is nothing new about that. That is supposed to be a basic requirement of his job: to protect the American citizens; to protect our borders; to protect our country.

The bill also includes zero funding for the border wall—zero, and it codifies dangerous catch-and-release policies.

So how did we get here? How is a border bill crafted that does nothing to secure the border?

Republican leadership put together this bill. They pushed things without telling the rest of the caucus and said: At the end of the day, this is the bill

that we have come up with—and we rejected it. Most of us didn't even know what was in the bill even at almost the time of the vote. The bill is just another public relations stunt from globalist Democrats pretending to care about the border during an election year.

We need to get serious about the national security disaster created by open borders—serious. If we don't believe that, we need to ask our allies over in Europe who have pretty much had their countries destroyed by immigration.

The American people don't want another messaging exercise. They want to feel safe in their neighborhoods. They pay our bills. They deserve it. We are here for them.

Over the last 3 years, Americans have watched in disbelief as Joe Biden has intentionally erased our borders and invited millions of illegal immigrants to invade our country. My bill, the Border Safety and Security Act, would shut down our borders until the Department of Homeland Security regains operational control because, as we speak, the border is being overrun. That means the border would be completely closed until DHS is able to track exactly who is coming into the country by either detaining them or setting up a program similar to “Remain in Mexico.” It is that simple.

If Democrats are serious about securing the border, they will support the Border Safety and Security Act.

Madam President, as in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 696 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). Is there objection?

The majority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, the background that leads up to this moment is worth a minute or 2 to be explained.

It was October. We faced some ominous challenges around the world. Our allies and friends were in conflict, and the United States wanted to stand by them.

President Biden made a request for a defense supplemental and said: We need to move on this quickly. For example, our friends in Ukraine, who are fighting off the barbaric tactics of Vladimir Putin, need our continued help. We shouldn't waste any time.

At the time, several Members of the Senate on the other side of the aisle said: No, you cannot even consider helping Ukraine fight this war against Putin unless you do something about our border. There has got to be a change in our border policy.

So there eventually emerged a group that took on the task of writing a bipartisan bill.

Make no mistake, legislation on a subject as serious as this will never pass as a partisan piece of legislation. It has to be bipartisan. Both sides of the aisle decided to enlist our colleagues to sit down in a deliberative effort to write a bipartisan border bill to address the crisis we face at the border.

The Republicans chose as their spokesperson, as their negotiator, JAMES LANKFORD of Oklahoma. JAMES LANKFORD is a certifiable conservative Republican who is respected on both sides of the aisle. I join in that chorus of respect for him.

The Republicans said to us: None of these freewheeling efforts. JAMES LANKFORD is our man. He will negotiate this, and we will stand by him.

At that point, CHRIS MURPHY, a Democrat from Connecticut, was enlisted to be part of that negotiating effort, along with the Senator from Arizona. They sat down and started a three-way effort to find a bipartisan bill. They worked on it not just for weeks but for months.

During that period of time, I met with them from time to time, not to interject my efforts or any ideas I had, but just to measure their progress. They were not happy about the course of business and how quickly they could reach a conclusion, but the fact of the matter is they did. They reached a bipartisan agreement, one which I don't agree with in many aspects, but it is a good one—a heartfelt, serious effort; a bipartisan Democratic and Republican effort.

We were prepared and did call on the floor of the U.S. Senate this bipartisan bill that Senator LANKFORD had led the Republicans into establishing. I believe it ended up with four votes—four votes.

The Republicans were told: Keep your hands off, Democrats, when it comes to Lankford's efforts. Let him do the work.

When he finally produced an effort, a good-faith effort, they rejected it, walked away from it.

The Senator from Alabama just explained that they didn't have time to read it. If I recall, several days had passed where that bill was available for our staffs to analyze and others to look at. Most of us who wanted to know the contents of it. I thought it was a step in the right direction moving forward. But it was rejected by the same Republicans who initiated the process by saying that there will be no supplemental for defense until there is a bipartisan bill, and the bipartisan bill is to be put together by the Senator from Oklahoma. When it finally appeared before us, they walked away from it. They walked away from this bipartisan bill.

I would just tell the Senator from Alabama, I have worked on this issue for a number of years. The only effort I have seen that finally resulted in comprehensive immigration reform that came to the floor was totally bipartisan. A gang of eight Senators, which I was part of, led by Senator MCCAIN on the Republican side, pro-

duced a good bill that received over 65 votes. It wasn't taken up by the Republicans in the House, but it was a good-faith, bipartisan effort. That is the only way we can pass legislation that is meaningful when it comes to immigration.

The bill that the Senator from Alabama produces here today will not secure our border. It will not prevent the flow of illicit drugs through ports of entry or improve public safety. It would allow the Secretary of Homeland Security to suspend the entry of all asylum seekers at the border anytime the Secretary deems it necessary to achieve "operational control" of the border—whatever that phrase means.

Let's be clear. No Secretary of Homeland Security, including the Secretary under President Trump, has ever achieved operational control of the border.

The bill also requires the suspension of entry at the border of all asylum seekers if all asylum seekers cannot be detained and placed in expedited removal. One again, no administration, Republican or Democratic, has ever been able to detain and place in expedited removal all or even most asylum seekers—not even President Trump. It couldn't be done. No Congress has been willing to provide the funding that would be necessary to do it.

This bill would indefinitely end asylum protection without additional resources for the Department of Homeland Security, without any alternatives for desperate women and children fleeing persecution, and without any additional consequences for those who violate our laws.

We have learned from past experience that attempting to shut down the border is inhumane and simply doesn't work. To assume that this is one big wall that we could close the gate on is just wrong. It is not the reality. Our experience with title 42 emergency health authorities demonstrated this. Repeated attempts at unlawful crossings soared despite title 42, as did the number of noncitizens who successfully evaded Border Patrol, often referred to as "got-aways."

Recent data from CBP shows that in fiscal year 2024, the daily number of "got-aways" was 70 percent lower than the period immediately before the end of the use of title 42.

The reality is that our current laws for processing asylum seekers at the border are fundamentally broken, and measures like this bill will not fix them.

The bottom line is, the buck stops here. The buck stops here in the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives.

The last time we passed meaningful immigration reform was over 30 years ago, and we wonder why this broken system continues to be broken. It is because of our dereliction.

In contrast, we have the opportunity to vote on a bipartisan border bill, which will be offered tomorrow. It was

written by Senator LANKFORD, a Republican of Oklahoma, Senator MURPHY, and Senator SINEMA.

This legislation would actually help secure the border and provide essential national security funding. It would reform broken laws that are not working to process asylum seekers at our border, and it would provide desperately needed resources to our Agencies to allow them to implement these new provisions.

While these new processes are being implemented, the bipartisan border bill would provide for a temporary suspension of asylum in between ports of entry if the number of asylum seekers arriving at the border exceeds the capacity of DHS to process.

I have some concerns about the bill, but it reflects a genuine, bipartisan effort to create solutions to outdated laws and underfunding that have plagued our immigration system for years.

I was really disappointed, as I am sure Senator LANKFORD was, to see most of my Republican colleagues vote against that bipartisan bill. Although the bill was written by Senate Republicans' designated negotiator, Senator LANKFORD, and endorsed by the National Border Patrol Council—the union that represents Border Patrol agents—the Speaker of the House declared it "dead on arrival" in the House before the text was even released. To think that the Border Patrol agents said that this will improve the situation—the Lankford bill—and the Republicans still voted against it tells us the whole story.

I hope my colleagues will work with me to pass immigration legislation that the American people deserve, one that supports our frontline law enforcement, addresses the needs of our economy, provides a path to citizenship for Dreamers and immigrant farmer workers, and lives up to our Nation's legacy of providing safe harbor to refugees fleeing for their lives.

The American people are tired of partisan posturing and bickering over immigration. That is why this bipartisan bill, which was encouraged by the Republicans and the Democrats, needs to be the starting point of our negotiation. They want us to work together to secure the border, support our economy, and stand by America's fundamental values.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Well, there you have it. The American people have their answer. Democrats don't care about securing the border. They never have, and they never will. They pretend to. They continue to choose open borders—more crime, more fentanyl overdoses, more human trafficking, and more American deaths.

Democrats will say Republicans tanked the bill that would have secured the border. You just heard that.

This is a blatant lie. This bill, crafted by Democrats, would have done absolutely nothing to strengthen the border—not one thing. In fact, it would have made things worse. It would codify the problems that we have had the last 3½ years.

My Republican colleagues have offered real solutions for the last month to fix the problem. We have a huge problem. Somebody needs to recognize that. But my Democratic colleagues have voted against and objected to every single thing that we have brought up.

Don't buy into this lie.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 505

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, let's start at the grassroots of Iowa.

The question that comes up frequently at my county meetings—and next week, I am going to hold a Q&A in 12 of Iowa's 99 counties, and I expect I will get this question that I am going to pose to you: Senator, what are you going to do about the open border, people illegally entering our country?

My answer is usually pretty short—that long before I came to the Congress, Congress passed laws saying you can't come to our country without our permission. In fact, I add that we are a very favorable country toward immigration because about 1 million people come here every year, and maybe we should have more who come here under our laws, within those laws, not breaking our laws by entering the country illegally.

I don't get much of a pushback from that because I explain to them that we pass laws, and then the President enforces those laws under our Constitution.

The President has decided not to enforce the immigration laws. It shouldn't surprise us that he has taken that position for 3½ years because he told us before the election that he was going to open the border.

But there are some things Congress can do about immigration. That is why I am here on the floor today to ask unanimous consent for a piece of legislation that I put in. Maybe if this legislation becomes law, the President still might decide not to enforce it, like every other law.

Since day one, the Biden administration has pursued an open border policy. The result has been utter chaos and a crisis at the southern border. This crisis has become an indelible hallmark of President Biden's America.

However, President Biden, as I have said, has the authority to secure the border. He is already empowered under current law to do that. He could do it today if he really wanted to. It is the same authority that President Trump used to secure our border just a few years ago.

The Constitution makes very clear that the President takes an oath that he shall take care to faithfully execute

the laws. President Biden doesn't follow that constitutional oath to take care in regard to the immigration laws. Trump did take that oath very seriously.

Under the Biden administration, some 9 million migrants have been allowed to illegally enter our country. That is about three times the population of my home State of Iowa. The President has done that for 3½ years. Let me repeat that that 9 million figure is like the entire population of Iowa nearly three times over.

So instead of taking care that the laws be faithfully executed, enforcing these immigration laws already on the books, this administration chooses to ignore our border and abuse our Nation's immigration parole and asylum system. That is what my bill deals with, the parole system.

Immigration parole is supposed to allow the executive branch to temporarily grant individuals entry into the United States on a limited but case-by-case basis for urgent humanitarian reasons or significant public benefit. But instead of case by case, the Biden administration uses this program to admit entire categories of people as a means to bypass the legal immigration pathways outlined by Congress—in other words, not doing it on a case-by-case basis.

The actions of President Biden are completely out of line with what Congress intended to be the parole authority. So to address this loophole, I have introduced S. 505, the Immigration Parole Reform Act.

My bill will close this loophole and ensure compliance with Congress's original intent as a limited authority for exceptional circumstances. My bill outlines specific parameters for what constitutes an urgent humanitarian reason or significant public benefit. This bill would also provide clarity on the timing and extension of immigration parole, among other reforms.

So at this point, Mr. President, as in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 505 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from California.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this week has given the American people yet another clear window into the Republican mind when it comes to immigration: They are not serious about addressing immigration or about having secure or humanely managed borders.

Instead, Republicans only seem to believe in highlighting the challenges at our border instead of actually taking action to address them, and it is because they are prioritizing how it may

impact the results at the ballot box this November. That is their goal: to stoke more and more fear of immigrants every month between now and election day.

So I have asked before, and I will ask again: My Republican colleagues, when are you ready to get serious about immigration reform?

All but ending the practice of parole and cutting off legal pathways to immigrants is not a serious approach to the immigration problem. They know it can't happen in practice, and maybe that is exactly why they are calling for it.

Let's be clear what this is and what this isn't. This is not updating the amnesty process, which is legal but in dire need of additional resources, so that we can provide due process for those who may be seeking amnesty and provide them determinations on their requests sooner rather than later.

This is not updating work visa programs, because I know that all of us are hearing from employers across industries that there is a need for additional workers to keep our economy thriving.

What we are talking about here with this measure is parole in place. Every President since Eisenhower has used the parole authority on a case-by-case basis to allow a safe and secure path for immigrants who are fleeing natural disasters or who need urgent, specialized medical care to come to the United States. That is what we are talking about. Both Republican and Democratic Presidents have used it because it is a humane way to help address global crises.

I will give you some more recent examples. We have been able to provide protections for families of our military members. We have been able to provide protections for people fleeing the war in Ukraine. We have been able to provide protections for people who fled Afghanistan after the Taliban takeover, and for Haitians, more recently, and Venezuelans and those of other nationalities seeking refuge from violence and instability in their home countries.

Taking it away will actually force more people to come to the southern border, instead of using other lawful pathways like parole to come in a more orderly way. Is that what Republicans really want—because that is what would happen—to force more people to go to the border so they can continue to point fingers at a crisis of their own making?

The President's ability to grant parole on a case-by-case basis to people fleeing horrific and dangerous conditions is actually fundamental to America's continued leadership and our proud history of embracing strategic immigration as part of our success.

This bill represents a lack of respect for humanity and the laws of our Nation, and, therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to speak for 30 seconds before I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I regret that there was objection because fixing the Biden border crisis begins with regaining operational control and security at the border. This responsibility ultimately falls to President Biden, as head of the executive branch, to enforce the border and immigration laws already on the books. In other words, I would ask President Biden to honor his oath, where he said, in upholding the Constitution, he would take care to faithfully execute the laws.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 2494

Mr. BUDD. Mr. President, in order to be a strong nation, we have to have strong borders, and right now we don't have that. We haven't had that for 3½ years. In fact, we are in the middle of the worst border crisis in American history.

This is a crisis of President Biden's own making. Starting on his first day in office, he has intentionally and repeatedly undermined security at the southern border. During his first 100 days in office, President Biden took 94 Executive actions to open the border, and, 3½ years later, nearly 10 million illegal aliens have entered our country.

Now, those 10 million include an unknown number of dangerous individuals, hundreds on the Terrorism Watch List, countless transnational cartel members, drug smugglers, and human traffickers. It is a laundry list of evil. And perhaps the worst consequences that we have seen over the past 3½ years are the tragedies: the innocent men and women taken from their families by an illegal alien who should have never been here in the first place.

So imagine being a mother or a father. You send your daughter off to college. You are beaming with pride, but you are also a little heartsick that they are going to be out there on their own. Then, a few months later, you get the worst call in your life. And that is the reality for the family of Laken Riley.

Or another situation: Let's imagine that your uncle is a sheriff's deputy. You couldn't be prouder of him. You know he gets up and he goes to work every day to defend and protect his community. One day, you see his name on the news as a victim of a pack of il-

legal alien gang members who brutally murdered him while he was on duty. That is the reality for the family of Wake County, NC, Deputy Sheriff Ned Byrd.

Now, I recognize that the debate around illegal immigration is full of passion and sometimes antagonism, but I believe we can all agree that if an illegal alien commits the crime of assaulting a police officer, he or she must be subject to immediate deportation.

And that is why I stand here today to propose that the Senate pass the POLICE Act. It is a straightforward bill. The POLICE Act simply states that an illegal alien can be deported for assaulting a police officer, firefighter, or other first responder. The bill has already passed the House, and it can be sent to the President's desk by passing it right now. Any Senator who claims to support the police should have no problem supporting this bill. So let's help remove dangerous individuals before another tragedy strikes.

Mr. President, notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session and that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2494 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this is an interesting bill to be offered for unanimous consent because it actually does nothing. It does nothing.

Why? Because individuals are already subject to deportation for assault—whether they assault a police officer, whether they assault a milkman, whether they assault your family member. People who are convicted of serious assaults of law enforcement are already deported. They already can face both State and Federal criminal allegations.

Under current law, if an individual is convicted of any crime of violence and sentenced to a year or more in prison—that is an aggravated felony—that person is deportable. Even more so, any crime of "moral turpitude," where the crime is punishable by imprisonment of 1 or more years, is subject to deportation.

Additionally, any noncitizens that are convicted of any aggravated felony, including misdemeanor offenses—including misdemeanor offenses—are subject to deportation.

This bill doesn't do anything. If you are here waiting for an asylum claim or on a green card and you assault a police officer, you are subject to deportation under existing law.

So why are we considering taking this up under UC? Well, I think Senator BUDD referenced it in his underlying remarks. It is part of an effort to try to make Americans believe that there is a specific dangerous threat posed to you by immigrants; that you should be afraid of immigrants; that

there is a crime wave sweeping this country caused by people who are coming to this country to seek a better life.

Listen, I spent 5 months negotiating a bipartisan border deal because I believe that we need to come together in a bipartisan way to bring greater order to the southwest border. So I won't take a backseat to anybody when it comes to making the tough decisions necessary to bring some border security to this country.

But the Senator offering this motion voted against that bipartisan bill. So did almost every other of his Republican colleagues. We had an opportunity to do something about bipartisan border security, and Republicans rejected it.

Why? Because President Trump said: No. Let's keep the border chaotic. Let's keep this an open political issue. Do nothing until the election.

We had a chance to come together, in a thoughtful way, on a bipartisan border bill, and we did not.

The facts are this. Whether you choose to want to believe the facts or not, that is not my decision; it is your decision.

But immigrants commit crimes in this country at a rate lower than natural-born citizens. You may not believe that if you watch FOX News every night, but I hate to tell you, it is the truth. So if you want a safe town or a safe neighborhood, you are better off—you are statistically safer—if you have immigrants because they commit crimes of violence at a rate lower than people who are born in the United States.

I don't know why we are being asked to vote on this bill because it doesn't do anything other than feed this idea, this false narrative, that this country has something to fear from families that are coming to the United States fleeing either economic desperation or violence or terror or torture for a better life.

For that reason, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. President, it is such an honor to serve the people in North Carolina, all 100 counties, all from different backgrounds. I don't profess to know what it is like in Connecticut, but I thank my colleague for his remarks.

But it is disheartening to hear that a simple piece of legislation, the Police Act, which states that an alien—illegal alien—could be deported for assaulting a police officer, firefighter, or first responder is nothing. I don't profess to understand that. Perhaps it is different in Connecticut than North Carolina. I don't know.

I don't want to put words in the mouth of the family of Laken Riley or the family of Deputy Sheriff Byrd, but I don't believe it is nothing.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4292

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, as in legislative session, notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be discharged from further consideration of S. 4292 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. PADILLA. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I read the measure that is being attempted to be brought up by this motion. I want to make one thing perfectly clear. It is already a Federal crime for noncitizens to vote in Federal elections. Every Member of the Senate should know that. In fact, any noncitizen convicted of even registering to vote could face up to 5 years in prison.

Every single State has a law prohibiting noncitizens from voting in Federal elections. The consequences for noncitizens go beyond prison time. Claiming to be a U.S. citizen, under penalty of perjury, while registering to vote or while actually voting are deportable offenses. So it is already against the law with significant consequences for violations.

And, in fact, experts have found that voting by noncitizens is exceedingly rare. A study of the 2016 election, for example, found that noncitizen votes accounted for—let me get this right—0.0001 percent. Doing the math, that is about 30 incidents of suspected—not even proven, suspected—noncitizens voting out of 23.5 million votes cast.

What does that tell us? It tells us that our current laws are working. Don't just take my word for it. The Cato Institute agrees. In November of 2020, the Cato Institute found that "noncitizens don't illegally vote in detectable numbers."

So, colleagues, plain and simple, this bill is a solution in search of a problem. What it attempts to do is, once again, make it harder for eligible Americans to vote or to discourage people from voting, particularly American citizens who happen to be experiencing homelessness, for U.S. citizens of color, for U.S. citizens without driver's licenses. Do they have any less of a right to vote than any of us or less of a claim to our country?

I speak today, Mr. President, as both a former California secretary of state as well as being a Member of this body. I have always believed that our democracy works best when as many eligible people participate. That is why I, along with several of our Democratic colleagues, introduced the Freedom to Vote Act. Now, the Freedom to Vote Act does not extend registration or voting rights to noncitizens. What does the Freedom to Vote Act do? It in-

cludes pro-voter policies for eligible Americans, like early voting, vote-by-mail. Imagine that, making it easier for eligible U.S. citizens to exercise their franchise. That is the American way. Whereas, this bill would only serve as yet another barrier to participation by imposing not just extremely burdensome but unnecessary requirements on registering to vote.

Therefore, Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, it is unfortunate that it didn't have the chance to pass this today. I would have loved to have passed it. The reason I would love to have passed it is because, as my friend and distinguished colleague, the Senator from California, just noted, it is illegal for a noncitizen to vote. Because it is illegal for a noncitizen to vote, we need to make sure that it doesn't happen.

The fact that it is prohibited by a law with Federal criminal penalties attached to it doesn't mean that it doesn't happen. It doesn't mean that it couldn't happen. It doesn't mean that it is not more likely to happen when we bring a whole lot more noncitizens into the country. There are now an estimated 30 million or so noncitizens inside the United States.

My friend and colleague from California cites a couple of studies. One of those studies is from the Cato Institute from 2020. This was about 12 million noncitizens ago. Under this administration, we let in an additional 12 million or so noncitizens into the United States. That rapid of an influx can cause problems.

He also cites another study from 2016. That 2016 study was probably 15 or 16 million noncitizens ago. Things do change.

Now, the Cato study, the one from 2020 that he mentioned, says that there is no evidence that noncitizens are voting in detectable numbers. It doesn't mean it is not happening. It may mean that they are difficult to detect. But the more noncitizens we have, the more time that elapses when the National Voter Registration Act, or NVRA, remains intact, the more predictable, foreseeable, and, indeed, likely it becomes that many people, some of them perhaps maliciously, knowingly intend to violate the law. Others who might be in sort of a gray area, not quite realizing what they are doing or the fact that it is illegal, might end up registering to vote.

Let's remember, in 1993, Congress passed the so-called motor voter law, the National Voter Registration Act.

It made it very easy to register to vote in Federal elections. All you have to do is check a box and sign your name. It is all on the honor system. If you do that, you are registered to vote.

Now fast-forward two decades. The Supreme Court of the United States decides a case interpreting the National Voter Registration Act as prohibiting

the States—preempting the field in such a way that States may not request any proof, any evidence of citizenship when registering someone to vote such that they would be eligible to cast a vote in a Federal election.

Meanwhile, we have a change in trend. Decades ago when the NVRA was passed, No. 1, we had far fewer illegal aliens in the country, and we also, No. 2, had a lot of States that wouldn't issue a driver's license or were reluctant to do so to someone who was illegally in the United States. It is now the case that at least 19 States issue driver's licenses to individuals who are unlawfully, illegally in the United States. All 50 States plus the District of Columbia issue driver's licenses to noncitizens generally.

What that means is that somewhere in the neighborhood of 30 million people, or at least the adult segment—that portion of the nearly 30 million people who are noncitizens inside the United States today—all they have to do is go get a driver's license, which most of them, if they have any interaction with other members of society, are likely to do, to go get a driver's license—you need a driver's license for all kinds of things. Once they do that, if they check that box and sign their name, all on the honor system, they are registered to vote. Not only does the State not necessarily know that they are noncitizens and ineligible to vote, the State is legally constrained, legally prohibited from asking for any evidence establishing whether or not they are citizens.

So this really is concerning. We shouldn't treat it lightly. And the fact that it is difficult to detect makes it more important, not less, to require evidence supporting citizenship.

Look, we have to do this in other contexts. Anyone that travels abroad or might at some point in the future travel abroad will have to apply for a U.S. passport. To do that, you are going to have to produce some sort of evidence of U.S. citizenship.

When you start a new job in the United States, you have to fill out an I-9 form. Under the I-9 form, if you are a noncitizen, you have to produce evidence of your visa and your eligibility under your visa program to work. If you are not here on a visa and you are an American, then you have to produce evidence that you are, in fact, a citizen of the United States.

So if you have to produce that stuff to get a passport, if you have to produce that stuff whenever you start a new job, why would it not make sense to require proof of citizenship upon registering to vote in a Federal election? How else are we supposed to protect our elections, our sacred elections within our constitutional Republic, from foreign interference?

Look, one person, one vote. One citizen, one vote. This is how it is supposed to work. This is a foundational principle, and it is under unprecedented threat today. It is under threat

specifically because President Biden and Secretary Mayorkas have refused willfully to enforce the law. Now we face a direct threat to our electoral system as a result.

Consider this: Since President Biden's inauguration, over 9.5 million undocumented immigrants have entered the United States illegally and have been observed. An estimated 12 million or so have come in. That includes the people estimated to have entered without being observed. This figure exceeds the populations of 36 U.S. States, creating a crisis that has been met with just troubling silence and inaction from many across the aisle.

With millions of unauthorized entrants on U.S. soil, the potential for election fraud through ineligible voting is not just a hypothetical risk, it is a looming reality.

Instead of urging the President of the United States to address this crisis, Democrats seem to prefer to resurrect the so-called Orwellian-named Border Security Act, a bill that has already failed in this body and will do nothing to mitigate the border issues at hand—the border issues created and then exacerbated by this administration.

With the influx of noncitizens under this administration, even if just a fraction—say 1 in 100—were to vote, this could translate to hundreds of thousands of votes, enough certainly to sway tightly contested elections and potentially alter the outcome even in something as significant and with nationwide implications as far-reaching as a Presidential election.

This is concerning considering that a recent study found noncitizens have ample openings to illegally vote. Somewhere between 10 percent and 27 percent of noncitizens are registered to vote, and somewhere between 5 percent and 13 percent of noncitizens vote in Federal elections, including Presidential elections.

Across the Nation, instances abound where States have inadvertently facilitated the crisis. I say inadvertently, but in some ways, their hands are tied. "Inadvertently" here sort of refers to the fact that they don't necessarily mean to; it is that they are prohibited from asking for proof of citizenship.

From unsolicited voter registration forms mailed to noncitizens, to driver's licenses issued without adequate checks, practices relying merely on the honesty of noncitizens, including illegal aliens, have opened the floodgates to voter fraud.

While it is true that it is already illegal for noncitizens to vote in Federal elections, there really are no effective systems in place to verify the citizenship of voters. A mere check on a box is all it takes, with little risk—very little risk—of being caught due to inadequate State election infrastructure.

Federal law even prevents States from requiring proof of citizenship when registering voters via Federal forms.

An increasing number of localities permit noncitizens to vote in local

elections, further blurring the distinctions meant to protect the integrity of our elections.

Prominent Democrats have openly discussed these tactics as not just existing elements but as things that are beneficial to their agenda. Only months ago, every Senate Democrat voted to count illegal aliens in the census to help them shore up more seats in Congress and more electoral votes in the electoral college.

This cannot continue. It is our responsibility, it is our moral imperative to close these gates. My bill, the Safe-guard American Voter Eligibility Act—also known as the SAVE Act—would be a vital step in securing the electoral process, ensuring that in every State, every vote cast is legitimate and every voter is duly registered.

The SAVE Act proposes amending the National Voter Registration Act to enable States to require proof of citizenship when registering voters for purposes of Federal elections.

Under the SAVE Act, we mandate that States obtain concrete documentary proof of citizenship at the time of voter registration. It specifies acceptable documentation that really is desperately needed. It is far more injurious, if you want to compare the two. If you want to talk about the amount of burdensome paperwork that goes on relative to what it is that needs protecting, I think it is at least as harmful, if not far more so, to fail to require documentation and proof of citizenship in the context of voting in a Federal election than it is when completing an I-9, which everyone has to do when they start a new job, citizen and non-citizen alike.

Furthermore, the SAVE Act compels States to proactively remove noncitizens from voter rolls and introduces Federal penalties for those who intentionally register noncitizens.

This bill echoes the sentiments of the American people from coast to coast. It transcends political affiliations and speaks directly to the core of what makes our country great: fair, free, and secure elections.

This is about preserving the integrity of our elections and ensuring that each State will have the opportunity to participate in a way that involves each vote being cast to reflect the American will.

If this administration insists upon keeping America's borders open, then the administration must also ensure that none of these illegal immigrants are thwarting our free and fair elections.

Look, this border crisis—make no mistake—was deliberately engineered and has been willfully perpetuated by this administration. Now, they shouldn't want open borders. There are a lot of good reasons why this is a bad idea, a lot of reasons why we shouldn't allow this. There are a lot of people like Laken Riley who have lost their lives or have otherwise endured heartache, trauma, and devastating con-

sequences because of people who should not have been here to begin with.

But if this is what they want, then for the love of all that is sacred and holy, please, they should at a minimum have the decency to their fellow Americans to make sure that those same people who they have willfully allowed to enter our country against our law and against the will of the American people at least not be able to vote in our elections because they are not citizens.

Every day we delay, the foundation of our electoral processes erodes a little more. We can't wait for this administration to enforce the law because this administration isn't enforcing the law.

By passing the SAVE Act, we send a clear message that in the United States, voting is not just a right and a privilege of citizenship, but it is also a protected and a cherished one—one that our own government won't deliberately allow to be diluted and made less meaningful.

As debates about election integrity rage, the SAVE Act stands out by guaranteeing that only American citizens will have a say in our elections, thereby keeping those elections free from foreign interference—something we all care about.

American elections must be decided by American voters, full stop.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4387

Mr. LEE. Our country is in the grips of the worst border security crisis in our history. President Biden's open border policies have caused an unprecedented humanitarian disaster, with grave consequences for public safety, national security, and, indeed, for the rule of law.

For years, Democrats have stood by and watched as President Biden presided over and intentionally exacerbated this historic crisis. They know that President Biden has the authority to secure the border. Yet, instead of taking him to task, they remain silent.

No, instead of calling on the President to fix the problem, we are here attempting to revise the so-called Border Security Act—a bill that has already failed to pass muster in this body and will do nothing to secure the border and, if anything, would likely make it worse if, heaven forbid, it became law. It would certainly make it worse when administered under this administration because of the amount of executive branch discretionary authority this bill creates.

Look, let's be honest here. This is a political exercise, not a serious debate, because that bill is going nowhere, and we all know that.

Since President Biden's inauguration, over 9.5 million undocumented immigrants have entered the United States illegally. Those are just the ones that we know about, just the ones that have been observed, that have been recorded by our border security

personnel. It is larger than the population of 36 States. Most of our States are smaller than the number of people who have been observed and recorded as crossing into our country through our southern border unlawfully just since January 20, 2021.

The magnitude of the border security crisis is hard to comprehend. What is not hard to comprehend is that this is a public safety crisis, and it should be treated as such. Our constituents from our various States know this, and we know it from them. They feel strongly about it, and they don't like it.

So let's not pretend that President Biden lacks authority to secure the border and needs new legislation or else he won't be able to do anything about it. That isn't true. That is science fiction fantasy. That is a fraudulently produced statement. It is a truth-free assertion.

President Biden, you have the power right now to secure this border. You have it and you know that you have it and you deceive the American people when you suggest otherwise.

Let's not waste the American people's time by debating a bill that stands to make the crisis even worse—even worse—by giving you, sir, more power to make this worse, which it would do. And we know already how you would utilize that discretionary authority because we know how you utilized the discretionary authority you have already been given.

We should be considering measures that force this administration to actually secure the border, that stay the President's hand, and that force him to do his job, which is to secure the border. We can do just that or at least move in the right direction on that front simply by passing my legislation, known as the VALID Act.

Thanks to the Biden administration, inadmissible aliens are not just entering the United States on foot, they are being flown on commercial flights—often at government expense—into and throughout the country. The CBP One mobile app, which was never intended to be used by migrants seeking entry into the United States, has been repurposed into a tool by the Biden administration to facilitate the entry of even more illegal aliens into the United States.

Today, migrants can download the app, put in whatever identifiable information they would like—no matter the accuracy of the information, regardless of whether they just made it up, just like they walked into a party and wrote their name down on a name tag saying: Hello, my name is thus and such. And then they can use the app as their sole exclusive form of ID necessary to enter the United States.

So the rest of us, if we travel outside the United States, need a passport to come back into the United States. But if you are an illegal alien: No documents, no citizenship, no visa, no problem; we got you covered. All you have got to do is color inside the lines. Just

write down whatever information you want to make up. Put it on the app. That is your ticket. You are getting in.

I can't tell you how many times my constituent service operation in my State office back in Utah gets calls from frantic, concerned American citizens. They are somewhere outside the United States. They lose their passport. It is a real crisis. We do our best to help them. We can almost always figure out a way to solve the problem, but it creates real difficulty.

The American citizens don't have access to the CBP One mobile app, but do you know who does? Illegal aliens, and it helps them get into the country.

Now, not only can illegal immigrants use the app to enter the United States by plane, but they can also use it to travel throughout the United States, within the United States, on domestic flights paid for by the U.S. Government. Migrants don't need a legitimate ID or a passport. They can board a plane using Biden's CBP One mobile app, which the TSA now proudly advertises at airports nationwide.

Of course, if you are an American citizen, you will have an entirely different airport experience. You will be expected to wait in long security lines, show proof of valid identification, and then potentially be subjected to an additional invasive security screening. Americans are expected to follow our country's laws. Yet illegal immigrants who are in the United States only because they broke our country's laws that govern how you get into this country are held to a lower standard. It is almost an insult to standards to call it a standard at all. It is a nonstandard.

The Biden administration is rewarding people illegally entering our country with their own personalized form of TSA PreCheck. But it is better than TSA PreCheck; it is free. You don't have to provide any documentation. You don't have to have any real security review.

This backward policy has real consequences. Hundreds of thousands of otherwise inadmissible aliens have entered the United States using the CBP One mobile app as their sole form of identification for travel authorization.

Among those who have entered by using the app include a Haitian migrant who, after entering the United States through the CBP One mobile app, was arrested for committing a double homicide in New York. Cory Alvarez, another man who entered the country through the app, was arrested for sexually assaulting a disabled 15-year-old girl.

Americans deserve the right to fly without fear, which is impossible when we have a President who allows people without verifiable information to enter our country against our laws.

My bill can end this unacceptable lapse in security and public safety, and it can do it today. All I am asking for is a vote, a vote on legislation that would prohibit individuals from flying from foreign countries into the United

States if they are using the CBP One mobile app, a notice to appear order, or a notice to report order as their sole form of identification or travel authorization.

This shouldn't be a hard idea to get behind. This shouldn't be controversial, not remotely. Before you board a plane, you should prove who you are, just like the rest of us have to do. We do it all the time. We have to prove who we are when we go to the doctor's office, the pharmacy, when we check into a hotel, pick out a rental car, if we get pulled over on the highway for speeding. Anytime we do just about anything of significance, it seems we have got to produce identification to show who we are.

Look, this has been a pretty widespread practice that Americans have been required to follow for a long time at airports, certainly since 9/11. Everybody just understands it is what you have got to do.

Even for a U.S. citizen to fly from one U.S. city to another, he or she must establish identification, proving identity. President Biden is reversing that standard and importing crime into every community in America. No community in our country should be forced to fear that foreign nationals whose identities we cannot confirm can travel free throughout the United States—freely, often at government expense; freely, without even having to produce so much as identification papers.

Earlier this month, one of our colleagues was quoted as saying: There is only one party that is serious about border security. It is the Democratic Party. We are going to ask Republicans to join us.

Look, I will pose the same question that he asked and impose it now to all my Democratic colleagues. If you are, as you claim, the party that is serious about border security, then, for the love of Pete, prove it. Step up. Go on record and show the American people where you stand on this commonsense border security reform, and let's pass the VALID Act.

(Ms. HASSAN assumed the Chair.)

So to that end, Madam President, notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session and that the Senate proceed to S. 4387, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I have a great deal of respect for my colleague from Utah. He and I have collaborated on a number of really important pieces of legislation, especially in the national security space. So I say all of this with tremendous respect for the Senator from Utah.

First, let's go to the heart of the argument that he is making because he makes an argument that you hear very often on this floor, that tens of thousands of people are entering the country illegally. They are entering the country illegally.

The Senator knows the law, I would probably guess, better than most here, and so he knows that those people who are entering the United States without permission also have a corresponding right to apply for asylum. So, technically, they enter the United States without permission, but then they are allowed to apply for asylum. And that right to asylum is a superseding right.

And so there has been no dispute—whether the President is Joe Biden or the President is Donald Trump—that if you enter the United States and claim asylum and have a valid claim of asylum that you are able to make, thus passing the credible fear screen, you get to stay in the United States to process that claim.

And so this idea that people coming to the United States to apply for asylum are here illegally is obviated by longstanding law that, in fact, requires the United States to allow those people to stay here while that claim is being processed.

I just think it is important for everybody to understand what the law is and that both Democratic and Republican administrations have allowed people with valid claims of asylum to stay here and to process those claims.

As to the specifics of this bill the Senator is asking for unanimous consent on—again, I say this with great respect for my friend—I have no idea what the Senator is talking about. I literally have no concept of the problem that he just described because it doesn't exist. There are not hundreds of thousands of people coming to the United States using CBP One as their only form of identification. That is not true, and I would suggest that the Senator check with his staff.

In order to qualify for CBP One, you have to have a passport. In fact, you have to have another means of identification in order to qualify for the CBP One program.

CBP One papers are not an accepted form of documentation by TSA. Individuals who are showing up at the airports are showing up with a passport or another means of acceptable identification.

The Senator may have examples of exceptions, but there are certainly not hundreds of thousands of people coming to the United States with only CBP One documentation to present to TSA. It is just not true.

CBP One, in fact, is the way by which we assure that individuals who are coming to the United States are, in fact, who they say they are. Many of the programs, through which we use CBP One, include a vetting process—a vetting process, frankly, that, admittedly, often does not take place outside of CBP One. When people come to the border and claim asylum, if you don't have detention capability—as has been the case under both President Trump and President Biden—many of those people are allowed into the country to process their asylum claim without the kind of vetting that is done in the CBP One program.

I just don't recognize the problem that the Senator is trying to solve here today, and I do think it creates a pretty problematic misimpression that you have the idea that there are hundreds of thousands of people showing up at TSA and plopping down a CBP One document, coming to the United States with only that document.

In fact, the only way you get the CBP One document is to have shown and verified your proper documentation.

In addition, this amendment just feels kind of unworkable. And if there is a specific workaround to the existing system that requires documentation, proof of identity in order to get a CBP One document, then I am happy to work with the Senator on it, but this amendment or this bill makes the requirement operative on the airline. The airline is not actually the entity that checks documentation. Those are entities run by the Department of Homeland Security.

So I just don't see the same problem that the Senator does. In fact, I think the CBP One program is an incredibly important way to validate identity to be able to do important vetting. And through certain processes through which we use CBP One documentation, it is a way to control the number of presentations at the border.

Remember, through CBP One and the CHNV Program, we have been able to greatly reduce the number of people who are showing up in an unplanned way at the border, in particular Cubans, Haitians, and Nicaraguans.

I understand Republicans have a policy disagreement with the mechanism by which we use the CBP One Program to fly individuals into the country with a sponsor, with vetting, so they don't show up in an unplanned way at the border, but it is, in fact, greatly reducing the number of people who are stressing our resources at the southwest border.

So I will continue to defend the use of CBP One as a very legitimate way to make sure that we have an ability to vet individuals and we have an ability to relieve pressure on the southwest border.

I just see this bill as attempting to tackle a problem that I have not been able to exist—I am happy to talk to the Senator offline to see if there is a more limited problem that he has identified that we can perhaps discuss and work together on.

But my broader frustration is this: If the Senator would just vote yes on the motion to proceed tomorrow, we could work on this in the context of a bipartisan foundation. If the Senator is upset about the underlying parole program, well, the bipartisan border security bill—negotiated by Senator LANKFORD, Senator MCCONNELL, myself, Senator SINEMA—it makes significant changes to that parole program. In fact, it eliminates for all intents and purposes the parole program used in between the ports of entry, the 236(a) program. It makes other substantial

reforms to the parole programs that limit the use of parole to true humanitarian purposes. That was vigorously negotiated by Senator LANKFORD and Senator GRAHAM and others.

I understand that the bipartisan bill is not perfect. It is not everything Senator LEE would want, not everything Senator LANKFORD would want, and not everything I would want. But it is a compromise. The vote tomorrow is just to begin debate, just to get on the bill so that we can see what amendments might be able to get to 60.

Maybe there is a more limited version of this—I would argue—badly crafted bill that could be added on to the bipartisan border bill, but we can't even have that debate, we can't even get to the bipartisan foundation because, almost to a person, Republican Senators are choosing—are choosing—to vote against this bipartisan bill, even considering the bipartisan bill.

Maybe this is not true for the Senator from Utah, but certainly others have been pretty clear about the fact that President Trump has decided that he wants no compromise, no changes in border policy before the election because he wants the border to be a mess. He thinks that is good politics for him. He wants Republicans to vote against everything—everything—in order to preserve this issue for political purposes.

I think we would be better off having a debate next week, getting onto the bipartisan border bill, which does have Republican support and has Democratic support—not all Democratic support because it is a real compromise. There are many of my Members who don't support the bipartisan border bill. But we could choose to get on this bill tomorrow, take the Senator's idea, vet it, work it out between the two parties, and have an old-fashioned Senate debate. But we are not going to do that because Republicans are going to vote almost to a person to reject even taking up the bipartisan border bill. Maybe not for every Republican Senator, but for many, that seems to be because President Trump wants to keep the border a mess for political purposes. And I regret that, I think the American people regret that.

I am looking forward to having a conversation with the Senator I have worked with on a lot of other issues, but this bill seems to attack a problem that I can't yet identify. For that reason, I would object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I appreciate the thoughtful analysis—consistent with his always thoughtful, analytical approach to matters—that has been offered up by my friend and colleague, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. Yes, he and I have worked together on a lot of things, including in the national security space. It reminds me, he and I need to talk about one of those things sometime soon.

I do, however, disagree with a number of conclusions that he has reached. I think I see where he is going, and I understand how he gets there, but I think he is mistaken on a couple of points.

No. 1, there have, in fact, been hundreds of thousands of people who have entered the United States using the CBP One mobile app as their basis for entering the country and as their form of identification—hundreds of thousands.

In fact, my understanding is that between October of 2022 and the end of September of 2023, that calendar year, there were a total of 221,456 such people who did that just from four countries alone—from Venezuela, Haiti, Cuba, and Nicaragua—people being brought in and then paroled. These were people who, as I understand it—the Department of Homeland Security has acknowledged—had no valid basis for entering the country, and that is why they had to be paroled into the country. They were using immigration parole illegally, illegitimately, to bring them in because to actually use immigration parole, the statute requires that it be made on an individualized basis, not a categorical one. These were brought in categorically.

With respect to his assertion regarding entry into the United States followed by an assertion of a right to proceed under our asylum laws, that is a different question altogether. First of all, if you enter the United States unlawfully and then apply for asylum, you still have entered unlawfully.

He describes, then, these individuals as having a right to asylum. Nobody has a right to asylum in the United States. We do have asylum laws. Those laws allow the Department of Homeland Security, through authority that goes through the Secretary of Homeland Security, to extend asylum status on a discretionary basis. There is no statutorily conferred right, certainly no constitutionally conferred right to asylum.

In effect, what we do have is that if you enter the United States without documentation and then you apply for asylum, you have to have your asylum claim adjudicated. That can take years. In fact, a number of people who are entering the United States now, if they apply for asylum after entering, they are often told that their court date may not occur until well into the 2030s.

We know that most asylum applications are denied. Most people who apply for asylum are ultimately deemed not eligible for asylum.

You can't call this a statutorily or a constitutional right—a statutorily conferred or a constitutionally conferred right—nor can you say that they are asylees as of the moment that they apply.

Under our asylum laws, while there is some complexity to them, I think that the most natural reading of them is that they are supposed to be de-

tained while their asylum applications are pending and until they are finally resolved, which, as I just noted, most asylum applicants are ultimately denied that.

So to tell them: OK, fill out this form using the app. That could be your form of identification. You may enter the country using that as your ID. You may fly about the country at will using that ID.

To say that that is based on some sort of lawful immigration status isn't accurate, and it certainly ignores the fact that we are flouting in countless circumstances either immigration parole or asylum in order to get them to that point.

As to the suggestion that those entering the country with the CBP One mobile app—if I understand my colleague's assertion correctly, I think he is saying you have to have other forms of ID, perhaps a foreign passport or something akin to that, in order to use the CBP One mobile app to enter the United States. That is not my understanding at all. I have had countless conversations—I as well as my staff—with officials within the Department of Homeland Security when we have raised these concerns. I have never heard any suggestion anywhere that the ability to use the app in that fashion is conditioned upon the ability to show, to produce a foreign passport or other official form of foreign identification.

I would add here, I am quite certain that that is not the case for the additional reason—not only because that would have come up by now in the countless conversations we had about this but also for an additional reason. You see along our southern border people ditching their identification papers—their identification cards, passports, driver's licenses, whatever they are—from their home jurisdictions at the moment they cross the border. They ditch them. They ditch them because they don't need them. They ditch them because that way, they can fill out the CBP One mobile app and make their name or their date of birth or whatever it is whatever they want. This is a very known phenomenon. These are varied widely observed facts along the southern border.

He said that these are not hundreds of thousands who have been here. Look, this is not my understanding. Madam President, 221,000-some-odd people flew in just from the four countries I mentioned alone and just for the 12-month interval I mentioned. We have many hundreds of thousands who have come in using the CBP One mobile app.

Look, at the end of the day, we do have a problem. We have a problem because we have so many people coming in here who don't have a visa to be here, who don't have citizenship, don't have status as lawful permanent residents or otherwise, and they are entering without documentation, without any other legal right.

The fact that this administration has chosen to paper over the fact that in any other administration, in any other era of American history or at least modern American history since these things started happening, those would be regarded as illegal aliens, which, of course, they are.

In this administration, they do their best to try to paper over that by either declaring them eligible for immigration parole even though they are not because you are not allowed to use immigration parole that way—you use immigration parole in two instances, both of which are specific, neither of which may be categorical.

There is the humanitarian use. For example, your mother is in the United States. You are outside the United States. You don't have a visa. You are not a citizen. You are a citizen of another country. You want to come in because your mother is sick. She is about to pass away. For humanitarian purposes, they will let you in for a brief period of time, understanding that it is momentary. The other is a public use purpose—public use. Let's say you speak a language that is needed in the United States—I don't know, interpret at somebody's trial, translation services or something like that. Either way, it has to be a specific individualized determination.

This administration is using these things by the hundreds of thousands to say: Come on in. If you are from Venezuela, Haiti, Cuba, Nicaragua, one of the other favorite countries on this, just come on in.

So papering over them doesn't make them legal. They are still illegal aliens, and we are still facilitating the process by which they enter the United States and making it easier for them to enter the United States without proper identification. This would fix that. This bill would fix that.

Now, I ask today not that we pass it by unanimous consent; I asked only that we turn to it, that we get on to it. Even that drew an objection. That is most unfortunate.

Finally, I want to make the point with reference to the 45th President of the United States. I, like many—I believe like most of my Republican colleagues, have grave concerns with the so-called border security measure—it is really more of an immigration bill than a border security measure—that Democrats want us to turn to next, that they want us to get onto. I have grave concerns with that, and most of my Republican colleagues do.

I will say this: Most of us had real concerns with this long before the 45th President of the United States weighed in on it.

My objections, though, had nothing do and still have nothing to do with the preferences of the 45th President of the United States with regard to that bill. They have everything to do with what that bill actually said.

Now, I understand a number of people put a lot of time into that bill. I get it.

But that bill didn't do what most of us as Republicans asked that it do, which is that it remove the President's vast discretion to make it easier to paper over and document illegal aliens to make them appear legal when, in fact, they are not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I know my other colleagues are waiting to speak. Very quickly, I know terminology matters a lot to my colleague, so I want just to put a fine point on this.

Republicans may have an objection to the way in which the President uses his parole authority, but the President has always had broad parole authorities. And the individuals who are here under CBP One are not illegal. They have been granted the ability to be in the United States under the President's parole authority. You can have a policy objection to that, and the courts may opine on whether the President has the authority to use parole in the way that he is using it, but those individuals are not here illegally.

That is really important. Again, it is, I think, an unfortunate misimpression to present.

Second, there is a difference between people using CBP One as the legal means to enter the United States versus using CBP One as their documentation to get on an airplane.

It is true. Tens of thousands of people from those four countries have used CBP One as the mechanism to be lawfully in the United States. It is not true that they are not providing documentation in order to use CBP One and in order to board an airplane. They are using passports and other documentation for those two purposes. So those are two different issues.

Yes, tens of thousands of people use CBP One as the means to come into the United States legally. No, hundreds of thousands of people do not use CBP One as their identification mechanism to get on an airplane. I just think it is important to distinguish between the two.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, let me just defer to my colleague from Utah for a few short moments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I will be brief, and I appreciate my friend and colleague for indulging me on this as I have just a couple of points.

Look, they are entering unlawfully. Again, this administration is using other laws to paper over their illegality. The fact that President Biden is unlawfully using immigration parole to make them appear legal still doesn't make it legal.

I believe it was Mark Twain who asked rhetorically: If you count the tail of a dog as a leg, how many legs does the dog have? I would respond

that it is still just four legs. It is still a tail and not a leg.

Somebody who enters unlawfully isn't made lawful in the United States just because the President of the United States is unlawfully using an authority that doesn't allow him to make them legal to do that.

As to the suggestion that those who enter using the CBP One app have uniformly provided a passport, it just isn't true. In fact, I had it confirmed right now with the person who helps me with these things, who helps constituents—the people in my State—who confirmed just now that it is not a requirement. They are not required to provide a passport in order to do this, and we know that this has been used over and over and over again by people who do not have documentation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I have a handful of unanimous consent requests to get out of the way.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. TESTER. Madam President, I was absent due to a personal matter when the Senate voted on vote No. 177 on confirmation of Angela M. Martinez, of Arizona, to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Arizona. On vote No. 177, had I been present, I would have voted yea.

Madam President, I was absent due to a personal matter when the Senate voted on vote No. 178 on the motion to invoke cloture on Dena M. Coggins to be U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of California. On vote No. 178, had I been present, I would have voted yea.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF WVTM 13

• Mrs. BRITT. Madam President, I wish to recognize and honor Alabama's longest continuously broadcasting station, WVTM 13, on its 75th anniversary.

WVTM 13 originally began as WAFM-TV, an affiliate of CBS, on May 29, 1949, becoming the first television station to broadcast in the Birmingham area and across our entire State. For over seven decades, the central Alabama region has benefitted greatly from WVTM's legacy of local reporting.

A few iterations later, the station's call letters became WVTM for "Vulcan

Times Mirror" on March 28, 1980, and have remained for decades. The "V" references the location of the station, on top of Red Mountain at Vulcan Park, and Vulcan statue, the largest cast iron statue in the world that exemplifies Birmingham's important iron and steel heritage.

Similarly, WVTM represents a significant piece of central Alabama's history, as well as its future. I am confident that just as this station has diligently served our local communities for 75 years, WVTM will serve Alabamians for the next 75 years.

From the station's founding to current leadership under Susana Schuler, WVTM has benefited from incredible professionals and stewards of its community. Now an affiliate of NBC, WVTM embodies its mission under Hearst Television each and every day to provide quality local news and information in an independent, fair, and unbiased manner.

On behalf of the people of Alabama, I offer my heartfelt thanks to the reporters, television anchors, video editors, producers, and entire WVTM staff who remain committed to broadcasting accurate, timely news to the communities they serve. Alabamians are proud to invite WVTM into their homes each and every day because the station has truly earned their trust through decades of diligence and excellence. Thank you, WVTM 13, for 75 years of exemplary service to our State.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. GEORGE E. LEWIS

• Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I rise today to honor Dr. George E. Lewis, for his outstanding service to our Nation and Maryland as he steps down as chair of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal NHP Federal Advisory Commission. Dr. Lewis began his service in 1966, when he was commissioned as a second lieutenant in the Army. As an Army officer, Dr. Lewis contributed to significant advancements to protect and treat our Nation's warfighters and citizens.

He proudly accepted in 1989 the Pentagon responsibilities of both the executive assistant to the Assistant Surgeon General for Medical Research and Development and the Army Surgeon General's liaison to the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Research, Development and Acquisition. Dr. Lewis also was the senior medical biological warfare defense expert in the Pentagon during Operations Desert Shield and Storm.

In 1991, Dr. Lewis served as a U.S. delegate to the 1991 United Nations Biological Weapons Convention Review Conference. In August 1992, he was assigned as program manager for combat medical systems and assumed command of the U.S. Army Medical Material Development Activity at Fort Detrick. In 1996, he retired after 30 years of military service.

Colonel Lewis's record of service and leadership extends well beyond his

military service. He has led efforts to preserve historical landmarks, to promote good citizenship, and to support tourism and the arts in Frederick County. He has been a critical partner to the C&O Canal NHP and Maryland's congressional delegation in the success of major initiatives including the restoration of the Catocin and Conococheague Aqueducts, the reconstruction of the towpath at Big Slackwater, and the completion of a new park headquarters near the canal's midpoint in Williamsport.

In recognition of his years of service to our country and Maryland, Dr. Lewis was the recipient of the Department the Army Research and Development Achievement Award, and his personal military decorations include the Legion of Merit, two oakleaf clusters; the Joint Service Commendation Medal; and the Army Commendation Medal, one oakleaf cluster.

In conclusion, I extend my gratitude to Dr. George E. Lewis for his outstanding service to his country and community.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:10 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha I.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 807. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the invaluable service that working dogs provide to society.

H.R. 3019. An act to establish an inspections regime for the Bureau of Prisons, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3317. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to remove the lifetime exemption from the prohibition on procurement of rolling stock from certain vehicle manufacturers for parties to executed contracts.

H.R. 5527. An act to amend section 1078 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 to increase the effectiveness of the Technology Modernization Fund, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5754. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 350 W. 1st Street, Los Angeles, California, as the "Felicitas and Gonzalo Mendez United States Courthouse".

H.R. 5799. An act to designate the checkpoint of the United States Border Patrol located on United States Highway 90 West in Uvalde County, Texas, as the "James R. Dominguez Border Patrol Checkpoint".

H.R. 5863. An act to provide tax relief with respect to certain Federal disasters.

H.R. 5887. An act to amend chapter 3 of title 5, United States Code, to improve Government service delivery, and build related capacity for the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6248. An act to require Amtrak to report to Congress information on Amtrak

compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 with respect to trains and stations.

The message also announced that pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 34, 118th Congress, and the order of the House of January 9, 2023, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. SCALISE of Louisiana, and Mr. JEFFRIES of New York.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

At 5:58 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled joint resolution:

H.J. Res. 109. Joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to "Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 121".

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 807. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the invaluable service that working dogs provide to society; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 3019. An act to establish an inspections regime for the Bureau of Prisons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3317. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to remove the lifetime exemption from the prohibition on procurement of rolling stock from certain vehicle manufacturers for parties to executed contracts; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 5527. An act to amend section 1078 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 to increase the effectiveness of the Technology Modernization Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5754. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 350 W. 1st Street, Los Angeles, California, as the "Felicitas and Gonzalo Mendez United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 5799. An act to designate the checkpoint of the United States Border Patrol located on United States Highway 90 West in Uvalde County, Texas, as the "James R. Dominguez Border Patrol Checkpoint"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5863. An act to provide tax relief with respect to certain Federal disasters; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 5887. An act to amend chapter 3 of title 5, United States Code, to improve Government service delivery, and build related capacity for the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 6248. An act to require Amtrak to report to Congress information on Amtrak compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 with respect to trains and stations; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 4381. A bill to protect an individual's ability to access contraceptives and to engage in contraception and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide contraceptives, contraception, and information related to contraception.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-4692. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Reynolds Channel, Atlantic Beach, NY" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2022-0854)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4693. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Security Zone; Cooper River, Charleston, SC" ((RIN1625-AA87) (Docket No. USCG-2024-0228)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4694. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Security Zone; Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Corpus Christi, TX" ((RIN1625-AA87) (Docket No. USCG-2024-0314)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4695. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Heavy Weather and Natural or Other Disasters in San Juan Captain of the Port Zone, Sector San Juan" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2023-0269)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4696. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Ohio River Mile Marker 6.2-13.3, Pittsburgh, PA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2024-0004)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4697. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Gulf of Mexico, Marathon, FL" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2024-0079)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4698. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of

Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Vineyard Wind 1 Wind Farm Project Area, Outer Continental Shelf, Lease OCS-A 0501, Offshore Massachusetts, Atlantic Ocean” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2023-0269)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4699. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Sabine River, Orange, TX” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2024-0224)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4700. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Panama City, FL” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2024-0138)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4701. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Oceanside Pier, Oceanside, CA” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2024-0318)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4702. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Kokosing ROV Survey Operation, Straits of Mackinac, MI” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2023-0204)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4703. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Presque Isle Bay, Erie, PA” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2024-0294)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4704. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Gordie Howe Bridge Construction, Detroit River, Detroit, MI” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2024-0293)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4705. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Submarine Power Cables Stone Laying Project, Straits of Mackinac, MI” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2024-0278)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4706. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Security Zone; 2024 NFL Draft, Detroit River, De-

troit, MI” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2023-0204)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4707. A communication from the Director of Rulemaking Operations, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Uniform Procedures for State Highway Safety Grant Programs” (RIN2127-AM45) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4708. A communication from the Congressional Affairs Specialist, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revised Management Measures for the 2020 Guided Sport Pacific Halibut Fisheries in International Pacific Halibut Commission Regulatory Areas 2A, 2C, and 3A” (RIN0648-BJ89) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4709. A communication from the Congressional Affairs Specialist, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region; Golden Crab Fishery of the South Atlantic Region; Dolphin and Wahoo Fishery of the Atlantic; Acceptable Biological Catch Control Rules” (RIN0648-BL98) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4710. A communication from the Congressional Affairs Specialist, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Pacific Island Fisheries; 2019-2021 Annual Catch Limits and Accountability Measures” (RIN0648-BJ41) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4711. A communication from the Assistant Division Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safeguarding and Securing the Open Internet; Restoring Internet Freedom” ((RIN3060-AK41) (WC Docket Nos. 23-320 and 17-108)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4712. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Television Broadcasting Services; Missoula, Montana” (MB Docket No. 23-380) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4713. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Establishment of the Comptche Viticultural Area” (RIN1513-AC77) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4714. A communication from the Director of Rulemaking Operations, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled

“Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Automatic Emergency Braking Systems for Light Vehicles” (RIN2127-AM37) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4715. A communication from the Congressional Affairs Specialist, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “National Marine Sanctuary Regulations; Corrections and Correcting Amendments” (RIN0648-AV85) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4716. A communication from the Congressional Affairs Specialist, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region; Amendment 49” (RIN0648-BL93) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4717. A communication from the Chairman of the Office of Proceedings, Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Reciprocal Switching for Inadequate Service” (RIN2140-AB60) (Docket No. EP 711) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4718. A communication from the Attorney Adviser, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Notice of Funding Opportunity for the FY 2023-2024 Consolidated Rail Infrastructure and Safety Improvements Programs” (FR-CRS-24-001) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4719. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the second session of the 118th Congress; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4720. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “All-In Pricing for Cable and Satellite Television Service” ((MB Docket No. 23-203) (FCC 24-29)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4721. A communication from the Biologist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approach Regulations for Humpback Whales in Waters Surrounding the Islands of Hawaii Under the Marine Mammal Protection Act” (RIN0648-BF98) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4722. A communication from the National Listing Coordinator, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Endangered and Threatened Species; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Nassau Grouper” (RIN0648-BL53) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4723. A communication from the Special Assistant, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Takes of Marine Mammals Incidental to Specified Activities; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to the Revolution Wind Offshore Wind Farm Project Offshore Rhode Island; Correction” (RIN0648-BL52) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4724. A communication from the Special Assistant, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Taking or Importing of Marine Mammals: Coast Guard’s Alaska Facility Maintenance and Repair Activities” (RIN0648-BK57) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4725. A communication from the Biologist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Taking of Marine Mammals Incidental to Commercial Fishing Operations; Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Plan Regulations” (RIN0648-BM31) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4726. A communication from the Marine Resources Management Specialist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Takes of Marine Mammals Incidental to Specified Activities; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to the Coastal Virginia Offshore Wind Commercial Project Offshore of Virginia” (RIN0648-BL74) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4727. A communication from the Marine Resources Management Specialist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Takes of Marine Mammals Incidental to Specified Activities; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to the Ocean Wind 1 Project Offshore of New Jersey” (RIN0648-BL36) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4728. A communication from the Biologist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Takes of Marine Mammals Incidental to Specified Activities; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to the Empire Wind Project, Offshore New York” (RIN0648-BL97) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4729. A communication from the Branch Chief, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Prohibition of Commercial Fishing in the Northeast Canyons and Seamounts Marine National Monument” (RIN0648-BL70) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4730. A communication from the Chief, Space Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Parts 2 and 25 of the Commission’s Rules to Enable GSO Fixed-Satellite Service (Space-to-Earth) Operations in the 17.3-17.8 GHz Band, to Modernize Certain Rules Applicable

to 17/24 GHz BSS Space Stations, and to Establish Off-Axis Uplink Power Limits for Extended Ka-Band FSS Operations” ((IB Docket No. 20-330) (IB Docket No. 22-273)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4731. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG Engines; Amendment 39-22725” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0993)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4732. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; MHI RJ Aviation ULC (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes; Amendment 39-22710” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0026)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4733. A communication from the Deputy Chief, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to Geophysical Surveys in the Gulf of Mexico” (RIN0648-BL68) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4734. A communication from the General Attorney, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Enhancing Transparency of Airline Ancillary Service Fees” (RIN2105-AF10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4735. A communication from the General Attorney, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Refunds and Other Consumer Protections” (RIN2105-AF04) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4736. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 25, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4737. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs, Department of Transportation, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 25, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4738. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Federal Highway Traffic Safety Administration,

Department of Transportation, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 25, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4739. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Disadvantaged Business Enterprise and Airport Concession Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program Implementation Modifications” (RIN2105-AE98) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 26, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4740. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class C Airspace; San Juan Luis Munoz Marin International Airport, PR” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2023-1906)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4741. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airman Certification Standards and Practical Test Standards for Airmen; Incorporation by Reference” ((RIN2120-AL74) (Docket No. FAA-2023-1463)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 26, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4742. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Leonardo S.p.a. Helicopters; Amendment 39-22684” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2023-2245)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4743. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Leonardo S.p.a. Helicopters; Amendment 39-22697” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2023-2244)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4744. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Canada Limited Partnership (Type Certificate Previously Held by C Series Aircraft Limited Partnership (CSALP); Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes; Amendment 39-22699” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2023-1818)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4745. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Engines, and Various Restricted Category Rotorcraft; Amendment 39-22723” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0774)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4746. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Diamond Aircraft Industries Inc. Airplanes; Amendment 39-22724” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0991)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4747. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39-22706” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2023-1413)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4748. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Canada Limited Partnership (Type Certificate Previously Held by C Series Aircraft Limited Partnership (CSALP); Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes; Amendment 39-22701” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2023-2135)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4749. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39-22716” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0764)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4750. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39-22712” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0009)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4751. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited Airplanes; Amendment 39-22715” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2023-2400)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4752. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG; Amendment 39-22704” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2023-2233)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4753. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4108” ((RIN2120-AA65) (Docket No. 31540)) received in the Office of the President of the

Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4754. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4107” ((RIN2120-AA65) (Docket No. 31539)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4755. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Wallops Island, VA” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2023-2204)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4756. A communication from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revised Management Measures for the 2020 Guided Sport Pacific Halibut Fisheries in International Pacific Halibut Commission Regulatory Areas 2A, 2C, and 3A” (RIN0648-BJ89) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4757. A communication from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Pacific Island Fisheries; 2019-2021 Annual Catch Limits and Accountability Measures” (RIN0648-BJ41) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4758. A communication from the Attorney for Regulatory Affairs Division, Office of the General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Standard Mandating ASTM F963 for Toys” (Docket No. CPSC-2017-0010) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4759. A communication from the Attorney for Regulatory Affairs Division, Office of the General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Standard for Automatic Residential Garage Door Operators” (Docket No. CPSC-2015-0025) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4760. A communication from the Chief of the Industry Analysis Division, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Annual Employment Report” (MB Docket No. 98-204) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4761. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish; Amendment 20” (RIN0648-BH16) received during adjournment of the Senate

in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4762. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Framework Adjustment 29 to the Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery Management Plan” (RIN0648-BH56) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4763. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Framework Adjustment 12 to the Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fishery Management Plan” (RIN0648-BI41) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4764. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Skate Complex; Framework Adjustment 4” (RIN0648-BH03) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4765. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Deep-Sea Crab Fishery; 2019 Atlantic Deep-Sea Red Crab Specifications” (RIN0648-XE900) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4766. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revisions to Framework Adjustment 57 to the Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan and Sector Annual Catch Entitlements; Updated Annual Catch Limits for Sectors and the Common Pool for Fishing Year 2018” (RIN0648-XG503) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4767. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northern Gulf of Maine Measures in Framework Adjustment 29 to the Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery Management Plan” (RIN0648-BH51) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4768. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled

“Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Framework Adjustment 57” (RIN0648-BH52) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4769. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Surfclam and Ocean Quahog Fishery; 2018–2020 Fishing Quotas” (RIN0648-XF641) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4770. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Tribal Usual and Accustomed Fishing Areas” (RIN0648-BH97) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4771. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries Off West Coast States; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Annual Specifications” (RIN0648-XG121) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4772. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries Off West Coast States; Highly Migratory Fisheries; California Drift Gillnet Fishery; Implementation of a Federal Limited Entry Drift Gillnet Permit” (RIN0648-BG81) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4773. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Adjustment of Southern New England/Mid-Atlantic Yellowtail Flounder Catch Limits” (RIN0648-XF987) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4774. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy, Department of Transportation, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4775. A communication from the Associate Chief Counsel, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Preventing the Improper Use of CHIPS Act Funding”

(RIN0693-AB70) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4776. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of VOR Federal Airway V-132 and Revocation of VOR Federal Airways V-131, V-307, and V-350 in the Vicinity of Chanute, KS” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2023-2247)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4777. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Establishment and Amendment of United States Area Navigation (RNAV) Routes; Eastern United States” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2023-2040)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4778. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4109” ((RIN2120-AA65) (Docket No. 31541)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4779. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4110” ((RIN2120-AA65) (Docket No. 31542)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4780. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Britten-Norman Aircraft, Ltd. Airplanes; Amendment 39-22736” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0044)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4781. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; CFM International, S.A. Turbofan Engines; Amendment 39-22727” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2023-1991)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4782. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; GA 8 Airvan (Pty) Ltd. Airplanes; Amendment 39-22728” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0035)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4783. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Adminis-

tration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Hamilton Sundstrand Corporation Propellers; Amendment 39-22721” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2023-1820)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4784. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Engines; Amendment 39-22720” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0771)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4785. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Preventing the Improper Use of CHIPS Act Funding; Revised Definition of Material Expansion” (RIN0693-AB70) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 7, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4786. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Preventing the Improper Use of CHIPS Act Funding” (RIN0693-AB70) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 7, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4787. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “CHIPS Incentives Program—Facilities for Semiconductor Materials and Manufacturing Equipment [Note: The Department has concluded that this notice is not a ‘rule’ within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. 804(3). Nevertheless, out of an abundance of caution, the Department is submitting it to each House of Congress and to the Comptroller General consistent with the procedures set forth in 5 U.S.C. 801(a).]” received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 7, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4788. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Notice of Funding Opportunity CHIPS Incentive Program - Commercial Fabrication Facilities [Note: The Department has concluded that this notice is not a ‘rule’ within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. 804(3). Nevertheless, out of an abundance of caution, the Department is submitting it to each House of Congress and to the Comptroller General consistent with the procedures set forth in 5 U.S.C. 801(a).]” (RIN0693-AB70) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 7, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4789. A communication from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Regulations and Security Standards, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Flight Training Security Program” (RIN1652-AA35) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4790. A communication from the Attorney Advisor of the Regulatory Affairs Division, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pipeline Safety: Periodic Updates of Regulatory References to Technical Standards and Miscellaneous Amendments" (RIN2137-AF13) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4791. A communication from the Deputy Chief Counsel, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Preventing the Improper Use of CHIPS Act Funding; Revised Definition of 'Material Expansion'" (RIN0693-AB70) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4792. A communication from the Acting Chief Counsel, Federal Transit Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Public Transportation Agency Safety Plans" (RIN2132-AB44) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4793. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Telemarketing Sales Rule" (RIN3084-AB19) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4794. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airman Certification Standards and Practical Test Standards for Airmen; Incorporation by Reference" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-1463)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4795. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands; 2018 and 2019 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish" (RIN0648-XF636) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4796. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Pacific Halibut Catch Limits for Area 2A Fisheries in 2018" (RIN0648-BH71) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4797. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Management Systems" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0491)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4798. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd Airplanes; Amendment 39-22740" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0045)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4799. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; MHI RJ Aviation ULC (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes; Amendment 39-22729" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0031)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4800. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; International Aero Engines, LLC Engines; Amendment 39-22719" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2023-1989)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4801. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39-22726" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2023-1214)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4802. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39-22717" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-2240)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4803. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes; Amendment 39-22740" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2023-2139)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4804. A communication from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Prohibition of Commercial Fishing in the Northeast Canyons and Seamounts Marine National Monument" (RIN0648-BL70) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4805. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Catch Sharing Plan" (RIN0648-BH53) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4806. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Groundfish Bottom Trawl and Midwater Trawl Gear in the Trawl Rationalization Program" (RIN0648-BH74) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4807. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Catch Sharing Plan" (RIN0648-BH58) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4808. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone off Alaska; Yellowfin Sole Management in the Groundfish Fisheries of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands" (RIN0648-BH02) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4809. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands; Final 2020 and 2021 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish" (RIN0648-XH080) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4810. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone off Alaska; Pacific Halibut and Sablefish Individual Fishing Quota Program; Community Development Quota Program; Modifications to Recordkeeping and Reporting Requirements" (RIN0648-BG94) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4811. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Approval of New Gear Under Small-Mesh Fisheries Accountability Measures" (RIN0648-BF57) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, without amendment:

S. 3564. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to include Indian Tribes among entities that may receive Federal surplus real property for certain purposes, and for other purposes.

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 3880. A bill to amend the Federal Assets Sale and Transfer Act of 2016 to make improvements to that Act, and for other purposes.

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, without amendment:

S. 4359. A bill to amend the National Dam Safety Program Act to reauthorize that Act, and for other purposes.

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 4367. A bill to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4688. An act to direct the Administrator of General Services to sell the property known as the Webster School.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 4385. A bill to reform pattern or practice investigations conducted by the Department of Justice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORAN:

S. 4386. A bill to amend the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a program under which the Secretary shall award competitive grants to eligible entities for the purpose of establishing and enhancing farming and ranching opportunities for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 4387. A bill to prohibit transportation of any alien using certain methods of identification; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. WELCH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SMITH, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 4388. A bill to improve the administration of justice by requiring written explanations by the Supreme Court of its decisions and the disclosure of votes by justices in cases within the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court that involve injunctive relief, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 4389. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to promote the increased use of renewable natural gas, to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and other harmful transportation-related emissions that contribute to poor air quality, and to increase job creation and economic opportunity throughout the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL:

S. 4390. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to prohibit the President, Vice President, Members of Congress, and other senior Executive branch personnel from accepting any foreign emoluments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. KAINE):

S. 4391. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to recognize digital skills and digital literacy as critical adult education and literacy objectives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. COTTON, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. RISCH, and Ms. ERNST):

S. 4392. A bill to establish the Southern Border Wall Construction Fund and to transfer unobligated amounts from the Coronavirus State and local fiscal recovery funds to such Fund to construct and maintain physical barriers along the southern border; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HIRONO, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 4393. A bill to provide protections for children in immigration custody, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mr. MORAN):

S. 4394. A bill to support National Science Foundation education and professional development relating to artificial intelligence; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. KELLY, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Ms. LUMMIS):

S. Res. 701. A resolution designating the week of May 19 through May 25, 2024, as "National Public Works Week"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 704

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 704, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for interest-free deferment on student loans for borrowers serving in a medical or dental internship or residency program.

S. 789

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 789, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a coin in recognition of the 100th anniversary of the United States Foreign Service and its contribution to United States diplomacy.

S. 1193

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1193, a bill to prohibit discrimination against individuals with disabilities who need long-term services and supports, and for other purposes.

S. 1266

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

S. 1673

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1673, a bill to amend title XVIII to protect patient access to ground ambulance services under the Medicare program.

S. 2150

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2150, a bill to establish an Interagency Council on Service to promote and strengthen opportunities for military service, national service, and public service for all people of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 2371

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2371, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income interest received on certain loans secured by rural or agricultural real property.

S. 2539

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2539, a bill to clarify that, in awarding funding under title X of the Public Health Service Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services may not discriminate against eligible States, individuals, or other entities for refusing to counsel or refer for abortions.

S. 3283

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3283, a bill to amend the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act to support workers who are subject to an employment loss, and for other purposes.

S. 3452

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3452, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to determine the eligibility or entitlement of a member or former member of the Armed Forces described in subsection (a) to a benefit under a law administered by the Secretary solely based on

alternative sources of evidence when the military service records or medical treatment records of the member or former member are incomplete because of damage or loss of records after being in the possession of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

S. 3502

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3502, a bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to prevent consumer reporting agencies from furnishing consumer reports under certain circumstances, and for other purposes.

S. 3679

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 3679, a bill to reauthorize the Dr. Lorna Breen Health Care Provider Protection Act, and for other purposes.

S. 3757

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 3757, a bill to reauthorize the congenital heart disease research, surveillance, and awareness program of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and for other purposes.

S. 3765

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) were added as cosponsors of S. 3765, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children program.

S. 3775

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 3775, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the BOLD Infrastructure for Alzheimer's Act, and for other purposes.

S. 3779

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3779, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants to establish or expand programs to implement evidence-aligned practices in health care settings for the purpose of reducing the suicide rates of covered individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 3959

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3959, a bill to require the Transportation Security Administra-

tion to streamline the enrollment processes for individuals applying for a Transportation Security Administration security threat assessment for certain programs, including the Transportation Worker Identification Credential and Hazardous Materials Endorsement Threat Assessment programs of the Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 4074

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4074, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to approve interstate commerce carrier apprenticeship programs for purposes of veterans educational assistance, and for other purposes.

S. 4084

At the request of Mr. WELCH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4084, a bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make grants to professional nonprofit theaters for the purposes of supporting operations, employment, and economic development.

S. 4091

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 4091, a bill to strengthen Federal efforts to counter antisemitism in the United States.

S. 4206

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4206, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to prohibit certain activities involving prohibited primate species, and for other purposes.

S. 4251

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4251, a bill to establish a payment program for unexpected loss of markets and revenues to timber harvesting and timber hauling businesses due to major disasters, and for other purposes.

S. 4258

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4258, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to punish criminal offenses targeting law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

S. 4296

At the request of Mrs. BRITT, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4296, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide more opportunities for mothers to succeed, and for other purposes.

S. 4300

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr.

BROWN) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) were added as cosponsors of S. 4300, a bill to require the Secretary of Labor to maintain a publicly available list of all employers that relocate a call center or contract call center work overseas, to make such companies ineligible for Federal grants or guaranteed loans, and to require disclosure of the physical location of business agents engaging in customer service communications, and for other purposes.

S. 4321

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4321, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to prohibit the payment of annuities and retired pay to individuals convicted of certain sex crimes.

S. 4323

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4323, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for a housing loan guaranteed by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to certain individuals who performed active duty for training.

S. 4333

At the request of Mr. VANCE, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4333, a bill to provide for the discharge of parent borrower liability if a student on whose behalf a parent has received certain student loans becomes disabled.

S. 4368

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 4368, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require, as a condition of receiving Federal Medicaid funding, that States do not prohibit in vitro fertilization (IVF) services, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4368, *supra*.

S. 4371

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4371, a bill to amend the Investor Protection and Securities Reform Act of 2010 to provide grants to States for enhanced protection of senior investors and senior policyholders, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 82

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE), the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SCHMITT), the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 82, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5,

United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Food and Drug Administration relating to “Medical Devices; Laboratory Developed Tests”.

S. RES. 505

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 505, a resolution condemning the use of sexual violence and rape as a weapon of war by the terrorist group Hamas against the people of Israel.

S. RES. 574

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of Florida, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VANCE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 574, a resolution expressing support for starting and growing a family through in vitro fertilization.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. KAINE):

S. 4391. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to recognize digital skills and digital literacy as critical adult education and literacy objectives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I rise today to introduce the Investing in Digital Skills Act, a bill that would help strengthen computer skills in the American workforce. This bill, which I am introducing today with my colleague Senator TIM KAINE, would make important updates to the Workforce Investment and Opportunity Act, known as WIOA, to help workers meet the digital skills demands of today’s jobs.

A key goal of WIOA is to help Americans overcome barriers to obtaining high-quality jobs and careers. The law requires State and local service providers to offer adult education and skills development programs that accelerate achievement of diplomas and credentials among American workers. This Investing in Digital Skills Act would allow information literacy and digital skills to be included among the skills development programs within these adult education programs.

Our legislation would help prepare individuals for the evolving demands of the digital economy, enhancing their employability and skill sets in a technologically advanced job market. Recent research conducted in partnership between National Skills Coalition and the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta found that 92 percent of jobs require digital skills, yet more than 30 percent of workers lack even foundational digital abilities. The research also found huge financial incentives for this upskilling: Jobs that require at least one digital skill earn 23 percent more than a job requiring none.

This issue is important to Mainers. Lisa Robertson, the director of York Adult Education, wrote to me, saying,

“Your bill would address a significant gap in current workforce development initiatives by recognizing the importance of digital skills training for adult learners. In today’s rapidly evolving job market, proficiency in digital literacy is no longer just a valuable asset; it is essential for individuals to succeed. . . .” I appreciate Lisa’s insights about today’s workforce needs. By modernizing WIOA with new tools to teach digital skills, the Investing in Digital Skills Act would help Americans maintain their competitive edge in workforce.

I urge my colleagues to support our legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 701—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF MAY 19 THROUGH MAY 25, 2024, AS “NATIONAL PUBLIC WORKS WEEK”

Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. KELLY, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Ms. LUMMIS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 701

Whereas public works professionals work around the clock to ensure the vital infrastructure, facilities, and services of communities to deliver dependable, sustainable, and resilient human needs that include the health, safety, and well-being of the people of the United States, while advancing the quality of life for all;

Whereas public works infrastructure, facilities, and services could not be provided without the dedicated efforts of public works professionals who represent Federal, State, and local governments, and private sector organizations throughout the United States;

Whereas public works professionals design, build, operate, and maintain the transportation systems, water infrastructure, sewage and refuse disposal systems, public buildings, sanitation and waste management systems, and other structures and facilities that are vital to the people and communities of the United States;

Whereas many public works professionals are first responders and are the first to arrive and last to leave a natural disaster area or incident scene; and

Whereas understanding the role that public infrastructure plays in protecting the environment, improving public health and safety, contributing to economic vitality, and enhancing the quality of life of every community of the United States is in the interest of the people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of May 19 through May 25, 2024, as “National Public Works Week”;

(2) recognizes and celebrates the important contributions that public works professionals make every day to improve—

(A) the public infrastructure of the United States; and

(B) the health, safety, and well-being of our communities that public works professionals serve; and

(3) urges individuals and communities throughout the United States to join with representatives of the Federal Government and the American Public Works Association

in activities and ceremonies that are designed—

(A) to pay tribute to the public works professionals of the United States; and

(B) to recognize the substantial contributions that public works professionals make to the United States.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I have 11 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2024, at 9:45 a.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2024, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2024, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2024, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2024, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2024, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2024, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2024, at 3:15 p.m., to conduct a business meeting.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2024, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed business meeting.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC POLICY

The Subcommittee on Economic Policy of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2024, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

The Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2024, at 4:45 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Alexandra Gelber, a detailee to the Senate Judiciary Committee, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the 118th Congress.

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

NATIONAL PUBLIC WORKS WEEK

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 701, submitted earlier today.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 701) designating the week of May 19 through May 25, 2024, as "National Public Works Week".

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MURPHY. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 701) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 23, 2024

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m. on Thursday, May 23; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Dalton nomination postcloture and that if the nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be im-

mediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order following the remarks of Senator BARRASSO and Senator WYDEN.

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

The Senator from Wyoming.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—
S. 4392

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor today to continue this discussion of the crisis at our southern border.

When Joe Biden walked into the White House, the southern border was secure. Tragically, for our country, he then signed 94 Executive orders in his first 100 days. He rolled out the welcome mat, and millions and millions of illegal immigrants flooded into our Nation. The Democrats in Congress joined him. They joined the President. They worked with him. They aggressively rolled back Republican-led policies that had worked to keep our country safe. Our southern border is now a pipeline for illegal crossings. Since Joe Biden took office, almost 10 million illegal immigrants have invaded America.

The Democrats' uncontrolled illegal immigration strains our tax dollars; it undermines the safety of our citizens; and it endangers our communities. Hard-working American taxpayers are now paying. They are paying for housing; they are paying for healthcare; they are paying for government handouts—all for illegal immigrants. According to one study, the Democratic border crisis costs States and cities close to \$450 billion each and every year.

The heaviest costs of this crisis are borne by families, by communities, and by local law enforcement. Day after day, lives are cut short or changed forever. Just 2 weeks ago, in Florida, an 11-year-old girl was kidnapped and sexually assaulted by a 20-year-old illegal immigrant brought into this country under the catch-and-release program of President Biden. He is here because of this dangerous program.

The local sheriff in Florida had this to say:

The Federal Government is victimizing the people who live in this country by letting these people in.

To my Democratic colleagues, I would say: You voted for open borders. I would ask you, What if this were your daughter or what if this were your granddaughter who had been kidnapped by an illegal immigrant brought in by catch-and-release—a 20-year-old here. Terrible. Frightening.

Fortunately, this young girl's mother was able to identify the situation, and she ran desperately to get that daughter who had been kidnapped.

We are here fighting to secure the border to make our communities safer. Democrats in this body have done nothing to secure the border. They have done nothing to stop the flood of illegal immigrants. The record by the Democrats in this body is appalling, and let me start with H.R. 2.

H.R. 2 is, of course, the House bill. It is called the Secure the Border Act of 2023. It is the strongest border security bill in our history. It completes the wall because walls work. It surges new technology to the border. It hires more Border Patrol agents and gives them a bonus. It ends catch-and-release, and it reinstates the successful plan of "Remain in Mexico." If signed into law, H.R. 2 would stop the flood of illegal immigrants.

Now, the House of Representatives passed this bill, the Secure the Border Act of 2023, on May 11 of 2023. Well, that was over a year ago. The Senate majority leader refuses to bring this House-passed bill to the floor, and he has been blocking the bill for over a year.

Of course, it is not just blocking the Secure the Border Act that is the problem. Democrats will not vote for real border security measures. For 3 years now, open border Democrats—each and every one of them—have rejected solutions aimed at fixing the border crisis not once, not twice but in 22 different recorded votes. Democrats banded together to say no to finishing the wall, no to ending catch-and-release, and no to restoring the "Remain in Mexico" policy. They blocked the Laken Riley Act.

Meanwhile, they have embraced policies that have tried to smooth the flow of illegal immigrants when people all across America are saying: Stop this flood. This includes sending illegal immigrants cash payments paid with taxpayer dollars. The Democrats continue to fund sanctuary cities. For 3 years, my Democratic colleagues have seemed to welcome the crisis at our southern border. They now want to run away from their record, and we know why. It is because election day is less than 6 months away, and they can read the polls. Democrats can run, but they cannot hide.

The majority leader recently said that the situation at the border is unacceptable. I am not sure he actually believes that. After all, one of his first comments after the 2022 election was that he endorsed amnesty for illegal immigrants. The majority leader said at the time that opening our country to illegal immigrants is "the only way we are going to have a great future in America." It is "the only way." That is what the majority leader said. It is "the only way we are going to have a great future in America"—amnesty for illegal immigrants.

The Democrats have no desire to secure the border. Every single Democrat

in this Capitol is responsible for the drugs, the deaths, and the destruction brought on by the invasion of our Nation by illegal immigrants.

This is a cycle of suffering that Senate Republicans are determined to stop. This week, I introduced a bill called the Build the Wall Act. We know that the border wall works. My proposal finishes the wall. It pays for it by clawing back unused COVID funding. This wall is absolutely vital to our Nation's security.

You know, once upon a time, Senator SCHUMER actually supported a border wall. Many of his Democratic colleagues supported a border wall. When Joe Biden was then-Senator Joe Biden—and I served with him in this body—he actually voted for a border wall. They have all flip-flopped, and we know why—politics, plain and simple.

To my Democratic colleagues, I say this: You are responsible for innocent Americans being victimized by illegal immigrants in communities all across the Nation. If Democrats are serious about securing the border, they should start by voting for a policy that actually works and is paid for. That is the reason to vote for the bill I have introduced, the Build the Wall Act.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the Senate resume legislative session and proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 4392, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I share our colleague's view that the southern border is serious business. I strongly favor smart, effective policies to deal with it.

The reason I can't support what he has proposed is that defunding infrastructure does not make sense, and that has long been the position of the Senate.

The money that is being discussed here has been supported unanimously over three particular initiatives here in the Congress. The authors of this, and I would say this specifically, have been Senator CORNYN, a member of the leadership on the other side of the aisle,

and our colleague from California, Senator PADILLA.

Let me repeat that. We have gone through this three times with strong bipartisan support from Republican leadership—our colleague from Texas, Senator CORNYN—and Senator PADILLA from California. The reason why is that we have said we can come up with smart policies on the border and also maintain our infrastructure.

Unfortunately, the funding that my colleague is talking about would harm the effort to ensure we build the roads and the bridges and that we deal with lead pipes in schools. That is what we are talking about. That is why the States and the localities have been such strong supporters of this.

My colleague serves on the Finance Committee. There are a number of areas where we have worked together. I will note that this week in the Finance Committee, a number of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have talked about how they want to generate more growth—a smart idea. Put me down as interested and wanting to work in a bipartisan way.

Well, the reality is, you can't generate big-league economic growth with little-league infrastructure, and that, unfortunately, is what is going on here. Where we agree that we ought to be tackling a very serious issue—the southern border—we disagree on the method of funding that effort.

I think defunding infrastructure is the end result of what my colleague is talking about, and it turns upside down the bipartisan coalition that has allowed us to use that money at the State and local levels with Republican leadership and our friend from California.

So that is why I have to object. Therefore, I do object this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, let me be very, very brief in just pointing out that this bill calls for using unspent COVID money, specifically as a result of the COVID pandemic that hit our Nation, money sent to be spent for that. It does seem to me and to probably just about every American that we are way beyond that period of

time, and money designated for that purpose has not yet been spent. It should be readily available for a project like this.

I would also note that my friend and colleague who is on the floor was, along with President Biden and Senator SCHUMER, one of those who did vote on September 29, 2006, for a bill, at the time, that was called the Secure Fence Act of 2006.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, just very briefly, having participated in these debates—this specific discussion now, on several occasions—again, my friend and I just have a difference of opinion. Senator CORNYN and Senator PADILLA have repeatedly talked about this being for the roads and bridges and dealing with lead pipes in schools. That is so central to the brighter future we all—Democrats and Republicans—want for our country.

So as we wrap up, I want it understood that I share my colleague's view about how serious the southern border is. What we differ on is how we are going to pay for it. And defunding infrastructure—which Senator CORNYN and Senator PADILLA set out to do, and I think in a very smart way—is not the way to go.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BARRASSO. I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:47 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, May 23, 2024, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 22, 2024:

THE JUDICIARY

DENA M. COGGINS, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA.

ANGELA M. MARTINEZ, OF ARIZONA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA.