

your race? Tell me about your ethnic background. Are you a lesbian? Are you gay? Are you bisexual? Are you transgender or are you queer or are you intersex?

Give me a break.

Then all of this information that is collected, this private information, has to be sent to the CFPB, and they are going to put it on their website. Are you gay? Are you lesbian? What race are you? They are going to put it on their website.

Now, the CFPB says: Well, it is going to be institutional-level data, just top-line data fields. Bull. You will be able to take this data, particularly if you are a small bank in a rural area, and be able to—the snoops will be able to go on that public website and identify small business people in their community—how much money they are borrowing, how they answered the question about whether they were gay, how they answered the question about whether they were intersex. This is incredibly private information.

And why? Why would the CFPB need this information? Well, the truth is, they don't, but I will tell you why. The CFPB is setting these small business people—but also these small banks—up for lawsuits. That is exactly what they are doing.

What happens if a small business person goes into the bank and the small banker says: Listen, I hate to have to ask you this, but the CFPB says I have to ask you. Are you gay?

As if that is anybody's business.

The small business person says: That is none of your business, and I am not going to answer that question. I am here for a loan, not to talk about my private life. What I do in the privacy of my bedroom with a consenting adult is my opinion, Mr. Banker.

The small banker says: You are right. I am sorry. I had to ask. They made me.

If the small business person won't answer the question, the small banker can get in trouble with the CFPB.

What has the world come to?

And the CFPB doesn't care about the cost. Do you know what this is going to cost to implement every year? Four hundred million dollars. Why? And that doesn't even include the cost of actually setting up this program. That will be hundreds of millions of dollars more.

It is not like the CFPB is exactly a wizard when it comes to data security. I mean, yes, it is going to be on their public website, but in terms of the granular information, the CFPB says: Oh, don't worry; we will protect it.

Right. Like they protected it a few months ago? The personally identifiable information of 256,000 consumers, which is being held by the CFPB, was breached. And do you know what the CFPB did? They didn't tell anybody for 2 months. They acted like a rock, only dumber. We are not talking about wizards here, wizards of financial data privacy and security.

You know, I hear it all the time, and the Presiding Officer probably hears it back in his State, perhaps. But people tell me all the time: Kennedy, what is wrong with Washington, DC? Why is common sense illegal there?

This rule. This rule. What has the world come to?

So my Congressional Review Act request is to have the Senate tell the CFPB that it is none of their business—none of their business—what a private American does with another private adult American in the privacy of their bedroom. We are free, so long as it doesn't break any laws, to express our sexuality however we want to, and it is none of the CFPB's business.

With that, I ask my Senate colleagues to overturn this rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we start the vote now, 1 minute early.

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

VOTE ON S.J. RES. 32

Under the previous order, the clerk will read the title of the joint resolution for the third time.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. BUTLER) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL).

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 260 Leg.]

YEAS—53

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

NAYS—44

Baldwin	Cantwell	Cortez Masto
Bennet	Cardin	Duckworth
Blumenthal	Carper	Fetterman
Booker	Casey	Gillibrand
Brown	Coons	Hassan

Heinrich	Murray	Smith
Hirono	Ossoff	Stabenow
Kaine	Padilla	Van Hollen
Kelly	Peters	Warner
Klobuchar	Reed	Warnock
Lujan	Rosen	Warren
Markey	Sanders	Welch
Menendez	Schatz	Whitehouse
Merkley	Schumer	Wyden
Murphy	Shaheen	

NOT VOTING—3

Butler	Durbin	Paul
--------	--------	------

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 32) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 32

Resolved the Senate and use of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to "Small Business Lending Under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (Regulation B)" (88 Fed. Reg. 35150 (May 31, 2023)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

(Mr. HICKENLOOPER assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). The Senator from Oklahoma.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate 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.

ISRAEL

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, earlier this year, I was with a bipartisan delegation. I traveled around the Abraham Accords countries. We were in Morocco, we were in Bahrain, we were in the UAE, and we were in Israel, talking about future advancement for peace. There was great optimism and engagement. There was economic activity, tourist activity. There was a lot of interaction with development on healthcare, on cyber protections, and cooperation together for energy and water.

Literally, there were families meeting each other, some of them for the first time in generations, to be able to have a conversation about a future in the Middle East based around peace. It was based off of an agreement that started on September 15, 2020, with the signing of the Abraham Accords, and it has continued to advance.

In fact, just as recently as a month ago, there was outspoken public support from Saudi Arabia and from Israel about advancing a normalization agreement between Saudi Arabia and Israel—what people thought would be unheard of just a few years ago.

There was an advance of conversation about how we could increase peace. And then, on the 7th of October, 1 day after the 50th anniversary of the start of the Yom Kippur War, a group of terrorists from Gaza penetrated the wall separating Gaza and Israel, and

they slaughtered 1,400 Israelis, brutally, many in their bed—children, elderly, disabled—it didn't matter. Whether they were college students at a concert, whether they were people traveling down a highway, or whether it was children, literally, on their playgrounds, they murdered them where they stood. And then they took hostages and retreated back into Gaza, for some reason assuming that Israel and the world would just not notice their barbarism.

Well, the world certainly noticed, and, as Americans, we obviously all lived in the shock and horror of the event with the Israelis and the rest of the world. Thirty-one Americans died in that attack, and 13 are missing, presumed to be hostages inside Gaza. Many of those individuals were killed simply because they were Jewish—period.

The pain of that has struck all of us over the course of the past several weeks now, and we have watched Israel rightly respond to the acts of terrorism, as we have as a nation, as well, when we were attacked on 9/11. We mobilized our forces. We identified al-Qaida, and we identified those who were harboring al-Qaida in Afghanistan and the Taliban and determined that type of attack would not happen again. And we, as a nation, determined we were not only going to stop the capabilities of al-Qaida to be able to attack us, but we were going to preemptively respond if we were attacked again. Our first goal, though, was to be able to prevent that kind of attack from coming at us again.

Israel is entirely right when they have been attacked by a terrorist organization to be able to say: That organization cannot do that to our Nation again and to our people again.

The United States has responded by sending two carrier strike groups to the Mediterranean, to literally park off the coast of Israel, to give a clear signal to Lebanon, to Iran: Do not engage in this.

We understand fully, as most of the world does, that Hamas is funded by Iran. And while many in the Muslim world, in the Arab countries continue to be able to speak out on behalf of Palestinians, they also understand that 70 percent of the funding for Hamas comes from Iran.

The weapons systems that Hamas has right now were fully funded by Iran, and the weapons systems in Lebanon, by Hezbollah, where they have been attacking Israel from the north, were fully funded and created and, many times, shipped directly from Iran.

Iran is the destabilizing force in this entire region, and we, as Americans, have made very, very clear that we understand that Iran is the one who funded this, who supplied the weapons systems, who supplied the training and the munitions. Iran is the one who continues to destabilize that region.

As Americans, we clearly speak out for the protection of all civilians in

every nation around the world and in every conflict in the world, but we were also very clear that Israel did not initiate this battle in the last 2 weeks. Hamas did, and they pulled their hostages back into Gaza, as they continue to be able to hide them among the civilian population. It is a painful peace for us to be able to see internationally. For us in Oklahoma, we are like many others that are in this Chamber as well. It personally affects many families in Oklahoma. Israel is a nation so small that there is no one that has not experienced the pain of a friend or relative, someone whom they work with, they know people who have been directly attacked. But in my State of Oklahoma, we are in the same condition. Many people that I interact with talk frequently about family, friends that live in Israel or that travel back and forth.

Quite frankly, last weekend, I worshipped with a Jewish congregation on Shabbat and heard the dialogue from many people about their travels back and forth and family and friends and what they personally experienced as a family based on this terrorist attack. Quite frankly, my State of Oklahoma has a very close bond with Israel, as the United States has a very close bond, close enough that we had many Oklahomans that were currently in Israel during that time of the attacks, and our office actively worked to be able to get many of those out, since many flights have been canceled out of Tel Aviv.

So we have actively worked to be able to get many of those individuals back home to Oklahoma, and they have quite a story to tell, as you would assume.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, the pain of this, though, is also something that we should pay attention to. We, as a nation, not only remember 9/11 and our response, but we also remember 9/11 was instituted by 20 people that were illegally present in the United States. We should not fail to remember that fact as well.

Recent statistics coming across our southern border identified in the last 2 years—just the last 2 years—we have had 70,000 individuals that have been identified as what they call special interest aliens. These are individuals that came between the ports of entry, that were running through to try to evade being captured. They are identified as special interest aliens because they have this designation: They potentially possess a national security risk to the United States or its interests. So they are identified as a special interest alien.

As I mentioned, we have had more than 70,000 of those that have crossed between our ports of entry just in the last 2 years. These are individuals from Syria, from Iran, from Iraq, from Pakistan, from west Africa, from locations

where terrorism is known to exist, and we don't have any criminal history of those individuals.

If you are thinking, I am glad we picked them up between ports of entry, well, let me finish the story for you. Most of those 70,000 special interest aliens were identified between the ports of entry and then were released into the country under Biden's policy on how he handles immigration currently. Those 70,000 individuals that were identified as potentially possessing a national security risk to the United States or its interests are in the United States right now.

Just in the past week, four individuals from Iran were picked up, multiple Syrians were picked up between our ports of entry and then released, awaiting a hearing in the future. And in current status right now, that hearing will be 8 to 10 years in the future. They are unmonitored. They are wandering around within our borders awaiting a hearing 8 to 10 years from now in the future, after being identified as a special interest alien.

We grieve for Israel, but for some reason, there are some in this body and in the White House that will not pay attention to our own national security issues and the obvious exposure that literally everyone in the country can see.

I can raise this issue with 100 people on the street outside this building, and all 100 would say, Oh, yeah, that is a risk. But for some reason, we can't get serious in this body to be able to take on the same thing, just to identify what are we going to do with individuals that are considered special interest aliens. Are we really going to just process them at the border and release them into the country? Or are we going to enforce our own sovereignty as just about every other nation does in the world? What are we planning to do on this?

I would just say, for the basic function of our national security, we should enforce our borders, and we should not just release special interest aliens out into the country, as has been done for now the last 2 years by the numbers of 70,000-plus.

So I would hope this body would get serious about dealing with issues like asylum, parole, and all the different features that have been used to release these individuals into the country, that we could fix that before we have the next 9/11 in our country.

ISRAEL

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, one last comment just based on news that is continuing to flow out.

All of us are absolutely heartbroken—absolutely heartbroken—at a hospital that had a major explosion from a rocket in Gaza. The initial reports came out just immediately: This must have been the Israelis that attacked a hospital. And many countries around the world immediately made