

CENTCOM area. They saw it. So what we did when we withdrew those troops was, effectively, to leave Israel surrounded by their worst enemies.

They have also noted Biden's record of appeasing hostile regimes. When Biden chose not to enforce—and this is important to note—this administration, this National Security Director, this President chose not to enforce oil sanctions against Iran. They did this knowing this would end up benefiting Hamas, Hezbollah, and the terrorist groups that are the proxies for Iran.

The President also knew that \$6 billion in a ransom payment would free up even more money for terrorist groups, more money for Hamas, more money for Hezbollah. That is the hallmark of this administration: looking the other way, appeasing Iran, and doing it at cost to the American people. Since 2021, President Biden has funneled \$730 million to the U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees.

Now, this agency, which has been around for decades, what they have become is a ferociously anti-Semitic organization that has a long history of employing people that—guess what—they are associated with Hamas. And Hamas has a history of stealing money from this agency and using the agency's facilities to store weapons.

Now, does that sound like humanitarian aid? Does that sound like money going to the purpose for which it was given? Of course not. And that is why, in 2018, President Trump halted the funding to the U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestinian Refugees.

Well, President Biden comes in and guess what he does. He turned that spigot back on, running wide open, even though he knew it was pretty much as good as writing a check to Hamas, a terrorist organization. And, by the way, we declared and recognized Hamas as a terrorist organization. We as a country did this in 1997.

So, you know, there are things we can do. And I have introduced legislation to halt funding to the U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees until Iran is expelled from the U.N. and until we investigate their crimes—what they are doing with this money, how it leads to death and destruction—because they are giving it to these terrorist organizations.

Iran gives Hamas about \$100 million a year—\$100 million. They also provide them with the weapons and armor and ammo and with supplies and training. We also know that Hamas has grabbed aid this week for State kits, medical supplies, food. It is not going to the people, the Palestinians; it is going to Hamas for their efforts.

Now, in the first 2 weeks of fiscal year 2024, Border Patrol captured 30 Iranians, as I said a few minutes ago. Now, they were trying to come across the southern border; two of them, Terrorist Watchlist. Now, this is this month. This is in the last couple of weeks. And we have gotten reports of

at least two more Iranians on that Terrorist Watchlist that have tried to come in.

So since last Monday alone—Monday a week ago—we have had 19 Iranians and 17 Syrians that tried to sneak into this country over the southern border.

So I would just ask my colleagues, my Democratic colleagues: Why do you think the terrorists—why do you think these people feel so emboldened? Whether it is the Iranians, the Pakistanis, the Russians, the Chinese, why are they flooding to our border to gain illegal entry into our country to evade our immigration laws, to fly under the cloak of darkness and get in here on U.S. soil? Why are they emboldened? Does this not worry you? Does this not cause you to say it is an imperative that we secure this border?

You know, right now, as we have looked at what is happening around the globe and, specifically, as we look at what has happened in Israel, you have got 1,400 Israelis who are dead; you have got 31 Americans who are dead; you have got individuals from dozens of other countries around the globe who are dead, who are injured, who have been taken hostage and have faced a horrific circumstance. We cannot let this pattern of neglect continue in our country. We cannot continue to make our Nation and our citizens vulnerable. We cannot let attacks happen on our soil. It is time that we close that southern border.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— S. RES. 413

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, I want to read here, briefly, from the law of the United States of America. This is the existing law; I am not trying to pass a law today. And it says: section 212(a)(3)(B), subsection—I am not going to read the whole number. The law of the United States Immigration and Nationality Act mandates that you are ineligible to enter into the United States if you endorse or espouse terrorist activity or persuade others to endorse or espouse terrorist activity or support a terrorist organization.

What that basically means is, if you are a supporter of a terrorist group or you encourage others to support the actions of a terrorist group—a designated terrorist group—the statute defines what that is, you are not supposed to get a visa.

And so it is reasonable to conclude that if you are already in the country—understand what I am talking about, I am not talking about American citizens; I am talking about someone who is a foreign national and that person is in the United States on a visa and that person is out there defending or encouraging others to defend and take the side of a terrorist organization, like, for example, Hamas or maybe Hezbollah or somebody else—if they

are not supposed to have a visa to come into the country, once they are already here, if they do that, they should lose that visa. That is applying existing law.

And so what I am going to come here on the floor and try to do today is pass something that I, frankly, thought was common sense, doesn't go any further than this, that basically urges—it is not even a new law. It is in the resolution. It basically says the Senate is asking the Biden administration, if they come across anyone who is here—a foreign national on a visa who supports Hamas—that that person's visa should be canceled, and they should be removed from the country through the proceedings involving removal.

That is what this resolution does. It, obviously, does things like condemns anti-Semitism and condemns the horrible attack from Hamas. But all it basically says is if you are a foreign national in the United States, you are here on a visa as a visitor and you support Hamas or you encourage others to support Hamas, you should lose your visa and you should be gone. That is what I hope to be able to do here today.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of S. Res. 413, which is at the desk; further, that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I want to make it very clear that there are 100 Members of the U.S. Senate who absolutely condemn the brutal attack by Hamas on innocent Israeli citizens; that absolutely condemn the kidnapping of Israeli citizens and some Americans; who absolutely condemn the vicious "kill Jews" philosophy of Hamas. And all of us have an opportunity—which I think all of us are going to take—to stand by Israel when it comes to going after Hamas.

I hope all of us are also going to do everything we can to encourage that every precaution that can be taken to protect innocent Palestinians be taken because they, too, have been kidnapped by Hamas, who cynically use them as human shields.

But I read the resolution of my colleague from Florida. This is not about enforcing the existing law. This is about compromising a constitutional right that Americans have enjoyed since the inception of our country. It is the First Amendment.

And it may be something that people in this body may object to, but when a person is in the United States, they enjoy the protections of our magnificent founding document to be free from unlawful searches and seizures and, certainly, to be able to say things that we may find repugnant. There have been many things that have been said that are repugnant.

But at a time of maximum stress—and we are in that right now—is when there is the maximum stress to compromise the right we have enjoyed of free speech protected by the First Amendment since the founding of our country.

And we have had some recent experience with this. After 9/11 and the trauma that our Nation experienced with the loss of over 3,000 wonderful people—in the Twin Towers, at the Pentagon, in Pennsylvania—there was a call to go after groups, to compromise rights. In hindsight, in those times when we did do the wrong thing, because we harmed innocent people in our anger—our justified anger, by the way—we don't want to do that again.

So this resolution—however my colleague wants to characterize it—is about what happens in this country. This may be something my colleague disagrees with, but when a person is in this country, they enjoy the benefits of our Constitution and the right of free speech. I stand for free speech.

My preference is that we focus on doing the things that this U.S. Senate can do to help Israel go after Hamas, to help all of the innocent Palestinians who seek to live in peace have that opportunity to do so.

I object.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). Objection is heard. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. If I may respond for a moment. I understand my colleague has to go. I know it is late and other things are going on. He is welcome to stay, obviously.

There were a couple of mentions about how I characterized the resolution. I will just read from the resolution:

Resolved, That the Senate [1] calls on the President of the United States to enforce existing law to revoke visas and initiate deportation proceedings for any foreign national who has endorsed or espoused the terrorist activities of Hamas, Palestinian Islamic Jihad—

People whose rocket yesterday hit a hospital in Gaza and killed innocent people—Hezbollah, or other Foreign Terrorist Organizations—

Which is a term that is defined by the State Department who issues a list of who those are—

That participated in terrorist attacks against Israel and United States citizens before, on, or after October 7, 2023.

Yes, we have a First Amendment right in this country to free speech, but everyone acknowledges there are limits to it. For example, you do not have a First Amendment right to call on people to overthrow the government of the United States. You don't have a First Amendment right to do that. You don't have a First Amendment right to incite people to violence. And there is no First Amendment right to a visa. I am not talking about U.S. citizens.

And, by the way, to be abundantly clear, this is very specifically written

to talk about people who have endorsed or espoused the terrorist activities of Hamas, Palestinian Islamic Jihad. This is not about people who support a two-state solution. This is not about people who are of Palestinian descent. It has nothing to do with any of them. People have every right to espouse those views. And I may disagree with them, but they have a right to do that.

What no one has a right to do, especially a visitor—not an American—a visitor to the United States granted a visa for which there is no constitutional right—that we are going to allow visitors into the country the law says they are not even allowed to be in, but now they are here. They got in because, obviously, nobody goes into their interview and says: I am a Hamas supporter, by the way, in case you are wondering. So they let them in the country. Or maybe they became a Hamas supporter while they are here. But they are here as visitors on a visa, espousing, defending, and supporting a terrorist organization that just committed a horrible slaughter, but they have been doing it for a long time—not at this scale and scope like we saw in one day.

This is not about the First Amendment. This is about people that are actively calling for the support of a terrorist organization that, if they could, they would slaughter Americans. If they have the capability to conduct an attack like that in the United States, they would. There is no constitutional right to that. And there is no constitutional right to a visa to remain in this country.

That is what I am talking about. That is what all this is about. It goes on, obviously, to condemn the attack and all the other things, which I think would not be controversial. But that is specifically what this is about.

The law is very clear. You are not allowed—it just makes all the sense in the world. Why would any country in the world say: We are going to give out visas to people who support terrorism? They wouldn't, and our law doesn't.

But now that they are here, somehow, they are immune to the application of the law? Now that visa is somehow a protected document? A visa is just like if we have to get a visa to go to another country. It is a country saying: We will allow you in as a visitor for a temporary period of time.

But there are all kinds of things that can get your visa canceled. There are all kinds of things that can get your visa canceled, like if you are here to do a certain kind of job and you are not doing that job, you are in default of the visa.

There are all kinds of things that, depending on the visa you are on, can get your visa canceled. Shouldn't one of them be espousing support for terrorism? Shouldn't that be one of the criteria we use? We can go back and forth. We can talk about all these other concepts. I promise you that all across America—I don't have to take a

poll. If you went up to the average person and asked them: Let me ask you a question. If someone is a visitor to this country, say they are here on a tourist visa or student visa or here on a visa as a visiting professor. They are here on a visa. And that person is out there supporting and encouraging others to support a terrorist organization that hates America, hates our values, but more importantly, that carries out violence; that espouses violence as their primary tool for activism—if you went and told somebody: Should we kick people out of this country—not Americans—who are foreign nationals who are here on temporary visas and are out there supporting terrorism inside our country? I guarantee you, the overwhelming majority of Americans would say, absolutely—absolutely, we should. I have had Democratic colleagues come up to me and say that today.

All this resolution does is—it doesn't even force the administration to do it. It just calls on them to do it. So I honestly don't understand the objection. I don't understand the rationale behind the objection. I hope we can maybe vote on it one day. Maybe we can get a vote on this, and that way everybody could be on the record.

We shouldn't have foreign nationals in our country that support Hamas or Hezbollah or any of these other groups.

I specifically tailored the language of this resolution to stick to the law and nothing more. I do not believe anybody should be out there committing acts of violence against people because of their ethnic heritage, because of their religion.

I tell this to people all the time. Do people realize, for example, that in the Israeli Army right now, there are Israeli Arabs who will be called to go into Gaza and fight in the war? There are Israeli Arabs who will fight for Israel because they are against terrorism. Do they realize in the Armed Forces of the United States, there are men and women who are Muslims, followers of Islam who have fought for the freedom of this country? This is not a Nation where your value as a person or status of American is determined by your religion or ethnic background. I reject that categorically.

We are heartbroken, for example, by a story that some deranged person knocks on a door and murders a little boy the other day screaming something about Muslim. That is a crime. I am glad he was arrested. He should go to jail. Anyone who does that should go to jail. That is the kind of violence that terrorists do.

No one is defending or talking about anything like that. What I am saying is common sense. You are a visitor. You are not even an American. You are a foreign national. You are here because we gave you a visa to be here temporarily, and now you are out there defending and supporting Hamas, a terrorist organization. You need to go. That is what this resolution asks the administration to do.

I hope we can get a vote on the Senate so at least everyone will know where everybody stands.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am rising today for the 25th time to address the multifaceted dark money scheme to capture and control our Supreme Court. We will look today at how the creepy billionaires who captured the Supreme Court get their message through to the Justices they helped plant there.

That, of course, is the last leg of the capture operation. First, you have the so-called Federalist Society list, purportedly created by the Federalist Society for former President Donald Trump to pick Supreme Court Justices from. Bad enough if that were true—a secretive, anonymously funded, private group picking Supreme Court Justices while accepting big, secret contributions. What could possibly go wrong? But it is actually worse. The Federalist Society can show no official process to cook up the list—no agenda item, no vote, no nothing. It was done in some back room secretly by the Federalist Society's Leonard Leo, the operative of the creepy billionaires who fund this endeavor.

The Federalist Society did let Trump use the "Federalist Society" name for cover on the list, as if it was their list, but it wasn't.

After that step, the fake list, came the billionaire-funded campaign to get the Senate to confirm the Federalist Society Justices. This part of the operation ran through another dark money front group, the Judicial Crisis Network, conveniently located just down the hall—in the same building, on the same floor—from the Federalist Society. "Judicial Crisis Network" is the fictitious name for yet another dark money front group. And, of course, millions in dark money were poured into Senate Republican political coffers from the same billionaires, and—no surprise—Republican Senators voted to confirm even deeply troubled Justices, and now there they sit on the Court.

So let's say you are a billionaire who funded all of this. You have your hand-picked Justices on the Supreme Court. How are they supposed to remember what you want? Well, easy—you tell them.

Queue the front groups that file briefs at the Supreme Court as amici curiae—Latin for "friends of the court." They file them in coordinated flotillas, usually of about a dozen. But where it is a really big deal to the dark money billionaires, they have sent in more than 50 of these briefs.

In the case where it was over 50, it was at the certiorari stage, early in the proceedings, to make sure the chosen Justices got the message. That case was Americans for Prosperity Founda-

tion v. Bonta. It was about disclosing donors behind dark money front groups. After the deluge of over 50 front group amici, the Federalist Society Justices let nonprofits—known as 501(c)(3)s—hide their donors even from sovereign States where they operate and which have a responsibility to police them for fraudulent abuse of the tax system.

This decision added more secrecy to the latest and greatest secret political influence technique, which is to pair a dark money 501(c)(3) with a dark money 501(c)(4) entity. This is—no surprise—precisely the secretive influence technique that the creepy billionaires deployed to get those chosen Justices on the Court.

Well, we have all witnessed the sordid saga of theatrically grotesque gifts and free travel that rightwing billionaires have bestowed on certain Supreme Court Justices. That is connected here. The billionaires who fund the Justices' gifts and entertainment also fund front groups that come in to tell the Justices what to do.

So the backdrop of the capture apparatus is that billionaires choose the Justices, fund the campaigns for their confirmations, and then send in flotillas of billionaire-funded front groups to give instructions. With that backdrop, let's look at recent and coming cases and how those front groups are doing.

Last term, the Federalist Society Justices handed several major wins to the front groups and their backers. One of these wins came in a case called Sackett v. EPA. It was the latest assault on the EPA's power to clean up our environment and hold polluters accountable.

Many of the big-spending, rightwing billionaires owe their fortunes to the polluting fossil fuel industry, so it is no surprise that their front groups are out to weaken the EPA.

The EPA has responsibility under the Clean Water Act to make sure that our country's water remains safe and clean. Naturally, the polluters and their front groups hate this, so in Sackett, they asked the Court to narrow as much as possible which waters the EPA could protect under the Clean Water Act.

The front groups had their fingerprints all over this case. To start, the attorneys who brought the case came from the Pacific Legal Foundation. Because it is a dark money group, it is impossible to know exactly who funds the Pacific Legal Foundation, but in the past, it has received money from the likes of ExxonMobil, the Koch Brothers' political apparatus, and other groups who fund climate denial.

A great many of these cases that bring in the flotillas of billionaire-funded amici are not brought up through regular litigation; they are brought by these front groups, teed up by front groups who bring in plaintiffs of convenience to bring a particular question up before the captured Court.

At the Supreme Court, at least 10 other far-right, front group amici all urged the Court to undermine the Clean Water Act. These amici included groups like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, one of the biggest mouthpieces for the fossil fuel industry, and the Americans for Prosperity Foundation, which we just spoke about, part of the Koch Industries' fossil fuel political operation.

I went over some of the briefs this morning in the Environment and Public Works Committee when we took a look at the Sackett case, and I will just do a brief summary right now.

The Pacific Legal Foundation has received money from Exxon, various Koch political foundations, DonorsTrust, the Bradley Foundation, and the Sarah Scaife Foundation.

Also in the case was the Americans for Prosperity Foundation, which has been funded by the Koch political operation, DonorsTrust, the Bradley Foundation, and the Sarah Scaife Foundation.

The Cato Institute was in the case with funding by the Koch political operation, Donors Capital, DonorsTrust, and the Bradley Foundation.

Something called the Claremont Center for Constitutional Jurisprudence chimed in with funding from Donors Capital, DonorsTrust, the Bradley Foundation, and the Sarah Scaife Foundation.

Liberty Justice Center came in with funding from DonorsTrust and the Bradley Foundation.

NFIB Small Business Legal Center came in with funding from Donors Capital, DonorsTrust, and the Bradley Foundation.

Atlantic Legal Foundation came in with funding from the Bradley Foundation and the Sarah Scaife Foundation.

Mountain States Legal Foundation came in with funding from the Koch political operation, DonorsTrust, Donors Capital, the Bradley Foundation, and the Sarah Scaife Foundation.

Southeastern Legal Foundation came in with funding from DonorsTrust, Bradley Foundation, and Sarah Scaife Foundation.

The Washington Legal Foundation came in with funding from the Koch political operation, Donors Capital, DonorsTrust, the Bradley Foundation, and the Sarah Scaife Foundation.

So the litigant and nine amici were all funded by the Kochs, by DonorsTrust and Donors Capital, and by the Bradley Foundation and the Scaife Foundation. They could just as easily have filed briefs in the name of the Koch political operation, DonorsTrust and Donors Capital, and the Bradley Foundation and the Sarah Scaife Foundation or even filed one brief filed by all of those entities, but instead they created this fake machinery of front groups, creating the illusion of multiplicity and the illusion of independence, when, in fact, these things are played like piano keys on a piano.