aliens into custody within 48 hours after receiving a request from a State and local government, provide essential information about illegal immigrants to the Justice Department, and supply resources to help localities enforce immigration law, including grants and increased space for detention facilities.

Do you see what is happening with all of this? When you have got entities that say, ''We are just not going to enforce the law; we are going to do something different, and we are going to ignore immigration law,'' what happens is every town becomes a border town, and every State becomes a border State.

This is one of the reasons that crime and the border are two of the top issues that people talk about.

Any person who is in this country illegally and committing a crime that endangers our communities should be immediately removed and barred from coming back.

Unfortunately, our Nation's crime issues go beyond the criminal illegal aliens. Across the country, from New York and Washington to L.A. and Chicago, we have seen far-left DAs and soft-on-crime judges push radical bail policies, including easing cash bail requirements or prohibiting cash bail altogether. Far from improving public safety, these so-called bail reforms put criminals back on the streets and place law-abiding citizens in danger.

After the Shelby County District Attorney's Office spearheaded bail reform and made it easier for criminals to avoid pretrial detention, homicides in Memphis last year reached a record-breaking number—398 homicides in Memphis, TN. Many of these were committed by criminals who were out on bail.

Just last month, a violent criminal who was out on bail for attempted murder set off a city-wide manhunt after going on a horrific rampage through the city of Memphis. Across his 5-hour-long crime spree, the offender carjacked a woman in a church parking lot, shot two people after breaking into a hair salon, and killed an innocent teenager outside of a strip mall.

In May, a repeat criminal posted bail after shooting and injuring an off-duty Memphis Police Department officer while attempting to break into a parked vehicle.

One month later, a gunman—while out on bail for carjacking and employing a firearm with intent to commit a dangerous felony—shot and killed a man during an attempted carjacking.

In November, a Memphis judge released the suspected murderer of a 15-year-old boy who was shot and killed outside his grandmother's house on Thanksgiving morning.

And just this month, a Memphis judge set just a $175,000 bond for a man charged with attempted first-degree murder against a police officer.

These tragedies should never happen to anyone, but far-left bail policies continue to prioritize criminals over law enforcement, families, and hard-working taxpayers. I can tell you, Tennesseans are tired of this. They are tired of seeing criminals being prioritized over hard-working taxpayers and families.

While addressing crime is the primary responsibility of local governments, there are important steps the Federal Government can take to ensure public safety. That is why I am introducing the Keep Violent Criminals Off Our Streets Act. It would deter States and localities from pushing pro-crime policies that make cities like Memphis less safe.

This legislation would block any State or local government from receiving Federal funds if they have a policy that prohibits the use of cash bail for offenders. It would also block Federal funds if they refuse to employ pretrial detention practices for every violent offender, including juvenile offenders.

With crimes spiking in Memphis and other cities across the country, it is essential that local governments protect their residents and put violent criminals behind bars where they belong.

I yield the floor.

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. BRAUN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNIZING THE NATIONAL DEBT AS A THREAT TO NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. BRAUN. Madam President, I come to the floor this evening to talk about our national debt, and I will be introducing a resolution here in a moment.

Our national debt, to put it in perspective, had never been much before the year 2000. Cumulatively, it was $5 trillion. That is a lot of zeroes behind a 5. That is a lot. But that is what it took from the beginning of the country—most of it did occur from the 1960s to 1980. That is when we started doing deficits, but it really started to get to where they became entrenched in standard operating procedure in the year 2000.

We did put two wars on the credit card. In 2000 to 2008, we went up to $10 trillion—all of a sudden, a lot more zeroes, with an extra zero and a 1. From 2008 to 2016, we went from $10 trillion to $16 trillion.

Now it gets to be a little more repetitive. I got here—elected—in 2018. By 2018, we are adding $1 trillion a year. Stick with me here. That is $16 trillion, 17, 18. So I get here as a Senator, alarmed by that when you come from a place like Indiana and you ran a business for 37 years, and if you even did anything close to that, I guarantee you your line of credit wasn't going to get renewed.

Since then—and we had a pandemic in there—it has gotten to where we have put a burden on future generations that I never imagined. I didn't think we would see it in this short a period. Well, we did roughly put $4 trillion more on the books through the worst pandemic we ever had. I think many of us question whether that was necessary or not. We probably could have done better. But we had already gotten into the routine of maybe erring on the side of doing more rather than less.

Well, since then, we have gone into enterprising through government. When we were borrowing just a few years ago $1 trillion annually, now we are doing it every 6 months. If you are good at math out there, try taking interest rates, which now are around 5, 6, 7 percent, depending on how the government is borrowing it, start applying that to $34 trillion or $35 trillion, and the only blueprint we have for us would be from the Biden administration that puts us $52 trillion in debt in 10 years.

That is a burden on our kids and grandkids. They will have to figure out how to pay it off. All of us here seem to be unconcerned about it. I think it would be a little different if we were knocking things out of the park.

So those numbers never go away. Sooner or later, interest is going to—well, it is going to be sooner. I think next year, we are going to spend as much on our entire defense industry and budget as we will on interest. It doesn't take long to where that is going to amount to—in 3 to 4 years, 5—what we spend on all discretionary spending here, domestic and defense.

The government has grown from never being more than 20 percent of our GDP to now the new baseline is 25 percent of our GDP. Our economy has only grown maybe a couple percent a year. That is digging a hole deeper and deeper that—anyone who is in the category of being kids and grandkids out there, look out.

It is not going to be easy to get back to where you are actually paying your bills as you accumulate them. If we don't, it will be the same thing Greece, Italy, Portugal, and Spain had to go through when they fell off the wagon as small economies. We are the largest economy in the world. There is no good ending to it.

It is no more difficult than just not spending more than we take in. Any good manager would figure out really quickly how to get back in line. Your banker would never allow you to renew a line of credit if you didn't. Here, we have the printing press in the basement, and the credit card gets renewed each year. That is no excuse that you should keep performing poorly when you know what the end result is going to be.

It is even a threat to our national security. For instance, we spend $850 billion, roughly, on defense. China, our main geopolitical foe, spends less than a third of that. Russia, which causes all that trouble around the world, spends about $90 billion. It begs the question, why can't we do better when we are spending all that money? It is because we don't have any of the safeguards. We are not running it like the biggest business in the world; we are running it like kids with their hands in the cookie jar, and that is not a good business plan. It is unsustainable.

I am not going to repeat the numbers, but if you take this out 10 years, that is going to be a mountain that is so high to climb and so hard to tear down that it will be tough to do. We could do it easily by just not digging the hole any deeper, meaning freezing our spending and allocating our resources better, just like all States do. We choose not to do it. We need to start.

I am on the Budget Committee. We haven't done a budget in the Federal Government that we have adhered to in over two decades. Finally, we are going to have to start knuckling down and having discipline like everyone else does or it will end up like a chapter 11 does in the real world when you have not paid attention to the details, you borrow too much money, and you have a couple years to work it out with your creditors. Hopefully, we will never get to that.

I am introducing this resolution called Recognizing the National Debt as a Threat to National Security.

As in legislative session, and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 600, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 600) recognizing the national debt as a threat to national security.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BRAUN. I know of no further debate on the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 600) was agreed to.

Mr. BRAUN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to and that the motion 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 preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. BRAUN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to complete my remarks, which I have done, followed by Senator PADILLA, for up to 5 minutes prior to the scheduled rollcall vote.

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

NOMINATION OF EUMI K. LEE

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, today, the Senate will vote to confirm Eumi K. Lee to the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California.

Judge Lee received her B.A. from Pomona College and her J.D., cum laude, from the Georgetown University Law Center. After law school, she clerked for Judge Jerome Turner on the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Tennessee, and she later clerked for Judge Warren J. Ferguson on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. During her time in private practice in San Francisco, Judge Lee worked on complex civil litigation, white-collar criminal defense, and appellate matters, and she tried approximately 21 cases to final decision.

She later served on the faculty of the University of California College of the Law, San Francisco, where she taught primarily within the clinical programs and wrote about criminal justice issues. In 2018, Judge Lee was appointed to the Superior Court of California in Alameda County by then-Governor Jerry Brown. She won election to a 6-year term in 2020. During her time on the bench, Judge Lee has handled a wide range of civil and criminal cases at both the trial and appellate levels, and she has presided over 70 trials since joining the bench.

The American Bar Association rated Judge Lee "well qualified" to serve on the Northern District of California. She has strong ties to the district, and she is strongly supported by both of her home State Senators, Mr. PADILLA and Ms. BUTLER. Her litigation background, her academic career, and her invaluable experience as a State court judge will serve her well on the Federal bench.

Judge Lee was the final judicial nominee from California who had the honor of being introduced at her hearing by my late friend and colleague Senator Feinstein. When Senator Feinstein introduced Judge Lee, she noted Judge Lee's "multitude of experience," and Senator PADILLA praised Judge Lee's "wealth of legal expertise." Those remarks highlight what Judge Lee will bring to the district court. I strongly support this nominee, and I urge my colleagues to join me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mr. PADILLA. Madam President, the Senate will soon consider the nomination of Judge Eumi Lee to serve on the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California.

I rise today to share, briefly, more about this dedicated public servant and to encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting her nomination.

The proud daughter of parents who survived the Korean war before emigrating to the United States, Judge Eumi Lee was born in Wisconsin and raised in Tennessee. She earned her bachelor's degree from Pomona College and her law degree from the Georgetown University Law Center.

After law school, Judge Lee clerked for several judges on the Federal bench—first, for the Western District of Tennessee, then in the San Francisco Bay area clerking on the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Now, those early days also included time working on complex litigation and white-collar defense matters in private practice, as well as developing a strong pro bono practice.

After a number of years of developing core litigation skills, she began teaching as a professor at UC Hastings College of law, supervising clinical students in direct representation and appearing alongside her students in State court.

It is there that Judge Lee also cofounded the Hastings Institute for Criminal Justice. Recognizing her remarkable record and diverse experience practicing law, in 2018, then-California Governor Jerry Brown appointed Judge Lee to the Alameda County Superior Court, where she became the first Korean American ever appointed to serve on that bench.

In the more than two decades that she has spent learning, teaching, and practicing law, Judge Lee has not only gained a wealth of legal expertise, but she has constantly reached out to support others on their path as well.

She has consistently worked to mentor women, people of color, and those typically underrepresented in the legal profession, because Judge Lee knows that public service doesn't stop at the courthouse doors.

In private practice, in the classroom, and in the courtroom, she has demonstrated the intellect and independent mind needed to serve on the Northern District with distinction. And I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting her confirmation.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

VOTE ON LEE NOMINATION

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

Mr. PADILLA. 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. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 98 Ex.]

YEAS—50

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