United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 170 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 16, 2024 *No. 66*

Senate

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

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Holy God, who inhabits eternity, lead our lawmakers with Your might. Help them to not run ahead of You or ignore Your wisdom. Restore their spirits with trust and hope, and order their steps toward Your desired destination. Lord, keep them calm in the quiet center of their lives so that they may be serene even in life's swirling stresses. Fill them with the peace that comes from keeping their focus on You. Help them to listen to others as attentively as they want others to listen to them.

And, Lord, please bring peace to our troubled world.

We pray in Your great 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, April 16, 2024.

To the Senate:

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

PATTY MURRAY,
President pro tempore.

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Ramona Villagomez Manglona, of the Northern Mariana Islands, to be Judge for the District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands for a term of ten years. (Reappointment)

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, right now, the world is in desperate need of American leadership. Russia's invasion of Ukraine, Iran's attack on Israel, and the Chinese Government's encroachments on the South Pacific threaten world peace, threaten America's prosperity, and threaten the very future of western democracy.

That is why, 2 months ago, the Senate passed a bipartisan national security supplemental with aid for Ukraine, for Israel, for the South Pacific, and for humanitarian assistance. We have called on the House of Representatives repeatedly to move our bill because the fastest way—the surest way—for Congress to get desperately needed aid to our allies is for House Republicans to put the supplemental on the floor. It would pass. That was true 2 months ago. It is still true today.

Yesterday evening, Speaker JOHNSON laid out a process for House consideration of the supplemental that would break it up into separate parts. I am reserving judgment on what will come out of the House until we see more about the substance of the proposal and the process by which the proposal will proceed. Hopefully, we will get details of the Speaker's proposal later today.

Again, time is of the essence.

Israel was attacked for the first time in its history directly by Iran. The people of Ukraine are now in all-out desperation. In fact, last week, the head of the U.S. European Command testified before the House Armed Services Committee that Russia's Army is now 15 percent larger than it was at the start of the war, and in a matter of weeks, Russia will outgun Ukraine by 10 to 1—10 to 1. That is not a very good prospect for Ukraine's survival. And anyone who thinks that the war in Ukraine will stay in Ukraine, remember the warning of Japanese Prime Minister Kishida:

Ukraine today may be East Asia tomorrow.

Around the world, civilians caught in the crossfires of war await desperately needed humanitarian assistance.

So the time for delay is over. Democrats have shown repeatedly our willingness to compromise to get important things done; and I will remind everyone of what I said from the beginning of this Congress: The only way to get things done is in a bipartisan way.

Again, we await to see more details of the Speaker's proposal. I urge him to

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

keep working in a bipartisan way to ensure this vital aid gets to our friends abroad as quickly as possible.

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT

Mr. President, now on Senate business, last night, I moved to place the House-passed FISA reauthorization bill on the legislative calendar. The Senate must pass FISA reauthorization by the April 19 deadline, just a few days away. We don't have much time to act.

To keep the process on FISA moving today, I will file cloture on the motion to proceed to the House-passed bill. Democrats and Republicans are going to have to work together to meet the April 19 deadline. If we don't cooperate, FISA will expire. So we must be ready to cooperate.

MAYORKAS IMPEACHMENT

Mr. President, on another matter, this afternoon, we expect the House will deliver the Articles of Impeachment of Homeland Security Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas. I urge all my colleagues to be in their seats when the articles are presented later today.

Once we receive the articles, the Senate will convene on Wednesday as a Court of Impeachment, and Senators will be sworn in as jurors. Senate President Pro Tempore PATTY MURRAY will preside.

As I have said repeatedly, we want to address this issue as expeditiously as possible. Impeachment should never be used to settle a policy disagreement.

Let me say that again. Impeachment should never be used to settle a policy disagreement.

Talk about awful precedence? This would set an awful precedent for Congress. Every time there is a policy disagreement in the House, they send it over here and tie the Senate in knots to do an impeachment trial? That is absurd. That is an abuse of the process. That is more chaos.

Nevertheless, when the House is ready to send us the articles, the Senate will act.

CHIPS AND SCIENCE ACT

Mr. President, now on chips, yesterday, the Biden administration announced a preliminary deal with Samsung to provide over $6 billion in funding from Chips and Science to build a new semiconductor manufacturing and research center in Texas. The administration's deal with Samsung supports over $40 billion of investment that is expected to create over 17,000 new construction jobs and over 4,000 new manufacturing jobs—all made possible by Chips and Science.

Thanks to the investments made in Chips and Science, I am proud to say that the United States is well on its way to our goal of producing 20 percent of the world's leading-edge chips by the end of the decade.

The Chips and Science investment is bringing manufacturing back to America, is shoring up our supply chains to prevent the kinds of chip shortages that raised prices during the pandemic, and is creating good-paying jobs to grow the middle class.

Now, we still have a lot of work to do, but these announcements are proof that the Democratic agenda is delivering real results for the American people and for our economy.

CREDIT CARD FEES

Mr. President, on credit card fees, last month, the Biden administration announced a new $8 cap on credit card late fees that would help millions of Americans save up to $10 billion a year.

The Biden administration's push to cut down excess late fees is great news for the people who have been taken advantage of by the big credit card companies for years and years.

But, now, if you can believe it, Republicans are pushing a bill to overturn the Biden administration's rule and let big credit card companies get richer at the expense of hard-working Americans. The Republican bill argues that even allowing big credit card companies to charge Americans absurdly high late fees will ''promote financial discipline and responsibility.'' Whose side are they on? It is hard to believe Republicans are actually trying to increase credit card fees.

Let me say that again so all Americans can hear this. Republicans want to let big credit card companies increase credit card fees in the name of ''fiscal discipline and responsibility.'' Give me a break.

By introducing a bill to block the Biden administration's rule, Republicans are doing the bidding of the big credit card companies and leaving the American people out to dry.

Let me be clear: Democrats will not allow the Republicans' bill to become law.

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 Republican leader is recognized.

MAYORKAS IMPEACHMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this afternoon, the Senate will be called, for just the 19th time in our history, to rule on the impeachment of a senior official of our government. It is a responsibility to be taken seriously. As I said the last time the Senate convened as a Court of Impeachment, it is a power that Congress must not exercise frivolously.

Today, the Senate will hear House managers charge Secretary Mayorkas with serious dereliction of duty—with a systematic refusal to enforce our Nation's immigration laws and with lying to Congress about the extent of the border crisis that unfolded on the Biden administration's watch.

The facts of the crisis are well-known. Since January of 2021, CBP has recorded more than 7.5 illegal crossings at our southern border, while observers estimate over 1.5 million known ''got-aways.'' And last December saw the highest daily and monthly numbers ever recorded.

In the 2 months since the House impeached Secretary Mayorkas, the border crisis has only continued, with excruciating consequences for innocent Americans.

On February 22, an illegal alien was arrested in Virginia for sexually assaulting a minor. The very next day, another illegal alien from Venezuela was arrested for the murder of Laken Riley, a young college student in Georgia. And the same month, yet another was charged with first- and second-degree murder for the shooting of a 2-year-old in Maryland.

For the Americans living right near the border, things are not improving. In February, one man working in Arizona recounted watching cartel guides lead over 170 people from around the world through one such opening in a matter of hours.

The House managers will make the case for Secretary Mayorkas's role in neglecting and exacerbating that crisis. As befits such a solemn and rare responsibility as convening a Court of Impeachment, I intend to give these charges my full and undivided attention.

Of course, that would require that Senators actually get the opportunity to hold a trial. This is exactly what history and precedent dictate. Never before has the Senate agreed to a motion to table Articles of Impeachment—not for an officer of either party, not once.

Instead, every single time that we have been called upon to render judgment, we have done so. We have convened a trial in accordance with rule XI of the Impeachment Rules agreed to in 1935. We have appointed a trial committee to dig into the facts and make a recommendation.

It would be beneath the Senate's dignity to shrug off our clear responsibility and fail to give the charges we will hear today the thorough consideration they deserve. I will strenuously oppose any effort to table the Articles of Impeachment and avoid looking the Biden administration's border crisis squarely in the face.

NATIONAL SECURITY SUPPLEMENTAL

Mr. President, now on an entirely different matter, 2 months ago, the Senate passed a national security supplemental that reflected the clear links between the challenges we face. That was by design. America's adversaries, from Beijing to Pyongyang and Moscow to Tehran, are actually all working together. They are reinforcing one another's efforts to sap our resolve, shatter our influence, and remake the rules of the road on their own terms. Anyone pretending that we can address these challenges individually, at our

leisure, is only kidding themselves. As I have said before, this isn't a matter of philosophical differences. The truth is plainly evident.

If you want to see the world the way our adversaries do, trace the trade of Chinese cash for sanctioned Iranian energy. Watch the trainloads of North Korean artillery arrive at the frontlines of Putin's onslaught in Ukraine. Follow the flows of Shahed drones to the Russian military. They are the same ones that Iran launched at Israel this past weekend. Or pay attention to the words and actions of America's friends. Listen to the way our Indo-Pacific allies describe the stakes of Ukraine's defense for the prospects of deterrence in their own region. Watch the way they invest their resources both in modernizing their capabilities and in helping Ukraine beat back aggression halfway around the world.

Now, America can choose, as it has nearly done before over the course of our history, to stick our head in the sand, to refuse to invest seriously in our own defense and in the alliances and partnerships that underpin it, to deny that a century of prosperity was purchased by American leadership and vigilance, but to do that now would be to ignore the basic fact that expanding America's defense industrial base and equipping our friends to resist and deter aggression are not competing policies but complementary ones.

Helping Ukraine has accelerated important programs to arm our allies and partners in the Indo-Pacific. It has called the attention of Pentagon officials, defense industry leaders, and Members of Congress to glaring gaps in our own capability and production capacity.

The Senate-passed supplemental would further expand the capacity of the arsenal of democracy. Of course, this isn't a one-off responsibility. The supplemental will not magically fix decades of underinvestment, and the administration and Congress will need to commit to taking our military requirements for missile defenses, long-range fires, and other critical military capabilities much more seriously.

But to continue to neglect the task in front of Congress right now would only compound the problem. Hesitation and indecision have prevented Ukraine from taking the fight aggressively to Putin's invaders. And if our friends are digging new defensive fortifications today, it is because they are starving—starving—for the munitions that would have helped them hold the ones they had already built on their frontlines.

Addressing the linked threats to America's national security interests isn't about cooking up ''bogus justifications''; it is about dealing with the world as it actually is. Our House colleagues will soon record whether they are prepared to do exactly that.

INFLATION

Mr. President, now on one final matter, last week, cumulative inflation since President Biden took office hit 19.4 percent. Since January of 2021, gas prices are up 47.8 percent. Car repair costs have increased 6.7 percent. In barely 2 years, car insurance premiums have increased—listen to this—45.8 percent.

Americans know that stable prices and basic safety shouldn't be much to expect from their new leaders. As one woman recently told reporters, ''What can you do? You need insurance. You can't have a vehicle or a house without them. So you have to . . . figure out where you can cut other things to make sure you can drive around.''

Of course, the soaring cost of insuring a car has a lot to do with the dangers of driving one in blue cities across America where soft-on-crime policies let violent offenders run free. Today, drivers are more likely than ever to become victims of crime, as 2023 saw rates of car theft tick up by 29 percent in 34 cities across the country—more than double since 2019. And 2023 was also the second year in a row that car thefts surpassed 1 million in the United States.

Here in Washington, local residents and Members of Congress alike have fallen victim to an unchecked surge of carjackings. And the city's response? Hand out free tracking devices.

Millions of Americans are waiting eagerly for this fever of incoherent policy to break. They are recalling woke prosecutors, and I suspect they plan to fire many more of their local, State, and national leaders this fall. Bidenomics isn't working, and neither is soft-on-crime radicalism.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

IRAN

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, this weekend, Iran and its proxies in Syria, Yemen, and Iraq fired a barrage of missiles and drones against Israel. The direct attack was a marked escalation on Iran's part. And it is time for the United States, our allies, and nations that support peace and freedom to make it clear to Iran that we are not going stand idly by while Iran threatens Israel and foments terror in the Middle East.

This weekend's attack was a notable escalation on Iran's part because weapons were fired from Iran and not just by Iran's proxies. Iran has been threatening Israel and undermining peace in the Middle East for decades—Hezbollah, the Houthis, Shia militias in Iraq and Syria, Palestinian Islamic Jihad, and, of course, Hamas.

Hamas gets approximately 90 percent of its military budget from Iran, and there is reason to wonder whether Hamas would even have had the capability to carry out its October 7 attack without the support it receives from Iran. There is certainly reason to wonder what the Middle East would look like today if Iran hadn't spent decades funding and arming terrorist organizations.

Enough is enough. There have been a lot of redlines drawn for Israel lately. It is past time to draw some for Iran. Unfortunately, the U.S. posture toward Iran under President Biden has too often been one of appeasement. It was President Biden's attempt to reinstate the Obama administration's flawed Iran nuclear deal. Then there was the Biden administration's attempt to unfreeze $6 billion in Iranian assets as part of a deal to free American prisoners. Thankfully, the administration ultimately refroze those funds in the wake of Hamas's October 7 attack against Israel. But unfreezing them in the first place was a serious mistake.

Just last month, for the second time since the October 7 attack on Israel by Iran-backed Hamas, President Biden renewed a sanctions waiver giving Iran access to $10 billion from energy sales. And now, this week, President Biden was quick to take options off the table for what U.S. assistance to Israel might look like in the wake of Iran's bold attack. This only suggests to Iran that there are limits to the United States-Israel partnership at the very time we must be making good on our ironclad relationship with Israel, not telling our ally it has to go it alone.

It is alarming when President Biden seems more intent on preventing Israel from responding to Iran's attack than on making it clear to Iran that there can be no more of these attacks and that Iran needs to cease all of its terrorist operations. Unless President Biden wants to continue to see Israel in danger, American troops threatened, and commerce through the Red Sea disrupted, he has to find a much stronger posture when it comes to Iran.

The United States should be making it clear to Iran that the United States will not allow another Iranian attack like the one that occurred this weekend and that we will not tolerate any more aggression from Iran. And it shouldn't be just the United States drawing this redline. As I said, it is time for the United States, our allies, and nations that support peace and freedom to resoundingly reject Iran's malign agenda.

The United States has an important role to coordinate action to back up the G7 statement and to press members of the U.N. Security Council to take a position on Iran's flagrant attack. The United States must also press forward to broker a deal for the normalization of Israel and Saudi relations, the prospect of which normalization many believe motivated the October 7 terrorist attack by Iran-backed Hamas. And, of course, the United States must continue to push for the return of all the hostages in Gaza and help Israel in its

vital mission to dismantle the threat of Hamas.

Mr. President, there may be no easy solution to peace in the Middle East, but standing up to Iranian aggression would be a good start. Iran spends at least $800 million per year supporting terrorist groups in the Middle East. I ask, again, what would the Middle East look like without the terrorist funding? I suspect it would look more peaceful and prosperous and that our ally Israel and innocent people around the Middle East would be able to sleep more easily at night.

So it is time for President Biden to step up. Continued appeasement and half measures on Iran will only prolong the cycle of violence in the Middle East and increase the risk of large-scale attacks against Israel like the barrage over the weekend. If President Biden steps forward with strength, perhaps the legacy of his Presidency can include something more than an inflation crisis and a national security disaster at our southern border.

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

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

The Senator from Texas.

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I would like to speak about the most important law that most Americans have never heard of, and that is section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. Last week, the House of Representatives passed legislation to reauthorize this important law before it expires at the end of this week.

FISA, as it is known—the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act—and section 702 in particular, is one of the most important and consequential laws we use to keep our country safe from adversaries overseas.

Congress enacted section 702 in 2008 in response to the threats posed by terrorist groups in the wake of 9/11. It tore down some of the walls that prevented the sharing of information that could be used to keep our country safe, and there is no question that it has been a success.

Information acquired through section 702 has helped to identify threats against U.S. troops and to thwart planned terrorist attacks abroad and here at home. It has enabled the Federal Government to stop components of weapons of mass destruction from reaching foreign actors. It has also helped disrupt our adversaries' efforts to recruit spies on American soil and send their operatives to the United States. It has helped to understand and combat fentanyl trafficking, identify foreign ransomware attacks, like the Colonial Pipeline ransomware attack, and uncover war crimes and gruesome atrocities in Ukraine.

For virtually every national security threat that America faces, section 702 is an invaluable asset. There is a reason why it is known as the crown jewel of America's intelligence gathering capabilities.

The President is briefed daily, in something called the President's Daily Brief, on these intelligence threats that are collected for the President's briefing, as I said, on a daily basis. A full 60 percent of the information contained in the President's daily classified intelligence brief is derived from section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

Everyone knows that this authority has not been without controversy. In recent years, the public has learned about extremely concerning misuses of this authority that go far beyond what Congress has authorized. But I want to make clear that the targeting of American citizens here in the United States is expressly prohibited under 702, so any targeting of an American citizen is illegal and should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

Just to be clear, this authority grants the intelligence community—by that I mean the CIA, the NSA, the DIA, the FBI—it grants authority to the Department of Justice and our intelligence community to get intelligence on foreigners located outside of the United States—in other words, if it is foreign nationals inside the United States, you cannot use section 702—but more importantly, foreigners outside of the United States who are deemed to be a threat to our national security, agents of a foreign power, for example. It cannot be lawfully used to target U.S. citizens, whether on American soil or elsewhere.

But this is where the issue gets a little bit thorny, and sometimes there is misunderstanding about exactly how this works. So let me go through some of the details. Where this becomes a little more confused is when there is incidental collection of U.S. persons. For example, if you are targeting a foreigner overseas and they are communicating with a U.S. person in the United States, that could be a citizen, that could be a lawful permanent resident. Well, if it is a lawful communication, lawful 702 targeting of the foreign national, and they are talking to a U.S. person, invariably there is going to be information—known as incidental collection—involving the communication with that U.S. person. In other words, both sides of the conversation will be revealed in that lawful targeting of a foreign person overseas.

Here is an example: Let's say the intelligence community is monitoring the communications of a Hamas terrorist in Gaza who is believed to pose a danger to our national security. He is not an American, and he is not on U.S. soil, but he is using U.S.-based communication networks. Let's say in this example that one of the people the Hamas terrorist is communicating with is an American on U.S. soil. Even though the American is not a target of the data collection, his side of the conversation would be visible because he is the one communicating with this foreign target.

But let me be clear. The intelligence community cannot target anyone they believed to be a U.S. person, nor can they target a foreigner with the pretext of getting American citizens' data. For that, you need a warrant. You need to go to court and show probable cause because that is a constitutional right granted to Americans under the Fourth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

The Fourth Amendment of the Constitution protects our people from unreasonable searches and seizures by the government, and an unchecked surveillance authority would directly violate that right. That is why we have guardrails. That is why we have protections to minimize the chances of that happening.

I know there has been some confusion. Some of it is from a misunderstanding. Some of it is people, frankly, just misrepresenting exactly what this authority does and does not do. But section 702 does not violate the Fourth Amendment. Every court that has considered the lawfulness of the 702 program has found that it complies with the Fourth Amendment. So when people stand up and say ''Well, section 702 allows the government to spy on Americans,'' that is, frankly, not true. If they say it violates the Fourth Amendment, well, you have at least three courts that have considered the issue and they have said no, it doesn't. So they need to come up with another argument.

To be clear, this is very targeted, very narrow surveillance authority. As a matter of fact, under the reforms passed in the House bill, there are very few circumstances under which the FBI, for example, can exploit or query the 702 information.

So once the information is lawfully collected—targeting a foreign national overseas; that is lawfully collected—it is in a database which can then be queried by the FBI, for example, but there are very limited circumstances where that can happen. They can only search that database if they believe the query or question would return foreign intelligence information or evidence of a crime. The Agency does not have carte blanche authority to probe or go fishing in 702 information.

Unfortunately, there have been some mistakes made by the FBI due to the lack of guardrails and reforms that are in the current bill passed by the House of Representatives. I applaud the House for passing important reforms that will minimize the chances of this inadvertent collection of U.S. persons' information, because it is a violation of the law.

In response to some of these reports of inadvertent collection of U.S. persons' information, in 2021, FBI Director

Chris Wray instituted significant reforms to prevent inadvertent queries and improve compliance. Virtually all of those reforms, which have been enormously successful, have now been incorporated in the statute that the House passed last week.

Here is an example: When FBI personnel conduct a query now, rather than having access to this database of lawfully collected 702 information, they are required to opt-in to include that information. They have to affirmatively choose to search that database. Previously, that was not the case. Section 702 data was included in every search by default, and most of the time, it was completely unnecessary.

Multiple reviews have shown that these reforms have made a dramatic difference for the better. Since 2021, since these reforms have been put in place, the total number of U.S. person queries have decreased by 98 percent. That is a dramatic improvement. It is not 100 percent. It is not perfect. We still have work to do. But a 98-percent improvement strikes me as pretty dramatic. On top of that, DOJ conducted a review last year and found that 98 percent of the FBI's 702 queries were fully compliant with these requirements.

This has been reviewed by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, which is three members of the Federal judiciary appointed by the Chief Justice of the United States.

These reforms implemented by the FBI voluntarily in 2021 and now included in the House reform bill are working, and that is why it is so important that we should codify those changes. We need to make clear that these heightened standards are not simply Agency policy but the law, and that is exactly what the House FISA bill does. It turns the FBI's 702 reforms into law to ensure that the Agency's 702 query policies cannot be neglected or loosened in the future. Once they become the law of the land, even if the FBI were to change its policy, it would be inconsistent with that law and be illegal.

The House bill also extends this authority for a period of 2 years, so our intelligence community can continue to identify threats to our national security and prevent them from materializing.

When we talked about 702 several years ago, FBI Director Chris Wray said, ''The fact that we have not suffered another 9/11-scale attack is not just luck.'' He noted that it is a product of diligence, teamwork, information sharing, dot-connecting, and much of that dot-connecting is made possible by 702.

So I appreciate Speaker JOHNSON in the Republican-led House for taking action on this bill before this critical authority expires at the end of the week, and I look forward to voting for it in the U.S. Senate.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

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

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

NOMINATION OF RAMONA VILLAGOMEZ MANGLONA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today, the Senate will vote to confirm Ramona Villagomez Manglona to the U.S. District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands.

Judge Manglona was born in Saipan, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands—CNMI. She received a B.A. from the University of California at Berkeley in 1990 and a J.D. from the University of New Mexico School of Law in 1996. Following her graduation from law school, she clerked for Judge Virginia Sablan-Onerheim and Judge Alexandro C. Casto, both on the CNMI Superior Court. Judge Manglona then began her legal career as assistant attorney general in the criminal division for the CNMI Office of the Attorney General. She served in the criminal division for 3 years before moving to the civil division in 2001. In 2002, she was appointed to serve as the attorney general for the CNMI. Judge Manglona was appointed to a 6-year term as an associate judge on the Superior Court for the CNMI in 2003 and was elected to serve a second term in 2009.

In 2011, Judge Mangona was nominated by President Obama and confirmed by the U.S. Senate to serve a 10-year term as the chief judge for the U.S. District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands. As the sole active Federal district judge in the Northern Mariana Islands, she performs the work of a chief judge, a magistrate judge, and a bankruptcy judge. In her entire judicial career, Judge Manglona has presided over 185 cases that have gone to verdict, 35 of which were bench and jury trials she presided over as a Federal district court judge.

The American Bar Association unanimously rated Judge Manglona as ''well qualified,'' and she was unanimously voted out of the Judiciary Committee by a vote of 21–0.

Judge Manglona is a highly experienced jurist who will continue to serve with distinction in her second term as a judge for the U.S. District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands.

I am proud to support her nomination.

VOTE ON MANGLONA NOMINATION

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 127 Ex.]

YEAS—96

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

NAYS—2

Marshall	Sullivan

NOT VOTING—2

Sinema	Wicker

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUJÁN). 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.

The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) is necessarily absent.

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 128 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Bennet	Booker	Butler
Blumenthal	Brown	Cantwell

Cardin	Kaine	Romney
Carper	Kelly	Rosen
Casey	King	Rounds
Collins	Klobuchar	Rubio
Coons	Lankford	Schatz
Cortez Masto	Luján	Schumer
Duckworth	Manchin	Shaheen
Durbin	Menendez	Smith
Fetterman	Murkowski	Stabenow
Gillibrand	Murphy	Van Hollen
Graham	Murray	Warner
Hassan	Ossoff	Warnock
Heinrich	Padilla	Welch
Hickenlooper	Peters	Whitehouse
Hirono	Reed	

NAYS—49

Baldwin	Grassley	Risch
Barrasso	Hagerty	Sanders
Blackburn	Hawley	Schmitt
Boozman	Hoeven	Scott (FL)
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Scott (SC)
Britt	Johnson	Sullivan
Budd	Kennedy	Tester
Capito	Lee	Thune
Cassidy	Lummis	Tillis
Cornyn	Markey	Tuberville
Cotton	Marshall	Vance
Cramer	McConnell	Warren
Crapo	Merkley	Wicker
Cruz	Moran	Wyden
Daines	Mullin	Young
Ernst	Paul	
Fischer	Ricketts	

NOT VOTING—1

Sinema

The motion was agreed to.

REFORMING INTELLIGENCE AND SECURING AMERICA ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 365, H.R. 7888.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 365, H.R. 7888, a bill to reform the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 365, H.R. 7888, a bill to reform the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978.

Charles E. Schumer, Mark Kelly, Tammy Duckworth, Catherine Cortez Masto, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Jack Reed, Debbie Stabenow, Sheldon Whitehouse, Mazie K. Hirono, Benjamin L. Cardin, Angus S. King, Jr., Margaret Wood Hassan, Michael F. Bennet, Mark R. Warner, Richard Blumenthal, Gary C. Peters, Jeanne Shaheen.

RECESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 2:10 p.m.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:52 p.m., recessed until 2:10 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the President pro tempore.

REFORMING INTELLIGENCE AND SECURING AMERICA ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—CONTINUED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—APPOINTING AND AUTHORIZING MANAGERS FOR THE IMPEACHMENT TRIAL OF ALEJANDRO NICHOLAS MAYORKAS, SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. McCumber, Acting Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives, announced that the House of Representatives had passed a resolution (H. Res. 995) appointing and authorizing impeachment managers for the impeachment trial of Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, Secretary of Homeland Security.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The message will be received, and the Senate takes notice of the action by the House.

EXHIBITION OF ARTICLES OF IMPEACHMENT AGAINST ALEJANDRO NICHOLAS MAYORKAS, SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY

At 2:38 p.m., the managers on the part of the House of Representatives of the impeachment of Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, Secretary of Homeland Security, appeared below the bar of the Senate, and the Sergeant at Arms, Karen Gibson, announced their presence, as follows:

Madam President and Members of the Senate, I announce the presence of managers on the part of the House of Representatives to conduct proceedings on behalf of the House concerning the impeachment of Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, Secretary of Homeland Security.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The managers on the part of the House will be received and escorted to the well of the Senate.

The managers were thereupon escorted by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, Karen Gibson, to the well of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Sergeant at Arms will make the proclamation.

The Sergeant at Arms, Karen Gibson, made the proclamation, as follows:

Hear ye! Hear ye! Hear ye! All persons are commanded to keep silent, on pain of imprisonment, while the House of Representatives is exhibiting to the Senate of the United States articles of impeachment exhibited by the House of Representatives against Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, Secretary of Homeland Security.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The managers on the part of the House will proceed.

Mr. Manager GREEN of Tennessee. Madam President, the managers on the part of the House of Representatives are present and ready to present the Articles of Impeachment, which have been preferred by the House of Representatives against Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security.

The House adopted the following resolution, which, with permission of the Senate, I will read, H. Res. 995:

Resolved, That Mr. Green of Tennessee, Mr. McCaul, Mr. Biggs, Mr. Higgins of Lousiana, Mr. Cline, Mr. Guest, Mr. Garbarino, Ms. Greene of Georgia, Mr. Pfluger, Ms. Hageman, and Ms. Lee of Florida, are appointed managers to conduct the impeachment trial against Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, Secretary of Homeland Security, that a message be sent to the Senate to inform the Senate of these appointments, and that the managers so appointed may, in connection with the preparation and the conduct of the trial, exhibit the articles of impeachment to the Senate and take all other actions necessary, which may include the following:

(1) Employing legal, clerical, and other necessary assistants and incurring such other expenses as may be necessary, to be paid from amounts available to the Committee on Homeland Security under applicable expense resolutions or from the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives.

(2) Sending for persons and papers, and filing with the Secretary of the Senate, on the part of the House of Representatives, any pleadings, in conjunction with or subsequent to, the exhibition of the articles of impeachment that the managers consider necessary.

Mr. Manager GREEN of Tennessee. With permission of the Senate, I will now read the Articles of Impeachment, H. Res. 863:

Resolved, That Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, Secretary of Homeland Security of the United States of America, is impeached for high crimes and misdemeanors, and that the following articles of impeachment be exhibited to the United States Senate:

Articles of impeachment exhibited by the House of Representatives of the United States of America in the name of itself and of the people of the United States of America, against Alejandro N. Mayorkas, Secretary of Homeland Security of the United States of America, in maintenance and support of its impeachment against him for high crimes and misdemeanors.

ARTICLE I: WILLFUL AND SYSTEMIC REFUSAL TO COMPLY WITH THE LAW

The Constitution provides that the House of Representatives ''shall have

the sole Power of Impeachment'' and that civil Officers of the United States, including the Secretary of Homeland Security, ''shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors''. In his conduct while Secretary of Homeland Security, Alejandro N. Mayorkas, in violation of his oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, to bear true faith and allegiance to the same, and to well and faithfully discharge the duties of his office, has willfully and systemically refused to comply with Federal immigration laws, in that:

Throughout his tenure as Secretary of Homeland Security, Alejandro N. Mayorkas has repeatedly violated laws enacted by Congress regarding immigration and border security. In large part because of his unlawful conduct, millions of aliens have illegally entered the United States on an annual basis with many unlawfully remaining in the United States. His refusal to obey the law is not only an offense against the separation of powers in the Constitution of the United States, it also threatens our national security and has had a dire impact on communities across the country. Despite clear evidence that his willful and systemic refusal to comply with the law has significantly contributed to unprecedented levels of illegal entrants, the increased control of the Southwest border by drug cartels, and the imposition of enormous costs on States and localities affected by the influx of aliens, Alejandro N. Mayorkas has continued in his refusal to comply with the law, and thereby acted to the grave detriment of the interests of the United States.

Alejandro N. Mayorkas engaged in this scheme or course of conduct through the following means:

(1) Alejandro N. Mayorkas willfully refused to comply with the detention mandate set forth in section 235(b)(2)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, requiring that all applicants for admission who are ''not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted . . . shall be detained for a [removal] proceeding . . .''. Instead of complying with this requirement, Alejandro N. Mayorkas implemented a catch and release scheme, whereby such aliens are unlawfully released, even without effective mechanisms to ensure appearances before the immigration courts for removal proceedings or to ensure removal in the case of aliens ordered removed.

(2) Alejandro N. Mayorkas willfully refused to comply with the detention mandate set forth in section 235(b)(1)(B)(ii) of such Act, requiring that an alien who is placed into expedited removal proceedings and determined to have a credible fear of persecution ''shall be detained for further consideration of the application for asylum''. Instead of complying with this requirement, Alejandro N. Mayorkas implemented a catch and release scheme, whereby such aliens are unlawfully released, even without effective mechanisms to ensure appearances before the immigration courts for removal proceedings or to ensure removal in the case of aliens ordered removed.

(3) Alejandro N. Mayorkas willfully refused to comply with the detention set forth in section 235(b)(1)(B)(iii)(IV) of such Act, requiring that an alien who is placed into expedited removal proceedings and determined not to have a credible fear of persecution ''shall be detained . . . until removed''. Instead of complying with this requirement, Alejandro N. Mayorkas has implemented a catch and release scheme, whereby such aliens are unlawfully released, even without effective mechanisms to ensure appearances before the immigration courts for removal proceedings or to ensure removal in the case of aliens ordered removed.

(4) Alejandro N. Mayorkas willfully refused to comply with the detention mandate set forth in section 236(c) of such Act, requiring that a criminal alien who is inadmissible or deportable on certain criminal and terrorism-related grounds ''shall [be] take[n] into custody'' when the alien is released from law enforcement custody. Instead of complying with this requirement, Alejandro N. Mayorkas issued ''Guidelines for the Enforcement of Civil Immigration Laws'', which instructs Department of Homeland Security (hereinafter referred to as ''DHS'') officials that the ''fact an individual is a removable noncitizen . . . should not alone be the basis of an enforcement action against them'' and that DHS ''personnel should not rely on the fact of conviction . . . alone'', even with respect to aliens subject to mandatory arrest and detention pursuant to section 236(c) of such Act, to take them into custody. In *Texas v. United States*, 40 F.4th 205 (2022), the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit concluded that these guidelines had ''every indication of being 'a general policy that is so extreme as to amount to an abdication of . . . statutory responsibilities' '' and that its ''replacement of Congress's statutory mandates with concerns of equity and race is extralegal . . . [and] plainly outside the bounds of the power conferred by the INA''.

(5) Alejandro N. Mayorkas willfully refused to comply with the detention mandate set forth in section 241(a)(2) of such Act, requiring that an alien ordered removed ''shall [be] detain[ed]'' during ''the removal period''. Instead of complying with this mandate, Alejandro N. Mayorkas issued ''Guidelines for the Enforcement of Civil Immigration Laws'', which instructs DHS officials that the ''fact an individual is a removable noncitizen . . . should not alone be the basis of an enforcement action against them'' and that DHS ''personnel should not rely on the fact of conviction . . . alone'', even with respect to aliens subject to mandatory detention and removal pursuant to section 241(a) of such Act.

(6) Alejandro N. Mayorkas willfully exceeded his parole authority set forth in section 212(d)(5)(A) of such Act that permits parole to be granted ''only on a case-by-case basis'', temporarily, and ''for urgent humanitarian reasons or significant public benefit'', in that:

(A) Alejandro N. Mayorkas paroled aliens *en masse* in order to release them from mandatory detention, despite the fact that, as the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit concluded in *Texas v. Biden*, 20 F.4th 928 (2021), ''parol[ing] every alien [DHS] cannot detain is the opposite of the 'case-by-case basis' determinations required by law'' and ''DHS's pretended power to parole aliens while ignoring the limitations Congress imposed on the parole power [is] not *non*enforcement; it's *mis*enforcement, suspension of the INA, or both''.

(B) Alejandro N. Mayorkas created, re-opened, or expanded a series of categorical parole programs never authorized by Congress for foreign nationals outside of the United States, including for certain Central American minors, Ukrainians, Venezuelans, Cubans, Haitians, Nicaraguans, Colombians, Salvadorans, Guatemalans, and Hondurans, which enabled hundreds of thousands of inadmissible aliens to enter the United States in violation of the laws enacted by Congress.

(7) Alejandro N. Mayorkas willfully exceeded his release authority set forth in section 236(a) of such Act that permits, in certain circumstances, the release of aliens arrested on an administrative warrant, in that Alejandro N. Mayorkas released aliens arrested without a warrant despite their being subject to a separate applicable mandatory detention requirement set forth in section 235(b)(2) of such Act. Alejandro N. Mayorkas released such aliens by retroactively issuing administrative warrants in an attempt to circumvent section 235(b)(2) of such Act. In *Florida v. United States*, No. 3:21–cv–1066–TKW–ZCB (N.D. Fla. Mar. 8, 2023), the United States District Court of the Northern District of Florida noted that ''[t]his sleight of hand—using an 'arrest' warrant as a de facto 'release' warrant—is administrative sophistry at its worst''. In addition, the court concluded that ''what makes DHS's application of [236(a)] in this manner unlawful . . . is that [235(b)(2)], not [236(a)], governs the detention of applicants for admission whom DHS places in . . . removal proceedings after inspection''.

Alejandro N. Mayorkas's willful and systemic refusal to comply with the law has had calamitous consequences for the Nation and the people of the United States, including:

(1) During fiscal years 2017 through 2020, an average of about 590,000 aliens each fiscal year were encountered as inadmissible aliens at ports of entry on the Southwest border or apprehended

between ports of entry. Thereafter, during Alejandro N. Mayorkas's tenure in office, that number skyrocketed to over 1,400,000 in fiscal year 2021, over 2,300,000 in fiscal year 2022, and over 2,400,000 in fiscal year 2023. Similarly, during fiscal years 2017 through 2020, an average of 130,000 persons who were not turned back or apprehended after making an illegal entry were observed along the border each fiscal year. During Alejandro N. Mayorkas's tenure in office, that number more than trebled to 400,000 in fiscal year 2021, 600,000 in fiscal year 2022, and 750,000 in fiscal year 2023.

(2) American communities both along the Southwest border and across the United States have been devastated by the dramatic growth in illegal entries, the number of aliens unlawfully present, and substantial rise in the number of aliens unlawfully granted parole, creating a fiscal and humanitarian crisis and dramatically degrading the quality of life of the residents of those communities. For instance, since 2022, more than 150,000 migrants have gone through New York City's shelter intake system. Indeed, the Mayor of New York City has said that ''we are past our breaking point'' and that ''[t]his issue will destroy New York City''. In fiscal year 2023, New York City spent $1,450,000,000 addressing Alejandro N. Mayorkas's migrant crisis, and city officials fear it will spend another $12,000,000,000 over the following three fiscal years, causing painful budget cuts to important city services.

(3) Alejandro N. Mayorkas's unlawful mass release of apprehended aliens and unlawful mass grant of categorical parole to aliens have enticed an increasing number of aliens to make the dangerous journey to our Southwest border. Consequently, according to the United Nations's International Organization for Migration, the number of migrants intending to illegally cross our border who have perished along the way, either en route to the United States or at the border, almost doubled during the tenure of Alejandro N. Mayorkas as Secretary of Homeland Security, from an average of about 700 a year during the fiscal years 2017 through 2020, to an average of about 1,300 a year during the fiscal years 2021 through 2023.

(4) Alien smuggling organizations have gained tremendous wealth during Alejandro N. Mayorkas's tenure as Secretary of Homeland Security, with their estimated revenues rising from about $500,000,000 in 2018 to approximately $13,000,000,000 in 2022.

(5) During Alejandro N. Mayorkas's tenure as Secretary of Homeland Security, the immigration court backlog has more than doubled from about 1,300,000 cases to over 3,000,000 cases. The exploding backlog is destroying the courts' ability to administer justice and provide appropriate relief in a timeframe that does not run into years or even decades. As Alejandro N. Mayorkas acknowledged, ''those who have a valid claim to asylum . . . often wait years for a . . . decision; likewise, noncitizens who will ultimately be found ineligible for asylum or other protection—which occurs in the majority of cases—often have spent many years in the United States prior to being ordered removed''. He noted that of aliens placed in expedited removal proceedings and found to have a credible fear of persecution, and thus referred to immigration judges for removal proceedings, ''significantly fewer than 20 percent . . . were ultimately granted asylum'' and only ''28 percent of cases decided on their merits are grants of relief''. Alejandro N. Mayorkas also admitted that ''the fact that migrants can wait in the United States for years before being issued a final order denying relief, and that many such individuals are never actually removed, likely incentivizes migrants to make the journey north''.

(6) During Alejandro N. Mayorkas's tenure as Secretary of Homeland Security, approximately 450,000 unaccompanied alien children have been encountered at the Southwest border, and the vast majority have been released into the United States. As a result, there has been a dramatic upsurge in migrant children being employed in dangerous and exploitative jobs in the United States.

(7) Alejandro N. Mayorkas's failure to enforce the law, drawing millions of illegal aliens to the Southwest border, has led to the reassignment of U.S. Border Patrol agents from protecting the border from illicit drug trafficking to processing illegal aliens for release. As a result, during Alejandro N. Mayorkas's tenure as Secretary of Homeland Security, the flow of fentanyl across the border and other dangerous drugs, both at and between ports of entry, has increased dramatically. U.S. Customs and Border Protection seized approximately 4,800 pounds of fentanyl in fiscal year 2020, approximately 11,200 pounds in fiscal year 2021, approximately 14,700 pounds in fiscal year 2022, and approximately 27,000 pounds in fiscal year 2023. Over 70,000 Americans died from fentanyl poisoning in 2022, and fentanyl is now the number one killer of Americans between the ages of 18 and 45.

(8) Alejandro N. Mayorkas has degraded public safety by leaving wide swaths of the border effectively unpatrolled as U.S. Border Patrol agents are diverted from guarding the border to processing for unlawful release the heightening waves of apprehended aliens (many who now seek out agents for the purpose of surrendering with the now reasonable expectation of being released and granted work authorization), and Federal Air Marshals are diverted from protecting the flying public to assist in such processing.

(9) During Alejandro N. Mayorkas's tenure as Secretary of Homeland Security, the U.S. Border Patrol has encountered an increasing number of aliens on the terrorist watch list. In fiscal years 2017 through 2020 combined, 11 noncitizens on the terrorist watchlist were caught attempting to cross the Southwest border between ports of entry. That number increased to 15 in fiscal year 2021, 98 in fiscal year 2022, 169 in fiscal year 2023, and 49 so far in fiscal year 2024.

Additionally, in *United States* v. *Texas*, 599 U.S. 670 (2023), the United States Supreme Court heard a case involving Alejandro N. Mayorkas's refusal to comply with certain Federal immigration laws that are at issue in this impeachment. The Supreme Court held that States have no standing to seek judicial relief to compel Alejandro N. Mayorkas to comply with certain legal requirements contained in the Immigration and Nationality Act. However, the Supreme Court held that ''even though the federal courts lack Article III jurisdiction over this suit, other forums remain open for examining the Executive Branch's enforcement policies. For example, Congress possesses an array of tools to analyze and influence those policies [and] those are political checks for the political process''. One such critical tool for Congress to influence the Executive Branch to comply with the immigration laws of the United States is impeachment. The dissenting Justice noted, ''The Court holds Texas lacks standing to challenge a federal policy that inflicts substantial harm on the State and its residents by releasing illegal aliens with criminal convictions for serious crimes. In order to reach this conclusion, the Court . . . holds that the only limit on the power of a President to disobey a law like the important provision at issue is Congress' power to employ the weapons of interbranch warfare . . .''. As the dissenting Justice explained, ''Congress may wield what the Solicitor General described as 'political . . . tools'—which presumably means such things as . . . impeachment and removal''. Indeed, during oral argument, the Justice who authored the majority opinion stated to the Solicitor General, ''I think your position is, instead of judicial review, Congress has to resort to shutting down the government or impeachment or dramatic steps . . .''. Here, in light of the inability of injured parties to seek judicial relief to remedy the refusal of Alejandro N. Mayorkas to comply with Federal immigration laws, impeachment is Congress's only viable option.

In all of this, Alejandro N. Mayorkas willfully and systemically refused to comply with the immigration laws, failed to control the border to the detriment of national security, compromised public safety, and violated the rule of law and separation of powers in the Constitution, to the manifest injury of the people of the United States.

Wherefore Alejandro N. Mayorkas, by such conduct, has demonstrated that he will remain a threat to national and

border security, the safety of the United States people, and the Constitution if allowed to remain in office, and has acted in a manner grossly incompatible with his duties and the rule of law. Alejandro N. Mayorkas thus warrants impeachment and trial, removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States.

ARTICLE II: BREACH OF PUBLIC TRUST

The Constitution provides that the House of Representatives ''shall have the sole Power of Impeachment'' and that civil Officers of the United States, including the Secretary of Homeland Security, ''shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors''. In his conduct while Secretary of Homeland Security, Alejandro N. Mayorkas, in violation of his oath to well and faithfully discharge the duties of his office, has breached the public trust, in that:

Alejandro N. Mayorkas has knowingly made false statements, and knowingly obstructed lawful oversight of the Department of Homeland Security (hereinafter referred to as ''DHS''), principally to obfuscate the results of his willful and systemic refusal to comply with the law. Alejandro N. Mayorkas engaged in this scheme or course of conduct through the following means:

(1) Alejandro N. Mayorkas knowingly made false statements to Congress that the border is ''secure'', that the border is ''no less secure than it was previously'', that the border is ''closed'', and that DHS has ''operational control'' of the border (as that term is defined in the Secure Fence Act of 2006).

(2) Alejandro N. Mayorkas knowingly made false statements to Congress regarding the scope and adequacy of the vetting of the thousands of Afghans who were airlifted to the United States and then granted parole following the Taliban takeover of Afghanistan after President Biden's precipitous withdrawal of United States forces.

(3) Alejandro N. Mayorkas knowingly made false statements that apprehended aliens with no legal basis to remain in the United States were being quickly removed.

(4) Alejandro N. Mayorkas knowingly made false statements supporting the false narrative that U.S. Border Patrol agents maliciously whipped illegal aliens.

(5) Alejandro N. Mayorkas failed to comply with multiple subpoenas issued by congressional committees.

(6) Alejandro N. Mayorkas delayed or denied access of DHS Office of Inspector General (hereinafter referred to as ''OIG'') to DHS records and information, hampering OIG's ability to effectively perform its vital investigations, audits, inspections, and other reviews of agency programs and operations to satisfy the OIG's obligations under section 402(b) of title 5, United States Code, in part, to Congress.

Additionally, in his conduct while Secretary of Homeland Security, Alejandro N. Mayorkas has breached the public trust by his willful refusal to fulfill his statutory ''duty to control and guard the boundaries and borders of the United States against the illegal entry of aliens'' as set forth in section 103(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Alejandro N. Mayorkas inherited what his first Chief of the U.S. Border Patrol called, ''arguably the most effective border security in our nation's history''. Alejandro N. Mayorkas, however, proceeded to abandon effective border security initiatives without engaging in adequate alternative efforts that would enable DHS to maintain control of the border and guard against illegal entry, and despite clear evidence of the devastating consequences of his actions, he failed to take action to fulfill his statutory duty to control the border. According to his first Chief of the U.S. Border Patrol, Alejandro N. Mayorkas ''summarily rejected'' the ''multiple options to reduce the illegal entries . . . through proven programs and consequences'' provided by civil service staff at DHS. Despite clear evidence of the devastating consequences of his actions, he failed to take action to fulfill his statutory duty to control the border, in that, among other things:

(1) Alejandro N. Mayorkas terminated the Migrant Protection Protocols (hereinafter referred to as ''MPP''). In *Texas* v. *Biden*, 20 F.4th 928 (2021), the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit explained that ''[t]he district court . . . pointed to evidence that 'the termination of MPP has contributed to the current border surge' . . . (citing DHS's own previous determinations that MPP had curbed the rate of illegal entries)''. The district court had also ''pointed out that the number of 'enforcement encounters'—that is, instances where immigration officials encounter immigrants attempting to cross the southern border without documentation—had 'skyrocketed' since MPP's termination''.

(2) Alejandro N. Mayorkas terminated contracts for border wall construction.

(3) Alejandro N. Mayorkas terminated asylum cooperative agreements that would have equitably shared the burden of complying with international asylum accords.

In all of this, Alejandro N. Mayorkas breached the public trust by knowingly making false statements to Congress and the American people and avoiding lawful oversight in order to obscure the devastating consequences of his willful and systemic refusal to comply with the law and carry out his statutory duties. He has also breached the public trust by willfully refusing to carry out his statutory duty to control the border and guard against illegal entry, notwithstanding the calamitous consequences of his abdication of that duty.

Wherefore Alejandro N. Mayorkas, by such conduct, has demonstrated that he will remain a threat to national and border security, the safety of the American people, and to the Constitution if allowed to remain in office, and has acted in a manner grossly incompatible with his duties and the rule of law. Alejandro N. Mayorkas thus warrants impeachment and trial, removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States.

Mr. President, that completes the exhibition of the Articles of Impeachment against Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security.

The managers request the Senate take order for the trial, and the managers now request leave to withdraw.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That would be ''Madam President.''

Thank you, Mr. GREEN.

The Senate will duly notify the House of Representatives when it is ready to proceed.

You may proceed to depart.

The managers were thereupon escorted by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, Karen Gibson, from the well of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

PROGRAM

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, for the information of all Senators, under impeachment rules, Senators will be sworn in as jurors tomorrow at 1 p.m.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

REFORMING INTELLIGENCE AND SECURING AMERICA ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

NATIONAL SECURITY SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, in light of the unprecedented attacks by Iranian forces on Israel over the weekend and on the 64th day since the Senate passed a bipartisan national security supplemental bill, I come to the floor to once again call on the House to pass critical funding for Ukraine, for Israel, for the Indo-Pacific, and, importantly, for our own national security needs here at home.

Over the past 6 months, I have worked with Senators from both sides of the aisle to urge the passage of supplemental funding to support our national security, and I am beyond disappointed that Speaker Johnson and

House Republicans have delayed much needed critical aid, especially given the Senate bill that passed here with 70 bipartisan votes. I believe and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle believe that that would pass the House if only the Speaker would bring the bill to the floor. Now, we hear this week that House Republicans may be nearing a vote on this aid, and while I am encouraged by that, it is way past time for us to help the courageous Ukrainians who are fighting, literally, for the life of their country.

As chair of the European Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, like so many in this Chamber, I have met with President Zelenskyy, traveled to Ukraine, and met with the women and men who are on the frontlines of this war. I know the dire state of affairs right now against Russia. We have heard from our Nation's top four-star generals and every single combatant commander. They have stressed the importance of what happens in Ukraine to operations elsewhere around the world.

Fortunately, Ukrainians remain fearless in the face of the brutality and aggression from Russia, but what the United States and our allies must do at this critical juncture is provide the military and economic support to help Ukraine win and define victory on its own terms. We must act now to ensure Ukraine's continued survival. We have heard testimony that, right now, for every shell that is being fired by the Ukrainians, five are being fired by Russia; and if we wait another month or more, it will be 10 for every shell that Ukrainians are firing.

Ensuring Ukraine's survival is not just about Ukraine; it is about pushing back on Vladimir Putin's campaign to return to the days of Soviet occupation and aggression. We have seen this movie before with Vladimir Putin. In 2008, he invaded Georgia. In 2014, he illegally annexed Crimea and parts of the Donbas in Ukraine. Then, of course, 2 years ago, he launched his full-scale, unprovoked invasion of Ukraine. If he wins—if the West fails to support Ukraine—we know that Vladimir Putin is not going to stop.

We have heard from the leaders of the Baltic nations of Poland, of other states in Eastern Europe, their fears for what happens if Vladimir Putin is successful in Ukraine.

Instead of letting Putin rewrite the rules of the road, we should put an end to his thinking that he can do as he pleases without consequences.

Delays by the House of Representatives to pass this supplemental have enabled Putin's delusional agenda. We have already heard from the Republican chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, MIKE TURNER, and Chairman MIKE MCCAUL from the House Foreign Affairs Committee, who have already said that a third of the Republican caucus is listing and spouting Russian disinformation.

This isn't just about Ukraine; American aid and support deters other bad actors from initiating conflict in other parts of the world.

Six months of inaction by Congress has enabled our adversaries. We saw it as recently as this weekend, when Iranian forces fired off hundreds of drones and rockets toward Israel. Now there is the potential for a broader war in the Middle East that could imperil more innocent lives and make the world more dangerous.

It is more important than ever that we take action in Congress because these episodes—Ukraine, the attack in Israel, what is happening in the Indo-Pacific—they don't happen in silos. Our adversaries are connected. They are sharing weapons and reveling in our inability to act. Iran is currently supplying more than 70 percent of Russia's drone capabilities. A top Chinese official was just in North Korea for the highest level talks in years. The Secretary General of NATO branded this partnership as a ''dangerous authoritarian alliance,'' and he is right. This group of dictators, autocrats, and adversaries threatens democracy. It is a threat that is very much like what we saw in the lead-up to World War II.

If we don't pass this supplemental, our adversaries, like Iran, will expand their own campaigns of aggression. If you are concerned about what China is doing, if you are concerned about what Iran is doing, the best way to deal a blow to these authoritarians is to support the Ukrainians in their effort to defeat Putin.

We have a chance to take a stand for freedom and democracy, if only our House colleagues would finally pass the national security supplemental.

I just got back from the Indo-Pacific with a congressional delegation that included six Members of the Senate and one Member of the House. It was bipartisan and bicameral. What we heard in the nations that we visited in the Indo-Pacific was that they understand the connection between what is going on in Ukraine and what is happening with China, with great power competition, with the aggression in the Indo-Pacific and the South China Sea, and against Taiwan.

If the House would pass the national security supplemental, we could degrade Russia, we could degrade the Iranian military capabilities, and we could do it without costing American lives. We could boost our economy through our defense industrial base.

Support for Ukraine and our allies isn't a blank check. It is not charity. The United States is providing Ukraine with critical equipment to defend itself and its territory. This equipment is pulled from U.S. stocks, which also means that it is putting people to work back at home.

Despite misinformation from too many House Republicans, a majority of the funding in the bill the Senate sent over more than 60 days ago is spent in the United States. It would be spent to replenish our own military stocks so that we can continue to meet our military requirements. It would shore up our military readiness and ensure that the U.S. industrial base can keep up with demand.

A destabilized Europe as a result of Ukraine losing this war would be a disaster for the U.S. economy. In my home State of New Hampshire alone, we export about $3 billion each year to Europe, which is our largest trading partner.

Putin poses a serious threat to our security and a peaceful, prosperous future. Our allies know this, and that is why, by the end of this year, 18 NATO countries will meet the 2-percent defense spending goal set by the alliance. This historic investment in our collective security shows that the United States is not shouldering this burden alone.

We can depend on our allies, and they must be able to depend on us. Let's remind ourselves that our NATO allies stood by our side after September 11. Right now, leaders from around the world are looking for the United States to step up and pass this bill. What message does it send to our allies if we ignore their pleas for support to save lives and ensure our collective security? What message does it send to our grandchildren if we tell them that we are willing to gamble sending them to fight in another war in Europe? There is one thing we know—that Putin is not going to stop in Ukraine.

America doesn't back down when it is called upon to defend freedom—at least we never have. Ukraine is now on the frontlines of the fight for democracy and freedom. We have the resources to act here. We have the ability to act. Now it is time for everyone in the House to find the courage to act because failure is not an option.

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

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

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, last week, we saw terrible flooding in parts of Louisiana. Here, as the charts will show—water shouldn't be up to the bottom of a vehicle. Here you see people getting on a bus, wearing waders. So people's lives were disrupted, just like with any serious flood. Now families are turning to FEMA, the National Flood Insurance Program, to help lift them out of the hole that last week's storms have left them in.

Moments like these are why people buy insurance. But what about after we have recovered and the Sun shines once more? There is increasing concern among Americans that they will not be able to afford their flood insurance for when the next storm hits.

A house is the biggest purchase most people make in their lifetime. Unless

you are among the wealthiest, you are taking out a mortgage to make that purchase. After you have bought your home, imagine if FEMA changes the rules and your flood insurance now costs more than that mortgage? No American should have to pay more in flood insurance than their mortgage, but that is the story I am hearing frequently from people in Louisiana.

There is a cost-of-living crisis being fueled by the inflation created by this administration. Inflation is costing Louisiana families $884 more a month compared to 2021. Everywhere they turn, they are frustrated with the fact that they are paying more and getting less.

When I speak to folks back home, they are not only worried about how to put food on their table but also how to pay for gas. They are worried about how they are going to be able to afford to stay in their homes and about how they can afford a good education for their children.

I would like to do something about some small part of it. Congress has the power to do something about it, and that is to make flood insurance affordable.

The National Flood Insurance Program was created as a safety net for the most vulnerable Americans. It covers 4.7 million American homes, but those millions of homes are at risk of losing their protection because of skyrocketing premiums caused by FEMA's new risk assessment system, Risk Rating 2.0.

Let's briefly talk about the history of NFIP Risk Rating 2.0 and how we got here. FEMA introduced Risk Rating 2.0 in October of 2021. It was slated to take effect in 2022 for new policies and in 2023 for existing policyholders.

Since then, Americans who rely on flood insurance have been held in a state of uncertainty. Before they were hit with that first bill, many families didn't know if their premiums would jump up; if they did, how much; and when the rate hikes would end.

FEMA told us that 77 percent of policyholders would see a premium hike but refused to publicly disclose how the Agency calculates individual policy rates. So now FEMA is sending Americans a bill and won't tell them how they came up with the price. If you were the American getting that bill, you would be incredibly frustrated. You wouldn't accept it if your mechanic stuck you with a crazy bill but didn't tell you what was wrong with the car. Why should we just accept from a government Agency that same kind of model? Theoretically, the government Agency is here to serve us.

Louisiana is one of the States getting hit the hardest. NFIP premiums in Louisiana are expected to go up by 234 percent, with some ZIP Codes seeing as much as an 1,100-percent increase—that is 1,100 percent. In real terms, some ZIP Codes will see an increase from around $600 to more than $8,000 annually. Couple that with the homeowner's insurance crisis. Couple that with inflation across the country. Couple that with the cost to heat your home. Couple that with the cost to go to the grocery store. It is clear why Americans feel they cannot keep their heads above water.

Insurance, just like everything else, has become less affordable. When folks can't afford flood insurance, they begin to drop that coverage, and the pool of policyholders shrink. The amount of risk is then placed on a smaller number of policyholders, which increases their premiums, which makes them drop their policies, and then we enter what is called an actuarial death spiral.

FEMA itself forecasted that over 20 percent of policyholders will leave the program because of higher premiums within the next 10 years. We are setting the program up for collapse and leaving Americans and American taxpayers holding the bucket.

Some groups will be hit even harder than others. FEMA won't tell us how they came up with the numbers of what they expect Americans to pay, but we do know they do not factor in income or the ability to pay. There is no discount or consideration for an elderly couple who is retired and living on a fixed income, bought their home in 1957, never had it flooded, and now their insurance premiums are rising. This is a real human condition.

Congress has the power to address it, and we need to step up now. If my colleagues and our friends in the House of Representatives wish to honor the people we serve, let's start with the 4.7 million policyholders being—I don't know if the word is ''mistreated''—mishandled by the National Flood Insurance Program, certainly poorly served.

I urge my colleagues to read our NFIP Reauthorization and Reform Act. Come talk to us about it. It is something which is bipartisan, which is reasonable and sensible, and which will actually address this need. Our goal is to make the National Flood Insurance Program more affordable for the homeowner, more accountable to the taxpayer, and more sustainable for society. Our bill does that, but we can only do so by working together.

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

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

MAYORKAS IMPEACHMENT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, with me today is one of my colleagues from my office, Mr. Matt Turner.

I want to talk about the woolly mammoth in the room: impeachment. I want my colleagues to just put aside for a second the legal aspect of this. Let's stop thinking for a second about how many lawyers can dance on the head of a pin, and let's just think for a moment what is about to happen over the next 2 days.

A few moments ago, the managers from the U.S. House of Representatives came over—every Member of the Senate was here and seated—and read their Articles of Impeachment, their charges, about Secretary Mayorkas. The U.S. House of Representatives—did you notice I said that? Representatives of the U.S. House of Representatives came over to us.

As I said the other day, we are not talking about some snow bro who likes chicken McNuggets and weed and has an opinion. We are not talking about some game boy who is living in his parents' basement and has an opinion—though both of them are entitled to their opinion because this is America.

We are talking about the U.S. House of Representatives. For months, they investigated the open, bleeding wound that is the southern border and why it is open and why it is bleeding. And after investigating it—not for days, not for weeks—for months, the U.S. House of Representatives voted two articles, two charges, in an impeachment of Secretary Mayorkas.

And those are serious charges. They are as serious as four heart attacks and a stroke. The first one is willful and systemic refusal to comply with the law—not negligence—willful and systemic refusal to comply with the law. The second charge is breach of the public trust—breach of the public trust. Serious, serious charges.

Now, this doesn't happen every day or every week or every month or even every year around here. Our country is almost 250 years old. This has only happened 22 times. Twenty-two times has the U.S. House of Representatives impeached a public official. And every single time—check it. Go Google it. Every single time—you can write this down, take it home to mama. Every single time, except when the public official has quit, the U.S. Senate has done its job, through thick and thin, whether the Democrats were in the majority or the Republicans were in the majority. It didn't matter who the President was. We did our job because we respect the institution of the Constitution; we respect the three branches of government; we respect the U.S. House of Representatives. We respect them enough to do our job. We held a trial every single time, except when the public official quit.

Now, in the next 2 days, you are going to hear one of my colleagues—the majority leader—say we don't need to hold a trial. He is going to say the evidence is insufficient, that it is not worth our time. I want you to think for a moment. Just ask yourself this question: How does he know the evidence isn't sufficient? How does he know? He hasn't heard the evidence.

What you are about to see, folks—it breaks my heart to say this. Over the next 2 days, what you are going to see is not about the evidence. It is not

about the law. It is not about the process. It is not about what should be 250 years of precedent in history. It is about raw, gut politics—raw, gut politics.

Some of my colleagues in this body do not want us to talk about the border in an election year, and we all know that. You know that. I know that. Everybody watching knows that. The American people know that. They may be poorer under President Biden, but they are not stupid. They can see that. And that is not right. It is vacuous. It is fraudulent. Regardless of what you think or you may think you think without having heard the evidence, the U.S. Senate should do its job. We should hold a trial.

Now, my Democratic friends have the votes. They can do pretty much what they want to. When you have got the votes, you know, you can—what is the old expression? You can make a koala bear eat hot peppers and like it if you have the votes. They have the majority, and I believe in the rule of law, and the rules are the rules. But sometimes—sometimes the majority just means a lot of the fools are on the same side. That is why we have a Bill of Rights in our Constitution: to protect our rights that the majority can't take away.

And I want to say this as respectfully as I can because I understand politics. I have been in this business for a while. The Presiding Officer has too. I have seen the dark side of it too. I have seen the good side, but I have seen the dark side. And what I am seeing right now is the dark side. I am seeing the dark side.

This is a political decision, and it is an insult to the Senate. And it is one more step of the U.S. Senate rotting from within, where we don't do our job for political reasons. So I am asking my Democratic colleagues—I say this gently, with as much respect as I can muster: Pretty please, pretty please, pretty please with sugar on top, let's do our job. Just because you have the votes, don't dismiss these impeachment proceedings summarily, like it is spam in your inbox. The U.S. Senate needs to do its job.

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

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

HEALTHY KIDS ACT

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, tens of millions of kids in America are anxious, depressed, angry, lonely, sedentary, sometimes insecure, and sometimes suicidal. And just about everybody—whether they are parents, teachers, mental health professionals, or even the kids themselves—points the finger at the same culprit: social media.

We do not need more data to tell us what is so painfully obvious in schools and homes across the country. Social media platforms, with their wildly powerful, covert, and addictive algorithms are driving our kids deeper and deeper into a sea of despair that they can't find their way out of. Kids are being unwittingly sucked into rabbit holes that leave them in a constant state of panic and outrage—ashamed of their own bodies, lacking meaningful friendships and connections.

The idea that a young kid—a kid—can feel so unhappy and so unfulfilled at the tender age of 8 or 9—so much so that they seriously contemplate self-harm—is appalling. And it is a uniquely modern crisis created over the past decades by profit-chasing tech companies for whom nothing and no one is off-limits, not even very young kids. The math for them is very simple: Attention means money. And the best way to hold people's attention is to make them upset and keep them upset.

You talk to any parent—whether they are raising a toddler or a teenager, whether they are a voter or nonvoter, a Democrat or a Republican—they are worried and they are frustrated about all the ways that social media is harming kids, but they don't know what to do about it or if they can do anything at all. Some might work two jobs and not have the time to monitor what their kids are up to online. Others might lack the technical literacy to operate parental controls and set limits on screen time.

All they really want is for their young kids to be off social media altogether, because there is no good reason that a 9-year-old should be spending hours every day scrolling through TikTok that has been programmed with no concern for whether the content is age-appropriate or not. There is no First Amendment right for an 11-year-old to be on Instagram while algorithm targets them with content glorifying starvation and fueling insecurities.

By the company's own admission, social media was never meant to be used by young kids. Yet any parent, or anyone who knows a parent, knows that young kids are on these platforms anyway. And the only way that it will stop is if the Federal law finally mandates that companies keep young kids off of their services.

Over the past year, my team and I have worked extensively with a broad range of advocates and stakeholders, as well as the Senate Commerce Committee leadership, to update my bill to protect kids on social media. Our updated bill, called the Healthy Kids Act, would do two simple things: It would prevent kids under 13 from being on social media at all; and it would ban algorithmic targeting on these platforms for kids under 17.

Delaying the onset of social media use is a straightforward and commonsense way to protect our youngest kids from the very worst of the internet's ills. Let them have a normal childhood in the real world—play a sport, learn an instrument, read a book, go to the park, walk around with friends. And once kids are on social media at 13 or 14 or whenever, they need protection, particularly from the algorithmic targeting.

Just last year alone, social media companies made $11 billion from ads targeted at kids under 18 in the United States—$11 billion. So it is no wonder that they have no appetite to change their business model without a Federal law. It is working great for them—just not for the millions of young kids who are sad and lonely and angry because of it. Kids need help, and they need protection. And because the companies have shown time and time again that they will not step up, Congress must.

I am glad that we are seeing renewed momentum and urgency right now with a number of different proposals on this issue in the U.S. Senate. All of them, my bill included, share the same goal of keeping our kids healthy. But at the heart of this effort is an essential question of when our kids ought to be allowed to be on social media. At what age is it appropriate to use? If we are going to protect these kids online and act as a counterweight to the rich and powerful tech companies, answering that question and establishing an age minimum is essential. And that is what the Healthy Kids Act does.

It is our job here in the Senate to consider any number of difficult challenges facing the country and the world and to debate what to do about them. What is more fundamental to the role of the Federal Government than to protect the most vulnerable Americans, especially our children?

If you think what is happening to kids online is unclear, look at the data. The percentage of high school students surveyed who experienced persistent feelings of sadness or hopelessness in the past year is 36 percent to 57 percent females; 21 percent to 29 percent males in 10 years—in 10 years.

It might be the phones. It might be the phones. You can consult the data. You can ask the Surgeon General of the United States. You can ask all of the people who have studied this. And they know it is early use of social media where—look, we all use social media, and our adult brains are not powerful enough to overcome the negative impacts. You are 13, you are 9, you are 7, you are going to be overpowered by these algorithms. We have to protect these kids.

And if you don't believe the data, talk to any parent—Democrat, Republican, parent of a 2-year-old, parent of a 12-year-old—everybody wants this tool in their toolkit. And the idea that we should pass a Federal law mandating that all the social media companies have to do is have a little thing in settings where you can turn the dials on all the different aspects of your social media account is ignorant. It is ignorant. The idea that all we really

need to do is precipitate a conversation between a parent and child about social media use—no. What parents need is to be able to say: I am sorry. That is illegal. I am sorry. You may not use these social media platforms.

I think it gets really tricky and really complicated once a kid is 13, 14, 15, 16, 17. I understand that. And we narrowed the bill to be more precise because there is no First Amendment right, there is no public policy upside for a 9-year-old to be on TikTok. Nobody can make that argument with a straight face.

And so as we consider our options going forward on tech policy—but specifically protecting children online—the threshold question is, At what age is it appropriate for a child to use social media? If I had my druthers, I would have set it at 16, honestly. But, certainly, we can all agree that there is no advantage to a child's life, a prepubescent child's life—a 9-year-old, a 4-year-old, an 11-year-old—being on social media.

I am confident we will get this done. I am confident that if this ever received a Senate floor vote, that it would be a resounding bipartisan majority. And I am confident that the American people support us in this.

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.

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

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

The Senator from Tennessee.

MAYORKAS IMPEACHMENT

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, we gathered just a couple of hours ago to receive the impeachment articles on Alejandro Mayorkas, who is the Secretary of Homeland Security. How interesting that, as we look at going through this impeachment, we have Senator SCHUMER, who is the majority leader, who has decided he wants to change his tune when it comes to dealing with impeachment.

Now, in 2019, right before the Democrats started in on President Trump and an impeachment trial for President Trump, Leader SCHUMER stood right here in this Chamber, and he said:

> We have a responsibility to let all the facts come out.
>
> We [have] to remember our constitutional duty to act as judges and jurors in a potential trial.

Now, those were his comments at that point in time. He was all for an impeachment trial, and it is our constitutional duty. You can look at article I, section 2 and section 3. Section 2 lays out the responsibility of the House in impeachment. Section 3 pertains to the Senate and how we are to proceed with a trial of impeachment.

But, as I said, Leader SCHUMER has decided that he wants to change his tune, and all of a sudden, he is not wanting this even though we actually have a public officeholder who deserves to stand for an impeachment trial, and that is Secretary Mayorkas. Now that the shoe is on the other foot, if you will, and now that it is about a Democrat, Leader SCHUMER wants to change the rules and say no. He is even willing to take unprecedented actions that this Chamber has never taken when it comes to the issue of impeachment.

I believe this should incense every single American. I know it incenses the people of Tennessee because what we have learned in the last 3 years about Secretary Mayorkas—even though his title is ''Secretary of Homeland Security,'' he does not believe in securing the homeland, and he has refused to fulfill his duty of securing the homeland.

I know that Secretary Mayorkas is doing the bidding of Joe Biden and the Biden administration. He is just doing what they tell him he has to do. That in and of itself tells you a lot about what this administration thinks about the security and sovereignty of this country. Here is why: On the Biden-Mayorkas watch, you have more than 9.4 million illegal aliens coming into this country. That is in less than 3 years—9.4 million.

We know that there are between 1.7 and 2.5 million ''got-aways.'' Some of those ''got-aways'' are included in that 9.4 million number, and others are not because they didn't see them as they were coming through and couldn't get to them. They found things they left on the roadside or in the woods, in the brush, later on.

Out of this 10 million or so who have illegally come into the country—by the way, just to help everyone have the right context, that number of 10 million is greater than the population of 38 of our States—38. That is how many people are coming in who are illegally entering the country.

Out of this number, you have thousands who are from countries of interest. That would be places like Pakistan, Uzbekistan, Iraq, Iran. And look at China. Look at what is happening there. You also have 300 known terrorists. As we heard in the impeachment articles today, under President Trump, you had no more than a dozen total over 4 years who were coming into the country. What do you have under Joe Biden? You have over 300 suspected terrorists. Even last week, we had an issue where DOJ and DHS and FBI and the other Agencies were admitting they had lost track of a terrorist from Afghanistan, and he was free-roaming the country for a year.

In addition to the terrorists and the people from countries of interest, fentanyl is coming across our borders. It is being smuggled in by the cartels. Fentanyl is the leading cause of death of Americans age 18 to 45. Fentanyl is a drug that—China has the precursor chemicals, and they are manufacturing this in labs that they have set up with, oh, by the way, the cartels in Mexico, and the cartels are the distribution hub for fentanyl. I talk to parents regularly who have a child who has lost a life or become addicted because of fentanyl.

In addition to all the fentanyl, you have the human trafficking. What is really so sad to me when you look at human trafficking—and for the cartels, human trafficking is a business. It has grown from a business that was $500 million a year in this country in 2018, and today it is a $13 billion-a-year business.

If you don't think the cartels are big business, if you don't think they are global entities, look at this. Globally, human trafficking is a $150 billion-a-year business. Where do these people want to come? Right here. They want to come into our country.

On top of this, there are more than 400,000 migrant children. Many of them have been recycled and abused by the cartels. Yes, indeed, the cartels are so into this human trafficking now that they have devised a scheme. It is child abuse. They take a little child. They write their name and the phone number to contact on that child's back. They put that child with a cartel member they are trying to get into the country. They pose as a family for the purpose of claiming asylum. Once the cartel member is across the border, what does he do? He lets the child go—lets the child go—and the child is sent back to Mexico.

So we add to all of these issues with the terrorists, with the people from countries of interest, with the drugs, with the human trafficking, with the sex trafficking, you look at what is happening to these children. Tens of thousands of these 400,000 children have been forced into really horrific, exploitative situations, including child labor and sex trafficking.

Across the country, you have dangerous, illegal alien criminals—they are called criminal aliens—who should never have been able to come into this country in the first place. They have harmed and they have murdered innocent Americans.

So all of these reasons as to why we should move forward with this impeachment, and on top of it you add that Secretary Mayorkas has repeatedly lied to Congress about our border being secure. He likes to say he has done everything to prevent this, but we know he has done everything to allow it and to allow the flow to continue.

Last year, DHS, his Agency, deported less than 5 percent of all migrant encounters at the border. In 2022, only 10 percent of all criminal illegal aliens in the United States were arrested.

While a border wall would do so much to help end the border crisis, Secretary Mayorkas stated:

> From day one, this Administration has made clear that a border wall is not the answer.

His words. From day one, they have made clear that a border wall is not the answer. Well, let me tell you something: Walls work. Throughout history,

walls have worked. The evidence is overwhelming.

Secretary Mayorkas has refused to uphold his constitutional duty of securing the homeland, and the American people are suffering the consequences.

Five years ago, Leader SCHUMER was all too happy to lead a partisan, baseless impeachment trial against President Trump. Yet, today, when faced with a Secretary who is unfit for office, Leader SCHUMER is trying to prevent a Senate trial and dismiss the House's Articles of Impeachment.

(Mr. WYDEN assumed the Chair.)

Never before has the Senate dismissed impeachment charges without holding a trial.

When I talk to Tennesseans, they talk about their frustration with Washington, DC, and their frustration with two tiers of justice. It seems there is a tier for the Democrats and the elites and illegals and another for Republicans and President Trump and people who are conservative.

It is important that Secretary Mayorkas be held to account. For 3 years, he has done President Biden's bidding by opening the border to millions of illegal aliens. If this Chamber upholds its constitutional duty to hold a trial, I will vote to convict Secretary Mayorkas and remove him from office.

While the Biden administration is working to make illegal immigration legal, border States such as Texas are stepping up to do what this administration will not do, and that is to secure the border.

Over recess, I spent time in El Paso, TX, to see firsthand how Governor Abbott and authorities in the Lone Star State are working to keep communities safe. Now, it is a part of the efforts in Texas to deter illegal immigration, and Texas is taking this seriously to make certain that they secure property there along the Rio Grande.

What they have done is to place buoys in the river, shipping containers on the embankment, razor wire behind that, and fences behind that. They did this along the Rio Grande there in El Paso to prevent illegal aliens from coming in through El Paso.

Texas has bolstered its barriers, and what you are seeing now is that the illegal aliens are traveling farther to the west. They are going to New Mexico. They are going to Arizona. They are going to California. Why? Because they are looking for somewhere easier that they can get into the country illegally.

(Mr. WELCH assumed the Chair.)

Bear in mind, the coyotes, they are working hard for all of these groups and for the cartels, and nobody enters without paying a coyote.

Now, when you look at what Texas is doing, taking this into their own hands—and you have got the State, you have got local counties—they are spending billions at the State level and millions in these counties. And as a result, illegal immigration in Texas dropped by 54 percent between December and January. And in the Del Rio Sector, which includes Eagle Pass, illegal entries fell by 76 percent.

This shows you border walls work. The Border Patrol has been telling us for decades: We need a barrier; we need better technology where we cannot have a barrier; and we need more officers and agents. So while the Biden administration pretends otherwise, knowing that walls work should not be a surprise. Border walls from ancient Athens to the Great Wall of China, they protected cities. They protected nations for thousands of years. Border barriers are used on nearly every continent on Earth to protect countries from illegal entry, from drug smuggling, and from terrorism.

But instead of supporting Texas and its successful efforts to deter illegal immigration, this administration and this Secretary of Homeland Security, they think it is a good thing to go sue Texas and try to make them remove their border barriers. While Texas has accomplished a lot in securing their border, protecting families, and saving American lives, President Biden's attack on our border security has placed a tremendous burden on our border States and communities. Indeed, every town has turned into a border town, every State a border State all across this country because of what is happening with the drug trafficking, with human trafficking, with sex trafficking, with crime in communities.

While I was in Eagle Pass, I sat down with some ranchers and farmers who have had their property destroyed, stolen, broken into by illegal aliens crossing into our country from Mexico. In one instance, two migrants broke into a rancher's home while his 16-year-old daughter was studying at home alone.

Texas law enforcement also warned about the ways cartels are using new technology to aid their smuggling operations, including by using Chinese-owned TikTok to recruit Americans into their human trafficking rings. At the same time, cartels are flying drones into the United States to scope out the location of border agents and redirect their smuggling routes.

More than anything else, authorities in Texas told me that they need more border wall construction, better technology, and more agents.

So if Secretary Mayorkas and President Biden refuse to help them, Congress has to step in. That is why I introduced legislation called the CONTAINER Act, which would empower border States such as Texas to place temporary barriers on Federal land to protect their communities.

No State or locality should face lawsuits from the Federal Government for trying to secure our border and to protect the sovereignty of the United States of America.

I also introduced the CLEAR Act, which would reaffirm the authority of State and local governments to enforce Federal immigration laws by apprehending, detaining, and then transferring illegal aliens to Federal custody. Among its important measures, this legislation would require the Department of Homeland Security to provide grants to State and local governments to help them enforce immigration law and construct detention facilities. It would also require DHS to take illegal aliens into custody within 48 hours after receiving a request from a State or locality and provide the Justice Department with essential information about illegal aliens who have overstayed their period of stay in this country.

After my visit to Eagle Pass, I know these pieces of legislation would do so much to support our border security along these border States, and I am hopeful that this President and his Department of Homeland Security will have a change of heart and will move forward with securing our southern border, just as this Chamber should move forward with an impeachment trial on Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

FISA

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise in strong opposition to this FISA bill. And, to begin, there is a central question before the U.S. Senate, and that is: Who should be forced to help their government spy?

The legislation coming from the other body gives the government unchecked authority to order Americans to spy on behalf of their government. This was slipped in, Mr. President, in the last minutes in the House of Representatives' bill, and this is the first time this language has ever been considered here in the U.S. Senate.

Under current law—section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act—the government can order the phone companies and email and internet service providers to hand over communications. This bill expands that existing power dramatically. It says: The government can force cooperation from ''any other service provider who has access to equipment that is being or may be used to transmit or store wire or electronic communications.''

Now, the language I just read to the Senate means that, if you have access to any communications, the government can force you to help it spy. That means anybody with access to a server, a wire, a cable box, a WiFi router, a phone, or a computer.

So think for a moment about the millions of Americans who work in buildings and offices in which communications are stored or passed through. After all, every office building in America has data cables running through it.

These people are not just the engineers who install, maintain, and repair our communications infrastructure. There are countless others who could be forced to help the government spy, including those who clean offices and guard buildings. If this provision is enacted, the government could deputize

any of these people against their will and force them, in effect, to become what amounts to an agent for Big Brother—for example, by forcing an employee to insert a USB thumb drive into a server at an office they clean or guard at night.

This can all happen without any oversight whatsoever. The FISA Court won't know about it. The Congress won't know about it. Americans who are handed these directives will be forbidden from talking about it. Unless they can afford high-priced lawyers with security clearances who know their way around the FISA Court, they will have no recourse at all.

Now, importantly, Mr. President—and you and I have talked about this—supporters of this provision will say that this doesn't change the fact that section 702 only targets foreigners overseas. But if the government thinks that those targets are communicating with people in the United States, they can go right to the source: the WiFi, the phone lines, the servers, the transmitters that store those communications.

If the government has an interest in those foreign targets, well, the Americans whose communications get collected are just plain out of luck.

Supporters of this provision will also say this was necessary because of a FISA Court opinion. I disagree. That opinion didn't gut section 702. This provision is not necessary, and there certainly is no justification for this vast expansion of surveillance authorities.

Supporters also claim that the provision has a narrow purpose and that the government doesn't intend to start tapping into everybody's phone line or WiFi, but that is not how this provision is written. It is not reflected in the actual legislation.

And I would say, respectfully, that anybody who votes to give the government vast powers under the premise that intelligence Agencies won't actually use them is being pretty darn naive.

Supporters also point to a handful of exceptions that were tacked onto this provision, excluding things like hotels and coffee shops. Anybody who reads the text will see that these provisions clearly are not designed to work. Even the coffee shop exception is meaningless because it wouldn't cover a company that maintains the coffee shop's WiFi. And the fact that there are a couple of random exceptions further proves my point.

This provision is going to force a huge range of companies and individuals to spy for their government.

Supporters have even argued that the bill had to be broadly written because what the government actually wants to do is secret. That is some ''Alice in Wonderland'' logic.

First, the American people deserve to know when the government can spy on them and when it can't. If you clearly can't explain to American voters why you need new powers, then you shouldn't have them.

And the distinguished Presiding officer of the Senate from Vermont, he has asked questions about this as well.

Second, it doesn't matter what the government might be secretly intending to do with these authorities at the moment. There is a statutory authority that will be in place for years, during which time the government may very well decide to dramatically expand its surveillance activities.

Now, some of my colleagues say they aren't worried about President Biden abusing these authorities. Well, last time I looked, the law applies to Presidents, regardless of their political power—excuse me—regardless of their position. In that case, how about President Trump? Imagine these authorities in his hands. If you are worried about having a President who lives to target vulnerable Americans, to pit Americans against each other, to find every conceivable way to punish perceived enemies, you ought to find this bill terrifying.

The bill expands 702 authorities in other ways. For example, it includes a dramatic increase in the use of 702 in vetting travelers to the United States. It requires that the Attorney General enable searches on all travelers, tens of millions of people who come to the United States annually. This is a dragnet search of every work colleague, neighbor, and classmate who is here on a visa; every grandparent visiting for a wedding or a funeral.

So what I have done in the last 10 or 12 minutes is point out that these are just some of the ways in which this bill expands warrantless surveillance authorities. On top of all of that, it fails to reform section 702 in any meaningful way.

I will start with the warrantless searches of Americans' communications swept up in section 702 collection. These searches have gone after American protesters, political campaign donors, even people who simply reported crimes to the FBI. The abuses have been extensive and well documented.

Now, supporters of this bill are going to argue: Well, the FBI has taken care of things. They have cleaned up their act.

But even after the FBI made changes to its internal policies, abuses continued, including searches for a U.S. Senator, State senator, and a State judge who had complained to the FBI about police abuses.

But the broader concern is that, without checks and balances, there is nothing preventing a rapid increase of abuses after reauthorization.

Supporters of this bill will say that it codified the FBI's internal changes. But what I would say is: Without real checks and balances written into the law, what good are these changes?

Reformers have put forward extremely modest, commonsense solutions. Warrants would not be required for all U.S. person searches. Reform proposals allow the government to see whether an American is communicating with foreign agents. A warrant is required only when the government wants to read the content of these communications—a situation that arises less than 2 percent of the time. Our provision also allows for emergency searches and has exceptions for imminent threats of death or injury, preexisting law enforcement or FISA warrants, consent, and access to malware in cyber attacks.

This modest reform should be debated and voted on in the Senate.

There are other commonsense reforms to section 702 that also are not in this bill. For example, it doesn't protect Americans against reverse targeting, and it doesn't prohibit the collection of domestic communications.

Finally, the bill should have been an opportunity to pass meaningful protections for Americans' privacy from abusive government subpoenas targeted at the most vulnerable groups in our society, including women, religious and racial minorities, and LGBTQ people.

Mr. President, 15 States have now banned abortion, with more on the way. When States enforce bans on reproductive health access, they will use everything from location data generated by connected cars and the smartphone in the patient's pocket to the Google search that the patient used to find the reproductive health facility or online telemedicine service. All of that can be obtained without a court order.

Congress needs to safeguard Americans' privacy, not give the President new surveillance powers. Congress has the time to draft comprehensive privacy and cybersecurity legislation, including a 702 reauthorization. My own view is that Chairman DURBIN's SAFE Act and my bipartisan, bicameral Government Surveillance Reform Act are both bills that have support across the aisle, across the Capitol, and they are ready for consideration.

I am going to close with this: This Chamber has the time to do the right thing. Senators do not need to rubberstamp a disastrous surveillance bill just because the Senate is, once again, considering it at the last possible moment. Once again—you can set your clock by it—the Senate considers FISA at the last possible moment.

The FISA Court recently renewed the court's annual 702 certifications, which authorize surveillance until April 2025. Let me repeat that. The FISA Court recently renewed the court's annual 702 certifications, which authorize surveillance until April 2025. That means there is no need for Congress to offer up a rush job. But under no circumstances should the U.S. Senate be cowed by those who say Senators have no choice except to sign off on whatever piece of paper the executive branch requests.

Reformers on both sides of the aisle here in the Senate have been ready and willing since last fall to have this debate; yet the status quo crowd wouldn't pick up the phone until the last possible minute to ensure that this body

wouldn't have time for anything but a last-second vote on what I believe is a dangerous bill. The only way this body is going to have a real debate about reforming government surveillance is by rejecting the House bill and standing up for the Senate's independence and Americans' constitutional rights.

As I have said on this floor before—and I think I will do it—throughout my time in public service, Ben Franklin got it right: Americans don't have to sacrifice liberty for security. The reality is, security and liberty aren't to be mutually exclusive. We can have both. The Congress has a duty to deliver a FISA law that does both, and I urge my colleagues to pursue exactly that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The Senator from North Carolina.

TRIBUTE TO DEBRA JARRETT

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I come here today to commemorate the retirement of one of my longest serving staff in my time in the Senate, Debra Jarrett.

She has been my administrative director for the last 9 years. She has worked in the Senate for 29 years. I was looking it up on the internet earlier today. To give you an idea of how long ago 29 years was, that was the year that ladies were getting ''Rachel'' haircuts because ''Friends'' was one of the most popular shows on. Jennifer Aniston was rocking the ''Rachel'' haircut. Boyz II Men was topping the charts. It was a long time ago. Debra really quickly demonstrated that this was probably the right place for her to start her career; and, today, we are looking at her turning another chapter.

My staff put together some comments that I am being loosely advised by. They said it was a bittersweet moment. Well, I personally think it is bitter. I am sure it is sweet for Debra, the person who is going to be retiring. I think it is probably a violation of the rules to point back here where Debra is sitting, so I am not going to do that. But if it wasn't a violation of the rules, I would point there. That is Debra, sitting here behind me on my wing, which she has been several times before.

When you come to the Senate, the amazing thing about coming to the U.S. Senate—I came in 2015—is they say, you know, ''Congratulations.'' They swear you in. They give you an allocation of money to run your operations. North Carolina has got about—almost 11 million people, so that dictates how much money you have to set up a State operation and a DC operation, but that is it. Your personnel practices, who you hire, how you provision computers—basically the whole running of the business operation; there is not some special department there—that is something you have to do. So one thing you learn very quickly is to find a highly competent person to do that, and I was blessed to have the opportunity to bring Debra in.

I said she has been in my office for 9 years, and she has been in the Senate for 29 years. I should start by saying she was born and raised in St. Joe, IN, population 460. Then she started to work for Dan Coats, the Senator from Indiana, as his legislative aide back in 1995. Then, in 1999, she joined Senator Judd Gregg as a special assistant. She was promoted to office administrator a year later, and she worked for Senator Gregg for 12 years. Then, when Senator Gregg retired, New Hampshire adopted her; and Kelly Ayotte, who was also a Senator from New Hampshire, brought her in as the director of administration. She did that for 4 years and then finally came to work for me.

Debra is somebody—and I do mean this. Even as a U.S. Senator, there are some people who scare me, and Debra is one of them because she is so on point for everything that we do whether it is the efficiency of our office or our fiscal conservative policy. We spend just enough, and we do return some of our office proceeds to the Treasury every year. We don't spend all of the money that we are allocated. Debra oversees all of that, but she oversees so much more.

You will hear—and I don't know. This may be common in other offices, but everybody in my State operation, about half my staff—about 30 of the 60 staff that I have working full-time are down in North Carolina—are as likely to have an endearing comment to make about Debra as people who see her every day up here in DC. And I mean everything. I mean, it could be telling staff, including my chief of staff, to understand our retirement system and how you can get the Federal match; getting these young people to think about their futures at such a young age; making sure that they go through open enrollment and get their health plan options renewed. With all the sorts of running of the office, Debra is on top of all of that.

But I think what makes her really interesting or makes it even more interesting is how she is, on any given day, likely to come up to me or my chief of staff or my legislative director and say: You need to check in on—fill in the blanks. You know, this person has just come in. They look like they are trying to get used to working in a Senate office—getting them settled down. She is watching every single aspect of this office and the health and hygiene of all the staff.

She has decided to retire after being vested for—almost 2 years now? You are not supposed to talk to me, but thank you for that—for almost 3 years now.

So 3 years—I got her to break a rule of the Senate floor, which is probably the coolest thing I could have possibly done if you know how rules-oriented Debra is. But she has been working with us, having the option to leave. She has just continued to work, and thank goodness, because we have gotten so much more out of Debra over the last 3 years and, certainly, over the last 9 years that she has been in my office.

I have staff up in the Gallery. I don't think I am supposed to recognize them either, but they are here as a testament to how special and how important she is to our Senate office.

Now, Debra is going to retire, but she is young, and I expect that she is going to go off and do other things. One thing I hope she does, if she decides to go back to Indiana, is to make sure that she is still a part of the TILLIS family.

And I thank you for your service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

MAYORKAS IMPEACHMENT

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, on February 2, 2021, DHS Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas took an oath that all of us in the Chamber have taken, an oath that many of us have taken who have served in the military—an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic. Yet here we are, 3 years later, with the worst border crisis our Nation has ever seen.

I rise today because we find ourselves at a critical moment in our Nation's history—a moment when the integrity of this very Chamber and its leadership is being tested, a time when we will see if our colleagues across the aisle are willing to do the right thing and hold Alejandro Mayorkas accountable for his dereliction of duty that has left our country a shell of what she once was.

Now with over 11 million border crossings, including 2 million unvetted ''got-aways'' now living here on U.S. soil—and amongst those are an unknown number of terrorists, violent gang members and drug cartels—Mayorkas has broken his oath, resulting in this dangerous and deadly invasion of our country. All you have to do is read your hometown news, and you are going to find a person in your community who has died from fentanyl or who has been physically abused or murdered by one of these unvetted illegal aliens.

From the moment Secretary Mayorkas took office, he has skirted the Constitution and broken the law as outlined in the Secure Fence Act of 2006, which clearly states he must maintain ''operational control'' and ''prevent unlawful entries into the United States.''

In the past 3 years alone, we have had nearly 2 million known ''got-aways'' successfully evade capture and enter our country—a number that includes hundreds of violent gang members and terrorists. To put that into perspective, the scale of this issue, today, over 800 ''got-aways'' illegally crossed into this country; yesterday, over 800 unvetted ''got-aways'' escaped into our country; and, tomorrow, 800 more unvetted aliens will end up here on U.S. soil, living in communities around the country. Maybe that is why law enforcement officers recently told me back home that we cannot arrest ourselves out of this crisis; that they are

so overwhelmed by crime now related to these illegal crossings that we cannot arrest ourselves out of this predicament.

Secretary Mayorkas has given free rein to drug cartels to smuggle in illegal aliens and deadly drugs like fentanyl, resulting in the deaths of 300 Americans every day, with a total of over 250,000 fentanyl-related poisoning murders—deaths—occurring under his watch. That is three times more than the number of brave soldiers we lost in the Vietnam war—three times more.

The Secretary has turned a blind eye to the exploitation of our borders by terrorists, Chinese nationals, and other high-risk individuals, causing the largest influx of terrorist border crossings in our Nation's history.

And let us not forget the abuse and weaponization of parole and asylum. Secretary Mayorkas has illegally admitted nearly 800,000 aliens per year—800,000—under this parole compared to just 5,000 per year under President Obama or President Trump—800,000 versus 5,000 a year.

There is no question that the situation at our borders is dire and that the responsibility of this historic crisis lies squarely at the feet of those who have failed to address it.

Instead of fulfilling his obligation to the American people, Secretary Mayorkas has unraveled our national security, unleashed our border into chaos, and launched an unmitigated disaster and culture of lawlessness that has left Lady Liberty vulnerable to exploitation. His actions—or lack thereof—have endangered the safety of every American, and there must be consequences.

Congress must step in and do the job that President Biden refuses to do and fire Secretary Mayorkas. Enough is enough. Americans deserve better.

We are here today because we take our oath seriously. With the House managers delivering the Articles of Impeachment to the Senate Chamber today, I hope our colleagues across the aisle, who also took an oath to protect and defend our great Nation, will do the right thing. Let's bring this to a trial, let's debate his record, and for the sake of America's safety and security, let's impeach Alejandro Mayorkas.

Taking this decisive action will send a clear message to this administration: They will be held accountable for orchestrating this deadly invasion.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, earlier today, we heard a very convincing case laid out by the House managers of why the Senate should fill its constitutional duty and proceed to a trial on the impeachment of Secretary Mayorkas.

If we were to hold that trial—and we should do so—this chart that I have been developing since I became chairman of Homeland Security in 2015 would basically be the irrefutable DNA evidence of the crime.

What I have tried to lay out in this chart is the cause and effect of an ongoing set of illegal immigration crises faced by the last three administrations. What I would like to do briefly here on the Senate floor is to go through that history dating back to 2012 and show the impact of certain actions, certain court decisions, certainly the lack of faithfully executing the law in this administration that has now resulted in an invasion of our country.

Let's go back to 2012. That is where this chart begins. Even before that, I had developed a chart just showing on an annual basis the number of unaccompanied children coming into this country. It averaged for many years somewhere between 2-, 3-, 4,000 a year.

Then, in June of 2012, President Obama issued his what I would consider lawless, unlawful deferred action on childhood arrivals. That is what has sparked all the succeeding illegal immigration crises, is that unlawful order, which, by the way, was a complete misuse of prosecutorial discretion, which is supposed to be meted out or administered on a case-by-case basis. For the first time, President Obama and his administration granted prosecutorial discretion to hundreds of thousands of people, and the world took note.

What happened over the intervening years is that people realized America's law has changed. We have reports. When people come to this country illegally, they would get their notice to appear before an immigration court. Well, that was used by human traffickers down in Central America. They called that their ''permiso''—their permission slip—to come to this country.

A couple of years after that unlawful order—deferred action on childhood arrivals—President Obama faced his border crisis. He actually called it a humanitarian crisis when, in May and June of 2014, they averaged about 2,200 encounters per day—2,200. That seems like the good old days. That is that little bump in comparison to President Biden's crisis at the border.

President Obama actually took action. He started detaining family units with children who came across the border, and it worked. He brought down the number of people crossing into our country illegally because there was a consequence to it.

Unfortunately, in February of 2015, pro-immigration groups—pro-illegal immigration groups—took the Obama administration to court under the Flores settlement, which was basically—back in the 1990s, there was a court case with a young immigrant girl named Flores, and the result of that settlement said that DHS could not hold an unaccompanied child for more than 20 days—again, an unaccompanied child.

The Obama administration interpreted that as, well, we can certainly hold a child when they are detained with their family. Again, these pro-illegal immigration groups took the Obama administration to court, took Secretary Jeh Johnson to court, and they reinterpreted the Flores settlement and said: No, you can't detain a child even if they are accompanied by their parents.

So the Obama administration faced a real decision: Should we detain the parents and release the child into HHS custody? They chose not to do that except in some situations where they felt that wasn't a real family unit and those parents may be a danger to that child. You can see the result of that. Basically, catch-and-release is what that resulted in. You can see the numbers started increasing prior to President Trump taking office.

If you remember, President Trump, during his election, made the open border—that catch-and-release—a huge issue in the campaign. When he got elected, again the world noticed. They felt there was going to be a real crackdown on illegal immigration, and they stopped coming. There was a huge reduction from the end of the Obama administration to when President Trump first took office.

Unfortunately, the law didn't change. That Flores reinterpretation stood. So President Trump was faced with trying to figure out how he could utilize what laws existed, what authority he had, with no help from Congress, to address this situation. He wasn't able to address it immediately. As a result, you can see the increase of not only single adults but family units exploiting that provision, and unaccompanied children, to the point where, in May of 2019, he hit his high point: almost 5,000 people per day.

You will notice that President Trump did something about it. He enacted the migrant protection program. He instituted safe third country agreements with countries in Central America. He had to threaten the President of Mexico with tariffs so the President of Mexico would cooperate with us in securing our border.

Over the next 12 months, President Trump by and large secured the border, to hit a low point in April of 2020, when a little more than 500 people per day were trying to come into this country illegally.

President Trump also had, starting in March of 2020, during the pandemic—remember, all of this reduction in illegal immigration occurred before the pandemic, but once the pandemic was in full swing in March and April of 2020, President Trump used his authority under title 42 and used that health emergency to start deporting people coming into this country illegally.

So you see the purple bar is the people expelled using title 42 authority.

Even though the number of single adults was rising—by the way, the reason it was rising is that during the Presidential debate of 2020, every Democrat Presidential candidate said they were going to end deportations and

offer free healthcare. That is a signal. The world listens to what elected officials or potential elected officials say, and they believe them. They also believe their eyes when, once people start coming in here, they are either detained and expelled or they are not detained.

Anyway, so people started coming into this country again, assuming that President Biden was going to win the election and the border would be opened up. Of course, that is exactly what happened, because once President Biden took office, he used the exact same Executive authority that President Trump used.

Let me just quickly cover that. Even after the Flores reinterpretation, the Supreme Court, in a ruling in 2018, said that existing law—even though it was weakened by that reinterpreted Flores decision or settlement—that the current law exudes deference to the executive branch. President Trump used that deference. President Trump used that Executive authority and pretty well closed the border.

President Biden came into office and, with literally hundreds of Executive actions, completely reversed President Trump's successful border security measures using that exact same Presidential authority, all that deference.

The point that is important to understand is that President Biden wanted an open border. He caused this crisis. He could end it if he wanted to. He still has the authority. Republicans in the Senate would be happy to strengthen that authority, to overturn this Flores reinterpretation.

By the way, Secretary Jeh Johnson opposed that reinterpretation. He didn't like that Court decision.

We would have been happy to strengthen President Biden's authority, but he doesn't really need us to to secure the border. That is the point.

Again, here is the DNA, the irrefutable DNA evidence of the crime. This didn't have to happen. President Biden didn't have to reverse President Trump's successful border security Executive orders, but he reversed them, and he opened up the border. The result now is that probably more than 6 million people have come into this country illegally and stayed. That is a number greater than the population of 31 States. That is the order of magnitude of the problem.

The impact of this open border policy is devastating. It is a catastrophe. Not only does this open border policy facilitate the multibillion-dollar business model of some of the most evil people on the planet—the human traffickers, the sex traffickers, the drug traffickers—how many hundreds of thousands of Americans have died of fentanyl overdoses?

President Biden and Secretary Mayorkas said that they are reversing all of Trump's border security provisions because they said it was inhumane. There is nothing humane about facilitating human and sex and drug trafficking.

Of course, the migrants come into this country—it is true, Venezuela is emptying their jails, their mental institutions. There are some bad people, there are some criminals coming into this country. Of course, we see evidence with these migrant crimes, horrific crimes—people who no longer are alive because of President Biden's open border policy, because of Secretary Mayorkas executing President Biden's open border policy.

I am not a lawyer, and I am not a prosecutor, but I believe it is a crime to aid and abet other crimes, so from my standpoint, I think the House managers ought to be allowed to make their case. Again, they laid out very compelling—very compelling—Articles of Impeachment today. It is a pretty simple case. It probably won't take that long for them to make their case, to present it for the Senate. Why won't Majority Leader SCHUMER allow the House managers to make their case? Why won't he allow the Senate to fulfill its constitutional duty to try impeachments?

Listen, impeachments are not that regular. The least we can do is fulfill that constitutional duty and listen to the evidence and allow the House managers to make their case. I think their case is overwhelmingly convincing.

The repercussions of President Biden and Secretary Mayorkas's open border policy will be felt by Americans for years, if not decades, to come.

About the only thing Congress can do when a President or a member of the executive branch is not faithfully executing the laws, when they are completely derelict in their duty, when their dereliction of duty or the lack of faithfully executing the law is resulting in the deaths of Americans—again, the open border policy is resulting in the deaths of American citizens. It is resulting in young women being forced into the sex trafficking trade. It is resulting in higher levels of fentanyl overdoses. That evidence needs to be heard. That case needs to be made. The Senate should hold a trial.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

ISRAEL

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I will get to the issue of Secretary Mayorkas's impeachment in a moment, but I would first like to speak to Iran's attack on Israel this weekend.

We all saw what happened on Saturday evening. Israel is once again under attack—this time, under direct attack from Iran—and the United States must clearly and strongly stand with our great ally and fully support its right and obligation to defend itself by any means necessary.

I was just in Israel, a few weeks ago, to meet with Prime Minister Netanyahu and see the terror and devastation that Iran-backed Hamas terrorists unleashed on the Jewish State on October 7, firsthand. More than 1,200 were murdered, and hundreds are still being held hostage by Hamas just for being Jewish. Americans are among the hostages and those murdered that day.

The horrors of that attack are difficult to describe and can never ever happen again. Today, I continue to pray for the safety of the Israeli people and call on every Republican and every Democrat to stand unequivocally with Israel as it fights for its very existence against evil terrorism.

Again and again, Democrats have blocked the passage of aid for Israel. Democrats have blocked Israel aid four times in the U.S. Senate.

The House has passed a good bill that is ready for Senate passage right now. I urge Majority Leader CHUCK SCHUMER to immediately put the House-passed Israel aid bill on the floor, as well as my Stop Taxpayer Funding of Hamas Act, tonight. Nothing before the Senate is more important, and I will do everything in my power to make sure that vote happens as soon as possible.

Let us all remember who the enemy is here and has always been: the evil and terror-supporting regime in Iran.

Since its first days, the Biden administration has emboldened Iran with appeasement, freeing billions upon billions of dollars to fuel Iran's support of terrorism and turning its back on Israel.

Israel is the only democracy in the Middle East and one of America's strongest allies, but it took President Biden months to meet or speak with Prime Minister Netanyahu after he took office. And, unfortunately, the world took notice.

Since October 7, President Biden and Democrats in Washington have continued to undermine Israel's fight against Iran-backed Hamas terrorists, further isolating our ally in its greatest time of need.

And here is where what has happened in Israel ties into the impeachment of Secretary Mayorkas that we are dealing with here at home this week.

MAYORKAS IMPEACHMENT

America and the freedom-loving nations of the world are less safe and secure because of President Biden's weakness and appeasement of evil regimes and the terror each support. That is a fact that the FBI Director confirmed when I questioned him in the Homeland Security Committee, last year.

And the terrifying truth is that, while President Biden's weakness has emboldened our enemies, Secretary Mayorkas has shown that he will do absolutely nothing to stop evil people from invading our country through our southern border and launching attacks on the U.S. homeland.

This isn't some hypothetical nightmare. The possibility of an attack by terrorists on U.S. soil is something that the FBI and U.S. intelligence community are terrified about.

The threats are all up. We know terrorists are coming into America because of the wide-open southern border.

That is a fact. America is a more dangerous place because Mayorkas and Biden have allowed criminals, drugs, terrorists, and other dangerous people into our communities.

There are real consequences to this failure to secure the border, and each victim has a name. Real Americans with families are being killed. Real American families are being torn apart by vicious crimes and deadly drugs because we have a wide-open border. Innocent Americans like Laken Riley are paying the ultimate price for Mayorkas's failures.

Ten million people have illegally crossed, and 6 million have been allowed to stay and had the red carpet rolled out for them, courtesy of the American taxpayers. There have been sexual assaults and murders committed by illegal aliens all across this country—even in my home State of Florida, where a young man was recently killed. The man charged with his death is an illegal alien.

Now, because of these failures, the Republican majority in the House has voted to impeach Mayorkas for violating his oath of office. They took their time. They got the evidence. They made the decision to impeach. Whether anyone in this Chamber believes it was right or wrong, that happened, and we should now hold a trial to let Mayorkas make his case. That is our constitutional duty.

But unlike what happened in 2019, when Democrats alone voted to impeach the President and Republicans controlled the Senate, Majority Leader CHUCK SCHUMER is going to deny Secretary Mayorkas the ability to defend himself in a trial. He will not have the ability to defend himself in a trial.

It seems to me that the majority leader doesn't want to let Mayorkas defend himself in a trial for one of two reasons. The majority leader is either acting out of pure political interests to protect his incumbent Members who don't want to talk about Mayorkas's record and the wide-open border he has created and all the crime, drugs, and illegal immigration it is allowing; or the majority leader is just terrified of a trial exposing Mayorkas's failure to a degree that acquittal would be extremely painful for the Democrats to explain to the American people.

Here is what I don't understand. Democrats voted against a bill to stop illegal aliens from getting on a commercial flight with no verifiable ID. You have to; they don't. Democrats voted against deporting illegal aliens who hurt police. And Democrats voted against the Laken Riley Act, which simply requires ICE to take illegal aliens who commit crimes into custody before tragedies strike.

So it seems to me that Democrats have no problem voting to keep this border crisis going and blocking every attempt the Republicans make to stop the crime and secure the border. But when it comes to Secretary Mayorkas, they shut everything down and don't let him speak.

Secretary Mayorkas is a former prosecutor. Surely, he knows how to handle himself and defend his actions. He must believe that he has a case to present to the American people on why he should not be found guilty, but he is not going to get that chance. And Senate Democrats are setting a dangerous precedent and destroying the rules and traditions of the Senate to keep Mayorkas silent.

I have one question: Is Mayorkas being silenced because Democrats are terrified of his record and unable to defend him or because they don't trust him? Whatever the answer might be, I urge my Democratic colleagues to get over the discomfort that it is causing them and do what is right for the safety of American families.

The events of this weekend have shown, once again, that the world is a much more dangerous place under President Biden's failed leadership. If Democrats put politics over the safety of American families and the security of our great Nation, I fear the consequences will be devastating beyond our worst fears.

I want everybody to stop for one moment—just stop and think about their families; think about their mom or their dad or their sister or brother or their wife; think about their children or their grandchildren or their nieces and nephews. Since Biden took office, people like that, just like your family that you love and cherish—people like that—here is what has happened to them: Some have died in drug overdoses. Some have been raped. Some have been murdered. Some have been sold into slavery, basically.

It is devastating. I don't know how anybody could sit there and not care about people just like their mom, their dad, their brother, their sister, their spouse, their children, their grandchildren, or their nieces and nephews. But that is exactly what is going on here when we do not have the opportunity to hold Mayorkas accountable.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, the House managers have officially delivered the letters of impeachment for Department of Homeland Security Secretary Mayorkas to the Senate. Now is the time for every Senator to go on record.

Do you think Mayorkas has done a good job at the border? Has Mayorkas fulfilled the oath he swore before this body to protect and to defend our country against all threats, foreign and domestic? Is our border secure?

The answer is simple. Mayorkas has intentionally failed to do his job.

Now, Senator SCHUMER and the globalist Democrats have the opportunity to conduct a full and a fair trial before the entire Senate and the public. Unfortunately, that is not how this is going to play out. Democrats are going to try to table the Articles of Impeachment, which has never been done in the history of the Senate. They are going to attempt to sweep the border crisis that President Biden has created under the rug.

Every single House Democrat voted to save Mayorkas's job. They endorsed our wide-open borders that have allowed terrorists, drug traffickers, and murderers into our country. The Democrats are lying to themselves and risking the lives of every American. Senator SCHUMER and the Democrats can't say they want to fix our border while voting to save Mayorkas's job.

Mayorkas has been derelict in his duty to secure the border in the 3 years he has been on the job. Our border is the least secure it has ever been. In fact, it is almost nonexistent. Our Border Patrol agents are so overwhelmed and receive such little support from the Biden administration to enforce our laws that they have been forced to release millions of illegal immigrants into the United States. And those who are released on parole, they are even given work permits.

The Biden administration is more concerned with taking care of illegal aliens than they are about protecting American citizens. We might as well start mailing every criminal, drug trafficker, and terrorist an open invitation to cross our borders.

I have spoken numerous times on this floor to highlight stories of Americans who have died at the hands of illegal aliens. Their tragic deaths are a direct result of Secretary Mayorkas's inaction. Mayorkas and Joe Biden have blood on their hands.

The most important responsibility of any sovereign nation is the safety of its citizens. Yet what did the Department of Homeland Security announce just last week? They plan on sending another $300 million to communities receiving illegal aliens from this border crisis.

The top priority of this administration is to let as many people in as quickly as possible, regardless of how many American lives are lost in the process.

The number of people crossing into the United States who are on the Terrorist Watchlist is unprecedented. Just last week, it was reported that an Afghan on the FBI Terror Watchlist has been in the United States for almost a year. He is a member of a U.S.-designated terrorist group responsible for the deaths of at least nine American soldiers and civilians in Afghanistan. ICE arrested him in San Antonio just this past February. Unfortunately, this known terrorist has been released on bond. He is now roaming our neighborhoods.

You know, it just isn't terrorists we have to worry about. Fentanyl is flowing freely across our borders, and it is killing hundreds of thousands of Americans—not thousands but hundreds of thousands. Law enforcement officers in my State of Alabama tell me, time and again, how their officers must wear heavy equipment and carry Narcan

spray to protect themselves from the fentanyl that is pouring into our communities. And, by the way, most will tell you they never heard of fentanyl until this administration came into power.

Despite the critical need to secure our borders and discourage illegal immigration, Mayorkas has been traveling the world—yes, this Mayorkas, traveling the world—lecturing other countries about their national security, while his refusal to enforce U.S. laws has exposed his own country to an invasion. It is embarrassing.

In February, he traveled to Austria to speak with Chinese officials about counter-narcotic efforts. Did he discuss with them the flood of Chinese illegal immigrants coming to the United States through the southwest border? Since October of last year, 22,000 Chinese nationals have been arrested by Border Patrol agents at the southwest border and released into our country. Most of these individuals are single adult males of military age.

Yet, the media tries to act like all these people crossing the border are innocent women and children. Now, some of them are, but most are not.

This invasion is more than a border crisis; it is a national crisis. Yet I seriously doubt Mayorkas even brought up that point in his meeting with the Chinese officials.

In February, he was in Germany for the Munich Security Conference. The Munich Security Conference is the largest international security meeting in the world. Mayorkas was there giving speeches on strengthening global security and partnerships. Meanwhile, the border he is responsible for is wide open, and thousands of people are dying. Give me a break. Our allies must be laughing at us—absolutely laughing.

The Secretary's priority should be here in our country, securing our borders, protecting our citizens. President Biden has made the United States a joke around the world.

Under this administration, nearly 10 million people have invaded our country. Every State is now a border State—every State. This is not a gray area.

Secretary Mayorkas has intentionally failed to do his job. He has personally lied to me to my face three times in the last 3 years—a U.S. Senator. Just tell me the truth. He can't say the truth. He can't tell you the truth.

To my Democratic colleagues, have you read the heartbreaking stories of innocent Americans who have been murdered by illegal aliens? Are you concerned? Are you concerned about the safety of your spouses, your kids, your nieces and nephews? Does it worry you that hundreds of terrorists are flooding our country? Does that bother you at all? Do you know somebody who has died of fentanyl which was trafficked into our country by cartels?

This isn't about politics, folks. Our national security and our country's future are at stake. Americans deserve to know the truth about how Secretary Mayorkas has intentionally failed to secure the border.

I will be voting to hold Mayorkas accountable.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, we have a job to do. That job is not optional. It is assigned to us by the United States Constitution—a document to which we have all sworn an oath under article I, section 3, clause 6. The Senate has the power and, I would add here, the duty to try all impeachments—not just some impeachments, not just those impeachments with which the majority party feels really happy about looking into, but all impeachments. It is the way it has always been in U.S. history.

When the House sends over Articles of Impeachment, if we have jurisdiction, which we clearly, plainly do here, it is our job to conduct a trial. What do I mean by that? Well, it is really a simple concept. In Articles of Impeachment, an accusation is made. Our job is to just decide whether that accusation is meritorious or not, whether the thing that has been accused is legitimate, whether the person who has been accused did the thing that was wrong—committed the high crime or misdemeanors spoken of in the Constitution.

We have a job to do, and it is a job that the Senate has always done when we have jurisdiction following the adoption of Articles of Impeachment.

Now, let's remember, this is a historic day. This hasn't happened very often. It is only the 22nd time in American history in which Articles of Impeachment have been adopted by the House. In this circumstance where we clearly, plainly have jurisdiction, there is no valid basis for us to do anything other than to decide whether the accusations are legitimate. We have to do that. We don't have the luxury of simply standing back and saying: Ah, we don't want to handle it.

Now, I know, I know, the Senate has found ways of shirking its responsibility over and over and over again in all of the operations of the Senate's work. Sometimes—most of the time, we sit as a legislative body, where we consider legislation. We pass law or decline to do so. Other times, we sit in an executive capacity, where we review Presidential nominations to consider them, whether we should confirm them, and also consider treaties. That is in an executive capacity. We also sometimes sit as a Court of Impeachment.

Now, in other areas, the Senate has found ways of shirking its responsibilities. We have handed off a whole lot of the lawmaking power to unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats in the executive branch. In our executive capacity, we have whittled down the number of executive branch nominees who are subject to Senate confirmation, even as the total volume of those individuals has increased. Now it seems we are determined yet again to whittle down our responsibilities in the one area where we have an affirmative duty, an affirmative obligation, an affirmative command within the Constitution requiring us to make a decision.

In the immortal words of Rush, in one of my favorite Rush songs of all time, called ''Freewill,'' if you choose not to decide, you still have made a choice. Yet that is what Senate Democrats are planning to ask us to do within 24 hours—ask us to not decide, ask us to take these accusations in these Articles of Impeachment duly passed by a majority of the House of Representatives, the body in the Congress that has the sole power to impeach—it is not just 218-plus random people who decided to make the accusations against Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas, who heads the U.S. Department of Homeland Security. No. It is those particular 218-plus people in the House of Representatives who have that power.

You see, there is a reason why the impeachment power belongs exclusively to the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives is within the legislative branch—the branch of the Federal Government most accountable to the people at the most regular intervals. Within the Congress, within the legislative branch, they are the body most accountable to the people at the most regular intervals. That is why they call it the People's House. They are the only ones entrusted with this power.

A majority of them, of that 435–Member body, has concluded that Alejandro Mayorkas must be impeached. Now, they didn't do it for light and transient reasons. They didn't do it because of a policy disagreement. No. A majority of the House of Representatives has chosen to impeach Secretary Mayorkas for the reason that he has affirmatively defied the commands of Federal law—the laws in particular that he is charged with administering.

They have identified at least seven or eight different provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, including section 235(b)(2)(A) and 235(b)(1)(B)(ii) and 236(c) and 236(a) and 212(d)(5)(A), just to mention a few of them.

These Articles of Impeachment outline a myriad of instances in which Secretary Mayorkas has been commanded decisively, unambiguously to detain illegal immigrants pending one action or another, pending one determination or another as to their eligibility either for immigration parole or for asylum or for something else. He is required to detain them, and he didn't detain them.

These are just a few examples of the many things that he has done in direct contravention to a direct command by the law. And it is not just that he didn't do the things that he was commanded to do; it is that he did the exact opposite of those things. He was commanded, for example, not to exercise his immigration parole authority

under 212(d)(5)(A). He is not allowed to do that categorically. He is allowed to do that only for discrete, individualized, particularized circumstances in which there is a profound, pronounced humanitarian or public need. Yet he issued all these categorical parole orders, creating categorical immigration parole programs allowing for literally hundreds of thousands of people a year to be brought into this country lawlessly, without documentation, without just cause to be brought into the United States. He made illegal immigrants legal by violating the affirmative command of the law.

It is not yet clear exactly what form the arguments presented by the Democrats tomorrow will take, but we do know this: Whether they call it a motion to dismiss or a motion to table, they want to not decide something that has to be decided, by order of the Constitution, by the Senate.

These accusations are real. They make a difference. They make a difference to the American people. These crimes—or I should say high crimes and misdemeanors—of which Secretary Mayorkas has been accused are not victimless crimes—far from it. These are offenses that have resulted in millions—on the low end, it is maybe 7 or 8 million; on the high end, it is more like 12, 13, or 14 million—of people who have come into this country unlawfully since January 20, 2021. The administration of Joe Biden has willfully, intentionally brought people into this country who aren't supposed to be here, who aren't allowed to be here. And it is not just the addition of those sheer numbers of people; it is the fact that among those people are many thousands of military-age Chinese males, many millions of military-age males from other countries, including hundreds of suspected terrorists, including thousands who come from countries that we pay close attention to because we know those countries are full of a lot of people who are bent on acts of lawlessness, violence, and terrorism against the United States of America.

This, of course, is just the beginning. This says nothing about the countless neighborhoods and schools and communities and jobs and lives that have been lost or violated or rendered unsafe or all of the above as a result of those who have been brought in not just with the acquiescence of but at the invitation of and with the assistance of the Secretary of Homeland Security, the very man whose job it is to protect us from those very things and who has very specific orders that he follows—orders that have been put into law by the Congress of the United States.

He is breaking the law over and over and over again specifically to allow for illegal immigration. So the Democrats are expected to come along tomorrow and say: Yeah, but we don't want to have to decide this. We don't want to have to decide it because, well, it is an election year, President Biden is on the ballot, and this is already an area where he is not doing well. And we have other Members of this body, including, you know, a certain Senator from Montana, for example, or maybe a certain Senator from Ohio, for example, or a Senator from Pennsylvania, among others, who are going to be up for reelection.

Sure, they would rather not have to address this. I understand why they would rather be doing something else, anything else, other than this. They would rather reorganize their sock drawer. Some of them would probably much rather have a root canal or another painful procedure without anesthesia than focus on this. But, alas, the Constitution is agnostic as to your sock-reorganization days. The Constitution doesn't care how often you go to the dentist and whether you get a root canal with or without anesthesia. But, you know, the Constitution does care about one thing in particular and very relevant here today, and that is that the Senate is to try all impeachments.

This is an impeachment. We have to try it, particularly in the absence of the case being rendered moot by a vacancy in office or death or otherwise—circumstances that are noticeably absent here. We have the duty to do this.

What happens when we don't? What happens if they get their way and they choose either to table or to dismiss or use some other fancy word to try to avoid doing their job? What happens? Well, more deaths occur—deaths like the tragic passing of Laken Riley, who was taken from us just a few weeks ago as a result of Secretary Mayorkas's lawless conduct along the border. But for his lawless conduct and his cavalier treatment of the law—in fact, his defiant refusal to abide by the law and, in fact, his dogged determination to break the law—Laken Riley would have still been alive. Countless others who have undergone horrific events within their families—murders, rapes, sexual assaults, robberies, drunk driving—all kinds of horrific trauma that the American people have endured. Some of that is going to happen from people who live here already. We shouldn't add to that by bringing in others who shouldn't be here to begin with. This is exactly the kind of thing that our immigration laws are designed to protect against.

As one who spent 2 years living and working along our southern border—living and working among and with the poorest of the poor, including many immigrants themselves, recent immigrants, in many cases—I can tell you, there is no group of people who has more cause to fear uncontrolled waves of illegal immigration than recent immigrants themselves, including, and especially, the poor who live on or near a border. It is their jobs, it is their families, it is their schools, it is their neighborhoods, it is their homes that are most directly put in jeopardy every single time we fail or, in the case of Secretary Mayorkas, we adamantly refuse to obey and enforce the law and we do everything that we can to undermine it as he has done.

There is no set of arguments I can imagine—I look forward to hearing what arguments might be had tomorrow, might be presented tomorrow—that could be presented with any kind of a straight face that could say we need not address the merits of this accusation—because there are none.

Perhaps, they will argue that this is an accusation amounting to mere maladministration—he didn't do a good job. That is not at all what we have here. Even if that is what we have here, that still wouldn't mean that they didn't have to try the case and come up with an answer as to whether or not he did what they said he did.

But the impeachment power goes back some, you know, two and a half centuries to the dawn of the Republic. Nearly two and a half centuries ago, when we became a country, we relied heavily on the legal systems—a tradition, in some cases—of the terminology used in England. And during the early years of the Republic, we had individuals who were familiar with our Constitution who were also familiar, having practiced in the law at the time of the Revolution and some cases before then—they knew the meaning of these words.

Supreme Court Justice Joseph Story is one of those individuals who lived, practiced, and wrote at and after the time of the American Revolution, during the early decades of our young Republic. And he explained that, among other things, an impeachment could be found, high crime and misdemeanor could be committed where, for instance, a lord admiral who was found to have neglected the safeguard of the sea. It is, perhaps, the most directly analogous comparison he makes to the Secretary of Homeland Security, that would be, you know, best described perhaps as a dereliction of duty, a failure to do one's job. If that—a lord admiral neglecting the safeguard of the sea—if that was a high crime and misdemeanor, it follows for sure—it is even more certain—that the Secretary of Homeland Security, having defied more than a half dozen direct commands of Federal law and done the exact opposite of those things, has also committed a high crime and misdemeanor.

Now, maybe some in this body disagree. Maybe some in this body believe that the facts are different than they have been alleged here. Well, that is what a trial is for. That is why we don't just take the word of the House of Representatives for it. We do our job over here. We have to review the accusation, and we have to review it against the backdrop of what arguments and evidence they present to us.

We will be sworn in tomorrow at 1 p.m. to be finders of fact and to be judges of law relevant to the impeachment accusation. If we decide not to decide, we still have made a choice. We

shouldn't do that here. Doing that here would be a dereliction of duty. Doing that here would be profoundly disrespectful to the hundreds of millions of Americans who elected us and, especially, to the families of those—like the family of Laken Riley and countless others—whose lives have been permanently and tragically disrupted by the lawlessness exhibited by Secretary Mayorkas.

We must do our job. We must hold a trial. That trial must culminate in a finding of guilt or innocence. The Constitution and our commitment to it requires nothing less.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). The Senator from Ohio.

TRIBUTE TO D. TAYLOR

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise early this evening to recognize D. Taylor, a fierce labor advocate, a key partner in our fight for workers in this country, a friend who retired from his role as President of UNITE HERE earlier this month. Everything D. has done—and I have watched him closely; I have worked closely with him. Everything D. has done over the course of his career comes back to the dignity of work, the idea that hard work should pay off for everyone, whether you punch a clock, whether you swipe a badge, whether you work in an office, whether you work for tips, whether you are raising children, or whether you are caring for an aging parent.

The dignity of work has guided D. Taylor through his whole career as he fought to unionize industries that have long been overlooked with workers who have long been underpaid and ignored.

For the past 12 years, D. served as President of UNITE HERE, a union that represents workers across the hospitality industry. Its members work in airports, in food service, in hotels. They make textiles; they serve on Amtrak trains; they cross the Nation.

It is not a coincidence we have seen momentum in the labor movement while D. has been at the helm of UNITE HERE. So often, where we have seen unprecedented union growth, D. and his members have been on the frontlines organizing, invigorating, calling for change. This generation—this youngest generation now—is quantifiably, certainly, the most pro-labor generation of our lifetimes.

Under D., UNITE HERE has become one of the fastest growing trade unions in the country. Despite a pandemic that devastated workers in hospitality, D. has actually expanded UNITE HERE. He focused on southern States and right-to-work States—much harder States to organize than the Presiding Officer's State of Maine or mine in Ohio—not that it is easy in those States with Federal law but even harder in those southern States.

Workers, traditionally, haven't had a seat at the table. During his time as president, D. oversaw the union's organizing of 140,000 service and hospitality workers in over 1,000 workplaces across the country. Because of D. and UNITE HERE, these workers now have a union card. That means higher pay; it means better benefits; it means safer workplaces; and it means something that many don't think about: It means more control over your schedule.

I remember being in Nevada at the Culinary Workers Union Local 226, which D. built into a powerhouse. That union is an inspiration for workers everywhere. They had a massive banner on the wall that said ''One job should be enough''; that workers should not have to have two and three jobs to support their families.

''One job should be enough.''

I remember—this wasn't directly about D., but I will never forget this discussion I had in Cincinnati. I was at an AFL–CIO dinner. There were a number of people—probably 300 people there. And there was one table where there were four or five middle-aged women. I sat down—they had an empty seat and said: Join us. And I sat down at the table and said: Tell me your story.

They said: We just organized custodial workers. We had our first contract—1,200 custodial workers negotiating with the downtown business owners in Cincinnati. They said: We signed our first contract.

I said: What does that mean to you?

A woman said: I am 51 years old. It is the first time I have a paid one-week vacation.

Those are the workers so often that D. Taylor organizes—workers who are generally low-paid, workers sometimes without healthcare, workers often without vacations, workers that have no say over their schedule. Those are the people that D. worked with. D. always said: One job should be enough. That is what he fought for.

He first got involved as a college student while working in a local restaurant. He joined the union. He eventually became the shop steward for that local. After graduation, he moved to Nevada to work on a UNITE HERE strike. He quietly moved up through the ranks, eventually leading the union in a 7-year—the famous 7-year Frontier Casino strike, one of the longest successful strikes in labor history. D. became a key player in negotiations with some of the largest casinos on the strip.

He became an institution at UNITE HERE. As a head of the Culinary Union, he built a coalition of service workers. He showed the country there is no reason a service job can't be a good job where you are respected, make good wages, and build a career.

As Gaming Division Director, he led casino workers across the country to victory, organizing new members and leading new strikes. He went on to be the general vice president of UNITE HERE before being elected as union president.

All along the way, he became known for that constant refrain: ''One job should be enough.'' Let me say that one more time: One job should be enough. For everybody in this institution, that is kind of the way it is. But for far too many low-paid workers, they have to work a second job or third job to pay the rent, to support their kids, to just get along every day.

He has fought to make that rally cry a reality by transforming standards for work in hospitality and services. It has meant securing higher pay. It has meant fighting for contracts with affordable, quality healthcare that workers have access to and can navigate their way through. It has meant standing up to layoffs. It has meant helping tens of thousands of workers get their jobs. Because of D., workers across the country are in better jobs with better pay and better benefits.

I have had the privilege of working with D. on many issues, including fighting for the Senate's dining workers. Believe it or not, the people who served us in this institution were making very suboptimal wages—some, barely enough. One man I met when I was involved in this actually lived and worked here all day and lived and worked at a homeless shelter all night. Imagine that.

One job should be enough.

They served the Senate during a pandemic, during a violent insurrection. Every day, they fed Senators and staff and tourists from Ohio and Maine and all over the country. Yet fewer than one in five of them, at that time, could afford the health insurance plan that was offered to them.

Together, we fought to make sure the new contract honors the dignity of work with the pay and the benefits and the respect that Senate dining workers deserve and have earned—that all workers deserve and have earned. It wouldn't have happened without D., without UNITE HERE, without the Senate dining workers who used their voices and their collective power to secure a better contract. That is just one example.

In every role, at every opportunity, D. has fought to turn jobs that traditionally have come with low pay and minimal benefits into careers where people can build a life and see a future—simply the dignity of work, where their work has dignity. For that, we are grateful for D.'s tenacity, for his advocacy. And for his leadership, we are grateful.

In retirement, D., of course, will keep fighting for workers as chair of UNITE HERE Health, and he will support the union and gaming industry. He will never fully retire.

I look forward to working with his successor, Gwen Mills, the current secretary treasurer of UNITE HERE, the first-ever woman president in this union's history to be elected to an international union; the first-ever woman in this union's history to ever be elected international union president in a union that has a huge number of women, as you know.

If you love this country, you fight for the people who make it work. That is

exactly what D. has done his whole life. It is what UNITE HERE has done. It is what I will continue to work with my colleagues to do in this body.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

ISRAEL

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, it has been just 6 months and a week since October 7. The whole world was shaken as a flood, as they actually called it, an Al-Aqsa flood of Hamas terrorists came through the wall separating Gaza and Israel in multiple places, and over the next several hours, they murdered 1,200 Israelis. They took 253 hostage, including 133 who are still hostage still today—6 months and a week.

Last week—now, I guess, 9 days ago—I was in Israel. I spent time with Israelis to meet with multiple different leaders and get a chance just to be able to talk to different folks in different parts of the country to see what is going on, on the ground.

This is a painful moment for the entire world but definitely a painful moment for Israel and for the entire region. We think back just 7 months ago and all the conversation was normalization between Saudi Arabia and Israel. And then a group of Hamas terrorists stepped in and killed as many people as they possibly could in an effort to also kill that normalization that is happening around the entire region, to do whatever they could to be able to drive a wedge, and so that peace could not continue to advance in the region.

What has happened since then has been painful for the entire world to watch, but it has been really painful for the people in that region more than anyone else.

I traveled to the far southern tip of Israel, along the border with Egypt, to be able to meet with some of the folks who are in that area, to be able to talk about the relationship between Egypt and Israel and what is happening day to day. I traveled to the kibbutzes that literally are right on the border with Gaza that are now vacant and empty and devastated.

I can't even begin to explain to this body, unless you have seen it before, the pain of walking through a large kibbutz where there were hundreds of people who lived just a few months ago and now to see every building shot up with bullet holes, burned, destroyed, and think at 6:38 that morning, during a Jewish holiday, on that Saturday morning, October 7, many people were still asleep when a group of Hamas terrorists came into their homes and murdered many in that village and took many hostages from that kibbutz.

We could literally walk by the doors, and the person who was walking with us could say: That family died, that family is a hostage, that family died, and go door-to-door as we walked around to be able to see it.

The person who was walking us through could even walk us through his own home, which was obliterated, and his son's home right there who died, and then he could point to Gaza and say: My other son is over there in Gaza right now.

At the same time, flowers were blooming and the grounds were beautiful and you realize the irony of this moment. Hostages being held in Gaza, families who are struggling every single day trying to make sense of this craziness and trying to figure out why a peaceful kibbutz, living their lives, farming, manufacturing, was overrun by a group of terrorists.

Right up the road we stopped by the Nova festival site, which is an absolutely beautiful location for outdoor concerts, for venues, for gathering, and has been for years. The trees and the setting, it is just beautiful. But the day that we were there, there were echoing noises of artillery that was being fired off literally within hundreds of yards of us as we were meeting with some of the folks who survived the Nova festival.

One person in particular whom we got a chance to be able to chat with and to be able to pick her brain about the ''what happens next'' was in one of the bomb shelters because there was a launch of missiles coming at them, but then those bomb shelters became places where literally they were sitting ducks for the terrorists as they came in with gunfire.

We traveled all the way to the north, had the opportunity to be able to visit with some of the mayors who are right along the border with Syria and with Lebanon, where whole towns are evacuated, whole towns where people can't survive the onslaught of artillery coming at them constantly.

We lose track of the fact that there are about a quarter million Israelis right now who are internally displaced as well, who live along the border with Gaza or live along the border with Lebanon or Syria. Those folks have also had to flee because while the world in the last several days has talked about 330 drone strikes, missile strikes, ballistics and cruise missiles that have come from Iran directly, for some reason, the world has lost track of the fact, not about the 330 bombs and missiles that have come at Israel in the last week, but the 12,000 rockets that have been fired at Israel since October 7—12,000.

Mr. President, 9,100 of those rockets have come in from Gaza launching at civilians in Israel; 3,100 of those rockets have been launched from Lebanon, from Hezbollah, into the north of Israel; and 35 rockets have been fired from Syria at Israel.

And I asked people: How many rockets would be fired at your house before you would respond in a way to be able to make it stop? Israel has had 12,000 fired at them since October 7. The United States has never ever put up with that without responding in a forceful way to say we are going to make it stop.

There has been a lot of conversation about Rafah, so I had a lot of conversations with Israeli leadership to be able to talk to them about the plan and what they are going to do.

You see there are Hamas brigades. Now, when we think about terrorism, often it is just random terrorists who are gathering. But Hamas actually has a military structure with brigades that they have actually put together of fighting brigades. Most of those brigades have been broken up. The remaining brigades of Hamas terrorists are all living underground at Rafah.

And while we need to do everything we can—and I had great conversations with Israelis about everything that they are doing to protect civilians and protect civilian lives that have nothing to do with this onslaught of terrorism, they are also keenly aware that the people who are living underground in Rafah are making public statements on social media that as soon as this war is over, they are coming again to do another October 7. And the Israelis are being very, very clear: We are not going to allow that to happen. We are not going to allow our Israeli citizens to be slaughtered in their beds early on a Saturday morning again.

So they are doing everything they can to be able to prepare for that moment, to be able to stop the group of terrorists who are living underground. It is interesting to me when I think about the Hamas terrorist organization. In the United States, our military trains and prepares itself to get between violence and civilians. Hamas does the opposite. Hamas actually trains and equips to put civilians between its military and violence.

They put the civilians on the top layer while the safe shelters underground are occupied by the terrorist armies. It is stunning to me just the mental difference between the two and how jarring that that really is.

Interesting conversations I had with some of the Israeli leadership, as well, just to be able to chat with them, to say: You can't eliminate Hamas by trying to be able to attack them over and over again to be able to eliminate all people who think like Hamas and who are actually a part of Hamas.

And their response was interesting to me. Their response was that we fully understand we are not going to obliterate everyone who is in Hamas. We want to stop the threat that is coming at us, but we understand that there will be members of Hamas in the future who will still think that way. And their response to me was there are still Nazis in the world right now. There are still people who claim to be a Nazi or a neo-Nazi right now, but the difference is, they don't run Germany. And their first goal was that we want to end Hamas's rule, a terrorist organization having the capacity to run the entity right next door to us.

We understand that there will still be people who think like that, but we want to show them there is a better way. And we still want to be able to have peace with our neighbors.

You see, this connection between Hezbollah and Syria and Hamas is Iran's plan and has been for a long time to build what they are calling a ring of fire around Israel. It was their way of protecting themselves—for the Iranian regime—that if they made it so violent around Israel, Israel would never actually attack Iran. That was their plan.

What is interesting was Israel has been working to be able to build a ring of ice around Iran. That is the Abraham Accords. As Iran is trying to make the region more violent, Israel is trying to make the region more peaceful. It is stark when it is side by side, isn't it? Israel is working to build relationships and has with UAE and with Bahrain.

They have had longstanding relationships with Jordan and with Egypt. They are working in their relationship with Saudi Arabia as they have even added Morocco into the Abraham Accords.

They are building a ring of ice into the region to bring the temperature down in a violent, hostile area, and for the folks who are in Hamas, they hate the thought of that because they don't want normalization; they want violence and control. And as they scream, ''from the river to the sea,'' they mean the death of every Israeli, and, quite frankly, every Jew worldwide. And they have been clear about that.

Now, what do we need to do as Americans? I think we need to be attentive in several areas. One is, Russia has formed an alliance with Iran. Many of the weapon systems that are being shot right now at Ukrainians are actually Iranian weapon systems, and we should not ignore that. This alliance between Russia and Iran continues to grow. In just the past several years, Russia has dramatically increased its number of military bases in Syria.

They have now gone over 100 there, and there are 103 bases now in Syria that are Russian active bases. We should pay attention to that.

For Iran, we have seen clearly what they are doing, how they continue to attack. Again, there is this focus on 330 drones, cruise missiles, and ballistic missiles that were fired at Israel just this past week. What people may not be tracking is what continues to happen from Lebanon, with the Iranian-backed Hezbollah continuing to attack Israel.

Just in the past 24 hours, Hezbollah has attacked northern Israeli communities and cities six times in the last 24 hours. But, of course, no media is covering that. But if you are in one of the communities that is now vacant in northern Israel—and that they fled and they are living in hotels or with relatives or fled to some other location from northern Israel—they are keenly aware of what continues to happen there.

We have got to deal with the continued threat and awakening from Russia, but we have got to also think seriously about what is happening with the regime in Iran. We, as a nation, have tried to pacify Iran. We tried to isolate them diplomatically.

Now, I don't call for a military attack on Iran. No one wants violence and war. We are not interested in our sons and daughters being involved in another conflict. But to think that Iran is going to suddenly be peaceful, when their regime is intent on trying to destroy Israel at the time, should awaken all of us to the reality of where Iran really is.

It was also good to be able to see, when 330 projectiles were coming at Israel this week, that the Americans stood by their side. They shot down a lot of those. The Israelis obviously shot down the majority of them. But the British also were engaged in shooting those down. We had French that were engaged. But also the Jordanians were engaged. The Saudis were engaged. The region is pushing back on a violent Iran that is intent on making the region worse and more unstable, not better.

Iran has used the vacuum of what has happened in Syria to move in their radicalism across Syria, and they continue to make it a more and more toxic place in Syria and in Iraq.

We, as the United States, should turn up our sanctions even more. We, as the United States, should isolate Iran even more. We, as the United States, should use every leverage that we have to isolate not only their economy but to be able to be focused in on that regime, because, quite frankly, that regime is oppressing its own people.

Our problem, as a nation, is not the Iranian people. They are living under the oppression of the Iranian regime as well. It is the regime that is there. And while some Members of this body have called for a change in leadership in Israel, I would call for a change in leadership in Iran, because that is really the problem in the region.

And we should find ways to be able to apply as much pressure as we can on that regime and to be able to message to the people of Iran, as often as we possibly can: We see you in the oppression that you live under every single day, and we wish better for you—for well-educated young men and women who live under the oppressive thumb of that leadership.

Something else we can do as the United States is to stop allowing our soil to be the place where the Iranian regime can spew their hatred. This Thursday, the Iranian Foreign Minister is flying to the United States to be able to speak to a group of people at the U.N., and our administration has given him a visa.

I have called on Secretary Blinken to say, literally: This is one of the Iranian leaders who is a leading voice in the IRGC, who is a leading voice in the attack, in the preparation for October 7, who is a leading voice of hatred toward the United States and the West and our ally Israel. We should not extend a visa while Iran is attacking actively from their soil and from all of their proxies. We should not extend a visa to the Iranian Foreign Minister to come stand on our soil, in our country, and spew his hatred. If he wants to do that internationally, he can.

Now, I understand the U.N. is a body and a place where we have allowed voices from all over the world to come speak. But do you know what? There was a moment when President Obama denied a visa to Iranian leaders because of where they were. There was a moment when President Trump also denied some visas to some of the Iranian leaders because of what they were actively doing.

This is a moment when President Biden and Secretary Blinken should tell the Iranian Foreign Minister: Not this week, not right now, not at all.

When you are attacking our friends, we should not loan them bits of our soil to do it from our territory. We should make it clear that the Iranian leadership that oppresses its own people and attacks our allies—and, by the way, uses their proxies to murder Americans who are also serving in the region—we should make it very clear: We will not allow that on our soil.

I made it clear when I was in Israel that the people of the United States see the people of Israel. We understand what they are living under. And, as a nation that has faced terrorism in our Nation, we understand the emotion that they have at this point, and we understand their tenacity.

We, as the United States, should be very clear: We have an ally, and it is Israel. We are going to walk with her. We are going to help Israel in every way that we can because she has been attacked and is in the middle of the war.

And when you walk through the streets of Tel Aviv or Jerusalem, you feel it. Just like when you are walking through the streets along the border with Gaza and Lebanon and Syria, you feel it. They are ready for peace. And Israel is actively building a ring of ice in the region to bring down the temperature of the region to push back directly on Iran's ring of fire.

We, as a Nation, should be clear on which one we support—those who are bringing peace or those who are bringing violence and hatred? We should make that continually clear and continue to be able to act on it diplomatically and, when we need to, to protect our allies in every way we can, like we did this week with Israel.

Let's pray for the peace of Jerusalem, but let's also stand by her.

With that, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma.

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

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

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. WARNOCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions: S. Res. 645 and S. Res. 646.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. WARNOCK. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

Mr. WARNOCK. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

ISRAEL

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, as most everybody knows, Iran recently launched several hundred drones and missiles at Israel. Fortunately, there were no fatalities. This attack was Iran's response to an Israeli airstrike on their consulate in Damascus, Syria, on April 1—an attack which killed seven Iranian officials. I applaud President Biden for doing what he can to make sure that this conflict does not get out of hand, does not escalate, and does not create what would be a disastrous regional war.

But while we pay attention to this developing Israeli-Iran crisis, I hope very much that we will not lose sight of the unprecedented humanitarian disaster now taking place in Gaza. We must not lose sight of that disaster.

As I am sure all Americans know, the war in Gaza began on October 7, when Hamas, a terrorist organization, invaded Israel, killed some 1,200 innocent men, women, and children, and took over 230 people into captivity, many of whom are still being held.

It has always been my view that Israel had a right to defend itself, respond to this attack, and to go after Hamas. It is also my view that Israel does not have the right to go to war against the entire Palestinian people, which is exactly what the Netanyahu government is doing.

Let us take a deep breath and understand that what is happening right now in Gaza is horrendous, it is inhumane, and it is in gross violation of American and international law. It is driven by extreme, rightwing Israeli Government officials and a government which is increasingly dominated by religious fundamentalists. That is who is driving this humanitarian disaster in Gaza.

What should be most troubling to the American people is that we as Americans are complicit because it is U.S. taxpayer dollars that have helped create this unprecedented humanitarian disaster.

Let me briefly describe what is going on in Gaza because it is so easy, in a world full of problems—the media focuses on this, focuses on that. Congress focuses on this and that. It is so easy to turn away from the tragedy in Gaza, but we must not do that.

There are about 2.2 million people living in Gaza—2.2 million—mostly poor and struggling people. Before the war—before the war—Gaza was a very poor and desperate area. Let us not forget the important fact that before the war, some 70 percent of young people in Gaza were unemployed. That was before the war.

Since this war began, over 33,000 Palestinians have been killed and 77,000 wounded. Unbelievably, 5 percent—5 percent—of the residents of Gaza have been either killed or wounded in a 6-month period—5 percent of their entire population. Two-thirds of those who have been killed or wounded are women and children.

Since the war began, 1.7 million people—over 75 percent of the population of Gaza—have been driven from their homes. Let me repeat it. Three-quarters of the population have been driven out of their homes. These people—poor, and many of them are children—do not know whether they will ever return; pushed out, not knowing where they are going to go, where they are going to sleep—three-quarters of the people of Gaza.

Over 60 percent—60 percent—of the housing units in Gaza have been damaged or destroyed. This housing destruction is unprecedented in the modern history of the world—60 percent of housing units damaged or destroyed.

But it is not just housing. Israel has systematically destroyed the healthcare system in Gaza. Gaza had 36 hospitals before the war. Now just 11 are partially operational despite the tens of thousands of injuries and hundreds of thousands of ill people. Persistent attacks on healthcare facilities have killed more than 1,200 workers.

I have spoken with several American doctors who have returned from missions to Gaza. They tell of operating for hours on end in crowded hospitals with little electricity or clean water or medical supplies. They have had to perform surgeries—including on children—with no anesthesia. They have to try to sterilize and reuse medical gauze. Thousands of women have had to give birth in these inhumane and dangerous conditions, and healthcare workers report a major increase in miscarriages. It is a healthcare nightmare.

But it is not just housing and the healthcare system that are being destroyed by the Netanyahu government; it is the physical civilian infrastructure in Gaza as well. More than half of the water and sanitation systems have been put out of commission. Only one of three water pipelines is operating. Clean drinking water is severely limited. Sewage, raw sewage, is running through the streets of Gaza, spreading disease. As we speak tonight, there is virtually no electricity in Gaza.

But it is not just housing and healthcare and infrastructure that are being destroyed. There are 12 universities in Gaza—12 universities. Unbelievably, each and every one of them has been either damaged or destroyed—universities. In addition, primary and secondary schools have also been completely disrupted. Over 600,000 children have no access to education.

As horrible as all of this is, there is something happening now that is even worse, and that is what these photographs speak to. Hundreds of thousands of Palestinian children face starvation. The people of Gaza are struggling to survive from day to day, foraging for leaves, eating animal feed, or splitting the occasional aid packages amongst their family. Even in Rafah, where aid is consistently distributed, people are desperately short of basic supplies, including food and water. In the north, the situation is far more desperate. At least 28 children have died of malnutrition and dehydration already—28 children—but the real toll is likely much, much higher.

Without food and clean water, with sanitation systems destroyed, and with little healthcare available, hundreds of thousands of people in Gaza are at severe risk of dehydration, infection, and easily preventable diseases.

Let me repeat once again. As we speak, hundreds of thousands of children are at risk of terrible deaths.

Let us be very clear. The conditions that the people in Gaza are experiencing today are the direct result of Israel's arbitrary restrictions on the aid getting into Gaza. This is not a matter of debate; it is an obvious reality that numerous—numerous—humanitarian organizations have repeatedly confirmed.

Israeli leaders themselves admit it. At the start of this war, the Israeli Defense Minister declared a total siege, saying:

> We are fighting human animals, and we are acting accordingly. . . . There will be no electricity, no food, no fuel, everything is closed.

In January, Prime Minister Netanyahu said openly that Israel is only allowing in the absolute minimum amount of aid necessary.

Tragically, the Israeli Government has lived up to those words. For months, thousands of trucks carrying lifesaving supplies have sat just miles away from starving children, prevented from reaching their destination by unreasonable Israeli restrictions and a military campaign conducted with little regard for civilian life. Trucks with food a few miles away from children who are starving—Israel is stopping those trucks.

The world saw evidence of that several weeks ago when seven aid workers

with World Central Kitchen were killed in an Israeli airstrike. But such attacks have been frequent, and Israel has killed more than 200 humanitarian aid workers in 6 months—not just the World Central Kitchen; 200 humanitarian aid workers since this war began.

Israel's blockade of humanitarian aid pushed the United States and the international community to extreme measures, including airdropping supplies and the construction of a port, in order to get food to starving people. That was our appropriate response.

Blocking desperately needed U.S. humanitarian aid is obscene, and it is unacceptable. It is also a violation of American law. The Foreign Assistance Act is extremely clear: No U.S. assistance may be provided to any country that ''prohibits or otherwise restricts, directly or indirectly, the transport or delivery of United States humanitarian assistance.'' That is precisely what Israel is doing, and Israel is clearly in violation of the law.

Following a tense, as I understand it, call between President Biden and Prime Minister Netanyahu 2 weeks ago, Israel committed to a number of steps to improve humanitarian conditions and aid access. These commitments include opening additional border crossings, increasing the number of trucks cleared for entry into Gaza, improving aid distribution within Gaza, and reopening some bakeries and a water pipeline to supply northern Gaza.

Two weeks later, where are we? Well, there has been a slight improvement in the volume of aid getting into Gaza. Since the beginning of April, an average of 181 aid trucks have crossed into Gaza per day. This is marginally higher than was the case over the last several months but far fewer than the 500 trucks per day that went into Gaza before the war and before the devastation of civilian life there.

Unbelievably, Israel continues to block many aid convoys from reaching those areas in Gaza that are most desperate. This morning, I spoke with a humanitarian aid worker who was in Gaza just last week, and he reported to me that humanitarian organizations continue—continue—to face arbitrary Israeli restrictions.

Since the U.N. warned of imminent famine in early February, more than 40 percent of all food missions have been denied. Children are starving. More than 40 percent of food missions have been denied. Last week again, the U.N. reported that 40 percent of aid convoys to north Gaza were denied access.

Israel's violations of international law are not limited to Gaza. They are also breaking the law in the West Bank. Over the weekend, in response to the tragic death of an Israeli teenager, large groups of armed Israeli settlers rampaged through 17 Palestinian villages over 3 days. These vigilantes shot dozens of people, killing four, and burned numerous homes. Videos taken by human rights groups show Israeli soldiers watching attacks unfold and doing nothing to stop them. To the best of my knowledge, no arrests have been announced as a result of these attacks.

While this was a particularly violent weekend, this is a daily occurrence for Palestinians in the occupied West Bank. Israeli soldiers and settlers have now killed more than 460 Palestinians in the West Bank since October 7, including more than 100 children. That is the West Bank.

What Israel is doing today in Gaza and the West Bank is a defining moment for Americans because we are deeply complicit in everything that is happening. This is not some far-off situation that we have nothing to do with. We are directly complicit. Now, the U.S. military is not dropping 2,000-pound bombs on civilian apartment buildings. That is not what the U.S. military is doing. But we are supplying those bombs to the Israeli Air Force. The United States is not blocking the borders and preventing food, water, and medical supplies from getting to desperate people. That is not what we are doing. But we have supplied billions of dollars to the Netanyahu government, which is doing just that. The United States is not annexing occupied Palestinian land, but it is providing political protection for the Israeli Government as it does so.

Despite the massive financial and military support the United States has provided to Israel for many years, the rightwing, extremist government of Netanyahu has ignored increasingly urgent calls from the United States to end the humanitarian disaster in Gaza, to stop settlement expansion in the West Bank, and to lay out initial steps toward a two-state solution.

Members of Congress may not know it. We live in a somewhat different world. But the American people have had enough. The American people are increasingly fed up with Netanyahu's war against Palestinians, and they do not want to see their taxpayer dollars spent to support the slaughter of innocent civilians and the starvation of children. That is not BERNIE SANDERS speaking. That is what the American people are saying. A recent Gallup poll showed that just 36 percent of Americans approve of Israel's military action, with 55 percent disapproving. A Quinnipiac poll showed that U.S. voters oppose sending more military aid to Israel by 52 percent to 39 percent. An earlier YouGov poll also showed that 52 percent of Americans said that the United States should halt weapons shipments to Israel until it stops its attacks in Gaza.

That is what the American people are saying. And maybe, just maybe, the Congress might want to listen to the American people rather than powerful special interests.

The New York Times is what I would describe as a pillar of the establishment. This is not a fringe organization. This is the establishment. And the New York Times, just this Sunday, had an editorial entitled ''Military Aid to Israel Cannot Be Unconditional.'' I would like to read a few paragraphs and then ask unanimous consent that the whole editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Apr. 13, 2024]

MILITARY AID TO ISRAEL CANNOT BE UNCONDITIONAL

(By the Editorial Board)

The suffering of civilians in Gaza—tens of thousands dead, many of them children; hundreds of thousands homeless, many at risk of starvation—has become more than a growing number of Americans can abide. And yet Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu of Israel and his ultranationalist allies in government have defied American calls for more restraint and humanitarian help.

The United States commitment to Israel—including $3.8 billion a year in military aid, the largest outlay of American foreign aid to any one country in the world—is a reflection of the exceptionally close and enduring relationship between the two countries. A bond of trust, however, must prevail between donors and recipients of lethal arms from the United States, which supplies arms according to formal conditions that reflect American values and the obligations of international law.

Mr. Netanyahu and the hard-liners in his government have broken that bond, and until it is restored, America cannot continue, as it has, to supply Israel with the arms it has been using in its war against Hamas.

The question is not whether Israel has the right to defend itself against an enemy sworn to its destruction. It does. The Hamas attack of Oct. 7 was an atrocity no nation could leave unanswered, and by hiding behind civilian fronts, Hamas violates international law and bears a major share of responsibility for the suffering inflicted on the people in whose name it purports to act. In the immediate aftermath of that attack, President Biden rushed to demonstrate America's full sympathy and support in Israel's agony. That was the right thing to do.

It is also not a question whether the United States should continue to help Israel defend itself. America's commitments to Israel's defense are long term, substantial, mutually beneficial and essential. No president or Congress should deny the only state on earth with a Jewish majority the means to ensure its survival. Nor should Americans ever lose sight of the threat that Hamas, a terrorist organization, poses to the security of the region and to any hope of peace between Palestinians and Israelis.

But that does not mean the president should allow Mr. Netanyahu to keep playing his cynical double games. The Israeli leader is fighting for his political survival against growing anger from his electorate. He knows that, should he leave office, he will risk going on trial for serious charges of corruption. He has, until recently, resisted diplomatic efforts for a cease-fire that might have led to a release of hostages still in the custody of Hamas. He has used American armaments to go after Hamas but has been deaf to repeated demands from Mr. Biden and his national security team to do more to protect civilians in Gaza from being harmed by those armaments. Even worse, Mr. Netanyahu has turned defiance of America's leadership into a political tool, indulging and encouraging

the hard-liners in his cabinet, who pledge to reoccupy Gaza and reject any notion of a Palestinian state—exactly the opposite of U.S. policy.

Thanks in part to the bombs and other heavy weapons supplied by the United States, the Israel military now faces little armed resistance in most of Gaza. But Mr. Netanyahu has ignored his obligations to provide food and medicine to the civilian population in the territory that Israel now controls. In fact, Israel has made it difficult for anyone else to provide humanitarian aid to Gaza. The United States has had to take extraordinary steps, including airdrops and building a pier, to overcome Israeli obstacles to providing humanitarian aid. Last week's attack on a World Central Kitchen convoy in Gaza, which killed seven aid workers and which Israel acknowledged was a mistake, underscores the enormous danger facing the international aid agencies that are stepping in to help.

This cannot continue.

Israel recently announce a pullback of troops from southern Gaza. But this is neither a formal cease-fire nor and end to the war, and it is incumbent on the Biden administration to persevere in its efforts to help end the fighting, free the hostages and protect Palestinian civilians.

A growing number of senators, led by Chris Van Hollen, Democrat of Maryland, have been urging Mr. Biden to consider pausing military transfers to Israel, which the executive branch can do without congressional approval. They were right to push for this action.

Last week, Representative Nancy Pelosi was among 40 House Democrats to sign a letter to the president and the secretary of state urging them to ensure that military assistance to Israel is in compliance with U.S. and international law. The mechanism to do that is already in place. In February, Mr. Biden signed a national security memorandum (NSM–20) that directed the secretary of state to obtain ''credible and reliable'' written assurances from recipients of American weapons that those weapons would be used in accordance with international law and that recipients would not impede the delivery of American assistance. Failure to fulfill those measures could lead to suspension of further arms transfers.

NSM–20 did not break ground. Many of its requirements are already law under the Foreign Assistance Act and other measures, and they apply to armaments supplied to other countries, including Ukraine. NSM–20 specifically excludes air defense systems and others used for strictly defensive purposes, but that still leaves many offensive weapons whose delivery the United States could pause. But NSM–20 is notable. It affirms the president's authority to use military aid as a lever in ensuring the nation's weapons are used responsibly.

The administration has tried many forms of pressure and admonition, including public statements, reported expressions of frustration and U.N. Security Council resolutions. None of them, so far, have proved effective with Mr. Netanyahu. Military aid is the one lever Mr. Biden has been reluctant to use, but it is a significant one he has at his disposal—perhaps the last one—to persuade Israel to open the way for urgent assistance to Gaza.

Pausing the flow of weapons to Israel would not be an easy step for Mr. Biden to take; his devotion and commitment to the Jewish state go back decades. But the war in Gaza has taken an enormous toll in human lives, with a cease-fire still out of reach and many hostages still held captive. The eroding international support for its military campaign has made Israel more insecure. Confronted with that suffering, the United States cannot remain beholden to an Israeli leader fixated on his own survival and the approval of the zealots he harbors.

The United States has had Israel's back, diplomatically and militarily, through decades of wars and crises. Alliances are not one-way relationships, and most Israelis, including Israel's senior military commanders, are aware of that. Yet Mr. Netanyahu has turned his back on America and its entreaties, creating a crisis in U.S.-Israeli relations when Israel's security, and the stability of the entire region, is at stake.

Mr. SANDERS. This is what the New York Times says:

The administration—

Biden administration—

has tried many forms of pressure and admonition, including public statements, reported expressions of frustration and U.N. Security Council resolutions. None of them, so far, have proved effective with Mr. Netanyahu. Military aid is the one lever Mr. Biden has been reluctant to use, but it is a significant one he has at his disposal—perhaps the last one—to persuade Israel to open the way for urgent assistance to Gaza.

Pausing the flow of weapons to Israel would not be an easy step for Mr. Biden to take; his devotion and commitment to the Jewish state go back decades. But the war in Gaza has taken an enormous toll in human lives, with a cease-fire still out of reach and many hostages still held captive. The eroding international support for its military campaign has made Israel more insecure. Confronted with that suffering, the United States cannot remain beholden to an Israeli leader fixated on his own survival and the approval of the zealots he harbors.

New York Times, last Sunday.

Mr. President, the United States has offered Israel unconditional financial support for a very, very long time. In recent years, that has amounted to $3.8 billion a year, with numerous additional forms of support. Right now, against my vote, Congress is considering another $14 billion in military aid for Israel, $10 billion of which is completely unrestricted military funding.

That unconditional support for the Israeli military must end. Instead of begging Netanyahu's extremist government to protect innocent lives and obey U.S. and international law, our new position must be simple and straightforward: Not another nickel for the Netanyahu government if their present policies continue.

The United States must use all of its leverage to secure an immediate cease-fire in Gaza and across the region and demand that the massive amount of humanitarian assistance that is needed to prevent famine and widespread humanitarian suffering is able to flow into Gaza.

Mr. President, history will judge what we do right now. History will judge whether we stand with starving children, whether we uphold America's professed values, or whether we continue to blindly finance the Netanyahu war machine.

I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATIONS

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

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

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

DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY,
Washington, DC.

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

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 24–04, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Iraq for defense articles and services estimated to cost $140 million. We will issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale upon delivery of this letter to your office.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. HURSCH,
Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 24–04

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

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Iraq.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment* $0.
Other $140 million.
Total $140 million.

Funding Source: Foreign Military Financing.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase: The Government of Iraq has requested to buy Contractor Logistics Support (CLS) and training in support of its C–172 and AC/RC–208 aircraft fleet.

Major Defense Equipment (MDE): None.

Non-MDE: Included is advising, technical, and proficiency training for Iraqi maintainers and aircrews; CLS; spare and repair parts, components, accessories, and repair and return support; minor modifications and upgrades; subscription services; overhaul and depot level maintenance and maintenance support; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (IQ–D–QCK, IQ–D–TLV).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: IQ–D–QCH.

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

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: None.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: April 15, 2024.

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

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Iraq—C–172 arid AC/RC–208 Aircraft Contractor Logistics Support and Training

The Government of Iraq has requested to buy Contractor Logistics Support (CLS) and training in support of its C–172 and AC/RC–208 aircraft fleet. Included is advising, technical, and proficiency training for Iraqi maintainers and aircrews; CLS; spare and repair parts, components, accessories, and repair and return support; minor modifications and upgrades; subscription services; overhaul and depot level maintenance and maintenance support; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated total cost is $140 million.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to improve the security of a strategic partner.

The proposed sale will improve Iraq's capability to meet current and future threats by helping to sustain its C–172 and AC/RC–208 aircraft and contribute to Iraq's self-sufficiency in maintaining its fleet. Iraq will have no difficulty absorbing these articles and services into its armed forces.

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

The principal contractor will be Northrop Grumman Corporation, of Falls Church, VA. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

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

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

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I was absent on Monday, April 15, 2024, for rollcall vote No. 126. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 478 Ramona Villagomez Manglona, of the Northern Mariana Islands, to be a U.S. District Judge for the District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands for a term of ten years, rollcall vote No. 126, PN1252.

RECOGNIZING THE 116TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. ARMY RESERVE

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the founding of the U.S. Army Reserve. On April 23, the Army Reserve will celebrate 116 years of service by our citizen soldiers who stand ready to answer the call to serve, bringing critical skills and capabilities to the Nation, while defending America's freedoms and liberties.

Across the United States of America, brave and dedicated men and women with great passion for service answer the call, no matter the personal sacrifice, to come together and make up the U.S. Army Reserve. Over the course of its long and storied history, our Reserve force has utilized a diverse set of professional skills, educational backgrounds, and experiences to honor and serve our great country.

Since the activation of the modern-day Army Reserve's predecessor the Medical Reserve, the United States has mobilized more than 1.3 million soldiers, trained, equipped and prepared to perform their duties at home and abroad. On any given day, upwards of 9,000 Army Reserve soldiers are mobilized or deployed to 23 countries worldwide in support of combatant commands, while tens of thousands of others in the Reserve train for deployments or participate in joint exercises to strengthen national alliances and partnerships across the globe.

The resilience of the Army Reserve is critical to our national security in responding to constantly changing and evolving challenges our country and allies face each day. To reinforce the Army and the joint force today and into the future, the Army Reserve supports all aspects of a soldier's life—family, employment, and education goals—integrating a rewarding uniformed experience and getting our citizen soldiers back to the fundamentals in defense of our Nation's interests.

In the great State of Arkansas, 2,184 soldiers and 38 units contribute an economic impact of $130 million to our State's economy.

As our reservists prepare for their next 116 years of service, they can take pride knowing they are a part of one of the most experienced forces in our Nation's history. I am grateful for the sacrifices each and every one of them make every day. As we look to the future, I am proud to be able to support our Army Reserve in achieving its mission of ''Ready Now'' and ''Shaping Tomorrow!''

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING DUNLAP HATCHERY

● Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, as a member and former chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each month I recognize and celebrate the American entrepreneurial spirit by highlighting the success of a small business in my home State of Idaho. Today, I am pleased to honor the Dunlap Hatchery as the Idaho Small Business of the Month for April 2024.

The Dunlap Hatchery, which was established in 1918 by Oscar Dunlap, is one of the longest standing hatcheries, not just in Idaho but in the Nation. The Dunlaps moved the hatchery from Junction City, OR, to Caldwell, ID, early on in order to expand hatchery operations. Originally a chick hatchery and pullets operation, after more than 100 years in business, Dunlap Hatchery now hatches more than 50 varieties of chickens, ducks, geese, turkeys, and game birds.

With 106 years of expertise in the poultry business under four generations of Dunlaps, the hatchery remains committed to providing quality products and exceptional service to their customers throughout the U.S. During peak season, their efforts guide the hatching of over 1 million chicks annually while operating a retail store to ensure customers have the supplies necessary to successfully raise chickens.

Congratulations to the Dunlaps and the employees of the Dunlap Hatchery on their selection as the Idaho Small Business of the Month for April 2024. Thank you for serving Idaho as small business owners and entrepreneurs. You make our great State proud, and I look forward to your continued growth and success.●

130TH ANNIVERSARY OF MOKAN GOODWILL

● Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Goodwill of Western Missouri and Eastern Kansas, also known as MoKan Goodwill, for their 130th anniversary of being a pillar of support for the Kansas City community.

Goodwill Industries' mission has remained the same since its founding: provide services and resources for those in need wherever they may be. For the Kansas City region, the Helping Hand Institute carried out this mission starting in 1894. They provided food, shelter, and work relief programs for those who were homeless and without resources. Through the Helping Hand Institute, thousands of Kansas City citizens were able to obtain employment and become self-sufficient.

By 1925, Goodwill Industries of Greater Kansas City had grown to incorporate workforce programs focused on collected used goods and then trained and hired people with disabilities or disadvantages to repair those goods. These repaired items were then sold in stores to support the program. In the 1940s, Goodwill had expanded its focus to become a training center and added services such as employment skills training and vocational rehabilitation for persons with disabilities. In 1956, Goodwill started workforce development programs supported by contracts with the State Department of Vocational Rehabilitation, providing paid employment for persons with disabilities who repaired donated furniture and clothing sold in Goodwill stores.

In 1978, it became apparent that a name better reflecting the geographical scope of Helping Hands Institute and Goodwill Industries' programs and services was needed. In 2010, the organization changed to its present name, Goodwill of Western Missouri and Eastern Kansas.

Today, I am proud to say that MoKan Goodwill continues to be a nonprofit

leader in the Kansas City region providing resources and services to individuals who face barriers to obtaining employment. No matter the barrier, MoKan Goodwill continues this 130-year mission to help provide those in need an opportunity to become self-sufficient and participate in the rich work of their local communities. I congratulate MoKan Goodwill on their service to our communities and wish them the best of luck with the next 130 years.●

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mrs. Stringer, one of his secretaries.

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT OF THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN PROCLAMATION 10371 OF APRIL 21, 2022, WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION AND THE EMERGENCY AUTHORITY RELATING TO THE REGULATION OF THE ANCHORAGE AND MOVEMENT OF RUSSIAN-AFFILIATED VESSELS TO UNITED STATES PORTS—PM 48

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Proclamation 10371 of April 21, 2022, with respect to the Russian Federation and the emergency authority relating to the regulation of the anchorage and movement of Russian-affiliated vessels to United States ports, is to continue in effect beyond April 21, 2024.

The policies and actions of the Government of the Russian Federation to continue the premeditated, unjustified, unprovoked, and brutal war against Ukraine continue to constitute a national emergency by reason of a disturbance or threatened disturbance of international relations of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Proclamation 10371.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 16, 2024.*

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:59 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5921. An act to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from authorizing certain transactions by a United States financial institution in connection with Iran, to prevent the International Monetary Fund from providing financial assistance to Iran, to codify prohibitions on Export-Import Bank financing for the Government of Iran, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5923. An act to impose restrictions on correspondent and payable-through accounts in the United States with respect to Chinese financial institutions that conduct transactions involving the purchase of petroleum or petroleum products from Iran.

H.R. 6408. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to terminate the tax-exempt status of terrorist supporting organizations.

At 2:38 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. McCumber, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, announced that the House has agreed to the following resolution:

H. RES. 995

Resolved, That Mr. Green of Tennessee, Mr. McCaul, Mr. Biggs, Mr. Higgins of Lousiana, Mr. Cline, Mr. Guest, Mr. Garbarino, Ms. Greene of Georgia, Mr. Pfluger, Ms. Hageman, and Ms. Lee of Florida, are appointed managers to conduct the impeachment trial against Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, Secretary of Homeland Security, that a message be sent to the Senate to inform the Senate of these appointments, and that the managers so appointed may, in connection with the preparation and the conduct of the trial, exhibit the articles of impeachment to the Senate and take all other actions necessary, which may include the following:

(1) Employing legal, clerical, and other necessary assistants and incurring such other expenses as may be necessary, to be paid from amounts available to the Committee on Homeland Security under applicable expense resolutions or from the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives.

(2) Sending for persons and papers, and filing with the Secretary of the Senate, on the part of the House of Representatives, any pleadings, in conjunction with or subsequent to, the exhibition of the articles of impeachment that the managers consider necessary.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following resolution:

H. RES. 863

Resolved, That Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, Secretary of Homeland Security of the United States of America, is impeached for high crimes and misdemeanors, and that the following articles of impeachment be exhibited to the United States Senate:

Articles of impeachment exhibited by the House of Representatives of the United States of America in the name of itself and of the people of the United States of America, against Alejandro N. Mayorkas, Secretary of Homeland Security of the United States of America, in maintenance and support of its impeachment against him for high crimes and misdemeanors.

ARTICLE I: WILLFUL AND SYSTEMIC REFUSAL TO COMPLY WITH THE LAW

The Constitution provides that the House of Representatives ''shall have the sole Power of Impeachment'' and that civil Officers of the United States, including the Secretary of Homeland Security, ''shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors''. In his conduct while Secretary of Homeland Security, Alejandro N. Mayorkas, in violation of his oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, to bear true faith and allegiance to the same, and to well and faithfully discharge the duties of his office, has willfully and systemically refused to comply with Federal immigration laws, in that:

Throughout his tenure as Secretary of Homeland Security, Alejandro N. Mayorkas has repeatedly violated laws enacted by Congress regarding immigration and border security. In large part because of his unlawful conduct, millions of aliens have illegally entered the United States on an annual basis with many unlawfully remaining in the United States. His refusal to obey the law is not only an offense against the separation of powers in the Constitution of the United States, it also threatens our national security and has had a dire impact on communities across the country. Despite clear evidence that his willful and systemic refusal to comply with the law has significantly contributed to unprecedented levels of illegal entrants, the increased control of the Southwest border by drug cartels, and the imposition of enormous costs on States and localities affected by the influx of aliens, Alejandro N. Mayorkas has continued in his refusal to comply with the law, and thereby acted to the grave detriment of the interests of the United States.

Alejandro N. Mayorkas engaged in this scheme or course of conduct through the following means:

(1) Alejandro N. Mayorkas willfully refused to comply with the detention mandate set forth in section 235(b)(2)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, requiring that all applicants for admission who are ''not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted...shall be detained for a [removal] proceeding...''. Instead of complying with this requirement, Alejandro N. Mayorkas implemented a catch and release scheme, whereby such aliens are unlawfully released, even without effective mechanisms to ensure appearances before the immigration courts for removal proceedings or to ensure removal in the case of aliens ordered removed.

(2) Alejandro N. Mayorkas willfully refused to comply with the detention mandate set forth in section 235(b)(1)(B)(ii) of such Act, requiring that an alien who is placed into expedited removal proceedings and determined to have a credible fear of persecution ''shall be detained for further consideration of the application for asylum''. Instead of complying with this requirement, Alejandro N. Mayorkas implemented a catch and release scheme, whereby such aliens are unlawfully released, even without effective mechanisms to ensure appearances before the immigration courts for removal proceedings or to ensure removal in the case of aliens ordered removed.

(3) Alejandro N. Mayorkas willfully refused to comply with the detention set forth in section 235(b)(1)(B)(iii)(IV) of such Act, requiring that an alien who is placed into expedited removal proceedings and determined not to have a credible fear of persecution ''shall be detained...until removed''. Instead of complying with this requirement,

Alejandro N. Mayorkas has implemented a catch and release scheme, whereby such aliens are unlawfully released, even without effective mechanisms to ensure appearances before the immigration courts for removal proceedings or to ensure removal in the case of aliens ordered removed.

(4) Alejandro N. Mayorkas willfully refused to comply with the detention mandate set forth in section 236(c) of such Act, requiring that a criminal alien who is inadmissible or deportable on certain criminal and terrorism-related grounds ''shall [be] take[n] into custody'' when the alien is released from law enforcement custody. Instead of complying with this requirement, Alejandro N. Mayorkas issued ''Guidelines for the Enforcement of Civil Immigration Laws'', which instructs Department of Homeland Security (hereinafter referred to as ''DHS'') officials that the ''fact an individual is a removable noncitizen...should not alone be the basis of an enforcement action against them'' and that DHS ''personnel should not rely on the fact of conviction...alone'', even with respect to aliens subject to mandatory arrest and detention pursuant to section 236(c) of such Act, to take them into custody. In *Texas v. United States*, 40 F.4th 205 (2022), the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit concluded that these guidelines had ''every indication of being 'a general policy that is so extreme as to amount to an abdication of...statutory responsibilities'' and that its ''replacement of Congress's statutory mandates with concerns of equity and race is extralegal...[and] plainly outside the bounds of the power conferred by the INA''.

(5) Alejandro N. Mayorkas willfully refused to comply with the detention mandate set forth in section 241(a)(2) of such Act, requiring that an alien ordered removed ''shall [be] detain[ed]'' during ''the removal period''. Instead of complying with this mandate, Alejandro N. Mayorkas issued ''Guidelines for the Enforcement of Civil Immigration Laws'', which instructs DHS officials that the ''fact an individual is a removable noncitizen...should not alone be the basis of an enforcement action against them'' and that DHS ''personnel should not rely on the fact of conviction...alone'', even with respect to aliens subject to mandatory detention and removal pursuant to section 241(a) of such Act.

(6) Alejandro N. Mayorkas willfully exceeded his parole authority set forth in section 212(d)(5)(A) of such Act that permits parole to be granted ''only on a case-by-case basis'', temporarily, and ''for urgent humanitarian reasons or significant public benefit'', in that:

(A) Alejandro N. Mayorkas paroled aliens *en masse* in order to release them from mandatory detention, despite the fact that, as the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit concluded in *Texas v. Biden*, 20 F.4th 928 (2021), ''parol[ing] every alien [DHS] cannot detain is the opposite of the 'case-by-case basis' determinations required by law'' and ''DHS's pretended power to parole aliens while ignoring the limitations Congress imposed on the parole power [is] not *non*enforcement; it's *mis*enforcement, suspension of the INA, or both''.

(B) Alejandro N. Mayorkas created, reopened, or expanded a series of categorical parole programs never authorized by Congress for foreign nationals outside of the United States, including for certain Central American minors, Ukrainians, Venezuelans, Cubans, Haitians, Nicaraguans, Colombians, Salvadorans, Guatemalans, and Hondurans, which enabled hundreds of thousands of inadmissible aliens to enter the United States in violation of the laws enacted by Congress.

(7) Alejandro N. Mayorkas willfully exceeded his release authority set forth in section 236(a) of such Act that permits, in certain circumstances, the release of aliens arrested on an administrative warrant, in that Alejandro N. Mayorkas released aliens arrested without a warrant despite their being subject to a separate applicable mandatory detention requirement set forth in section 235(b)(2) of such Act. Alejandro N. Mayorkas released such aliens by retroactively issuing administrative warrants in an attempt to circumvent section 235(b)(2) of such Act. In *Florida v. United States*, No. 3:21-cv-1066-TKW-ZCB (N.D. Fla. Mar. 8, 2023), the United States District Court of the Northern District of Florida noted that ''[t]his sleight of hand – using an 'arrest' warrant as a de facto 'release' warrant – is administrative sophistry at its worst''. In addition, the court concluded that ''what makes DHS's application of [236(a)] in this manner unlawful...is that [235(b)(2)], not [236(a)], governs the detention of applicants for admission whom DHS places in...removal proceedings after inspection''.

Alejandro N. Mayorkas's willful and systemic refusal to comply with the law has had calamitous consequences for the Nation and the people of the United States, including:

(1) During fiscal years 2017 through 2020, an average of about 590,000 aliens each fiscal year were encountered as inadmissible aliens at ports of entry on the Southwest border or apprehended between ports of entry. Thereafter, during Alejandro N. Mayorkas's tenure in office, that number skyrocketed to over 1,400,000 in fiscal year 2021, over 2,300,000 in fiscal year 2022, and over 2,400,000 in fiscal year 2023. Similarly, during fiscal years 2017 through 2020, an average of 130,000 persons who were not turned back or apprehended after making an illegal entry were observed along the border each fiscal year. During Alejandro N. Mayorkas's tenure in office, that number more than trebled to 400,000 in fiscal year 2021, 600,000 in fiscal year 2022, and 750,000 in fiscal year 2023.

(2) American communities both along the Southwest border and across the United States have been devastated by the dramatic growth in illegal entries, the number of aliens unlawfully present, and substantial rise in the number of aliens unlawfully granted parole, creating a fiscal and humanitarian crisis and dramatically degrading the quality of life of the residents of those communities. For instance, since 2022, more than 150,000 migrants have gone through New York City's shelter intake system. Indeed, the Mayor of New York City has said that ''we are past our breaking point'' and that ''[t]his issue will destroy New York City''. In fiscal year 2023, New York City spent $1,450,000,000 addressing Alejandro N. Mayorkas's migrant crisis, and city officials fear it will spend another $12,000,000,000 over the following three fiscal years, causing painful budget cuts to important city services.

(3) Alejandro N. Mayorkas's unlawful mass release of apprehended aliens and unlawful mass grant of categorical parole to aliens have enticed an increasing number of aliens to make the dangerous journey to our Southwest border. Consequently, according to the United Nations's International Organization for Migration, the number of migrants intending to illegally cross our border who have perished along the way, either en route to the United States or at the border, almost doubled during the tenure of Alejandro N. Mayorkas as Secretary of Homeland Security, from an average of about 700 a year during the fiscal years 2017 through 2020, to an average of about 1,300 a year during the fiscal years 2021 through 2023.

(4) Alien smuggling organizations have gained tremendous wealth during Alejandro N. Mayorkas's tenure as Secretary of Homeland Security, with their estimated revenues rising from about $500,000,000 in 2018 to approximately $13,000,000,000 in 2022.

(5) During Alejandro N. Mayorkas's tenure as Secretary of Homeland Security, the immigration court backlog has more than doubled from about 1,300,000 cases to over 3,000,000 cases. The exploding backlog is destroying the courts' ability to administer justice and provide appropriate relief in a timeframe that does not run into years or even decades. As Alejandro N. Mayorkas acknowledged, ''those who have a valid claim to asylum...often wait years for a...decision; likewise, noncitizens who will ultimately be found ineligible for asylum or other protection—which occurs in the majority of cases—often have spent many years in the United States prior to being ordered removed''. He noted that of aliens placed in expedited removal proceedings and found to have a credible fear of persecution, and thus referred to immigration judges for removal proceedings, ''significantly fewer than 20 percent...were ultimately granted asylum'' and only ''28 percent of cases decided on their merits are grants of relief''. Alejandro N. Mayorkas also admitted that ''the fact that migrants can wait in the United States for years before being issued a final order denying relief, and that many such individuals are never actually removed, likely incentivizes migrants to make the journey north''.

(6) During Alejandro N. Mayorkas's tenure as Secretary of Homeland Security, approximately 450,000 unaccompanied alien children have been encountered at the Southwest border, and the vast majority have been released into the United States. As a result, there has been a dramatic upsurge in migrant children being employed in dangerous and exploitative jobs in the United States.

(7) Alejandro N. Mayorkas's failure to enforce the law, drawing millions of illegal aliens to the Southwest border, has led to the reassignment of U.S. Border Patrol agents from protecting the border from illicit drug trafficking to processing illegal aliens for release. As a result, during Alejandro N. Mayorkas's tenure as Secretary of Homeland Security, the flow of fentanyl across the border and other dangerous drugs, both at and between ports of entry, has increased dramatically. U.S. Customs and Border Protection seized approximately 4,800 pounds of fentanyl in fiscal year 2020, approximately 11,200 pounds in fiscal year 2021, approximately 14,700 pounds in fiscal year 2022, and approximately 27,000 pounds in fiscal year 2023. Over 70,000 Americans died from fentanyl poisoning in 2022, and fentanyl is now the number one killer of Americans between the ages of 18 and 45.

(8) Alejandro N. Mayorkas has degraded public safety by leaving wide swaths of the border effectively unpatrolled as U.S. Border Patrol agents are diverted from guarding the border to processing for unlawful release the heightening waves of apprehended aliens (many who now seek out agents for the purpose of surrendering with the now reasonable expectation of being released and granted work authorization), and Federal Air Marshals are diverted from protecting the flying public to assist in such processing.

(9) During Alejandro N. Mayorkas's tenure as Secretary of Homeland Security, the U.S. Border Patrol has encountered an increasing number of aliens on the terrorist watch list. In fiscal years 2017 through 2020 combined, 11 noncitizens on the terrorist watchlist were caught attempting to cross the Southwest border between ports of entry. That number increased to 15 in fiscal year 2021, 98 in fiscal

year 2022, 169 in fiscal year 2023, and 49 so far in fiscal year 2024.

Additionally, in *United States* v. *Texas*, 599 U.S. 670 (2023), the United States Supreme Court heard a case involving Alejandro N. Mayorkas's refusal to comply with certain Federal immigration laws that are at issue in this impeachment. The Supreme Court held that States have no standing to seek judicial relief to compel Alejandro N. Mayorkas to comply with certain legal requirements contained in the Immigration and Nationality Act. However, the Supreme Court held that ''even though the federal courts lack Article III jurisdiction over this suit, other forums remain open for examining the Executive Branch's enforcement policies. For example, Congress possesses an array of tools to analyze and influence those policies [and] those are political checks for the political process''. One such critical tool for Congress to influence the Executive Branch to comply with the immigration laws of the United States is impeachment. The dissenting Justice noted, ''The Court holds Texas lacks standing to challenge a federal policy that inflicts substantial harm on the State and its residents by releasing illegal aliens with criminal convictions for serious crimes. In order to reach this conclusion, the Court...holds that the only limit on the power of a President to disobey a law like the important provision at issue is Congress' power to employ the weapons of inter-branch warfare...''. As the dissenting Justice explained, ''Congress may wield what the Solicitor General described as 'political...tools'—which presumably means such things as...impeachment and removal''. Indeed, during oral argument, the Justice who authored the majority opinion stated to the Solicitor General, ''I think your position is, instead of judicial review, Congress has to resort to shutting down the government or impeachment or dramatic steps...''. Here, in light of the inability of injured parties to seek judicial relief to remedy the refusal of Alejandro N. Mayorkas to comply with Federal immigration laws, impeachment is Congress's only viable option.

In all of this, Alejandro N. Mayorkas willfully and systemically refused to comply with the immigration laws, failed to control the border to the detriment of national security, compromised public safety, and violated the rule of law and separation of powers in the Constitution, to the manifest injury of the people of the United States.

Wherefore Alejandro N. Mayorkas, by such conduct, has demonstrated that he will remain a threat to national and border security, the safety of the United States people, and the Constitution if allowed to remain in office, and has acted in a manner grossly incompatible with his duties and the rule of law. Alejandro N. Mayorkas thus warrants impeachment and trial, removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States.

ARTICLE II: BREACH OF PUBLIC TRUST

The Constitution provides that the House of Representatives ''shall have the sole Power of Impeachment'' and that civil Officers of the United States, including the Secretary of Homeland Security, ''shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors''. In his conduct while Secretary of Homeland Security, Alejandro N. Mayorkas, in violation of his oath to well and faithfully discharge the duties of his office, has breached the public trust, in that:

Alejandro N. Mayorkas has knowingly made false statements, and knowingly obstructed lawful oversight of the Department of Homeland Security (hereinafter referred to as ''DHS''), principally to obfuscate the results of his willful and systemic refusal to comply with the law. Alejandro N. Mayorkas engaged in this scheme or course of conduct through the following means:

(1) Alejandro N. Mayorkas knowingly made false statements to Congress that the border is ''secure'', that the border is ''no less secure than it was previously'', that the border is ''closed'', and that DHS has ''operational control'' of the border (as that term is defined in the Secure Fence Act of 2006).

(2) Alejandro N. Mayorkas knowingly made false statements to Congress regarding the scope and adequacy of the vetting of the thousands of Afghans who were airlifted to the United States and then granted parole following the Taliban takeover of Afghanistan after President Biden's precipitous withdrawal of United States forces.

(3) Alejandro N. Mayorkas knowingly made false statements that apprehended aliens with no legal basis to remain in the United States were being quickly removed.

(4) Alejandro N. Mayorkas knowingly made false statements supporting the false narrative that U.S. Border Patrol agents maliciously whipped illegal aliens.

(5) Alejandro N. Mayorkas failed to comply with multiple subpoenas issued by congressional committees.

(6) Alejandro N. Mayorkas delayed or denied access of DHS Office of Inspector General (hereinafter referred to as ''OIG'') to DHS records and information, hampering OIG's ability to effectively perform its vital investigations, audits, inspections, and other reviews of agency programs and operations to satisfy the OIG's obligations under section 402(b) of title 5, United States Code, in part, to Congress.

Additionally, in his conduct while Secretary of Homeland Security, Alejandro N. Mayorkas has breached the public trust by his willful refusal to fulfill his statutory ''duty to control and guard the boundaries and borders of the United States against the illegal entry of aliens'' as set forth in section 103(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Alejandro N. Mayorkas inherited what his first Chief of the U.S. Border Patrol called, ''arguably the most effective border security in our nation's history''. Alejandro N. Mayorkas, however, proceeded to abandon effective border security initiatives without engaging in adequate alternative efforts that would enable DHS to maintain control of the border and guard against illegal entry, and despite clear evidence of the devastating consequences of his actions, he failed to take action to fulfill his statutory duty to control the border. According to his first Chief of the U.S. Border Patrol, Alejandro N. Mayorkas ''summarily rejected'' the ''multiple options to reduce the illegal entries...through proven programs and consequences'' provided by civil service staff at DHS. Despite clear evidence of the devastating consequences of his actions, he failed to take action to fulfill his statutory duty to control the border, in that, among other things:

(1) Alejandro N. Mayorkas terminated the Migrant Protection Protocols (hereinafter referred to as ''MPP''). In *Texas* v. *Biden*, 20 F.4th 928 (2021), the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit explained that ''[t]he district court...pointed to evidence that 'the termination of MPP has contributed to the current border surge'...(citing DHS's own previous determinations that MPP had curbed the rate of illegal entries)''. The district court had also ''pointed out that the number of 'enforcement encounters'—that is, instances where immigration officials encounter immigrants attempting to cross the southern border without documentation—had 'skyrocketed' since MPP's termination''.

(2) Alejandro N. Mayorkas terminated contracts for border wall construction.

(3) Alejandro N. Mayorkas terminated asylum cooperative agreements that would have equitably shared the burden of complying with international asylum accords.

In all of this, Alejandro N. Mayorkas breached the public trust by knowingly making false statements to Congress and the American people and avoiding lawful oversight in order to obscure the devastating consequences of his willful and systemic refusal to comply with the law and carry out his statutory duties. He has also breached the public trust by willfully refusing to carry out his statutory duty to control the border and guard against illegal entry, notwithstanding the calamitous consequences of his abdication of that duty.

Wherefore Alejandro N. Mayorkas, by such conduct, has demonstrated that he will remain a threat to national and border security, the safety of the American people, and to the Constitution if allowed to remain in office, and has acted in a manner grossly incompatible with his duties and the rule of law. Alejandro N. Mayorkas thus warrants impeachment and trial, removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 5921. An act to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from authorizing certain transactions by a United States financial institution in connection with Iran, to prevent the International Monetary Fund from providing financial assistance to Iran, to codify prohibitions on Export-Import Bank financing for the Government of Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 5923. An act to impose restrictions on correspondent and payable-through accounts in the United States with respect to Chinese financial institutions that conduct transactions involving the purchase of petroleum or petroleum products from Iran; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 6408. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to terminate the tax-exempt status of terrorist supporting organizations; to the Committee on Finance.

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–4031. A communication from the President and CEO, Inter-American Foundation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Foundation's FY23 Annual Performance Report (APR) and FY25 Annual Performance Plan (APP); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4032. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the second session of the 118th Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4033. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting additional legislative

proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the second session of the 118th Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4034. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015, with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4035. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notification of intent to exercise the authority under section 506(a) (2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, to provide assistance to Haiti; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4036. A communication from the President and CEO, Inter-American Foundation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Foundation's FY25 Congressional Budget Justification; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4037. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license amendment for the export of firearms abroad controlled under Category I of the U.S. Munitions List to Senagal in the amount of $1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 22–037); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4038. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license amendment for the export of firearms, parts, and components controlled under Category I of the U.S. Munitions List to Sweden in the amount of $1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 23–063); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4039. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed amendment for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services to the United Kingdom in the amount of $50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 23–070); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4040. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license amendment for the export of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to various countries in the amount of $100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 23–065); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4041. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license amendment for the export of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to Canada and the UK in the amount of $50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 23–079); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4042. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''A report concerning amendments to paragraph (c)(5) of Category XI of the U.S. Munitions List, within the International Traffic in Arms Regulations, 22 CFR pts. 120–130, promulgated pursuant to section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778)''; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4043. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed transfer of major defense equipment, with a sales value of approximately $1,326,000,000 (Transmittal No. RSAT–23–9887); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4044. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license amendment for the export of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to the United Arab Emirates and the United Kingdom in the amount of $50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 23–062); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4045. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed transfer of major defense equipment, with a sales value of approximately $270,000,000 (Transmittal No. RSAT–23–9987); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4046. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed amendment for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services to the United Kingdom in the amount of $100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 23–076); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4047. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license amendment for the export of firearms abroad controlled under Category I of the U.S. Munitions List to Sweden in the amount of $1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 23–084); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4048. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license amendment for the export of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to the Republic of Korea in the amount of $100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 23–078); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4049. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing Benefits'' received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 4, 2024; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4050. A communication from the Regulatory Policy Analyst, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Food Additives: Food Contact Substance Notification That Is No Longer Effective'' (RIN0910–AI01) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 4, 2024; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4051. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Institute of Museum and Library Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Director of the Institute of Museum and Library Services, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 4, 2024; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4052. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Short-Term, Limited-Duration Insurance and Independent, Noncoordinated Excepted Benefits Coverage'' (RIN1210–AC12) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 4, 2024; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4053. A communication from the Senior Policy and Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Short-Term, Limited-Duration Insurance and Independent, Noncoordinated Excepted Benefits Coverage'' (RIN0938–AU67) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 2, 2024; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4054. A communication from the Supervisory Workforce Analyst, Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act Effectiveness in Serving Employers Performance Indicator Joint'' (RIN1205–AC01) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2024; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4055. A communication from the Supervisory Workforce Analyst, Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act Title I Non-Core Program Effectiveness in Serving Employers Performance Indicator'' (RIN1205–AC08) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2024; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4056. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment to Prohibited Transaction Class Exemption 84–14 (the QPAM Exemption)'' (RIN1210–ZA07) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 4, 2024; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4057. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Community Services Block Grant Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2019''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4058. A communication from the Board of Trustees, National Railroad Retirement Investment Trust, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual management report relative to its operations and financial condition for fiscal year 2023; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4059. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Upholding Civil Service Protections and Merit System Principles'' (RIN3206–AO56) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 11, 2024; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4060. A joint communication from the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary

of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to Thefts, Losses, or Releases of Select Agents and Toxins for Calendar Year 2022; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4061. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the second session of the 118th Congress; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4062. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the second session of the 118th Congress; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4063. A communication from the Equal Employment Opportunity and Inclusion Director, Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation's fiscal year 2023 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4064. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Technical Correction'' (5 CFR Part 1631) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 4, 2024; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4065. A communication from the Equal Employment Opportunity Director, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Farm Credit Administration's fiscal year 2023 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4066. A communication from the General Counsel, Government Accountability Office, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office's fiscal year 2023 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4067. A communication from the Secretary to the Board, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's fiscal year 2023 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4068. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report advising Congress that the President is exercising his authority to remove from office the Inspector General for the Railroad Retirement Board; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4069. A communication from the Deputy Archivist of the United States, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulations Implementing the Privacy Act of 1974'' (RIN3095–AC21) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 4, 2024; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4070. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Removal of 30-Calendar-Day Waiting Period Between Withdrawals'' (5 CFR Part 1650) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 4, 2024; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4071. A communication from the Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Corporation's fiscal year 2023 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act) received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4072. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25–427, ''Restaurant Revitalization and Dram Shop Clarification Amendment Act of 2024''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4073. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25–415, ''Medical Cannabis Clarification Supplemental Temporary Amendment Act of 2024''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4074. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25–416, ''Medical Cannabis License Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2024''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4075. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25–417, ''Election Worker Protection Temporary Amendment Act of 2024'' ; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4076. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25–418, ''Historic Preservation of Derelict District Properties Extension Temporary Amendment Act of 2024''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4077. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25–419, ''Extended Students' Right to Home or Hospital Instruction Amendment Act of 2024''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4078. A communication from the Director of Equal Employment Opportunity, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's 2023 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act) received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4079. A communication from the Chief Judge, Superior Court of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Superior Court's Family Court 2023 Annual Report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–101. A resolution adopted by the City Council of Hialeah, Florida expressing its unanimous and unconditional support of the state of Israel in its military campaign against Hamas, a terrorist organization that undertook an unprovoked and criminal attack on October 7, 2023, resulting in the deaths and abductions of thousands of Israeli civilians; and urging the United States to support Israel in its hour of need and supporting Israel's ability to protect itself and its people from Hamas, and similar terrorist organizations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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 Mrs. BRITT (for herself and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 4126. A bill to allow a period in which members of the clergy may revoke their exemption from Social Security coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. LANKFORD, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. CAPITO, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 4127. A bill to provide for the consideration of a definition of antisemitism set forth by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance for the enforcement of Federal antidiscrimination laws concerning education programs or activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TUBERVILLE (for himself, Mr. MARSHALL, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. ERNST, Mr. BUDD, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 4128. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress a report on abortions facilitated by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 4129. A bill to contribute funds and artifacts to the Theodore Roosevelt Presidential Library in Medora, North Dakota; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Ms. ERNST):

S. 4130. A bill to require the establishment of a pilot program to expand early child care options for members of the Armed Forces and their families; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

S. 4131. A bill to reform Federal firearms laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself and Ms. BUTLER):

S. 4132. A bill to establish the Chuckwalla National Monument and expand Joshua Tree

National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. TUBERVILLE, and Mr. HAGERTY):

S. 4133. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to require secret ballot elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PADILLA:

S. 4134. A bill to amend the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 2014 with respect to the total amount of Federal assistance for projects in States experiencing severe drought and projects in historically disadvantaged communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 4135. A bill to require broad agreement for changes to sentencing law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. BRAUN, and Mr. MULLIN):

S. Res. 642. A resolution urging all members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to oppose confirmation of a new Secretary General, if the candidate was a former leader of a member country which did not spend 2 percent of gross domestic product (GDP) on defense; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. Res. 643. A resolution recognizing the Interstate Compact on Educational Opportunity for Military Children and expressing support for the designation of April 2024 as the ''Month of the Military Child''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. BUTLER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WELCH):

S. Res. 644. A resolution expressing support for the designation of April 1, 2024, through April 30, 2024, as ''Fair Chance Jobs Month''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KING (for himself, Mr. DAINES, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. COONS, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. TESTER, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BUDD, Mr. BENNET, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. BRAUN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. PETERS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. BUTLER, Mr. COTTON, Ms. SMITH, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WICKER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MARSHALL, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CRUZ, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. REED, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. KAINE, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. Res. 645. A resolution designating the week of April 20 through April 28, 2024, as ''National Park Week''; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Mr. MULLIN):

S. Res. 646. A resolution honoring the life and legacy of Lieutenant General Thomas P. Stafford; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 42

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 42, a bill to improve the management and performance of the capital asset programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs so as to better serve veterans, their families, caregivers, and survivors, and for other purposes.

S. 138

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 138, a bill to amend the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 to modify certain provisions of that Act.

S. 444

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 444, a bill to require any convention, agreement, or other international instrument on pandemic prevention, preparedness, and response reached by the World Health Assembly to be subject to Senate ratification.

S. 567

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. BUTLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 567, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, and for other purposes.

S. 663

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 663, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the waiting periods for disability insurance benefits and Medicare coverage for individuals with metastatic breast cancer, and for other purposes.

S. 704

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors 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. 711

At the request of Mr. BUDD, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 711, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the invaluable service that working dogs provide to society.

S. 712

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. BUTLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 712, a bill to identify and address barriers to coverage of remote physiologic devices under State Medicaid programs to improve maternal and child health outcomes for pregnant and postpartum women.

S. 815

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 815, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the female telephone operators of the Army Signal Corps, known as the ''Hello Girls''.

S. 1161

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1161, a bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to reauthorize the voluntary public access and habitat incentive program.

S. 1252

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1252, a bill to support the human rights of Uyghurs and members of other ethnic groups residing primarily in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region and safeguard their distinct civilization and identity, and for other purposes.

S. 1267

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1267, a bill to amend the Fair Housing Act to prohibit discrimination based on source of income, veteran status, or military status.

S. 1514

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1514, a bill to amend the National Housing Act to establish a mortgage insurance program for first responders, and for other purposes.

S. 1705

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1705, a bill to amend the Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grant program to promote career awareness in accounting as part of a well-rounded STEM educational experience.

S. 1723

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1723, a bill to establish the Truth and Healing Commission on Indian Boarding School Policies in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1885

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1885, a bill to eliminate employment-based visa caps on abused, abandoned, and neglected children eligible for humanitarian status, and for other purposes.

S. 1950

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) were added as cosponsors of S. 1950, a bill to extend the temporary order for fentanyl-related substances.

S. 2003

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2003, a bill to authorize the Secretary of State to provide additional assistance to Ukraine using assets confiscated from the Central Bank of the Russian Federation and other sovereign assets of the Russian Federation, and for other purposes.

S. 2188

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2188, a bill to increase access to pre-exposure prophylaxis to reduce the transmission of HIV.

S. 2294

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2294, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to furnish hospital care and medical services to veterans and dependents who were stationed at military installations at which those veterans and dependents were exposed to perfluorooctanoic acid or other perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances, to provide for a presumption of service connection for certain veterans who were stationed at military installations at which those veterans were exposed to such substances, and for other purposes.

S. 2307

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2307, a bill to support and strengthen the fighter aircraft capabilities of the Air Force, and for other purposes.

S. 2757

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2757, a bill to limit the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from modifying the rate of payment or reimbursement for transportation of veterans or other individuals via special modes of transportation under the laws administered by the Secretary, and for other purposes.

S. 2825

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2825, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the United States Army Dustoff crews of the Vietnam War, collectively, in recognition of their extraordinary heroism and lifesaving actions in Vietnam.

S. 3119

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3119, a bill to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from reclassifying broadband internet access service as a telecommunications service and from imposing certain regulations on providers of such service.

S. 3305

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

S. 3356

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3356, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to modify the role and duties of United States Postal Service police officers, and for other purposes.

S. 3409

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. BUTLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3409, a bill to end the use of solitary confinement and other forms of restrictive housing in all Federal agencies and entities with which Federal agencies contract.

S. 3531

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3531, a bill to prohibit actions to carry out the Department of Commerce's pause in the issuance of new export licenses for certain exports under the Commerce Control List.

S. 3765

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor 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 name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor 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. 3954

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3954, a bill to amend the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 to promote timely exploration for geothermal resources under geothermal leases, and for other purposes.

S. 4057

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4057, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to postpone tax deadlines and reimburse paid late fees for United States nationals who are unlawfully or wrongfully detained or held hostage abroad, and for other purposes.

S. 4071

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4071, a bill to establish an Office of Colonias and Farmworker Initiatives within the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

S. 4072

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VANCE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4072, a bill to prohibit the use of funds to implement, administer, or enforce certain rules of the Environmental Protection Agency.

S. 4084

At the request of Mr. WELCH, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) were added as cosponsors 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. 4093

At the request of Mr. BUDD, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4093, a bill to review and consider terminating the designation of the State of Qatar as a major non-NATO ally, and for other purposes.

S. 4120

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4120, a bill to support the direct care professional workforce, and for other purposes.

S. 4125

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SCHMITT) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 4125, a bill to establish the Jackie Robinson Ballpark National Commemorative Site in the State of Florida, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 63

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 63, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to

''Employee or Independent Contractor Classification Under the Fair Labor Standards Act''.

S. RES. 74

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. BUTLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 74, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of the Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

S. RES. 385

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 385, a resolution calling for the immediate release of Evan Gershkovich, a United States citizen and journalist, who was wrongfully detained by the Government of the Russian Federation in March 2023.

S. RES. 589

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 589, a resolution honoring Wadee Alfayoumi, a 6-year-old Palestinian-American boy, murdered as a victim of a hate crime for his Palestinian-Muslim identity, in the State of Illinois.

S. RES. 599

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 599, a resolution protecting the Iranian political refugees, including female former political prisoners, in Ashraf-3 in Albania.

S. RES. 616

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 616, a resolution condemning the treatment of Dr. Gubad Ibadoghlu by the Government of Azerbaijan and urging his immediate release, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself and Ms. BUTLER):

S. 4132. A bill to establish the Chuckwalla National Monument and expand Joshua Tree National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. PADILLA. Madam President, I rise to introduce the Chuckwalla National Monument Establishment and Joshua Tree National Park Expansion Act.

The Chuckwalla National Monument Establishment and Joshua Tree National Park Expansion Act would establish a new Chuckwalla National Monument to protect approximately 620,000 acres of public lands, while also expanding Joshua Tree National Park by adding approximately 17,842 acres of previously designated public lands that were identified as suitable for inclusion in the park by the National Park Service.

The proposed Chuckwalla National Monument's vast desert landscape spanning from the area along Joshua Tree National Park's southern boundary, along Interstate 10 from the eastern Coachella Valley, and all the way to the Colorado River are worthy of permanent protection.

This area has a unique, biodiverse ecosystem; is home to habitats for species like the Chuckwalla lizard and the endangered desert tortoise; and contains critical migration corridors for desert bighorn sheep. This area is also cherished for outdoor recreation activities like hiking and rock climbing.

The lands within the proposed national monument include the homelands of the Iviatim, Nuwu, Pipa Aha Macav, Kwatsaan, and Maara'yam peoples (Cahuilla, Chemehuevi, Mojave, Quechan, and Serrano Nations). Designating the Chuckwalla National Monument would help to protect important spiritual and cultural values tied to the land such as multi-use trail systems established by indigenous peoples, sacred sites and objects, traditional cultural places, geoglyphs, petroglyphs, pictographs, and native plants and wildlife.

I am proud to work to introduce this legislation that would preserve part of California's vast desert landscape, help ensure more equitable access to nature and recreation, protect biodiversity, and preserve decades of cultural riches, particularly for the Tribal governments who have worked so hard to protect this area.

I want to thank Representative RAUL RUIZ of California for leading the House companion and Senator BUTLER for her cosponsorship in the Senate. I look forward to working with our colleagues to pass the Chuckwalla National Monument Establishment and Joshua Tree National Park Expansion Act as quickly as possible.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 642—URGING ALL MEMBERS OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION TO OPPOSE CONFIRMATION OF A NEW SECRETARY GENERAL, IF THE CANDIDATE WAS A FORMER LEADER OF A MEMBER COUNTRY WHICH DID NOT SPEND 2 PERCENT OF GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT (GDP) ON DEFENSE

Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. BRAUN, and Mr. MULLIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 642

Whereas, in 2006, member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) first agreed to spend 2 percent of gross domestic product on defense;

Whereas, in 2014, at the NATO Summit in Wales, all member countries once again committed to maintain or move toward meeting the 2-percent defense spending minimum within 10 years;

Whereas, by 2022, only 11 member countries met the 2-percent minimum, including the United States and the United Kingdom, which were the only 2 major economies;

Whereas, throughout 2023, several countries significantly increased their defense spending, and in 2024, NATO expects 18 member countries to achieve the spending commitment despite historically not being able to fulfill the commitment;

Whereas this commitment is important to not only the defense of all NATO member nations, but also a commitment to the alliance itself; and

Whereas, through the Secretary General's role as the senior officer of the alliance, they must advocate for the fulfillment of the commitment and the continued strength of the alliance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) declares that the next Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization should not be a former leader of a member country that did not spend 2 percent of its gross domestic product on defense spending;

(2) emphasizes that the demonstrated ability of countries with economies of all sizes within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to meet the 2-percent defense spending minimum proves that the failure of a member country to meet the commitment is a choice of will and not of circumstance;

(3) acknowledges that it would be hypocritical for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to be led by a Secretary General who formerly led an alliance member country that failed to fulfill the 2-percent gross defense spending minimum;

(4) declares that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization will never reach its full potential as long as the Secretary General is a member of a country's leadership that did not fulfill its commitment to the Organization; and

(5) urges all member countries to prioritize defense spending and to meet their obligations to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

SENATE RESOLUTION 643—RECOGNIZING THE INTERSTATE COMPACT ON EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY FOR MILITARY CHILDREN AND EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF APRIL 2024 AS THE ''MONTH OF THE MILITARY CHILD''

Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. RES. 643

Whereas brave men and women serve in the Armed Forces and protect the security and freedom of the United States;

Whereas over 1,300,000 active-duty members and nearly 1,000,000 ready-reserve members serve in the Armed Forces;

Whereas there are more than 1,540,000 military-connected children and youth who move, on average, 6 to 9 times during their educational career;

Whereas they encounter unique educational challenges when these children and youth move between public and Department of Defense Education Activity schools;

Whereas the Interstate Compact on Educational Opportunity for Military Children

was developed in 2007 by the Department of Defense and the Council of State Governments to ease the educational transitions of military-connected students attending public schools and Department of Defense schools worldwide;

Whereas the Compact helps military children and youth stay on grade level and facilitates on-time graduation;

Whereas, while it is not exhaustive in its coverage, the Compact addresses key issues encountered by military families: eligibility, enrollment, placement, and graduation;

Whereas the Compact uses a comprehensive approach to provide a consistent policy in every school district and member State;

Whereas the Compact Commission, which includes the 50 States and District of Columbia, works tirelessly to recognize that our military-connected children and youth serve too and to pay tribute to their commitment and service to the country; and

Whereas April is the Month of the Military Child, and a month-long salute will encourage our country to support military-connected children and youth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate encourages—

(1) citizens to ''Purple Up!'' and wear purple to express our appreciation and celebrate the unsung heroes of the Armed Forces; and

(2) all citizens, communities, and business and government leaders across the United States to honor, support, and show appreciation for military-connected children and youth.

SENATE RESOLUTION 644—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF APRIL 1, 2024, THROUGH APRIL 30, 2024, AS ''FAIR CHANCE JOBS MONTH''

Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. BUTLER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WELCH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 644

Whereas, in the United States—

(1) nearly 80,000,000 people have a record of arrest or conviction;

(2) an estimated 19,000,000 people have felony convictions;

(3) nearly 13,000,000 people are charged each year with misdemeanor offenses;

(4) 600,000 people are released each year from Federal and State prisons;

(5) Black, Indigenous, and Latino people are 5, 4.2, and 2.4 times more likely than White people to be incarcerated, respectively, and also face higher rates of arrest; and

(6) LGBTQ+ individuals are 3 times more likely to be incarcerated and also face higher rates of arrest;

Whereas people who have been convicted of a crime and served their sentence continue to face consequences after release due to systemic biases and stigmas against formerly incarcerated individuals;

Whereas recidivism rates in the United States are among the highest in the world, with almost 44 percent of people who are released returning to incarceration within 1 year;

Whereas, in the United States, nearly ⅔ of the formerly incarcerated population is jobless at any given time;

Whereas, in the United States, nearly 14,000 laws and regulations and 48,000 collateral consequences restrict formerly incarcerated individuals from getting professional licenses needed to work in some jobs;

Whereas 20 States and the District of Columbia allow occupational licensing boards to categorically reject applicants with prior convictions;

Whereas obstacles to employment, such as difficulty obtaining identification needed for employment, add undue burdens on returning citizens and formerly incarcerated individuals;

Whereas formerly incarcerated individuals earn nearly $100 less per week than the average worker;

Whereas fair-chance employers can leverage financial incentives, such as the work opportunity tax credit, to benefit from hiring formerly incarcerated individuals;

Whereas employing returning citizens and formerly incarcerated individuals will result in a robust, vibrant, diverse, and resilient workforce;

Whereas having jobs that pay living wages, are conducive to health, provide opportunities for skillset development, provide opportunities for promotion, and provide benefits will facilitate stable employment and reduce recidivism;

Whereas returning citizens who have received vocational training while incarcerated are 28 percent more likely to obtain employment within 1 year of reentry into society than those lacking such training; and

Whereas, in addition to employment insecurity, returning citizens and formerly incarcerated people face numerous other obstacles to reentry and societal reintegration, including—

(1) housing insecurity and homelessness rates that are 10 times higher than the general public;

(2) near total restrictions in 12 States on access to temporary assistance for needy families established under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) or the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.); and

(3) greater prevalence of chronic health conditions, lower quality and coverage of health insurance, and mortality rates that are 13 times higher than the general public: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses support for the designation of April 1, 2024, through April 30, 2024, as ''Fair Chance Jobs Month''; and

(2) supports efforts to—

(A) ensure that people directly impacted by incarceration obtain stable and high-quality employment, housing, healthcare, and nutrition;

(B) dismantle structural barriers to fair-chance hiring and employment, such as licensing restrictions, employer liability, and insurance restrictions;

(C) expand workforce development programs for returning citizens, formerly incarcerated individuals, and others directly impacted by incarceration, including—

(i) pre-apprenticeship programs;

(ii) registered apprenticeship programs;

(iii) career coaching, resume-building, technology literacy, and other skillset development programs; and

(iv) programs that educate employers on best practices for, and the benefits of, fair-chance hiring;

(D) match jobs providers with returning citizens and formerly incarcerated individuals seeking jobs;

(E) support efforts from labor unions and worker organizations to engage returning citizens and formerly incarcerated individuals who are seeking jobs;

(F) publicize work opportunities that are open to applicants with prior arrest or conviction records; and

(G) foster greater collaboration and dialogue between Federal, State, and local government agencies, community-based organizations, advocacy groups, employers, labor unions, currently and formerly incarcerated individuals, and others directly impacted by incarceration to enhance fair-chance hiring and employment and help to heal communities impacted by mass incarceration.

SENATE RESOLUTION 645—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF APRIL 20 THROUGH APRIL 28, 2024, AS ''NATIONAL PARK WEEK''

Mr. KING (for himself, Mr. DAINES, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. COONS, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. TESTER, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BUDD, Mr. BENNET, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. BRAUN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. PETERS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. BUTLER, Mr. COTTON, Ms. SMITH, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WICKER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MARSHALL, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CRUZ, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. REED, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. KAINE, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. MURPHY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 645

Whereas, on March 1, 1872, Congress established Yellowstone National Park as the first national park for the enjoyment of the people of the United States;

Whereas, on August 25, 1916, Congress established the National Park Service with the mission to preserve unimpaired the natural and cultural resources and values of the National Park System for the enjoyment, education, and inspiration of current and future generations;

Whereas the National Park Service continues to protect and manage the majestic landscapes, hallowed battlefields, and iconic cultural and historical sites of the United States;

Whereas the units of the National Park System can be found in every State and many territories of the United States, and many of those units embody the rich natural and cultural heritage of the United States, reflect a unique national story through people and places, and offer countless opportunities for recreation, volunteerism, cultural exchange, education, civic engagement, and exploration;

Whereas, in 2023, the national parks of the United States attracted nearly 325,500,000 recreational visits, an increase of 4 percent over 2022 visitation levels;

Whereas visits and visitors to the national parks of the United States are important economic drivers, responsible for contributing $50,300,000,000 in spending to the national economy in 2022;

Whereas the dedicated employees of the National Park Service carry out their mission to protect the units of the National

Park System so that the vibrant culture, diverse wildlife, and priceless resources of these unique places will endure for perpetuity; and

Whereas the people of the United States have inherited the remarkable legacy of the National Park System and are entrusted with the preservation of the National Park System throughout its second century: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of April 20 through April 28, 2024, as ''National Park Week''; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States and the world to responsibly visit, experience, recreate in, and support the treasured national parks of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 646—HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL THOMAS P. STAFFORD

Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Mr. MULLIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 646

Whereas, on September 17, 1930, Lieutenant General Thomas Patten Stafford (referred to in this preamble as ''General Stafford'') was born in Weatherford, Oklahoma, to Thomas and Mary Ellen Stafford;

Whereas, in 1952, General Stafford graduated with honors from the United States Naval Academy, after which he joined the newly formed Air Force;

Whereas, in 1958, General Stafford entered the United States Air Force Experimental Test Pilot School at Edwards Air Force Base, California;

Whereas, in 1959, General Stafford graduated from the United States Air Force Experimental Test Pilot School, receiving the A.B. Honts Award as the outstanding graduate, and thereafter became an instructor and wrote flight performance and aerodynamics textbooks for the school;

Whereas, in 1962, General Stafford was chosen among the second group of astronauts by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (referred to in this preamble as ''NASA'') to serve in projects Gemini and Apollo;

Whereas, in 1965, General Stafford developed techniques for and piloted Gemini VI, completing the first rendezvous in space;

Whereas, in 1966, General Stafford commanded Gemini IX, demonstrating 3 different types of rendezvous, including the rendezvous that would be used in future Apollo lunar missions;

Whereas, in 1969, General Stafford commanded Apollo 10, piloted the first lunar module to descend within 9 miles of the Moon, designated the first lunar landing site, performed reconnaissance of future Apollo landing sites, and completed each of the essential steps in the final preparation for the upcoming Moon landing, including the first rendezvous around the Moon;

Whereas General Stafford and his crew won the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences Special Trustees Award (commonly known as an ''Emmy Award'') for initiating development of and taking the first colored images from space;

Whereas, during the return of the Apollo 10 mission, General Stafford set the record for the fastest speed traveled by a human, at 24,791 miles per hour (or Mach 36), which, as of 2024, is still the record and is documented in the Guinness World Book of Records;

Whereas, in 1975, General Stafford took command of the Apollo-Soyuz Test Project for his final space mission, during which General Stafford and Cosmonaut Alexei Leonov shook hands during docking, completing the first international space flight and helping to diminish Cold War tensions;

Whereas General Stafford was nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize for his role in the Apollo-Soyuz mission;

Whereas, in 1975, General Stafford left NASA to serve as the commander of the Air Force Test Center at Edwards Air Force Base, California;

Whereas General Stafford, as Air Force Deputy Chief of Staff for Research, Development, and Acquisition, established requirements for, and initiated development of, the first stealth attack aircraft, the F117A, which was the only stealth attack aircraft in the world for 25 years, and initiated the Air Force roadmap for the air superiority fighter that is still in use in 2024;

Whereas General Stafford, just before his retirement in 1979, wrote the specifications for, and initiated the development of, the Advanced Technology Bomber, now known as the B–2 Stealth Bomber, the only stealth bomber force in the world as of 2024, and initiated the development of the AGM–129 Advanced Cruise Missile;

Whereas, from 1991 to 1993, General Stafford led the efforts of NASA to repair and service the Hubble Space Telescope and was presented with the NASA Public Service Award;

Whereas, in 2011, General Stafford was awarded the Wright Brothers Memorial Trophy for pioneering achievements that have led the way to the Moon, to greater international cooperation in space, and to a safer United States;

Whereas General Stafford completed more than 507 hours in space flight time and flew more than 127 types of aircraft and helicopters during his career, along with 4 kinds of spacecraft and 3 types of boosters;

Whereas General Stafford advised several Presidents on space policy and served as the Chairman of the NASA Advisory Task Force on the International Space Station;

Whereas General Stafford gave a lifetime of service to the United States—

(1) as a member of the Armed Forces;

(2) as an astronaut and commander at NASA; and

(3) while serving in other positions in the executive branch;

Whereas General Stafford contributed immensely to the space race and the advancement of the United States in space policy and exploration; and

Whereas General Stafford demonstrated extraordinary dedication and service to the United States throughout his distinguished career: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the life and legacy of Lieutenant General Thomas P. Stafford for his contributions to the Armed Forces and the space mission of the United States; and

(2) extends its heartfelt condolences to the family and friends of Lieutenant General Thomas P. Stafford.

NOTICES OF INTENT TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I submit the following notice in writing:

In accordance with Rule V of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend the following: (1) Rule VII, paragraph 2; (2) Rule VIII, paragraph 2 the phrase ''during the first two hours of a new legislative day.''; and (3) Rule XIV, paragraph 6 for the purpose of considering on the same day as introduction an organizing resolution relating to the impeachment trial of Alejandro N. Mayorkas, Secretary of Homeland Security, the text of which is as follows:

SECTION 1. SUMMONS.

(a) In General.—A summons shall be issued which commands Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas to file with the Secretary of the Senate (in this resolution referred to as the ''Secretary'') an answer to the articles of impeachment with respect to Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas no later than 8 session days after the date on which the articles of impeachment are transmitted, and thereafter to abide by, obey, and perform such orders, directions, and judgments as the Senate shall make in the premises, according to the Constitution and laws of the United States.

(b) Service.—The Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate is authorized to utilize the services of the Deputy Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate or another employee of the Senate in serving the summons.

(c) Notice Of Answer.—The Secretary shall notify the House of Representatives of the filing of the answer and shall provide a copy of the answer to the House of Representatives.

(d) Filing Of Replication.—The Managers on the part of the House of Representatives may file with the Secretary a replication no later than 7 session days after the date on which the articles of impeachment are transmitted.

(e) Notice To Counsel.—The Secretary shall notify counsel for Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas of the filing of a replication, and shall provide counsel with a copy.

(f) Delivery And Printing Of Answer And .Replication; Entry Of Plea.—The Secretary shall provide the answer and the replication, if any, to the Presiding Officer of the Senate on the first day the Senate is in session after the Secretary receives them, and the Presiding Officer shall cause the answer and replication, if any, to be printed in the Senate Journal and in the Congressional Record. If a timely answer has not been filed, the Presiding Officer shall cause a plea of not guilty to be entered.

(g) Printing As Senate Document.—The articles of impeachment, the answer, and the replication, if any, together with the provisions of the Constitution of the United States on impeachment, and the Rules of Procedure and Practice in the Senate When Sitting on Impeachment Trials, shall be printed under the direction of the Secretary as a Senate document.

(h) Relation To Rules.—The provisions of this section shall govern notwithstanding any provisions to the contrary in the Rules of Procedure and Practice in the Senate When Sitting on Impeachment Trials.

(i) Motion To Table.—A motion to table the articles of impeachment shall not be in order.

SEC. 2. COMMITTEE.

(a) In General.—Pursuant to rule XI of the Rules of Procedure and Practice in the Senate When Sitting on Impeachment Trials (in this section referred to as ''rule XI''), not later than 7 session days after the date on which the articles of impeachment are transmitted, the Presiding Officer shall appoint a committee of 12 Senators to perform the duties and to exercise the powers provided for in rule XI (in this resolution referred to as the ''committee'').

(b) Recommendations.—The majority leader and minority leader, in consultation with their respective conference, shall each recommend 6 members, including a chair and

vice chair, respectively, to the Presiding Officer for appointment to the committee.

(c) Authority As A Standing Committee.—The committee shall be deemed to be a standing committee of the Senate for the purpose of reporting to the Senate resolutions for the criminal or civil enforcement of the committee's subpoenas or orders, and for the purpose of printing reports, hearings, and other documents for submission to the Senate under rule XI.

(d) Authority To Waive Requirements Relating To Questions.—During proceedings conducted under rule XI, the chair of the committee is authorized to waive the requirement under the Rules of Procedure and Practice in the Senate When Sitting on Impeachment Trials that questions by a Senator to a witness, a manager, or counsel shall be reduced to writing and put by the Presiding Officer.

(e) Report.—Not later than 90 calendar days after the date on which all members of the committee are appointed under subsection (a), the committee shall submit to the Senate a report compiling all evidence, exhibits, and witness testimony received by the committee, which—

(1) shall include a certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings had and testimony given before the committee; and

(2) may include a statement of facts that are uncontested and a summary, with appropriate references to the record, of evidence that the parties have introduced on contested issues of fact.

(f) Staffing And Expenses.—The actual and necessary expenses of the committee, including the employment of staff at an annual rate of pay, and the employment of consultants with prior approval of the Committee on Rules and Administration at a rate not to exceed the maximum daily rate for a standing committee of the Senate, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate from the appropriation account ''Miscellaneous Items'' upon vouchers approved by the chair of the committee, except that no voucher shall be required to pay the salary of any employee who is compensated at an annual rate of pay.

(g) Termination.—The committee shall terminate not later than 45 calendar days after the pronouncement of judgment by the Senate on the articles of impeachment against Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas.

SEC. 3. CONVENING AS COURT OF IMPEACHMENT.

At 1 p.m. on the first day on which the Senate is in session after the date that is 90 calendar days after the date on which all members of the committee established under section 2 are appointed, the Senate shall convene as a Court of Impeachment to consider the articles of impeachment against Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas.

SEC. 4. NOTICE.

The Secretary shall notify the House of Representatives and counsel for Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas of this resolution.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, I submit the following notice in writing:

In accordance with Rule V of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend Rule XXII, including the availability of a motion to table one or more of the Articles of Impeachment against Alejandro Mayorkas, for the purpose of allowing a full trial in which witnesses may be subpoenaed to testify about the loss of family members to the fentanyl crisis as a result of Mayorkas's actions that have caused ''the flow of fentanyl across the border and other dangerous drugs'' to increase dramatically, as alleged in the first Article of Impeachment against him.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. WARNOCK. Madam President, I have 10 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 ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet in open and closed session during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 16, 2024, at 9 a.m., to receive testimony.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 16, 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 Tuesday, April 16, 2024, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 16, 2024, at 10 a.m., to conduct a business meeting.

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 Tuesday, April 16, 2024, at 10 a.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 Tuesday, April 16, 2024, at 10 a.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 Tuesday, April 16, 2024, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 16, 2024, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 16, 2024, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING, TRANSPORTATION, AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

The Subcommittee on Housing, Transportation, and Community Development of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 16, 2024, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Meagan Ezell, an intern in my office, be granted floor privileges until April 17, 2024.

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

NOTICE: REGISTRATION OF MASS MAILINGS

The filing date for the 2024 first quarter Mass Mailing report is Thursday, April 25, 2024. An electronic option is available on Webster that will allow forms to be submitted via a fillable PDF document. If your office did no mass mailings during this period, please submit a form that states ''none.''

Mass mailing registrations or negative reports can be submitted electronically at http://webster.senate.gov/secretary/mass___mailing___form.htm or e-mailed to OPR___MassMailings@sec.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact the Senate Office of Public Records at (202) 224–0322.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, APRIL 17, 2024

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 11 a.m. on Wednesday, April 17; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 365, H.R. 7888.

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, Senators will be sworn in as jurors in the Court of Impeachment at 1 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:26 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, April 17, 2024, at 11 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 16, 2024:

THE JUDICIARY

RAMONA VILLAGOMEZ MANGLONA, OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS, TO BE JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS FOR A TERM OF TEN YEARS.