

is to stop them from getting into that situation in the very first place. And it certainly wouldn't be done unilaterally from the White House with no say from this Congress on the \$150 billion program.

Now, even worse, the benefits of just canceling or pausing student debt are mainly going to those at the top of the income range. Graduates with the most debt also tend to be those with the longest degrees and they are now doctors or lawyers. These people, doctors and lawyers, might have plenty of debt now, but people with graduate degrees are also much more likely to have a higher salary and much higher lifetime earnings.

Are the two-thirds of the Americans without college degrees somehow less deserving of a free \$10,000 or \$50,000 in canceled debt than doctors or lawyers? And what about those people that have already paid off their loans? Are they going to bear the costs of people that borrowed too much when this is forgiven at the \$10,000 or \$50,000 level?

I am sure many Iowans would be happy to have their car loans or mortgages paid off. Is there any thought about what this can lead to? It is pretty clear. Canceling debt is not a solution. Instead, I have been glad to see many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle join my bills to prevent excess student debt in the very first place.

We need to help students by giving them the information they need to find the best college for their needs at a cost they can afford. Otherwise, forgiving student debt is a slippery slope to a lot of other interests wanting debt forgiveness.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The majority leader is recognized.

UKRAINE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I want to begin by responding to a particularly disgusting comment made over the weekend by Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov. As the Russian Army continues slaughtering civilians, Foreign Minister Lavrov did what many others who now reside in the dustbin of history have done before him—resort to anti-Semitism to defend his nation's action.

As the highest ranking, Jewish elected official in the United States, I take particular umbrage at what Mr. Lavrov said. Asked on Italian television yesterday to defend his nation's invasion of Ukraine, Mr. Lavrov repeated the deranged conspiracy that Ukraine is dominated by Neo-Nazis and dismissed President Zelenskyy's own Jewish heritage by saying:

I believe Hitler also had Jewish origins.

He also added:

We have been hearing the wise Jewish people say that the biggest anti-Semites are the Jews themselves.

I have only one word for this: "sickening." It is sickening. Mr. Lavrov's comments are just sickening and deserve to be condemned by all who oppose the dangers of anti-Semitism. They tap into the very old and very poisonous notion that the Jewish people themselves were the architects of the worst human atrocities in modern history even when they were aimed at Jews themselves.

Mr. Foreign Minister, you are fooling no one. The war crimes committed by Russia are as plain as day for the world to see. And to justify Russia's violence with appeals to anti-Semitism is sickening; it is dangerous. It is chilling to see Russia's top diplomat—he should not be called a diplomat after saying that. It is chilling to see Russia's top foreign policy person so casually spread disinformation about the history of the Holocaust in order to advance Mr. Putin's political and military agenda.

I condemn Mr. Lavrov's comments in the strongest possible terms, and every individual who wishes to guard against the poisons of anti-Semitism should do the same.

Now, Madam President, over the weekend, Speaker PELOSI led a delegation of House Members to Ukraine and met with President Zelenskyy to pledge our country's support for the Ukrainian people.

We have the obligation to demonstrate that support by approving another round of Ukrainian emergency funding. Now that President Biden has made a formal request for \$33 billion, our appropriators are hard at work turning the request into legislation. It is my hope that a bipartisan agreement can be reached very soon and that the Senate can begin processing this aid package on the floor as early as next week.

Quickly approving this emergency funding for Ukraine is essential to helping the people of Ukraine in their fight against Russia. Again, I expect both sides to work quickly, decisively, and with bipartisan cooperation to get this aid out the door and onto the President's desk, just as we did for the first round of aid back in March.

I will also work to include a provision that arms the Federal Government with the tools needed to liquidate assets the United States seized from Russian oligarchs, such as yachts, mansions, private jets, art collections, and the like.

Specifically, the Senate should expand existing forfeiture laws that will turn up the heat on these corrupt individuals who made their own ill-gotten gains from the vicious, evil, dictatorial Vladimir Putin. We need to go after these crooked oligarchs. They have gotten rich off Putin's regime. Their ill-gotten gains should have no safe ref-

uge within the United States, and it would be great if the proceeds from these assets would be used to support the Ukrainian people. I think that is the right way to go, and I will work to see that the Senate acts in this space.

Two months into the war, it is clear that support from the United States and our allies has been essential in helping Ukraine resist Russia's invasion. But the bloodshed is very likely far from over, and the cost borne by the Ukrainian people has been immense. According to the U.N., at least 3,000 civilians have been killed since the start of the war, and the true number is unfortunately, sadly, far higher than that in all likelihood.

The United States thus has a moral obligation to give the Ukrainian people the tools they need for as long as they need them, more money for Javelins, Stingers, howitzers, Switchblade unmanned aerial munitions, and much more. And make no mistake, the Senate will move swiftly to get an emergency funding package passed and sent to the President's desk.

CORONAVIRUS

Madam President, on COVID, now, in addition to providing emergency funding to Ukraine, the Senate must also keep prioritizing another round of funds to fight COVID and keep our families safe.

On Ukraine funding and COVID funding, Republican obstruction will not serve the American people. Instead of threatening political games, I urge Senate Republicans to work with us to get moving on COVID funding A-S-A-P.

Over the past few months, the United States has made unmistakable progress in getting life closer to normal than at any other point since the spring of 2020. But as we all know, all it takes is another nasty variant to force new closures of our schools, our businesses, our churches, our communities.

Meanwhile, every day that we don't act to pass new COVID funding is another day that other nations place orders on the remaining supply of vaccines, testing, and therapeutics—in particular, therapeutics.

God forbid another variant begins spreading across the country, and we don't have the tools, the medicines, the vaccines, the testing in place to respond simply because our Republican friends have blocked our ability to fund now the ability to buy those materials, those vaccines, those therapeutics, and keep them on the ready if and when a new variant hits.

If Republicans continue to obstruct more funding, then a few months from now we could be in the terrible situation of not having enough vaccines to save lives, enough tests or testing to monitor disease, and enough therapeutics to reduce the severity of cases of COVID when they come.

Let me say that one more time. If Republicans continue to obstruct more funding now, then a few months from now, we could be in a terrible situation of not having vaccines to save lives,

testing to monitor the disease, and therapeutics to treat the disease.

I don't want to have to read that back in someone's face 3 months later. I would rather have the funding now. That is what most Americans want. Please stop obstructing. We don't need to go down that path, as I said. By now, we have tools and know-how to prevent closures of schools and of stores and of everything else in case another variant makes its unwelcome arrival.

Now what we need is the funding to actually purchase the tools. They have been developed by American ingenuity, American companies; but other countries are buying them because we, ridiculously, stupidly, are not funding them because of obstruction across the aisle—political objectives getting in the way of the help, vitality, and return to normal of the American people. So we need to fund these—we need to actually purchase these tools now so that we are ready.

Republicans should work with Democrats to pass another COVID funding bill A-S-A-P. It is not really much harder than that.

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

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

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, when it comes to addressing the many challenges facing America today, the Biden administration's preferred strategy is to blame someone else.

President Biden has tried to blame the previous administration for the supply chain challenges, and he has also tried to blame the administration for his deadly and dangerous withdrawal from Afghanistan in a precipitous fashion, which our friends and allies simply were left to read about it or hear about it in the newspaper and hustle to get their own people out of Afghanistan, as we were as well.

And now we are seeing the blame game being played out again on the border. Last week, Secretary Mayorkas, the Secretary of Homeland Security, claimed the administration inherited, in his words, "a broken and dismantled system," a defense we have heard before.

Now, there is no question that our immigration system is in need of reform. As a matter of fact, we have been working on that the entire time I have been in the U.S. Senate. But as I have said before, we never fail to fail when it comes to fixing our broken immigration system.

But the fact of the matter is the Biden administration is playing on the same field as previous administrations. Presidential authorities haven't changed. Congress hasn't passed sweep-

ing reforms that make it difficult to enforce our laws at the border. Yet, here we are, experiencing record levels of illegal immigration into the United States.

Just to provide some historical context for how bad President Biden's first year in office stacks up against previous administrations, consider this: During the first year of the Obama administration, an average of 44,000 migrants were apprehended each month—that is each month—along the southwestern border. During the first year of the Trump administration, that number was cut in half because the Trump administration had different policies with regard to removing people who were illegally coming across the border, or if they were claiming asylum, making them wait until their claims were ruled on by an immigration judge in Mexico rather than being welcomed into the United States and never to be heard from again.

So 44,000 a month for the Obama administration; 20,000 a month for the Trump administration. But during the first year of the Biden administration, numbers took off like a rocket.

An average of 176,000 migrants were apprehended at the southern border each month. One more time: 44,000 for President Obama; 20,000 for President Trump; 176,000 for President Biden. That is nearly nine times as many migrants as we were seeing just 4 years ago.

Again, Congress hasn't passed any major laws that have caused this dramatic increase. President Biden has the same authorities as the previous administrations. He has been in office for more than a year and has had plenty of opportunity to use the authorities Congress has given him to address this humanitarian and national security and public safety crisis.

He has even had plenty of time to work with Congress to pass bipartisan bills, like my Bipartisan Border Solutions Act, which I introduced with Senator SINEMA. And we now have a number of bipartisan cosponsors, and it was filed in the House with bipartisan support as well—HENRY CUELLAR, a Laredo Democrat, and TONY GONZALES from the largest contiguous border district in Texas and in the country—a Republican.

So we introduced this bill. We laid it out for the administration, thinking that maybe, just maybe, if their poll numbers got bad enough, they would be looking for a lifeline, they would be looking for a way out.

But the Biden administration has shown zero interest. The President has even threatened to end the use of title 42, which is a public health law that gave the Border Patrol some tools to repel illegal immigration by single adult males.

The Border Patrol told me a long time ago, even toward the end of the Trump administration, during the middle of the pandemic, that if they lost use of title 42 as a means to control im-

migration—admittedly not something that it was designed for but something they were able to use it for—they would lose control of the border completely.

So far we have heard no suggestions by President Biden what he intends to do. We know title 42 won't be there forever. COVID won't be a pandemic forever. But what we would like to know—and I think what the American people deserve to know—is what they are going to do in terms of enforcing the law of the land once title 42 goes away.

Well, last week, Secretary Mayorkas released what he called the "Department of Homeland Security Plan for Southwest Border Security and Preparedness."

Well, this plan is largely a recycled and repackaged version of the same vague promises that we have heard all along—bolstering resources, increasing efficiency, and administering consequences for unlawful entry.

Even the portion of this proposal that includes specifics, such as increasing the use of expedited removal, are completely unrealistic. In order to use expedited removal—and that is the means by which the Border Patrol encounters someone and says: You can't come into the United States and will be removed—you have to have enough manpower to process migrants and enough space to keep them in custody until that can happen.

Without detention space, the promise of using expedited removal is a hollow one. Given the current pace of migration and the amount of beds that Customs and Border Protection has to detain people who are subject to expedited removal, given the current pace, the number of beds is a mathematical impossibility.

Secretary Mayorkas said the Department of Homeland Security has increased the number of beds in Customs and Border Protection facilities and can now hold approximately 18,000 people.

Again, under the Biden administration, we have seen 176,000 people a month coming across the border. Secretary Mayorkas is bragging about 18,000 detention beds. Obviously, those beds would fill up quickly and be overwhelmed.

In March, an average of 7,000 migrants crossed the border every day. The administration has predicted that if title 42 is lifted, which it has attempted to do and still intends to do so, that number could reach 12,000 to 18,000 migrants every day—12,000 to 18,000 every day. And, obviously, all of those 18,000 beds for detention facilities would fill up in a single day.

That is why I believe that this plan is not worth the paper it is written on unless the administration actually follows up to execute it; and, clearly, we are not seeing action, and, clearly, the arithmetic doesn't work for Secretary Mayorkas's plan. They are going to have to engage in the same sort of