

those standards. The highest Court in the land has decided it will have the lowest ethical standards.

It is hard to understand. Here is Harlan Crow, the Texas billionaire, spending all this money on one Supreme Court Justice, saying that we cannot, in Congress, ask hard questions about the ethical standards of the highest Court in the land because it would put undue influence on the Court.

Bottom line: Undue influence is what this is all about. No one should be able to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on a Senator, a Congressman, or certainly a Supreme Court Justice without full disclosure and compliance with the law.

For the Supreme Court to say that is asking for too much, I think the American people can draw their own conclusions. They have a right to know, if Harlan Crow thinks our passing an ethics code for the Supreme Court would put undue influence on the Court, how does he explain spending hundreds of thousands of dollars on gifts, trips, on yachts, and chartered airplanes for a Supreme Court Justice? Is he not seeking undue influence on the same Court? It is obvious that it is true.

What surprised me after I received this letter—and, once again, was offended by the logic of it, if there is any—at the end of the day, I looked online today to find that this attorney, Michael Bopp, is saying that he made an offer now to meet with the staff of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

I read the letter for a third time. And I thought, how did I happen to miss that? Well, it turns out it is the final sentence in the letter. And I would like to read it to you.

Please feel free to have your staff contact me with any questions concerning this response and to set up a time to further discuss your requests.

That, I suppose, is the offer to meet. I am not going to turn it down. We are going to meet with him if he wishes to discuss this further.

But before we go any further than that conversation about this committee, let me make a reference to the bottom line in this controversy. Chief Justice John Roberts, the person that this Court is named after, as all Chief Justices are—the Roberts Court has the authority this afternoon, before 5 o'clock, to announce a resolution to resolve this issue once and forever, to make sure that the Court steps away from the sordid affair with the right conclusion. To put a code of ethics in a standard of ethical conduct in place will bring this Court into the same world of reality as the rest of the courts in the United States.

The American people need to have confidence in this Court. And hiding gifts of hundreds of thousands of dollars, not disclosing, and paying no price when they are finally discovered is not the way to convince the American people that the Court is credible.

We are going to continue in the Senate Judiciary Committee to do all that

we need to do to get to the bottom of this controversy. The American people have a right to believe in this Court, as they do in this Congress. And we have to do everything under our power to make sure that happens.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa.

CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today, once again, I am here to discuss my constitutional oversight of the Justice Department and the FBI. It surely has been a very busy year thus far for congressional oversight, and let me say rightly so. That is the way it should be because we know, first, Congress passes laws, but Congress can't stop there. We have got to make sure that Congress follows up to guarantee, under our checks and balances of our Constitution, that a President will faithfully execute the laws.

In many of my speeches on the topic of oversight, I have discussed how political infection has taken root in the Biden Justice Department and FBI. Such a political infection is catastrophic to the trust the American people must have in these institutions in order for those institutions to have any legitimate effect.

To restore this country's confidence in the Justice Department and the FBI, these Agencies must come clean with a 1023 document that whistleblowers have approached me about.

An FBI 1023 document is used to collect information from what the FBI calls a confidential human source.

A confidential human source is not—I want to emphasize—is not a mere walk-in or a mere tip like some journalists have reported. Confidential human source purpose is to advance investigative activity, and the FBI takes great care to make sure that they can vet these people and know that they serve a useful purpose.

The 1023 that I sought from the FBI references a criminal scheme involving then-Vice President Biden and his alleged receipt of \$5 million for a policy decision. Now, at first, the FBI refused to even admit that this document existed, let alone admit that this document was marked "unclassified."

Then I told Director Wray last week that Chairman COMER and I have reviewed the 1023. I told Director Wray that this 1023 is marked "unclassified." I told him that it was dated June 30, 2020, and I and Chairman COMER demanded that he produce that document.

Director Wray made one excuse after another to not produce it. I reminded Director Wray about how the FBI has a penchant for leaking classified information to the media and producing documents to the media. In fact, we all know that the FBI did exactly that in a May 18, 2023, New York Times article. The FBI, therefore, has no legitimate basis to refuse production of a non-classified document to the Congress of the United States.

Let's keep in mind that Congress has received 1023 documents in the past, and now the FBI is subject to a legitimate subpoena for that very document. In last week's phone call with Director Wray, I also asked him if the 1023 is part of an ongoing investigation. He answered that it is relevant to an ongoing investigative matter.

From that vague answer, it is reasonable to conclude that it is part of an ongoing investigation, otherwise it wouldn't be relative to one. It is also reasonable to conclude that the FBI finds it reliable enough to continue using it several years later.

Still—still—that doesn't preclude Congress from running a parallel investigation pursuant to our constitutional oversight responsibilities.

You may remember that this Senator did the same thing during Crossfire Hurricane. If anything, this entire process is a lesson for the executive branch with respect to Congress's constitutional power of oversight.

Now, remember, Congress funds the executive branch, not the other way around. Remember, the document referenced other details that I believe will be made public in time. We have duties to the whistleblowers who have provided legally protected unclassified disclosures to us. These whistleblowers are patriots and must be protected.

Partisan media, most likely in conjunction with the Biden FBI, has misleadingly reported the 1023 is from a tranche of information provided by Rudy Giuliani. News reports last week dispel that notion and make clear that 1023 information that we request is independent of Giuliani.

Those news reports also show that the source who formed the basis of the 1023 is a long-serving FBI source. The source reportedly received numerous validations from the FBI. The source reportedly operated even during the Obama administration. Based on what I have been told about yesterday's meeting, the FBI didn't contradict these findings.

Today, I can say that based upon unclassified and legally protected whistleblower disclosures, the FBI source in the 1023 has been paid at least \$200,000 by the FBI since the source was opened and operational.

High-dollar payments obviously mean the FBI believes the source to be credible and reputable. That makes sense, since Director Wray said the 1023 is relevant to an ongoing investigative report.

So is the FBI looking at bribery allegations against members of the Biden family? Is U.S. Attorney Weiss looking into this? Did the FBI follow normal investigative processes and procedures or did they just sweep this under the rug?

For example, did the FBI try to improperly use the August 2020 Brian Auten assessment to shut down the 1023 reporting by falsely labeling it "disinformation"? What exactly is the FBI doing with the information in this 1023 document that we request?

A vague pronouncement that the 1023 is relevant to an ongoing matter is certainly not even close to enough information to satisfy Congress as well as the American people about what is actually being done with the information on this 1023 document.

The Justice Department and the FBI no longer deserve the benefit of the doubt. Just read the Durham report and its example after example of Justice Department and FBI failures that the Durham report points out.

And since July of last year, I have raised one whistleblower allegation after another to Attorney General Garland and to Director Wray of the FBI relating to the Biden family investigation.

Now, just remember this: The Justice Department and the FBI have failed to dispute a single whistleblower allegation that I have made public. They have also failed to provide any records that I have requested from the FBI or the Department of Justice.

Here, with this 1023 document that I have been referring to throughout my remarks, the Biden Justice Department and FBI must explain to Congress and the American people what, if anything, they have done with this information. And they need to show their work. We are not accepting their word anymore. We are seeking documentary proof of what they did to investigate the matter or their failure to so do. Given the gravity of the issues at stake, the American people deserve nothing less.

So to the Justice Department and the FBI: Quit playing games and recognize whom you work for. You are not working to protect the corporate interests of the FBI; you are working for the American people.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

BUSINESS BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, every day, Texans reach out to my office to talk about challenges that they and their families are facing, or maybe they see something on the news or read something in the local paper that causes them concern about what the Federal Government is up to; but most often, they call and tell me that inflation continues to strain their household budgets, and they are fearful that a recession is approaching. They are raising concerns about the security breakdown at the southern border and fears about rising crime rates in their communities. They share stories about teenage students who died from fentanyl poisoning, maybe friends of their family, and they tell me they are terrified for their own children's safety.

Of course, these concerns aren't unique to Texas. People across the country—everyone—wants affordable gas and groceries. We all, presumably, want dangerous drugs off the streets and dangerous people behind bars. We all want to live in safe communities so

we can pursue our dreams. In short, the American people aren't asking for a lot. All they want is to be able to live happy, healthy lives. And they are asking Congress to remove some of the burdens that are making that more difficult.

That is what we need to be doing here in the Senate. In recent months, the Republican-led House has been a flurry of activity. They passed legislation to unleash the power of American energy and reduce costs to consumers. They passed legislation to classify fentanyl as a schedule 1 substance—the most dangerous of drugs—and to give parents a say in their children's education. They have also passed legislation to improve veterans' healthcare, to stand behind law enforcement officials, and to address fraud and abuse in the unemployment insurance system.

Speaker MCCARTHY and the Republican majority in the House have responded to the concerns of the American people not with rhetoric but with action.

That is a sharp contrast with what we have witnessed here in the Senate. The first major piece of legislation that passed this Chamber was just last week after months of President Biden saying he wouldn't even negotiate with the House on raising the debt limit; but he finally did, up against the back of a potential default.

Before that, the Senate has passed legislation repealing the Iraq war authorization. We reauthorized grants for firefighters and we confirmed some Federal judges and other nominees. Then we passed a handful of Republican-led resolutions to overturn Biden administration executive orders, and that is about it.

Now to be clear, there were some wins in there. Less than a week ago, the Senate passed a resolution I introduced with Senator CASSIDY, the Senator from Louisiana, to overturn President Biden's student loan scheme claiming to cancel student loans for people who agreed to borrow the money. But, somehow, by "canceling," what he really meant was transferring that burden to the taxpayers. We were able to get a bipartisan vote overturning that decision here in the Senate.

But given the fact we are 5 months into the year, this is an embarrassingly short list of accomplishments. Clearly, the Republican-led House is doing its job, but the Democrat-led Senate is not doing a whole lot. The American people are clamoring for action—again, not just lip service. They want action on inflation, on crime, on the border, energy prices, and so much more.

But for some reason, the majority leader, the Senator from New York, Senator SCHUMER, seems content to just put us in neutral and coast. We haven't even had votes on Mondays. We come in on Tuesday and leave on Thursday, 3 days out of the 7-day week. The American people understand that we are coasting here. We are not giving

it our best or our all. So there is no doubt we have a major productivity problem here in this Chamber. And that needs to change soon.

We have a lot of work we need to do before the end of the year. First on the docket is the National Defense Authorization Act. Each year this legislation provides our military leaders and our servicemembers with the certainty they need to prepare for the threats of today and tomorrow. And those threats are doing nothing but growing on a daily basis. Whether it is China, Russia, Iran, or North Korea, an on-time National Defense Authorization Act is absolutely critical.

Senator WICKER, the Senator from Mississippi, is leading those efforts on our side of the aisle, and I am confident that he and our colleagues on the Armed Services Committee will deliver another strong NDAA. But Senator SCHUMER, the majority leader who is the floor leader, is the one who sets the agenda. He needs to carve out the floor time to make this a priority so we can move on to the Senate's next big task which is funding the government.

Now, as part of the debt limit agreement last week, Senator SCHUMER agreed to bring up all 12 appropriation bills to the Senate floor by September 30. The reason that is so important is that last year in December, Speaker PELOSI and Majority Leader SCHUMER decided, basically, that the rest of us were going to be potted plants and given the opportunity to vote up or down on an Omnibus appropriation bill rather than doing the work of passing each appropriation bill out of committee, across the floor, giving every Senator an opportunity to participate in shaping that legislation. So thank goodness Speaker MCCARTHY was able to negotiate an agreement to get us back to that regular order, a more transparent, more rational process. You would think that with \$31.4 trillion in debt, that the majority leader, Senator SCHUMER, would recognize this as a priority.

But these appropriation bills do some essential things like funding our military, veteran services, border security, and so much more. Again, this is a departure—or what I hope will be a departure—from what we saw in 2021 and 2022, when the Congress and the Democratic-led Senate did not pass a single appropriation bill until that omnibus bill came up in December.

Individual funding bills are the starting point for sound financial decision making here in Washington. They allow us to cut wasteful spending and invest in our priorities. That is what a budget is all about. It is about priorities, and our No. 1 priority needs to be our national security.

Senator COLLINS, the Republican ranking member on the Appropriations Committee, and Senator MURRAY, the