

In May, the Institute for Supply Management's industrial PMI showed that our manufacturing sectors are shrinking. We hear all about that we have to make more here. Guess what. Our manufacturing sectors are shrinking. Extended pressure on manufacturing output and prices for goods has been caused by higher interest rates, increased cost of living, and complete economic uncertainty. And this further restricts our ability to make things in this country.

That is why I have introduced the American Investment in Manufacturing Act. It is a bill that would reinstate a much needed measure that allows industries affected by sustained high interest rates to grow, to increase jobs and wages, and to contribute to the U.S. economy. It is past time that this body stand with American manufacturing—our small business owners and the employers and employees that keep this great country running.

My colleagues and I continue to put forward solutions that invest in an “all of the above” energy plan: innovative ways to utilize everything from conventional, renewable, and nuclear energy sources to build back our energy independence; solutions that rein in government spending, that attack the true causes of fraud, waste, and abuse, that will saddle future generations with insurmountable debt; solutions that provide proper resources to our veterans, those who have served our country and put their life on the line for our freedom deserve our utmost respect and support.

What makes this all the more frustrating is that the Senate has proven our ability to legislate in a bipartisan way. We have done so on multiple fronts in recent memory on issues like infrastructure, American competitiveness, and just last week as we acted to raise the debt ceiling and avoid economic catastrophe.

There is no reason why this body should be hamstrung on addressing the biggest needs of our country and improving the lives of our residents in the areas where they need it the most.

I understand that floor time is a precious commodity, especially knowing that we have to take up action on several must-pass pieces of legislation. We have to pass 12 appropriations bills out of this body; we have to pass the farm bill; we have to pass FAA reauthorization; and perhaps, most significantly, a bill that under this Democratic leader has never gotten a fair amount of its time or consideration, the National Defense Authorization Act.

The American people want to see this place work for them. They want to see action on issues that impact them every single day. I encourage the majority leader to heed the concerns of our constituents and join in our efforts to provide the answers American families and communities are desperately looking for.

Until then, my Republican colleagues and I will continue to put forward the

answers that the American people deserve.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, the White House and the Department of Homeland Security released a press release yesterday to talk about what is happening on the border currently, especially on our southwest land border. I wanted to read just one line from the press release that was put out by Homeland Security yesterday, where they state in their press release:

The administration's plan is working as intended. [The administration's plan is working as intended.]

Now, what they were referencing was what is happening on the southwest border and the number of people who are crossing our border that are being “encountered” at the border. That is the new term from Homeland Security for the number of people who cross our border illegally. They are “encountered.”

In the past, those individuals—and what I mean “in the past,” I mean the past 2 years. Those individuals crossed our southern border and asked for asylum because they were told by the cartels what to say. The cartels would say to each individual as they crossed and paid the fee to the cartel: Tell them you are afraid in your country.

They would cross the border. They would say the words, “I am afraid in my country.” They would be given an asylum hearing date in the future. That date is anywhere—depending on where they go in the country—between 3 years and 7 years in the future. And they are told they can go anywhere in the United States they want to travel during that time period.

Now, that is what it used to be. The administration came forward and said: We have a whole new plan. Our new plan post-title 42—that is the end of the pandemic restrictions—our new plan is that we are going to tell people there is a rebuttable presumption that you don't qualify, so don't come.

So here is what has happened. Now you cross the border—and there are two ways you can cross the border. Now, this is the new plan: You can either fill out the paperwork before you come or, when you cross, we will fill out the paperwork for you.

If we fill out the paperwork for you, it will take longer for you to come into the country and cross the border or you can fill out the paperwork before. What is that called? It is called CBP One. It is an app that now you can download from anywhere in the world, fill out your paperwork ahead of time, and when you cross, they will quickly expedite you into the country for your asylum hearing anywhere between 3 and 7 years in the future or, if you cross between ports of entry, then it is going to take you probably another 8 hours or so for them to get all the paperwork filled out for you, and then you will

still be released into the country and have a hearing 3 to 7 years in the future.

What does the administration mean when they said the administration's plan is working as intended? They have now split up the numbers, and they have announced: Look, our numbers are less than 4,000 people now who are crossing the border illegally.

It was just 10,000 people 2 weeks ago. Of course, what they didn't say was the week before that, it was right at 5,000. But what they are not saying is they have actually taken—if you fill out on the app ahead of time, they don't count those numbers anymore.

Here is what has happened. We have the same number of people illegally crossing our border this week that we had 3 weeks ago and that we had 3 weeks before that.

The administration now has just split up the numbers, how they are counted. If you fill out the app in advance or we fill it out for you when you cross the border, those are now two separate sets at the border, but they are still the same exact people who are crossing into the country. Except when I was at the border just 2 weeks ago and asked how all of this is working, I asked a very simple question: What are you noticing that is different now than what was different before?

The response from CBP was: Well, it is the same. People are still moving in. They are allowed to be able to come into the country between ports of entry or at ports of entry, that is the same. But what has changed is a dramatic increase in the number of non-Spanish speakers who are coming.

And the first words that I had from several different individuals I spoke with, both from nongovernmental organizations and from our Federal law enforcement when I was there last, was that we are worried for our national security. In fact, Federal law enforcement used the exact term. We have military-age, single adult men coming into our country from non-Spanish-speaking nations in the Middle East, West Africa, Russia, and China now in much higher numbers than we had before.

Just to set the context of what is happening now while the administration is saying the plan is “working as intended,” here is what has happened: In the first 2 weeks of the end of title 42, we had 1,000 men from Mauritania, West Africa, come across our border—1,000. Exactly none of them do we have criminal background information on—none of them.

Let me just compare 2 years ago to this year. So far this year, and this year is not over—if I look at Mauritania, we had 90 people 2 years ago from Mauritania; so far this year, 4,300—so far this year. By the way, that doesn't include the May number that I was just saying. That is 1,000 more. So we are well in excess of 5,000 this year so far from Mauritania.

From Iran, it has gone from 62 to almost 300.

From Syria, and we have no background information on any of the folks coming in from Syria, we have had right at 200 people come in from Syria so far this year.

From Pakistan, we have had over 500. From Somalia, we have had over 1,600.

From China, we have had right at 10,000 people this year. If I go back 2 years ago, from China, it was 450.

Yes, there is a huge shift that is actually occurring of Middle Eastern men, North African men, men from Russia and from China who are accelerating across our southern border, because right now apparently the administration's plan is "working as intended," and we have thousands of people who are still crossing our border.

I have heard even some recent reporting in the news on this that the numbers are way down. The numbers are way down. But apparently the press doesn't take the time to be able to look and see that the numbers have actually been split out into two different categories. The numbers are not down. In fact, the numbers right now would average somewhere around 450,000 a month—right now.

The highest month during the peak of the immigration surge under the Obama administration, the highest month that happened during that time period when there was chaos and cameras that were focused on the Southwest border—the highest month was 69,000. The administration is now saying "Our plan is working" when there are 150,000 a month coming across the border.

It is not working. It is fudging the numbers. It is trying to tell the American people: Look away. It is trying to say "We are doing a whole new set of enforcement on the border" when really what is happening is that people are being released into the country the same as they have always been released into the country for the last 2 years. The difference is, they are told: Hey, if you show up for your hearing 3 years from now, we may be more strict to you. But at the border, they are moving through just the same, being waved through.

I bring this up to this body to ask a simple question: Have we learned nothing from 9/11? Thousands of Americans died because a group of individuals overstayed their visas here in the United States. No one went to check on them. No one went to track them and just ignored the realities of what could be there.

We have a huge national security risk, and God forbid we have a huge terrorist attack again just because we want to tell everyone "The plan is working as intended. Look away. The numbers are down" when we literally have people coming in from all over the world who may be coming to work here or may be coming in for nefarious reasons. We don't know. We literally don't know if these folks are fleeing poverty or fleeing justice because we

have no criminal history on these individuals coming in from around the world—none.

In fact, as frightening as it may seem, right now the current policy happening at the southwest border is if someone shows up without any identification or with a photocopy of an ID that they say is theirs, it is being accepted as real.

They can literally come in and say, I am from Mauritania or Somalia or Syria or Iran or China or Russia, and this is my name, and they have no ID. We are creating for them a new ID card that is an American ID card and handing them a new identity and saying "Show up at your hearing 3 years from now, in the future. Travel anywhere you want in the country. You can use this card to fly, to travel, or to show as ID" when we literally have no idea if that is what their name is or that is the country they are from. That is the plan that is "working as intended" right now on our southwest border. I think it is a huge national security vulnerability.

We need to talk about asylum. We need to talk about how we are going to define the national security risks of the United States. This body needs to have a real conversation about what legal immigration looks like and what we are going to say to the world about illegal immigration.

If any of these individuals were to travel into Canada right now, the Canadians already have a clear law dealing with asylum. These folks would not be accepted into Canada because it would violate their basic asylum rules on how they handle it. But they are being literally waved into our country with no ID, with no criminal background check, and released into the country under the promise that they will show up at a hearing 3 to 7 years in the future. Can somebody explain to me why that is logical?

If these same folks moved into Germany and said they wanted to claim asylum, Germany would put them in what they call a humanitarian center, where they would stay. They wouldn't be released into Germany. Germany would never do that. They would stay in that one humanitarian area while they process through their asylum claim, and if they didn't qualify for asylum, they would be sent back to their original country, and that is usually within about 2 to 3 months. We are instead handing them a brandnew ID, which we have no idea is their real name, releasing them into the country, and saying: We hope you show up 3 to 7 years from now at your hearing. Can somebody tell me that is wise?

I am not asking for something crazy or something, quite frankly, the rest of the world doesn't already do, but for some reason, this body is locked up to talk about what everyone sees as obvious, and we refuse to even debate the issues of asylum and national security.

This is not caustic and hard; this is reasonable, where most Americans are.

But we are not even talking about it on the floor right now, but we should because it matters. The national security of our country is counting on us having adult conversations about the direction of our country, and I would encourage us to get started on this sooner rather than later for the sake of our future as a nation.

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. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the following nominations en bloc: Calendar Nos. 76, 128, and 216; that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc without intervening action or debate; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations of Justin L. Martinez, of Utah, to be United States Marshal for the District of Utah for the term of four years; William R. Hart, of New Hampshire, to be United States Marshal for the District of New Hampshire for the term of four years; and Shannon R. Saylor, of Virginia, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Virginia for the term of four years, en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

GAO OPINION LETTER

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following GAO opinion letter be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Matter of: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service—Applicability of the Congressional Review Act to Food and Nutrition Service Policy Memorandum CRD 01-2022, Application of Bostock v. Clayton