

that seek to harm us and discard any guardrails at all. We can't expect companies to adopt guardrails, as I said, if their competitors won't be forced to do so as well.

So it is only a task that government can do with help and input from the experts. That was made clear at the hearings yesterday. Even those AI companies that are way out front on this now admit that they need some government action, we need some kinds of guardrails.

Later this year, Congress will host the first-ever AI Insight Forums to bring the best developers, experts, and legislators in one room to identify the areas where we can take action and to make sure we are asking the right questions to begin with. Ensuring our national security and safety will be one of the most important issues we discuss.

I want to thank everyone who attended yesterday. It was bipartisan, and we must keep this issue bipartisan. How to deal with AI is not a Republican issue; it is not a Democratic issue; it is a national issue.

I really want to thank our little group of Senators—HEINRICH, ROUNDS, and YOUNG—for helping organize these briefings. I look forward to the third briefing soon.

FEDERAL JUDICIARY

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, on forum shopping in the judiciary, our Federal judiciary is built on the trust and confidence of the American people, but right now, sadly, Americans' faith in the judicial system is at an alltime low thanks to the hijacking of our courts by the MAGA hard right and the unfair practice known as forum shopping.

Forum shopping essentially allows litigants in certain cases to handpick judges sympathetic to their cause. At its core, forum shopping undermines the spirit of a fair and balanced judiciary. That is why earlier this week I sent a letter to 18 of my Democratic colleagues and to the chair of the Advisory Committee on Civil Rights, calling on the Judicial Conference to consider reforms that would put an end to forum shopping.

If Americans want to see a clear example of why forum shopping is a serious problem, consider the Northern District of Texas. In that district, civil cases are often assigned to a single judge, if not one of just a few.

And it so happens, one of those judges is infamous—infamous—for his well-documented opposition to freedom of choice.

Do you know who knew that? The MAGA Republicans. So when MAGA Republicans sought to strip away access to FDA-approved abortion medication, widely available for decades, they intentionally targeted the Northern District of Texas, where only one judge sat. They knew which judge they would get.

To those who don't follow judiciary procedure, in most districts there are a bunch of judges. They put the case on wheel, and they spin the wheel around, and whomever the arrow lands on gets the case. You can't pick your judge.

But in this case, you can pick your judge, and in this case, it is an extreme MAGA judge, who we know has views that are so, so deeply held that no unbiased bystander can think a fair trial will be held.

And, lo and behold, of course, that judge sided with the anti-choice extremists, marking the first time ever that a judge has ordered a drug to be taken off the market nationwide. It doesn't just affect Amarillo and northern Texas. It affects the whole country.

This isn't equal justice. This isn't a fair or impartial application of the rule of law. This is extremists using forum shopping to pull a fast one on the vast majority of Americans who opposed this ruling.

And, of course, women's freedom of choice isn't the only issue at stake. When extremists can manipulate our judiciary to get judges of their preference, it endangers everything from healthcare to immigration reform, to commonsense gun safety, to voting rights.

Forum shopping is a serious problem that will only worsen Americans' crisis of faith in the judiciary. The letter Democrats sent offers a path for sensible, good-faith reforms that will preserve an independent Federal judiciary, while letting in much needed fresh air into America's halls of justice.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, now on nominations, today, we will confirm two more district judges: Tiffany Cartwright to serve in the Western District of Washington and Myong Joun to serve in the District of Massachusetts. We will also move forward on two executive nominations: Kalpana Kotagal to be a member of the EEOC, and David Uhlmann to be an Assistant Administrator of the EPA.

Ms. Kotagal is exceptionally qualified to serve on the EEOC, and, if confirmed, she will shift the balance of the Commission.

So it is going to be a busy day here on the Senate floor with several votes on nominees, and I thank my colleagues for their cooperation.

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. THUNE. Madam 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.

The Republican whip.

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, summer has arrived, which means Congress is turning its attention to appropriations bills for the coming year, and my hope is that this year Congress will consider all 12 appropriations bills under regular order.

Now, what do I mean by regular order? Regular order refers to allowing bills to go through the committee process—including hearings and a markup, where members of the committee have a chance to amend and improve the bill—and then a referral by the committee to the Senate as a whole.

Bills are then considered on the Senate floor. Some bills pass the Senate by unanimous consent, while others undergo a full debate, including amendment votes, before being voted on by the Senate as a whole.

Then, if necessary, the bill goes to a conference committee or is passed back and forth between the House and the Senate to reconcile any differences between the House and Senate bills before the amended versions are then put to the full House and Senate.

That is what is considered the "regular order" process, and it is generally the best way to make laws. Regular order allows for a truly deliberative process. It provides the time to fully consider all aspects of legislation and to hear input from a broad array of Members. It promotes collaboration, compromise, and a sense of ownership of the final legislation, which makes bills more likely to pass. And, it is a transparent process, one that ensures that both Senators and the American people can see how the legislation in question is made and have ample time to digest it—not to mention the key fact that, by ensuring the input of more Senators, regular order helps ensure that a broader swath of the American people is represented in any final legislation.

Regular order is something that I think most Members generally aspire to. But the actual use of regular order has all too frequently been in short supply around here in recent years.

Too often, major legislation has been written behind closed doors and dropped on Members at the last minute—bypassing the chairmen, ranking members, and Senators who sit on the committees of jurisdiction and would otherwise have the opportunity to consider and amend the legislation in committee, before being brought up for a floor vote with little or no opportunity to offer amendments.

Fifty years ago, most bills were going through regular order. In fact, 83 percent of the legislation considered on the Senate floor during the 1970s was a product of the committee process. But by the 2010s, those numbers had dropped sharply, along with the number of Senate floor votes on amendments.

But, of course, even while the use of regular order has decreased, some legislation does still go through the regular order process. And I can personally attest to the fact that the use of regular order can bring major bipartisan successes.

During my time as chairman of the Commerce Committee, I focused on promoting collaboration and ensuring that bills in our committee's jurisdiction went through the regular order process, and we accomplished a lot: the first reauthorization of the Federal Communications Commission in more than a quarter century, the first reauthorization of the Surface Transportation Board in its 20-year history, multiple bills to advance the development and adoption of 5G, the longest surface transportation reauthorization since 1998, the longest reauthorization of the FAA since 1982, the first law to hold websites accountable for facilitating sex trafficking, and lots more. The vast majority of the bills that I just named ended up passing the Senate by strong bipartisan margins. And, of course, those are just examples of what was then our committee's jurisdiction.

There are plenty of others. For example, Democrats are more often associated with imposing burdensome government regulations than with lifting them. But Senator CRAPO's 2018 bill easing the regulatory burden for community banks and credit unions went through the regular order process, and, ultimately, 17 Senate Democrats joined Republicans to support the bill.

In 2015, the HELP Committee passed one of the largest rewrites of our Nation's K-12 laws, the Every Student Succeeds Act, which returned more power to States when it comes to how kids are educated, by holding numerous hearings and multiple days of markups and considering dozens of amendments. In the end, that law passed with 85 votes in the U.S. Senate.

The 2018 farm bill, which reauthorized important safety net programs for farmers and ranchers, passed the Senate with 87 votes, following robust consideration by the Agriculture Committee, amendment votes on the Senate floor, and a conference committee.

And the list goes on. Regular order promotes collaborative, bipartisan, and successful results. As I indicated, regular order has been in somewhat short supply in the Senate in recent years. But I am encouraged by the fact that there seems to be a growing desire to return to regular order and that the Democrat chair and Republican vice chair of the Senate Appropriations Committee have expressed a shared commitment to considering all 12 appropriations bills this year through the regular order process.

But there are concerning signs too. The Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee recently held its first partisan markup since the Affordable Care Act in 2009. That defeats the whole idea of a committee process

that can yield a bipartisan result on the Senate floor, and it suggests the Democrats are still too entrenched in the partisan far-left mindset that saw them force legislation like the so-called American Rescue Plan Act through Congress. That was the bill that helped plunge our Nation into its current inflation crisis.

And perhaps even more concerning, recently, the majority leader, when referring to his plans on artificial intelligence, actually claimed that Congress will need "to invent a new process to develop the right policies to implement our framework" because the committee process "won't suffice."

I wonder how his committee chairs feel about that, and I would venture to suggest that the committee process has worked pretty well to develop all sorts of important legislation and to get buy-in from Senators.

As we continue with the appropriations process, I hope that the determination expressed by the Democrat chair of the Senate Appropriations Committee to pass all 12 appropriations bills through regular order will prevail, and I hope that this same attitude will be applied to other legislation that the Senate must consider this year—like the National Defense Authorization Act, the Federal Aviation Administration reauthorization, the farm bill, and more.

If we want to get anything done in divided government, we are going to have to compromise, and the regular order process promotes the kind of bipartisan, collaborative action that will allow us to accomplish real things for the American people.

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

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

The Senator from Texas.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, since the President of the United States, President Biden, took office, America's southern border has faced unprecedented challenges. Unfortunately, none of these struggles seems to have captured President Biden's attention—not the 5.4 million border crossings or the more than 1.5 million "got-aways"; not the 1.6 million pounds of illicit drugs that were seized by Border Patrol, the 108,000 Americans who died last year from drug overdoses; not the tractor/trailers filled with the bodies of dead migrants or city sidewalks lined with people who have nowhere to go; not even the fact that the cartels are making a fortune off the backs of vulnerable migrants and fueling America's drug crisis.

The American people have been stunned by the scope and the scale of President Biden's border crisis—and I call it that because it is a result of his policies. But it has been going on for 2½ years now, and the Biden administration doesn't seem to care. The administration has tried to deflect, distract, even deceive the American people into thinking things are just not that bad or maybe they could be worse. But the spin doctors can only accomplish so much. We have continued to learn about the many ways the Biden administration has fumbled its mission at the southern border. And the consequences have been absolutely devastating.

Reporting from the New York Times earlier this year looked at what has happened to unaccompanied migrant children once they arrive into the United States. Since President Biden took office, 300,000–300,000 unaccompanied children have arrived at the border. To be clear, these children did not cross the border with their parents, but they did get some help—mainly the coyotes or the human smugglers who, for a fee, will smuggle people into the United States. But these children, as we might expect, are particularly vulnerable as they make this dangerous journey north in the custody of these criminal organizations.

The sad reality is that many come to the United States in the care of these criminals, and parents who paid smugglers thousands of dollars to bring their children into the United States are taking an incredible risk with their children. We know this journey is not safe, and it is not easy. Many children are subjected to violence, exploitation, even sexual abuse at the hands of these criminal smugglers. Many, as you might expect, arrive in the United States traumatized and in poor physical health.

Now, you would think that once these children have made this dangerous journey across the southern border and they are taken from the custody of the cartels to that of the U.S. Government, that they would be safe. Unfortunately, we know that is not the case.

Of the more than 300,000 migrant children who arrived in the United States on President Biden's watch, roughly 85,000 could not be accounted for 30 days after they were placed with a sponsor.

Just to be clear, the process is, the Border Patrol receives these unaccompanied children and has a responsibility to turn them over to Health and Human Services and the Office of Refugee Relocation, or ORR, who then proceeds to identify a sponsor in the United States where this child may be sent to await an asylum hearing that will likely never occur. But the problem is not just that this asylum hearing will not likely ever be held, it is that these children may never be heard from again as far as the Federal Government is concerned.