

Americans think that is a great idea: Somebody with that kind of dangerous history, with an active restraining order against them, should not be able to buy a gun or possess guns. That was the law in Texas at the time. It worked for this woman who was being badly abused, and her life was unquestionably under threat.

Rahimi thinks that he should have the guns. He thinks that notwithstanding his long criminal history, the restraining order, that the Constitution requires him, a domestic abuser, to have weapons. So he has brought a case that has reached the Supreme Court asking to invalidate all laws that keep weapons away from domestic abusers who are the subject of restraining orders.

If this case is decided in his favor, it is not just an outrage, it is not just dangerous; it is a frontal assault on democracy because what it would say is that the Supreme Court—not the U.S. Congress, not the elected branch of government—is going to micromanage the decisions as to who can have a gun and who can't have a gun. They will decide who is dangerous and who is not dangerous. That should make you really nervous if the outcome of this case is to decide that Zackey Rahimi is a responsible individual, capable of owning and possessing more weapons.

Later in that year, Rahimi threatened another woman with a gun, which resulted, that time, in a charge of aggravated assault. Rahimi then participated in five separate shootings—five separate shootings—all of which were in public places. Rahimi was arrested and convicted of possessing a firearm. He was ultimately sentenced for these crimes for a long time in jail.

Restraining orders are designed to look at someone, assess their penchant for violence, and then take guns away from them to protect a spouse or a woman or a girlfriend. Rahimi was violent. He was wildly violent after the restraining order. This is exactly whom the law in Texas is designed to protect us from. Yet we are perhaps weeks away from the Supreme Court invalidating that law, invalidating Connecticut's law, invalidating Georgia's laws so that domestic abusers, with histories of vicious assault, can get their hands back on weapons.

But this should come as no surprise to Americans because we have won this fight, this fight to start moving the laws of this country toward common sense. We want people to have a right to own firearms. I believe in the Second Amendment. I believe the Second Amendment protects the right of private gun ownership. I do. But I think that there is a class of individuals—a pretty small class of individuals—who have demonstrated so clearly that they are so dangerous and so irresponsible with firearms that they should not have them. It is a small class of individuals. Zackey Rahimi is clearly in that class. And the idea that we are weeks away from somebody like him

being able to get guns again should shake this country to its foundation.

Maybe the Supreme Court listens to America; maybe they don't. But this country needs to understand the gravity of the decision that is being made and the wholesale shift that will occur in legislating on the question of gun safety.

If Rahimi wins this case, we are no longer in charge. The Supreme Court will now, on a case-by-case basis, decide who can have a gun and who can't. Frankly, that is bad for progressives and supporters of gun violence prevention. That is bad for conservatives as well because once the Supreme Court gets in the business of that kind of micromanaging, we are all out of jobs. We will just show up to work, punch our clock but have really nothing to do because they ultimately will pull the strings. They will substitute themselves as the new governing policy-making body in this country.

With the stakes so high for women's safety in this country, with 70 women dying every month at the hands of an intimate partner, we cannot let that happen.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican whip.

AMERICAN LEADERSHIP

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, we have had no shortage of reminders in the last couple of years that we continue to live in a dangerous world.

Vladimir Putin's war of aggression in Ukraine, increased Chinese belligerence, and Hamas's October 7 attack, enabled by Iran, are all powerful reminders of the fact that there will always be malign actors in this world who must be confronted. These events are also a powerful reminder of something else, and that is the need for American leadership on the global stage.

Nature abhors a vacuum, and if the United States and other free countries don't lead, other countries will fill the void—countries like Iran, Russia, and China.

I don't need to tell anyone that all three of these countries have been flexing their power in recent years and seeking to expand their footprint. Iran, as Hamas's recent attack so pointedly reminded us, is supporting terrorist organizations throughout the Middle East: Hamas, Hezbollah, Palestinian Islamic Jihad, the Houthis in Yemen, Shia militias that are attacking U.S. troops in Iraq and Syria. And the list goes on. Nor is Iran confining its sphere of activities to the Middle Eastern countries.

Iran has provided Russia with weapons to use in its war on Ukraine, and it is helping Russia to build its own drone-manufacturing facility to dramatically increase Russia's drone supply.

Russia, of course, is currently providing the world with a clear illustration of its imperial aspirations in its war of aggression in Ukraine. And

Putin has made it clear that his ambitions don't end there. He is also occupying territory in Georgia and seemingly working in asserting Russian influence in Moldova and the Balkans.

And as for China, whether it is increasingly aggressive threats against Taiwan, efforts to expand its military and economic hold over the Indo-Pacific, menacing U.S. military aircraft, or sending a spy balloon across the United States in an attempt to gather information on sensitive military sites, China has made it very clear that it is set on expanding its power—and woe to anyone who gets in its way.

And it is backing up its determination with an aggressive military buildup that has seen the Chinese military outpace the U.S. military in modern capabilities like hypersonic missiles.

So it is abundantly clear that bad actors are flexing their power. And, as I said, our response to that must be a renewed commitment to American leadership internationally.

Now, American leadership doesn't mean attempting to fix every country's problems or to get militarily involved in every conflict around the globe. We neither can nor should attempt to become the world's policeman. But that doesn't mean that we should retreat from the global stage or confine our focus to one or two areas.

There is a lot that we can do while not attempting to play global policeman or to solve every conflict. In the first place, we can and should project the kind of strength that makes bad actors unwilling to tangle with us—or with our allies. That means first, and foremost, having a strong military prepared to meet and defeat any threat, backed up by resilient supply chains. But it also means things like a strong economy and developing our energy resources so that we don't have to depend on hostile countries or hostile areas of the world for oil.

Military and economic strength is a powerful deterrent. But it is not enough. We also have to engage on the global stage. We need to build and maintain relationships with allies, support free nations, and stand against hostile actions by hostile countries.

The stronger the bonds of free nations and the more united our response to belligerent countries, the less scope these countries will have for their aggression.

The world stage is going to be dominated by someone. And when free countries abdicate a leadership role, malign actors are likely to end up controlling the playing field.

Some might suggest that the United States should only engage globally when events directly and immediately affect us. But, unfortunately, that thinking often involves underestimating just how much we are affected by world events, even those that are not a direct and immediate attack on U.S. interests.

Some, for example, would question our continued support for Ukraine.

Well, I question what will happen if we don't support Ukraine. Withdrawing American support for Ukraine could very well end up with a victorious and newly emboldened Putin on the doorstep of four former Soviet satellite states—now NATO members whom we are bound by treaty to protect.

If Putin wins in Ukraine, it is not hard to imagine him viewing incursions into one or more of these former Soviet states as a good idea. And given our treaty obligations—and the imperative to prevent a Soviet Union 2.0—it is not hard to imagine American troops being drawn into the resulting conflict.

Supporting Ukrainians' efforts to defend themselves against Putin's war of aggression is a way of preventing a conflict that would require a far greater commitment from the United States—not to mention warding off a likely catastrophic economic fallout in Europe from a wider war, which would take a heavy toll on American businesses and consumers.

Furthermore, there is little question that a Russian victory in Ukraine would embolden not just Putin but other malign actors—notably China.

If Russia is successful at taking over part or all of Ukraine, why shouldn't China think it can successfully take over Taiwan? We should be supporting Ukraine—not just because peoples fighting for freedom against tyranny are worthy of support, but because supporting Ukraine, like supporting Taiwan and Israel and other free countries, is in our national interest.

We should support Ukraine with an endgame in mind. Saying we will back Ukraine “for as long as it takes,” as the President likes to say, is noble. But not being intentional about the resources we send risks prolonging this war without advancing toward that end state.

We can't expect Ukraine to tread water indefinitely. And I am hopeful that the arrival of M1 Abrams tanks, longer-reaching ATACMS missiles, and soon—soon—F-16s, while too late to meaningfully contribute to Ukraine's summer counteroffensive, will enable Ukraine to make new battlefield gains.

The Senate will soon take up a supplemental spending bill to address defense issues. And any such bill should promote security abroad by providing support for our allies—specifically, right now, Ukraine, Israel, and Taiwan.

And after three successive years of recordbreaking illegal immigration at our southern border, we should make sure that any supplemental also focuses on building up our security here at home by tightening security at our borders, in addition to addressing military priorities like ramping up munitions production.

Senators GRAHAM, LANKFORD, and COTTON have produced a substantive plan to help secure the border and stem the historic level of illegal migration under this President's watch. And we should take up their proposal to address this essential aspect of our national security.

We can't solve every problem or bring peace to every conflict around the world. But the United States can be a powerful force for good, if we are willing to lead. And we should use our strength and influence to contain evil actors and advance peace and freedom around the globe. Failing to do so may have consequences for our national security now and long into the future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PADILLA). The Senator from Kansas.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 6126

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, what if it was your family in these body bags? What if your wife, your daughter, or your mom were raped, tortured, and killed? What if videos of your baby or your grandchild being massacred were posted all over social media? What if a month had passed and there has been no meaningful action from your ally, the most powerful nation in the world?

I stand here today to right this wrong. Today, we will show the world that, once again, America will be there to do justice, to stand up for humanity, and ensure Hamas does not become more powerful.

As I stand in this Chamber, we have the opportunity to send a real message to Iran and its terrorist proxies that we will stop their hatred and evil from spreading.

This morning, I rise in support of the bipartisan, House-passed, standalone legislation to provide aid to the people of Israel, our strongest ally in the Middle East, during their ongoing war with Hamas. It is hard to believe that today marks a month—a month—since the October 7 savage attacks by the Hamas army of terror on the people of Israel.

Hamas unleashed an attack that was worse than animals, killing thousands of Israelis and 36 American citizens. And, right now, there are as many as 240 people taken hostage by these savages that only know one language: death and destruction.

Right now, there are families of hostages here at the U.S. Capitol begging for their loved ones to be no longer tortured, for their loved ones to reach safety from the grips of this evil army of terror.

Time is of the essence. And it is imperative that the Senate not delay delivering this crucial aid to Israel another day. A timely military aid package with a unified voice from Congress showing support for Israel will not only add to Israel's stability, it will slow down and hopefully stop the evil plots of Hamas, Iran, and its proxies.

Our bill provides military assistance and resources to Israel at the exact spending levels the Biden administration has requested. And I want to emphasize: These are the exact spending levels President Biden put forth that he agrees Israel needs in this time of war.

You can imagine my surprise—and the surprise of many—to hear that our Commander in Chief, admitting to a

significant security crisis in the Middle East, has threatened to veto this aid package.

Now, think about this. Our President is threatening to veto the aid he requested from Congress. With this veto, he would snatch defeat from the jaws of victory. And why? “Why?” many, many people are asking. Just because it isn't being leveraged for a \$105 billion boondoggle package with another blank check to another unending war in Ukraine.

Today, we plan on calling the President's bluff and delivering this critical standalone measure in a bipartisan victory for the White House. We must fast-track this much needed assistance to one of our staunchest allies: the people of Israel.

If this military aid and our strong message of support is not delivered soon, Israel will find itself fighting a war on three fronts. We know that Iran has those capabilities; that through their proxy forces, they have the ability to send long-range missiles to Israel from Lebanon and Yemen.

Helping our ally who is fighting a war from all angles against Hamas shouldn't require a prolonged battle here in Congress. This is a no-brainer and should have been done yesterday—or the week before.

The support for this package to Israel is bipartisan and bicameral. Again, our legislation honors the spending levels outlined by the Biden administration for Israel and keeps aid to Israel separate from the other conflicts.

What I want to make perfectly clear to every American is that our standalone package is an opportunity to secure a huge, bipartisan win for all of humankind and get aid to Israel quickly. The legislation we brought to the floor today ensures that funding for Israel is not coupled with a billion dollars of additional moneys in aid to Ukraine, Taiwan, or for a mass amnesty program at the border.

By passing this standalone spending bill today, the Senate will expedite the arrival of the assistance to Israel after the House and our newly elected Speaker, MIKE JOHNSON, passed with bipartisan support.

Now, many of us have concerns about the Ukraine conflict. But until the White House answers the 12 questions posed by the House, including the need for an inspector general and a clear-cut peace strategy, many of us will continue to block sending billions more in dollars to what looks like a stalemate that has already, tragically, cost over 200,000 lives.

Here in the home front, what is even more disheartening for the American people is this White House embrace of open-border policies that has allowed almost 10 million—that is right, we are approaching 10 million illegal crossings of our border, making every State a border State and every American less safe.

And it is a poke in the eye to every Member of Congress who has been to