

We cannot convince anyone who doesn't want to acknowledge the glaring facts on the ground. The Senate has to act.

ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. President, now on another matter, years of moral rot and intellectual decay began to catch up with America's most elite universities. The President of the University of Pennsylvania resigned 4 days after failing to state whether calls for genocide against Jews constituted bullying or harassment under her institution's conduct policy.

In the face of an alarming wave of vile anti-Semitism—including death threats—on college campuses, the heads of Penn, Harvard, and MIT did everything they could to avoid condemning one of the world's oldest forms of hatred.

Of course, the Ivy League administrators' lack of moral clarity is not a recent development. For more than 2 months now, universities across the country have been engaged in an embarrassing public cycle of equivocations and apologies.

And for years, elite institutions have sheltered despicable anti-Semites under the guise of academic freedom and let them poison a generation of young minds with hateful, postmodern ideologies. The especially alarming part of the Penn, Harvard, and MIT testimony last week was just how brazenly—brazenly—their cynical embrace of free speech contradicted their response to supposed slights against leftist orthodoxy.

Today's elite college campuses are hardly bastions of free speech. The Ivy League's enforcement of speech restrictions against a laundry list of wrongthink and "microaggressions" would make censors in Pyongyang blush.

There is room to punish faculty for inviting guest speakers with objectionable views or assigning controversial class readings as Penn's president did just last year. There is room to revoke invitations for academic panelists and deplatform visiting lecturers who fail to toe the elite liberal line on social issues, as Harvard has done repeatedly.

But apparently there might not be room in the Ivy League's extensive speech restrictions to take action against calls for genocide against Jews, as Harvard's president told our House colleagues, it would—listen to this—"depend on the context."

Some current—and now former—leaders of America's most elite echo chambers would like us to believe they have a deep and abiding commitment to intellectual diversity and freedom of speech, but they are not fooling anybody. In fact, Harvard ranks dead last in a leading watchdog ranking of campus free speech. Its speech climate rated "abysmal." "Abysmal," how is that for context?

It is rather simple. Universities can enforce their existing speech restrictions evenly or they can start applying their newfound embrace of free speech across the board—and not just for anti-Semites and terrorist sympathizers.

Until they decide, the Ivy League's most philanthropic alumni will continue to vote with their checkbooks. Harvard alone is reportedly facing more than \$1 billion in canceled donations over its president's astounding failure. Even with their gargantuan tax-free endowment, that is real money. And until universities commit to protecting innocent Jews on campus, bright, young students might just vote with their feet.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois.

GUATEMALA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, over the weekend, I joined Senator TIM Kaine of Virginia on a trip to Guatemala and Honduras. With us were Senators MERKLEY, BUTLER, WELCH as well as Guatemalan-American Congresswomen TORRES of California and RAMIREZ of Illinois.

Both Guatemala and Honduras have struggled with conflict, corruption, stark inequality, and fragile democratic governments.

Many of us have forgotten that until the 1980s, much of Latin America was led by military dictators, sometimes with Cold War-era support from the United States.

Guatemala's bloody 36-year civil war only ended in 1996. It is a reminder of why the U.S. attention to this region's nascent and often fragile democracies is so important.

Guatemala is facing a deeply challenging Presidential transition. In October, Bernardo Arevalo won in a decisive landslide election where he pledged to tackle endemic corruption. Early polls showed him at 3 percent of the vote. When the final election took place, he won by 20 percent, a 1 million vote plurality, but outgoing President Giammattei, and Attorney General Porras are, unfortunately, attempting to undermine that peaceful transition ahead of the January 14 inauguration.

I might add that unlike other elections in Central and South America, this election where Mr. Arevalo prevailed was monitored by international sources, and the votes were challenged in court, counted, and found to be still in his favor, overwhelmingly.

In fact, shortly after President Giammattei didn't show up for a meeting with us one morning, his government crudely tried to annul the recent election results. This clumsy coup attempt—which was globally rejected—must not succeed. The Guatemalan voters' choice must be respected.

I want to raise the attention of the Senate to two Guatemalan political prisoners we asked about but were denied an opportunity to visit in prison, former prosecutor Virginia Laparra and journalist Jose Ruben Zamora. You won't be surprised to hear that both focused on issues of corruption, which is why they landed in jail on nonsense charges.

I look forward to working with the new President-elect, Arevalo, once he is sworn in, and hope their release will be one of his early actions.

HONDURAS

Mr. President, in 2021, neighboring Honduras elected its first female President, Xiomara Castro, who many hoped would bring much needed change after decades of misrule and instability. Though she claims repeatedly to be an ally of the United States and closely aligned with our values, there have been some actions by her government in transition that raise serious concerns about commitment to democratic norms and, unfortunately, of closer ties to China, Cuba, Venezuela, and even Russia. President Castro still has an opportunity to show that we can work together for the common values that we share. I hope she takes that path.

Early in Senator Kaine's adult life, he spent a year in a Jesuit mission in Honduras, teaching Hondurans how to be carpenters and welders. It was in a Jesuit school for impoverished children where he gave a year of his life. I want to commend TIM Kaine for that effort, what he calls his "North Star" in his life, which helped to make him a thoughtful leader and one of the most admired Senators on the floor. His commitment to the region is a reminder that we still have important allies and responsibilities in our own neighborhood.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. President, I would also like to speak briefly on the National Defense Authorization Act. The bill authorizes \$886 billion for America's defense, expanding benefits for servicemembers and strengthening national security. It provides a 5.2-percent pay increase for our troops and the Pentagon civilian workforce, the largest increase in 20 years. Importantly, the conference report excludes a number of dangerous partisan provisions that were designed to rip away the freedoms of the very Americans whom, every day, we send to defend them.

This bill includes a number of provisions I offered, including to uphold Ukraine's territorial sovereignty, as that country fights for survival against Russia. Here is this country, hanging on by a thread, wondering if the United States is going to come to its assistance as people fight and die every single day to stop the invasion of Putin and his forces.

It is hard to imagine that we have reached a point where we have promised to stand by a country like Ukraine in this time of testing and we have mobilized the NATO alliance and many other nations to join us in that effort, and then have the rug pulled out from us by Donald Trump, who said he changed his mind on Ukraine.

To strengthen our security partnerships with our allies, such as the Baltics and Australia, we have to stay the course. I am convinced that the Ukrainians will prevail. We must show that we are determined to help them prove it.

This year the bill also authorizes many important programs. It is not

perfect, and it includes an unnecessary extension of section 702. I won't go into the details of this complicated mechanism that we have to try to detect those who threaten our country, but, from the beginning, I raised questions about its compliance with the constitutional guarantees of people being safe in the searches and seizures of the government. We will continue to discuss this over the weeks and months ahead.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. President, I want to close on the topic that Senator MCCONNELL raised, immigration. It is not an easy issue. I have given 20 years of my life here in the Senate to the issue of immigration and feel it was time well spent. It is over 20 years ago that I introduced the DREAM Act. Before I introduced this bill, if you asked most people what the "Dreamers" were, they would say a British rock group headed up by a guy named Freddie. Well, today, when you say "Dreamers," people know what you are talking about: infants, toddlers, and children brought to the United States by their parents, growing up here, going to school, and determined to help this country succeed in the future. And what they find when they are teenagers is that they are undocumented; they don't have legal status in the United States.

I have always believed that they deserve a chance. The overwhelming majority of Americans of both political parties believe the same thing. But we have been unable to enact that law, and, as a consequence, at least 800,000 who were helped with the DACA Program by President Obama still have their fate in doubt as it courses through our Federal court system. That is something we should do automatically—we should have done it a long time ago—to protect these young people and the aspirations they have to make us a better nation. These are young people who will serve not only as teachers and engineers, but doctors and nurses and members of our military. If we give them the chance to fight and die for America, they will do it. They want to be part of this Nation's future, and they deserve that opportunity.

But, currently, we are debating only one thing, and that is the policy at the border—the southern border of the United States. I will tell you this: I have taken a close look at the situation at the border, and I know that change is necessary. But it must be change consistent with our values and realistic.

For the Republicans to propose change which says that those who come into the country seeking asylum will either be detained or sent to remain in Mexico—a policy that Donald Trump tried during his Presidency—there are some fatal flaws here. How in the world are we going to detain all those people presenting themselves at the border? That is simply a promise that can't be kept. And, secondly, as for this notion of "Remain in Mexico,"

there is only one party to this conversation that hasn't agreed to it, Mexico. They don't want to have these people residing in their country for long periods of time while we work out changes in America's legal system.

It is hard to imagine, when you see the intractable positions taken by some on immigration, that there actually was a moment when we agreed on a bipartisan basis to pass comprehensive immigration reform. The Gang of 8, which I was part of, put that together. It was an extraordinary effort, and it was successful because of the hard work of a lot of people and a lot of time spent going through—painstakingly going through—each and every provision of the bill.

It can be done. It needs to be done. But the notion that in 7 days or 14 days we can craft some change in immigration policy that will help us, from time immemorial, is unrealistic and naive, and to condition any assistance to Ukraine on the achievement of that political goal is nonsense.

What we can do is come up with an agreement, I believe, on a bipartisan basis to enforce provisions and rules at the border that are consistent with American values but really do make it clear that we cannot sustain the number of people who are presenting themselves at the current time. I think that can be done, but only as a preliminary step to move us toward comprehensive immigration reform.

There are some, incidentally, who call for immigration reform but have never voted for an immigration bill one time in their political lives. That is a reality. So we shouldn't listen to their guidance if they haven't proven that they are open to vote for anything on the subject.

This is an important issue to a lot of people. I was in Guatemala City yesterday, as a matter of fact—or was it Saturday? This weekend, I met with people from Venezuela who were making their way to the U.S. border—they were mothers with small children—and I thought to myself: Who would embark on that dangerous, deadly journey with small children, realizing that every step of the way they are the most vulnerable person in the country?

As you travel through these countries, they are assaulted by people who steal everything that they own and threaten them with physical abuse and other things. I can't imagine how desperate these people must be to risk their families and their kids to make it to America. But then I think back: As a son of an immigrant myself, I know there was a determination in my family to make it in this country.

We have got to find a way to carefully construct a border policy that still takes advantage of the opportunities of immigration—the people who will come here and make us a better nation in the years ahead—and do it in a fashion that is thoughtful, not vindictive. That is what immigration requires, and I hope that we can reach that goal.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

UKRAINE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, tomorrow morning, Leader MCCONNELL and I will welcome Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyy to the Senate. This will be the third time President Zelenskyy meets with Senators since the start of the war, and it will be his most important visit of all.

The war in Ukraine stands at a crossroads, with our friends in desperate need of American aid to maintain pressure on Vladimir Putin. The last time President Zelenskyy spoke to the Senate, he warned us that without more aid, Ukraine will lose the war—simple as that. Earlier today, he warned military officers at the National Defense University that "if there's anyone inspired by unresolved issues on Capitol Hill, it is just Putin and his sick clique."

So if there is a word for what we most need this week, the word is to be serious about the task at hand. If Republicans in the Senate do not show they are serious about finalizing an agreement for the national security package, Vladimir Putin is going to walk through Ukraine and right through Europe.

Both parties understand that aiding Ukraine and resisting Putin are critical for our national security, but Republicans and only Republicans are holding everything up because of unrealistic, maximalist demands on the border.

Last week, we put forth a serious bill to address our national security needs. The package included robust border security provisions. Republicans rejected it out of hand, demanding their way or the highway, even though they were offered an amendment of their choosing—and they only need 11 Democrats to go along.

This posture is unserious. Again, Republicans and only Republicans are holding everything up because of unrealistic, maximalist demands on the border.

I want to be very clear. Democrats very much want an agreement if possible. We talked all weekend with our Republican counterparts to find some kind of agreement. We talked again earlier today. We are not there yet, but as a sign of good faith, Democrats are going to keep trying.

If Republicans keep insisting on Donald Trump's border policies, then they will be at fault when a deal for aid to Ukraine, Israel, and humanitarian aid to Gaza falls apart. The onus is on Republicans to show they are willing to moderate.

Let me say that again. If Republicans keep insisting on Donald Trump's border policies, then they will be at fault when a deal for Ukraine, Israel, and humanitarian aid to Gaza falls apart. Republicans will be giving Vladimir Putin the best gift he could ask for.