

most sophisticated health system in the world—health workers there have worked to save lives amid frequent bombardment in overcrowded hospitals without electricity or adequate fuel or medicine. And in the midst of all of this, over 300 health workers have been killed.

The lack of basic necessities and overcrowded conditions are contributing to a dramatic increase in disease, and 10 percent of the population now has acute respiratory infections. Those with long-term medical conditions that require advanced treatment have little hope of receiving adequate care.

Amidst this devastation, approximately 180 women give birth in Gaza every day, facing unbelievable dangers and completely inadequate medical care. Without enough food or clean water, let alone necessary medications and antibiotics, many of these women face serious complications, and their children will bear lifelong scars from this war.

That is just a bit of the story in terms of what is happening in Gaza right now—a story that we cannot continue to ignore.

Let me say a word about why this is happening, about what the immediate causes of this humanitarian disaster are. The answer is not complicated. At every step of the way, the Israeli Government has failed to provide even the most basic protections to civilians. Every humanitarian move has been extracted only after weeks of delay and outside pressure from the United States and others.

The result of all of this is that today, just 20 to 30 percent of what is needed in humanitarian aid is being brought into Gaza. There is not enough food. There is not enough water. There are not enough medical supplies. There is not enough fuel.

Onerous Israeli border inspections are a major cause of this crisis. Today, there is a 3- to 4-week wait for trucks to get into Gaza, while children are starving. Many trucks are unloaded and reloaded numerous times, often to be searched for the same items.

It is understandable that Israel wants to ensure that no weapons are reaching Hamas. We all understand that. But senior U.S. officials tell us that they have seen no evidence of Hamas theft or diversion of U.N. aid. Meanwhile, Israel is rejecting things like tent poles, feminine hygiene kits, hand sanitizers, water testing kits, and medical supplies. If a single item in a truck is rejected, then the whole truck has to go back to the start of the process, causing enormous delays. Kerem Shalom crossing, the main entry point equipped to process trucks in large numbers, is only open 8 hours a day.

I want to thank our colleagues Senator VAN HOLLEN and Senator MERKLEY for their courage in going to the Egyptian-Gaza border and coming back here and reporting to us their personal observations of the crisis there.

It is hard to see this process and not conclude that what is taking place is a

deliberate effort to slow humanitarian aid. Sure enough, just last week, Prime Minister Netanyahu said that Israel is only allowing in the absolute minimum amount necessary.

When trucks do eventually get across the border, they face a whole new set of problems. Israel is bombing targets across Gaza, and its ground forces are fighting across much of the enclave and have closed many major roads. For aid trucks to move safely and avoid being bombed or shot, every movement must be cleared with the Israeli Defense Forces.

This deconfliction process has repeatedly failed. Even when notified, Israel has sometimes hit aid convoys. Medical facilities and humanitarian shelters cleared with Israelis have been struck numerous times. Tragically, the first half of January actually saw a deterioration in humanitarian access. In that period, Israel denied 95 percent of U.N. attempts to bring fuel and medicines to water wells and health facilities in north Gaza.

Netanyahu's rightwing government is starving the Palestinian people. On top of its indiscriminate bombardment, Israel is imposing onerous restrictions that are blocking the delivery of essential humanitarian aid.

All of this is unacceptable. We are running out of time as we face one of the most severe humanitarian catastrophes of recent times.

This should not be seen as just a terrible crisis taking place many thousands of miles away from our shores. This is a tragedy in which we, the United States of America, are complicit.

Much of what is happening right now is being done with U.S. arms and military equipment. In other words, whether we like it or not, the United States is complicit in the nightmare that millions of Palestinians are now experiencing.

In my view, Israel must take urgent steps immediately to open up humanitarian access. The water pipelines must be rapidly repaired and reopened. More border crossings, including in the north, must be opened. Inspections must be streamlined and sped up. Deconfliction of aid deliveries must be prioritized. And Israel must stop blocking essential humanitarian supplies.

These are not new issues. These are concerns that have been repeatedly communicated to the Israeli Government for months by the United States, by the U.N., and, in fact, by the global community. But the Israeli Government has refused—refused—to take these steps.

This has got to change now. Tens of thousands of lives hang in the balance. If we care about human rights and if we believe in the dignity of every human life, as we so often profess, we cannot allow this gruesome and horrible situation to continue. This is an urgent, unspeakable crisis. Every day matters, and we must act and act now.

Israel is not doing what is needed, despite the repeated pleas of the U.S.

Government and the President of the United States. That is why, in my view, we need to use every tool at our disposal to make Netanyahu change the direction he has taken.

As part of that effort, last week, the Senate voted on what I consider to be a very modest step, a resolution requiring the State Department to report on any human rights violations that may have occurred in Israel's military campaign in Gaza. The resolution was based on longstanding U.S. law requiring that any security assistance or military equipment provided to any country be used in line with internationally recognized human rights. That is what that resolution was about.

This is not a radical idea: making sure that the weapons we supply any country are used consistent with American law and international law. Yet just 11 U.S. Senators voted for that resolution.

We cannot continue turning a blind eye to the suffering in Gaza and the humanitarian catastrophe that is unfolding there. We cannot continue to ignore the fact that it has been American bombs and military equipment that has helped create this crisis.

Given the scale of the disaster, how could any Member of the Senate tell us that they do not want to know how billions in U.S. military aid is being used? How can we not want to have that very simple information?

My colleagues and I will continue to push for this information, which is absolutely necessary for Congress to conduct its oversight duties. But in addition to getting answers, I believe the United States must use all of our leverage to end this horrific war. And the primary leverage that we have over the Israeli Government is the billions of dollars in military aid we provide to them every year and the \$14 billion being proposed for Israel in the supplemental budget.

Madam President, in my view, we must loudly and clearly say no to Netanyahu's indiscriminate bombing, no to this manmade humanitarian catastrophe, and no to the unprecedented level of human suffering that is taking place in Gaza now. We must use our leverage to demand an end to the bombing, a humanitarian ceasefire to allow aid to flow to those who are suffering, and to secure the release of the more than 130 hostages still being held in Gaza. We must also demand that the Israeli Government begin the necessary work to lay the groundwork for a two-state solution.

Bottom line: There is a horrific catastrophe taking place right now. We cannot continue to ignore it. We must act.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). The Senator from Rhode Island.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, let me get to the point at hand. I

am back now for the 27th time to call attention to the rightwing billionaires' scheme to capture and control our Supreme Court and connect it to things that are going on at the Court right now.

The billionaire elite that captured our Supreme Court wants to use it to attack Americans' ability—our ability as a people—through regulation, to protect our own health and safety, and the goal, mostly, is to benefit the big polluters in their midst.

A word on regulation: As modern innovations have raised the standard of living in the United States and around the world and corporations have grown to international behemoths and billionaires have claimed for themselves a larger and larger share of the world's wealth, regulation has come to have a very important role.

Big corporations' well-known motive to maximize profits, I should say, inevitably causes dangers to society. If you think of a big industrial plant that without oversight would leach chemical byproducts into the soil and water, poison wells, and spread cancer, you have got an idea of why regulation is needed.

Over many decades, Congress created administrative Agencies to perform this task, staffed by scientists and other experts to use their expertise to manage and rein in these industrial dangers. The American system of regulation made our society safer and more prosperous. Period.

As heavy equipment and dangerous chemicals came to mines and factories and construction sites, regulators implemented workplace safety standards. The meatpacking jungle led to sanitation requirements in production facilities. Automobile highway carnage produced seatbelts and airbags. Stockjobbing "boiler rooms" and insurance fraud provoked regulations to protect investors and insureds.

What has been the result? Workplace illnesses, injuries, and deaths declined. Foodborne illnesses that used to kill thousands of people per year have been practically wiped out. Highways are no longer carnage; boilers rarely explode; and medications and stock offerings and insurance policies are all safer for consumers.

And, by the way, in this environment of safety, corporate profits soared. The S&P 500 has returned an excess of 7,800 percent. Clean air and clean water and safe food and cars are actually good for business. Regulation is good. Regulation is a public good.

But a gang of recalcitrant polluters is in the crew that captured the Supreme Court. And they want not only to pollute for free, they want to pollute without expert regulation.

Well, even Republican Congresses wouldn't go for that so they turned to their captured, unaccountable Court.

First, they got the Court to create a brandnew, so-called major questions doctrine, basically a too-big-to-regulate escape hatch for big polluters. And

now they are using their captured Court to attack another precedent, the legal doctrine known as Chevron deference, which is pretty simple: Unless the law is clear, on technical matters courts defer to the Agency experts.

This arrangement makes sense. Congress isn't suited and usually hasn't the expertise to make fine, technical determinations. So to prop up their attack on this commonsense principle, polluters have invented some fake arguments.

A few years ago, these industries and their rightwing front groups began arguing that Chevron deference has a separation-of-powers problem. It may make all the sense in the world, but it has a separation-of-powers problem that courts must attend to because they say it gives unchecked and disproportionate power to the executive branch.

The problem with that argument is that it is just not true. It is flatout false. Congress's legislative grant of administrative authority to Agencies comes with significant checks and balances. I am not going to go into all the details, but for starters, Agency heads are appointed by an elected President and confirmed by an elected Senate. And Agencies may not promulgate rules willy-nilly; they have to take public notice and comments.

And Agency rules are subject to judicial review to make sure they are consistent with the rules and the Administrative Procedures Act and the public information and comment and the evidence. That helps make sure that regulations by law have to be both reasonable and consistent with the evidence and the facts.

And in Congress, when all that is going on, we exercised direct oversight over these administrative Agencies. We do it through our oversight committees that have specific jurisdiction on specific Agencies. We do it through the appropriations process. Very often you see appropriations riders to control Agency behavior.

And we do it through the expedited review of the Congressional Review Act, which we are seeing a lot of now in the Senate, and it allows for a very quick review by Congress of a challenged Agency rule. And, in fact, Congress has used that process to overturn Agency rules 20 times since 2001.

The legal vehicle for the polluters' attack on Chevron comes in a case called *Loper Bright Enterprises*. As usual, where polluter interests are involved, this case brought out a rogue's gallery of what I would call the "usual suspects"—front groups that have spent decades trying to dismantle the government's ability to regulate the big industries that secretly fund the front groups.

They arrived at the captured Court at the end of a long process that began with industry-funded think tanks that reverse-engineered fringe ideas and legal theories that will serve rightwing donor interests. Then those fringe

ideas and legal theories cooked up in the doctrine factories get taken into other think tanks and around captured trade associations and bounced around and put more and more into the public debate and, ultimately, once they have been credentialled by this echo chamber of front groups, they get pushed—these manufactured legal theories get pushed into courtrooms around the country, very often, through coordinated flotillas of secretly funded amicus briefs.

There is a whole ecosystem of secretly funded corporate front groups that manage this whole process. It seems complicated, but it is less complicated than a piano and people know how to play pianos.

Now, much of this is funded by the Koch Brothers—now one is deceased—but the Koch Industries, a political influence operation, which is a powerful, rightwing, dark money political network.

Look at this *Loper* case. The lawyers who represent the petitioners in this case are working for free—supposedly—ostensibly for a public interest law firm called Cause of Action.

This supposed public interest law firm discloses no donors and does not report any employees. As the New York Times discovered in this article, those lawyers actually work for Americans for Prosperity, the central battleship of the Koch Brothers' political front group armada.

That armada, by the way, is very cozy with some of the far-right Justices of the Supreme Court. Indeed, ProPublica has reported that Justice Clarence Thomas has repeatedly flown out to serve as the celebrity draw for the Koch political operations fundraisers, including funding that landed at Americans for Prosperity. As is now standard practice in these cases, a flotilla of dark money front groups appeared as amici curiae—purporting to be independent but actually with enormous common funding and orchestration. These front groups are frequent flyers that spout anti-regulation arguments before the Supreme Court regularly, like, for instance, the major questions doctrine I mentioned earlier. From the creation of these doctrines in rightwing hothouses, through their amplification via rightwing front groups, to their insertion into legal arguments by rightwing amici, the common thread through the whole process is massive, secret funding from billionaire special interests.

The amici supporting petitioners in the *Loper* case include the Buckeye Institute, the Cato Institute, the Competitive Enterprise Institute, the Landmark Legal Foundation, the Mountain States Legal Foundation, the National Right to Work Legal Defense Foundation, the New Civil Liberties Alliance, the Pacific Legal Foundation, and, of course, our friends at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. All of them have received hundreds of thousands, sometimes millions of dollars from these rightwing donors—from DonorsTrust,

from Donors Capital Fund, from the Koch family foundations, from the Bradley Foundation, and in some cases, from good old ExxonMobil itself.

These two—DonorsTrust and Donors Capital Fund—are donor-advised funds that allow ultrawealthy interests to direct funding anonymously to their pet projects. They are essentially identity laundering operations. The money comes in from the donor who wants to be secret. It lands at DonorsTrust. They in turn give it under their own name. The recipient gets it, and there is no record of who the true donor was.

DonorsTrust has been described as the “dark-money ATM of the right,” and, with Donors Capital, it has laundered over a third of a trillion dollars—a third of a trillion dollars—into climate denial operations.

Many of these same amici also received Koch Family Foundation funding and Bradley Foundation funding. Those are two other top-10 funders of climate denial. Fossil fuel corporations like ExxonMobil have also directly funded some of these amici.

This is an operation. This is a part of a scheme.

ExxonMobil has given significant money to the Cato Institute, the Competitive Enterprise Institute, the Landmark Legal Foundation, and the Mountain States Legal Foundation, as well as the Pacific Legal Foundation—and that is what we know. There could be other money that went through DonorsTrust, for instance, and into these groups and the ExxonMobil name was laundered off the funding.

Some of these amici also received funding from groups affiliated with Leonard Leo. Leonard Leo has been the operative for the billionaires in the Court-capture operation.

This is a chart of some—some—of the front groups that Leo coordinates.

This question of capturing the Court in order to undermine public safety regulations? Trump White House Counsel Don McGahn actually called these two operations “two sides of the same coin.” We have it from inside the White House that these schemes are coordinated.

The Loper amicus, Advancing American Freedom, received \$1.5 million from Leonard Leo’s Concord Fund—this group—between 2020 and 2021. Leo’s Concord Fund operates under the fictitious name Judicial Crisis Network and, operating under that fictitious name, spent millions of dollars on Court capture—for instance, on advertisements for the rightwing nominees to flood the airwaves with TV ads supporting them.

By the way, it also supports Republican State attorneys general, who then challenge Federal regulations the billionaires don’t like before the sympathetic judges who were put on courts through this operation.

Just to give you an idea, the Concord Fund and the 85 Fund are the two kind of base entities. They operate out of the same location with overlapping

staff and funders and directors. I would argue that the corporate veil between the two could be pierced with a banana.

The operation of these two entities—a conjoined 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4)—then has these different legs. Each one of these six legs is a fictitious name—a fictitious name filed under Virginia corporate law—through which these entities operate. It is not a separate thing. It is just a fictitious name for—in this case, Judicial Education Project for the 85 Fund.

So these eight organizations are, in effect, the same organization, and out of it, money gets pumped up to these entities, which are Leonard Leo’s means of extracting wealth for himself for his services provided in making sure that this piece of his operation can go forward and help capture the Court.

So that is the background of all of this.

So when the Judicial Crisis Network shows up here, it is a pretty significant tell that there is more going on here than just independent organizations bringing their views to the Supreme Court.

It is not enough to flood the Supreme Court with this fake onslaught of coordinated amici curiae; there has also been a coordinated editorial campaign. In fact, it has been hard to miss the editorial campaign launched to create favorable ideological terrain for the captured Court’s Justices to end Chevron deference.

The rightwing apparatus has cranked out op-eds in just about every major publication across the country in the past week. It has been a surge of propaganda pushing that falsehood about unaccountable bureaucrats.

One particularly odious editorial appeared in the pro-polluter Wall Street Journal editorial page. I refer to it just generally as “the polluter page” because that is its reason for being. It was written in the Wall Street Journal editorial page by Mr. David Rivkin.

Mr. Rivkin is described as follows by the Wall Street Journal:

Mr. Rivkin served at the Justice Department and the White House Counsel’s Office in the Reagan and George H.W. Bush administrations.

But he has done so much more. For instance, he is Leonard Leo’s personal lawyer. This guy, with what my office refers to as the “Leo bug” of phony front groups, has this guy, who authored the Wall Street Journal editorial, as his personal lawyer.

By the way, Rivkin is the same guy who several months back gave Justice Alito a very friendly interview right in this Wall Street Journal editorial page to justify Alito’s undisclosed travel on a private jet on a freebie trip accompanied by—oh—Leonard Leo, no less. He is the same guy who, in a current case before the Supreme Court, before Alito, who has not recused himself, is attempting to secure an enormous tax giveaway for billionaires.

Rivkin’s cosigner, Mr. Grossman, Andrew Grossman, is described as “a sen-

ior legal fellow at the Buckeye Institute and an adjunct scholar at the Cato Institute.” OK, that is a pretty fair description.

By the way, if you go back here—there is the Buckeye Institute, and there is the Cato Institute. They have already briefed the case. The lawyer who writes the brief is now just pumping his own amicus brief in the Wall Street Journal editorial page with the lawyer for Leonard Leo, who did Justice Alito the big favor of trying to head off a Senate investigation into Alito’s travels. So it is a pretty rich mix.

If you look at all of this, what you discover is that this whole scheme is actually pulled off by a very small number of people on the billionaires’ payroll. They are very busy constantly switching hats and running multiple front groups out of the same enterprise so that it looks like there is more, filing multiple briefs in a Supreme Court case so it looks like there is more, but it is actually a pretty small, billionaire-funded operation. It has just been diabolically effective, and it has begun to pay off for the billionaires.

In *West Virginia v. EPA*, the Supreme Court hobbled Agency authority to regulate for our public health and safety by adopting what they called the major questions doctrine—the same one I mentioned earlier—and that in turn has prompted an onslaught of challenges to administrative regulatory authority from which the administrative law legal landscape is still reeling. There is enormous upheaval from that novel doctrine imported by the billionaire-selected Justices of the Supreme Court into American law.

It would actually add insult to that injury for the Court to break even more precedent by attacking Chevron. Frankly, they may not really even need to because the major questions doctrine is such a powerful weapon in their hands against administrative safety regulation that they may not actually need to do much damage to Chevron. They have a weapon. But it looks from the argument like the Court is actually poised to attack Chevron deference. If it does, it not only will add to the dangers to Americans’ health and safety, against which regulation protects, but it will also move the unaccountable Supreme Court further into the policymaking function properly left under the American system of government to the elected political branches.

In short, it is a power grab by the unelected judicial branch at the behest of and for the benefit of polluter billionaires, and they have done this on the specious grounds—the false grounds—that these administrative Agencies are unaccountable.

Well, even if that claim were true, it is hardly solved by moving the locus of decision to the least accountable part of the government—to the U.S. Supreme Court. If your problem is that

decisions are being made in unaccountable fashion by bureaucrats, then moving it to even less accountable judges is not a solution to the problem.

But the fact of the matter is that they are wrong about the bureaucrats because of the CRA, because of the Administrative Procedures Act, because of the appropriations process, because of congressional oversight, and because of executive appointment to the control of these Agencies. It just ain't so, but it is a lie that is repeated and repeated and repeated and begins to be echoed by the Justices of the captured Court.

To sum up, by all appearances, a Koch operation-funded legal theory supported by Koch operation-funded amici is about to be deployed by Koch operation-funded lawyers to convince Koch operation-funded Justices to achieve a longstanding goal of Koch industries: the ability to pollute more easily and more cheaply.

To twist American law through those techniques for that purpose is a deeply degraded thing. It would be a tragedy for the American people. But do you know what? It is the scheme in a nutshell. It is why all the effort was put together—the hundreds of millions of dollars were spent—to capture and control the U.S. Supreme Court for the benefit of a small cabal of creepy billionaires.

To be continued.

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. LEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### BORDER SECURITY

Mr. LEE. Madam President, we find ourselves in a situation in which every State in America is a border State.

Now, it didn't used to be this way, and as one who has spent 2 years living along the U.S.-Mexico border, where I served as a missionary in my early twenties, I am familiar with border towns; I am familiar with what they go through. And I can tell you from that experience, where I lived and worked among the poorest of the poor along the border, among a lot of people who were recent immigrants themselves—some documented, others not documented—I can tell you that no one fears uncontrolled waves of illegal immigration more than people living along the border, including and especially those who are recent immigrants. It is, after all, their jobs, their neighborhoods, their children's schools, their communities that are placed at risk every time there is an uncontrolled wave of illegal immigration.

Now, since I lived in border communities in the early 1990s in South Texas, things have gotten a lot worse, and they have gotten exponentially

worse over the last 3 years. Things got so bad in the last month that we were setting all kinds of the wrong records. Day after day, we were exceeding the maximum number of daily migrant encounters our Border Patrol had ever observed in the history of our country. These are not the kinds of records that we want to break nor are they the kinds of records that, when broken, are without consequence—very real, very tangible consequences—to the American people, starting, of course, with those living in border communities, but extending through all 50 States as all 50 States are seeing, feeling, experiencing, and paying the cost—the high cost—of this wave of lawlessness. It is not a victimless crime.

Just as the drug cartels are being enriched to the tune of many tens of billions of dollars a year—smuggling their human traffic across international boundaries—and just as the human traffic that they carry, it is bringing in enough fentanyl that it killed over 100,000 Americans last year and enough fentanyl that, if distributed to enough people, would kill every American many times over.

When that many people—we are talking somewhere in the range of 8 to 10 million people; maybe it is even more—enter a country unlawfully in such a short period of time—in just 3 short years—there are all sorts of consequences to that. Among them happens to be the erosion of the rule of law. When that many people come into the country and their first experience with this country—their very entry into this country's borders—is itself an unlawful act, it doesn't bode well for the rule of law in America. It doesn't send a positive signal for what kind of country we are becoming.

We have experienced that in every one of our States. We have seen crimes committed that should never have been committed because they were committed by people who should never have been in this country to begin with.

All of this is before we even get to the question of who exactly is coming across our border. Our Border Patrol agents have observed all kinds of things in recent months and years but especially in the last few months. People are not just coming from Central America anymore—and not just coming from Central and South America—but from all over the world, from all kinds of countries that you ordinarily wouldn't expect to be represented in large numbers crossing illegally across our southern border into the United States—countries like Afghanistan, like Syria, like China, and many, many others. We have seen many hundreds coming across who are on the Terrorist Watchlist—known terrorists. We have seen a whole lot of others—many hundreds by some measures, thousands who have likely entered—who are from countries, and otherwise entering under circumstances, that are cause for alarm.

Yet this is going on with the acquiescence—some would say with the blessing—of a Presidential administration which appears to have ordained this very result—invited it and effectively guaranteed it.

This has been really good for the drug cartels, which have been enriched to the tune of tens of billions of dollars every single year that Joe Biden has been in office—every year. But it has been really bad for the American people, especially America's poor and middle class and anyone living on or near a border or in any community where people have been displaced or where people have been ravaged by the effects of criminal activity carried out by those who should never have been in this country to begin with.

The problem got so bad over the last few months that the State of Texas decided that it had to act. You see, Texas has a really long international border at the southern end of its State, and along that border, the State of Texas sought areas that were being traversed constantly—traversed constantly and yet, perhaps, were not patrolled as well as they would have liked. These were places where there were no adequate barriers, natural or otherwise, that could keep people out but that the State of Texas knew could be protected if barriers could be placed there. So the State of Texas started putting up barriers along some of these stretches of border and, in particular, along a particular 27-mile stretch of border.

The Biden administration struggled to process these many thousands of illegal aliens crossing our border every single day, with all kinds of things to do to try to stop this or, at least, act like they are trying to stop it or, at least, process them or whatever it is that they have been ordered to do that day. Apparently, this was too much for the Biden administration, because President Biden directed the Department of Homeland Security and the personnel along the border in Texas to go in and start taking down these barriers. They were putting up ladders across some of the barriers, cutting holes in other barriers, cutting concertina wire in other circumstances.

So the State of Texas said: Good heavens. That doesn't seem right. It doesn't seem right that, you know, we are besieged by these people who want to break our laws in order to enter our country.

The President is the chief executive officer of the Federal Government, and it is the Federal Government that is responsible for protecting us from invasion. Remember, an invasion can occur either by an organized, armed military force or it can be a nonorganized, non-uniformed, nonmilitary force that is just entering another country en masse without authorization. That is the Federal Government's responsibility. It is one of the chief responsibilities, one of the most important responsibilities.

But because the Federal Government wasn't carrying out that responsibility