

since we have seriously considered an immigration reform bill. We had a chance, didn't we, just a few weeks ago? There was a bipartisan group—and the White House was part of it—that wanted to sit down and change the immigration and border security laws of the United States.

The Republican effort in this regard was led by JAMES LANKFORD, a conservative, respected Republican from Oklahoma, and on our side, Senators MURPHY and SINEMA, who negotiated for weeks, week after week, to come up with a proposal. The notion was to finally address the border security of the United States in a comprehensive, bipartisan, realistic way. It was controversial. There were some parts of it that I didn't care for at all. But I thought this was a good-faith, bipartisan effort.

We were assured that because the Republican Senators had chosen Senator LANKFORD as their negotiator, that it at least would entertain some support on the Republican side. We called the measure on the floor, and it failed because the Republicans would not join the Democrats in engaging in this bipartisan effort.

The issues raised this morning by Senator BUDD could have been resolved, perhaps, if we would have had that kind of bipartisan negotiation, but it didn't happen.

I had my concerns about the deal, but it certainly should have moved forward.

When it came to a vote, the vast majority of Republicans opposed it at the request of former President Donald Trump, who urged a "no" vote, who wanted the measure to stop and not be considered and moved forward and said:

Go ahead and blame me for it.

Well, I am blaming you for it, and I am blaming those who stepped away from this bipartisan opportunity.

Donald Trump has made clear that he does not want a solution to our challenges at the border; he wants an issue for the November election. So we stepped away from it—the only realistic chance to have a bipartisan solution.

I urge my colleagues to reject Donald Trump's advice. Let's get back to the table. Let's consider the issues raised by the Senator this morning and other issues that are important and make a bipartisan decision to move forward to solve this problem.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. President, I am deeply disappointed in my Democratic colleagues for objecting to a bill that, had it been in place, Laken Riley's life would have been spared. The Democratic Party's commitment to open borders is causing otherwise preventable tragedies to occur again and again and again.

But while we are here, let me address some of the counterarguments that we have heard.

One contention is that this bill would apply to individuals merely accused of a crime, robbing them of due process. Well, the fact that illegal aliens are freely roaming around the country in and of itself is illegal. If they then commit another crime, authorities are well within their rights to detain them.

The law that this bill would strengthen already requires detention for those who have been involved in various acts, such as drug trafficking, prostitution, and other vices, regardless of whether or not they have been convicted.

Opponents of this bill don't just have a problem with this bill; they have a problem with well-established laws on the books.

Another argument that I have heard is that this bill would violate the Constitution's standing requirements to file lawsuits.

The Supreme Court in the United States v. Texas provided a clear roadmap for Congress to authorize lawsuits against the executive branch for failing to enforce the law. The bill follows that roadmap and upholds the Constitution's separation of powers.

The bill authorizes a state attorney general or other authorized officer to bring a lawsuit against executive branch officials for failure to enforce immigration laws in a manner that harms such State or its residents. The bill authorizes a Federal court to grant appropriate injunctive relief. This bill does not prejudice the result of any case or tie a judge's hands. The bill simply ensures that States are given their day in court to protect their citizens against the harmful, lawless, open border policies of the Biden administration.

I simply don't believe that another American family needs to experience a tragedy like the one that befell the Riley family. I am going to continue to work with my colleague from Alabama, Senator BRITT, and all my colleagues to push this legislation until it passes this Chamber.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

NOMINATION OF DENNIS HANKINS

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, it has been almost a year since President Biden nominated Dennis Hankins to be the U.S. Ambassador to Haiti. In that time, Haiti has gone from a tenuous political situation into a security and humanitarian catastrophe.

Vicious gangs, armed largely with weapons trafficked from the United States, have plunged the country into chaos. They have burned government buildings. They have attacked police stations. While the Prime Minister was out of the country to facilitate an international peacekeeping mission, gangs led a massive jailbreak, releasing nearly 4,000 prisoners. Mr. President, 15,000 Haitians have been forced to flee their homes. Almost half of the population is facing a food insecurity crisis. And this is within a very short

distance of the United States of America. Thousands have been murdered, hundreds kidnapped. According to U.N. officials, gangs have used collective rapes to instill fear, punish, subjugate, and inflict pain.

We are on the verge of having a failed state roughly 800 miles from our shores.

Secretary Blinken was in Kingston this week to help broker a political agreement with other partners in the region—an agreement for a political path forward that includes the creation of a transitional Presidential council following the resignation of the Prime Minister.

I am pleased that we are finally voting on Ambassador Hankins' nomination so he can start doing the job he was nominated for, but it has taken us way too long to get to this point. I am pleased that we are voting on his nomination. It should have been done well before now.

I mentioned this week my meeting with General Richardson, our SOUTHCOM commander, as to how critical it is in our hemisphere and around the world to have confirmed Ambassadors to speak on behalf of America.

We want to have a strong voice on what is happening in Haiti, but how can we have that if we don't take advantage of having a confirmed Ambassador? I am glad we are correcting that today. This nomination has been held up for reasons that have nothing to do with Haiti and nothing to do with the qualifications or experience of the nominee.

U.S. leadership matters, especially in a country so close to our border. We need Senate-confirmed Ambassadors on the ground who can work with Haitian leaders and diplomats in the region to lay the groundwork for a transitional unity government.

We need someone who understands the depths of the humanitarian suffering, which, if not addressed, will lead to thousands of Haitians seeking refuge at our southern border.

Most importantly, we need someone who can help coordinate once the Kenyan-led Multinational Security Support Mission is in place, which will be critical to restoring security. We need that multinational security force in place, but we need our voice to make sure they can be successful.

In Haiti—in this region and throughout the world—we need to have confirmed Ambassadors. Ambassador Hankins has more than two decades of Foreign Service experience. He has served in some of the most complex, crisis-prone situations in the world, including in Haiti.

In 2015, he was confirmed as Ambassador to Guinea by unanimous consent—unanimous consent. He was previously confirmed. He has the experience and the vision to guide this process forward and advance U.S. national interests.

I want to call on my colleagues to support the administration's outstanding funding request for Haiti. Not

only do we need to get the Ambassador confirmed, but we need to have our contributions available so that the multinational force that Kenya is leading can be deployed and we can start to restore order in Haiti so that a transitional government has a possibility of restoring the order necessary to avoid the current crisis and be able to address the humanitarian needs and stability that the people of Haiti so badly need. But it starts with us confirming the Ambassador, and we have a chance to do that with this next vote.

I am pleased that we have this opportunity today, and I urge my colleagues to support this nomination.

VOTE ON HANKINS NOMINATION

With that, I ask unanimous consent that the vote that was supposed to start at 12 noon start immediately.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Hankins nomination?

Mr. CARDIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN).

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 92 Ex.]

YEAS—89

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Barraso	Graham	Ossoff
Bennet	Grassley	Padilla
Blackburn	Hagerty	Paul
Blumenthal	Hassan	Peters
Booker	Hawley	Reed
Braun	Heinrich	Ricketts
Britt	Hickenlooper	Risch
Brown	Hirono	Romney
Budd	Hoeven	Rosen
Butler	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Cantwell	Johnson	Sanders
Capito	Kaine	Schatz
Cardin	Kelly	Schmitt
Carper	King	Schumer
Casey	Klobuchar	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Lankford	Sinema
Collins	Lee	Smith
Coons	Lujan	Stabenow
Cornyn	Lummis	Tester
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Thune
Crapo	Marshall	Tillis
Cruz	McConnell	Tuberville
Duckworth	Menendez	Van Hollen
Durbin	Merkley	Vance
Ernst	Moran	Warner
Fetterman	Murkowski	Warrick
Fischer	Murphy	

Warren	Whitehouse	Wyden
Welch	Wicker	Young

NAYS—1

Kennedy

NOT VOTING—10

Boozman	Markey	Shaheen
Cotton	Mullin	Sullivan
Cramer	Rubio	
Daines	Scott (SC)	

The nomination was confirmed.

(Mr. KING assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETERS). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Nicole G. Berner, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

TRIBUTE TO DALLAS SEAVEY

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I am here today for a really fun update. Some of you have been here before when I have had occasion to speak about the Last Great Race. The Last Great Race in Alaska is really all about the Iditarod.

I note the presence of my friend from Vermont, who was sitting where the Presiding Officer is last year, and he was so captivated by the story of the Iditarod. He said: Lisa, when you come back and you give the great announcement, let me know.

So I am pleased to be able to regale you with yet another Iditarod.

This is an extraordinary tradition—51 years in Alaska—where dogs and mushers have left the starting in the Willow, Wasilla area to head north on an almost 1,000-mile—and in some years, an over 1,000-mile race—test of a musher and K-9 against all of the elements.

And it is always a bit exciting, but this year, I am really excited to be able to announce that we have made history yet again with the Iditarod Trail Sled Dog Race. Dallas Seavey has won for the sixth time in a row. This is the first time any musher has ever won more than five Iditarods. This extraordinary young man from an extraordinary mushing family has made history in a way that is absolutely worth celebrating.

Again, for those who are not familiar with the Iditarod, it is about a 1,000-mile sled dog race. It goes from the Anchorage area, where we host the ceremonial start—I was there a couple of weeks ago—and then they begin their actual race the following day, on Sunday.

They proceed all the way up to Nome, and this is not easy terrain. You

are going over mountains. You are going over ice on the ocean. You are going over rivers. The terrain is challenging, and, certainly, the temperatures are challenging. This year has been a test for all of our mushers. On certain parts of the trail, they were seeing temperatures down in the negative 40 degrees. When you get yourself moving behind a dog team and get that wind in your face, it is no pleasant journey by any stretch of the imagination. It is tough. It tests the mushers. It tests the canine athletes. But it is an extraordinary, extraordinary race that was based off of a relay effort to get diphtheria serum to Nome during an outbreak in the 1920s. We no longer carry the diphtheria serum, but we carry strong messages about, again, the role of working dogs, the role that mushers and their teams have had in a State like Alaska.

I want to speak a little bit about the Seavey family because, as we are celebrating and recognizing Dallas's extraordinary achievements, having won now six Iditarods, it is important to know that he comes to this race with the Iditarod literally in his veins.

The family tradition started back in 1973. This was the very first Iditarod, and Dallas's grandfather participated in that race. Dan Seavey ran the very first Iditarod. He ended up placing third—pretty respectable, absolutely—but he stayed with it. He stayed with the Iditarod, and he raced in four additional Iditarod races.

Then there is Dan's son, Mitch Seavey, who took the reins from his dad. He started his own racing kennel, and Mitch went on to win three Iditarods himself. He raced in a total of 28 different Iditarods. That is a lot of racing. That is a commitment to the race.

Mitch had four sons, three of which have taken on the Iditarod themselves. The oldest, Danny Seavey, raced three times in the Iditarod; Tyrell Seavey, he has raced twice; and then, of course, Dallas, who has competed in a total of 14 Iditarods. I think it is also worth noting that Dallas's wife, Jen, has also herself competed in the Iditarod. So this is a family, again, who is extraordinarily committed and dedicated to dog racing and, particularly, with the Iditarod.

I think it is somewhat unique to know that it was just a couple of years ago that Dallas and Mitch—his dad—were competing in the same race. How many different sports activities, competitions—intense competitions—do you see a father and a son as competitors? It is really quite remarkable how the Seaveys came to this race and how they have committed to it.

When Dallas started racing in the Iditarod, he was the youngest competitor when he entered the race. It was just 2 weeks before his 18th birthday. So he started pretty young and has stayed in it since 2005.

At 25, he became the youngest competitor to win the Iditarod. He also