

himself attended. You talk about weaponizing the census.

If you don't believe me, listen to what New York City is saying itself. Just last week, New York City announced that it is challenging the 2023 Census Bureau annual estimates, arguing that the government failed to count some 50,000 illegal aliens currently in the city. They are desperate to count these illegal aliens because 727,000 people have moved out of New York since 2020. They have got to backfill that population to preserve their Federal influence.

It is clear why the majority leader and my Democrat colleagues voted against any change to the census. It is not because they are afraid that Republicans will weaponize it; it is because Democrats already have weaponized it.

Prior to this vote, the concept was decried by Democrats in the media as a "conspiracy theory." Democrats' unanimous vote against ending this practice changed it from a conspiracy theory to a conspiracy—period.

It is why they have done nothing to secure our southern border, and it is why there is no outrage from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle when confronted with the fact that the number of illegal aliens who have entered the United States since Biden took office exceeds the population of 36 States. And President Biden and Democrats aren't just sitting back and allowing the crisis at our southern border to unfold; they are actively encouraging it.

For example, President Biden has been secretly flying hundreds of thousands of illegal aliens from foreign countries into blue-city airports across the United States in order to resettle them there.

Earlier this month, scarce details emerged regarding the administration's secret flights. They revealed that more than 320,000 illegal aliens were flown directly into the United States last year alone. One can't help but wonder whether the President is trying to make it even easier for blue States to backfill their declining populations and shore up their political power by delivering these illegal aliens directly to them.

Flying migrants from foreign countries into the United States in the midst of a record-shattering illegal immigration crisis is completely absurd. I plan to soon file an amendment to the appropriations bill that would prohibit the Biden administration from doing this.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this commonsense measure.

The question is simple: Are Democrats willing to allow a vote on my amendment to stop President Biden from using secret flights to import hundreds of thousands of illegal aliens into the United States? Or are they so desperate to preserve this political power grab that they can't risk the

possibility of losing it by allowing such a vote to occur?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

ISRAEL

Mr. RICKETTS. Mr. President, on October 7, Hamas—a terrorist organization—committed a horrible atrocity on the people of Israel. Over 1,100 people were killed, hundreds taken hostage.

We must support Israel to destroy this terrorist organization called Hamas. We must get our five American hostages back, and all the hostages must be released. We need to have an ironclad friendship with Israel to get this done.

This seems obvious to most Americans. However, on the floor of this very institution, the majority leader got up and called for new elections in Israel; and Israel's Prime Minister, he said, was the obstacle to peace.

It is absolutely outrageous the majority leader would make that speech from this floor while we have five American hostages being held by a terrorist group. He was pandering to the fringe anti-Israel, pro-Hamas wing of his party. It is despicable. It is terrible that he would undermine an ally of ours who shares our values, who has a democratically elected government, and undermine them in their hour of need when they are fighting against a terrorist organization.

This is good versus evil. The atrocities Hamas committed were barbarous, uncivilized. And yet the majority leader took their side.

Americans know Hamas must surrender—Hamas must surrender and release the hostages—and that we need to support Israel until Hamas is destroyed.

So what was the majority leader doing? Well, was he really concerned about the elections in Israel, or was he concerned about our elections? Pandering to the pro-Hamas terrorist wing of his party, somehow trying to distance himself from Israel—it is unbelievable.

Now, President Joe Biden, on October 7, talked the talk. He said we would stand with Israel no matter what. But the President called the majority leader's speech a good speech. He has been backing away from our ally Israel.

There are even reports that he is considering conditioning some of the aid to meeting Hamas's conditions. This is outrageous. What do you think Hamas does when they see the President of the United States start to step back from our ally?

If they were going to negotiate a cease-fire and somehow release hostages, you know that this is actually the opposite of what they are going to do now. They know if the President is weakening, the longer they hold out, the better their position is. It is the opposite of what we should be doing.

Hamas is a terrorist organization and understands one and one thing only, and that is strength. We need a Presi-

dent who is going to project that strength—project the strength and support our ally Israel. That is what would bring our hostages home. That is what would bring all the hostages home.

Let Israel do the work of civilized nations and destroy this terrorist organization. That is what needs to happen.

Everyone in America knows it is not the Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu who is the obstacle to peace; it is Hamas who is the obstacle to peace.

Hamas started this. October 6 there was a cease-fire. They broke it on October 7. Hamas is responsible for every death on October 7 and every death since then. They are the obstacle to peace.

I am proud to stand with my colleagues and remind the majority leader that Hamas is a terrorist organization that is the obstacle to peace, not our friend and ally Israel.

I will point out to him what Americans know: that this is a terrorist organization that needs to be destroyed. We must stand with Israel. I am proud to say I stand with Israel. The majority leader and the President must reverse course and stand with Israel as well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

ELECTRIC VEHICLES

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak about the President's most recent attacks upon the freedoms of the American people. This week, the Biden administration, the Environmental Protection Agency, announced that it is going to put stringent new limits on gas-powered cars.

In effect, this delusional new regulation is attempting to kill the sale of gas-powered cars in America and, in doing so, try to force every American to buy an electric car.

President Biden seems to want to regulate every room in the house of the American people. He started in the kitchen with our stoves, continued throughout the house, and now he is headed to the garage. This is a coercive crusade, and it is a crusade against consumer choice. It is a crusade against convenience and also against affordability.

Last year, less than 1 in 10 of the vehicles sold in this country were electric vehicles. Under this new rule, Biden is demanding that the EVs make up two-thirds of all new car sales by the year 2032. Apparently, the administration thinks it is smarter than everyone else. They want to pick what you can drive and punish people who choose to drive something different. Why? Well, it is all in the name of the smug superiority of the coastal elites who think they ought to be running the country.

Now, this is the crux of the new Biden car ban. Driven by this blind faith in the climate religion regardless of the cost to our country in terms of energy being affordable, available, or reliable. The costs are real, and they

are expensive. The benefits are theoretical, unproven, exaggerated, and certainly burdensome. President Biden is pushing ahead anyway.

To Democrats, what kind of cars Americans drive isn't a practical question; it is one based on theology. Their war against gas-powered cars amounts to what I believe is foolishness at best and leftwing lunacy at worst. Americans reject and continue to reject this unwelcomed intrusion into our lives. They reject it for good reason. They know that this Biden car ban will drive their lives into the ditch.

Certainly, that is the case for the people of my home State in Wyoming. It is bad for the families in my home State. It is bad for the workers in my home State. It is bad for American national security. Farmers and ranchers count on their vehicles. It can be a matter of life and death. People know not to run out of fuel, not to run out of gas. They know what it is like in the winters. They know to always be fully prepared and fully loaded with gas before they head out on the roads in Wyoming.

They want their vehicles to be reliable and affordable. We have, in Wyoming, cold winters, vast distances. Electric cars are not meant to benefit and survive in either. President Biden's push to force Wyoming drivers to buy expensive vehicles they don't want, don't need, and most families can't afford is ridiculous and an abuse of power.

Electric cars are a reasonable choice for some people. They aren't a reasonable choice for everyone, and that is why these new administrative rules are so unreasonable. Electric cars should never be Americans' only option. And no one should be forced to buy a vehicle at a time they can least afford it.

Because of what we have seen with Bidenomics, that time when people can least afford things is turning out to be right now. People are suffering from the costliest regulatory agenda in history and also for increasingly higher interest rates for auto loans. Trying to force families to buy expensive new vehicles they don't want and can't afford is completely out of touch.

It has also become clear that Joe Biden's car ban is going to lead to a steep loss of jobs in the auto industry, particularly union jobs. We heard loud and clear from the unions about it. As the CEO of Ford Motor Company, Jim Farley, said last year, electric vehicles will require 40 percent less labor to make than the typical traditional gas-powered vehicle. According to one estimate, the transition to EV production will kill about 117,000 auto jobs in the United States. Another estimate puts that number much, much higher.

It is already hitting home for some automakers and autoworkers. The owner of Chrysler laid off 1,200 employees at his Jeep plant in Illinois. Ford cut 3,000 white-collar jobs last year. The reason for the layoffs, both companies say, is the EV transition. By push-

ing ahead with this Green New Deal fantasy, Joe Biden is pushing hundreds of thousands of union workers off the assembly line and into the unemployment line.

Plus, the Biden car ban puts activist demands ahead of America's national security. I mean, that is what is happening. President Biden is rejecting what is needed by American workers to try to appeal to a group of voters influenced by a TikTok climate influencer who visited the White House, met with John Podesta, and is now trying to drive the administration's energy policy.

When we take a look at the electric batteries that are used to power these vehicles, where are they coming from? Well, 80 percent of the world's electric batteries right now are coming from communist China. Communist China controls 60 percent of the critical minerals that are used to make these batteries. When Joe Biden and the Democrats try to force-feed electric vehicles to Americans, it is a recipe for more dependence on the dictators and the despots, including the Chinese Communist Party.

We need to change course. We want to stop Biden's mandate madness. We are working to put American drivers, not Washington bureaucrats, back in the driver's seat for when people make decisions in this country. Americans should be able to make their own decisions about what type of vehicle works best for them and be able to buy it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. CARPER. My colleague JOHN BARRASSO has just spoken. He and I used to lead the Environment and Public Works Committee. We worked together over the years on a lot of issues. He is good at finding the middle in a bunch of those and I think I am, too, and so is our Presiding Officer.

I want to follow up on the issue of electric vehicles. The reason why there is a strong interest in this country and around the world in electric vehicles is because they don't put greenhouse gases into the atmosphere. The reason why we are concerned about greenhouse gases coming out of fossil fuel vehicles—it is something like 30 percent of the greenhouse gases in this country being produced by our mobile fleet, our cars, our trucks, our vans—almost all of them are gas- and diesel-driven.

We are seeing a real tick up in the last 3 or 4 years in electric vehicles. There is a lot of interest right now in a combination—hybrids—where you run for a while—vehicles run for a while on battery and for a while some of these on other sources of fuel. I think we need both of those.

The reason, again, why it is important for us to do something real with

respect to reducing greenhouse gas emissions, about 30 percent of our greenhouse gas emissions come from the cars, trucks, and vans we drive—about 30 percent. About another 25 percent comes from the powerplants—coal-fired plants, natural gas-fired plants. That creates the electricity we use in our businesses and our homes. Maybe another 20 percent of our greenhouse gases in this country come from manufacturing plants—steel mills, asphalt plants, that kind of thing.

Should we be concerned about this? Yes. Last year was the hottest year on record on our planet—hottest year. It was the hottest year in the United States, and the expectation is that it is going to continue to worsen as time goes by.

For those of us who live in the coastal communities, there is a great concern in Delaware and all up and down the east coast, gulf coast, and Pacific coast about sea level rise. We see threats to people's homes, their businesses, their jobs. So there is a real incentive to do something about that as well.

One of the things Senator BARRASSO and I and JOHN NEELY KENNEDY, the Senator from Louisiana, have worked on before is one of the major sources of carbon emissions, which, as I mentioned, is our mobile fleet. But another one comes from, believe it or not, refrigerants that are in the air-conditioners, the freezers—the coolants that we have used—something called HFCs, hydrofluorocarbons. There is a need to actually phase those down.

We have new substances that can be used as a refrigerant to address the concerns that we have with HFCs, hydrofluorocarbons.

The two colleagues I just mentioned, we all worked together toward legislation—a treaty called Kigali—the last couple of years to adopt a stepdown plan over 15 years so we reduce about 85 percent of our use of those HFCs.

Why am I interested in HFCs? In terms of the threat they pose to us with respect to climate change, they are 1,000 times more potent than carbon dioxide. Think about that. HFCs are 1,000 times more potent. That is why we are concerned about doing something, and we are.

Methane. We have way too much methane in our air. And I worked a couple of years ago with my colleague JOE MANCHIN from West Virginia and others from EPA to come up with a methane emissions reduction program, which is now being implemented.

Why do we care about methane emissions? They are about 85, 90 times more potent than carbon dioxide when it comes to climate change.

There used to be, oh gosh, a criminal. I am trying to think of what his name was. He was up in New York State back during the Depression. He used to rob banks. He used to rob banks. The Presiding Officer may remember this story. He used to rob banks—a lot of them. He finally got caught and was

arrested, put on trial. He came before the judge and the judge said to him: Why do you rob banks? He said: Your honor, that is where the money is.

The reason why we go after hydrofluorocarbons, the reason we go after methane and auto emissions is that is where the emissions are. They pose a great threat to our planet.

The young people sitting down here to the right of our Presiding Officer today, they look young, and they are probably all about 15, 16, 17 years old. They are pages. They are from all over the planet. I want to make sure, at the end of the day, they have a planet to grow up on. I want to make sure they will have families of their own and their children and grandchildren will have a planet to grow up on and grow old on. I also want to make sure they have jobs to support themselves and their families.

One of the untold stories about the work that we are doing to reduce these greenhouse gas emissions is we can create jobs while doing that. We can create a lot of jobs in terms of building vehicles, cars, trucks, and vans. We put people to work, believe it or not, using hydrogen. This is something that is especially a bright future in our country.

People are going to hear a lot in the days to come—weeks to come—something called hydrogen hubs. We could actually use hydrogen to fuel airplanes. We could use hydrogen to fuel buses. We put out a lot of emissions. We could use hydrogen to fuel large trucks—all of that. We could use hydrogen to create electricity in powerplants.

The question is, Are we doing that? We are. We are doing it in a way that creates jobs—a whole lot of jobs. The idea that if we want to reduce emissions, harmful emissions, we will cripple the economy—that is not really true. We can have both. It is like having your cake and eating it too; in this case, having the benefit of reducing greenhouse gas emissions and creating a whole lot of jobs and putting people to work.

One more word on hydrogen hubs. The Presiding Officer and I and others have worked on this for a while. The administration has put out some guidance from the Treasury Department on the use of hydrogen to help reduce emissions. As it turns out, I studied economics in school. I got here later on. I spent a lot of time in the Navy, and I know a thing or two about nuclear power. You hear a lot about nuclear power. There is a process called electrolysis where we can use electricity created by nuclear power, which puts out no emissions—no harmful emissions. And there is electricity created by hydro. In Maine, where the Presiding Officer is from, they have a fair amount of electricity that is produced by hydroelectric power. I learned just several years ago that there is a process called electrolysis that uses electricity that comes from nuclear powerplants and electricity that comes from

hydroelectric plants and puts out no emissions. And we can use that electricity in conjunction with water, H₂O, in a way that separates the ‘H’—the hydrogen—from the oxygen, and we can harness that hydrogen and use it in a lot of ways that would enable us, as I have just spoken, to reduce harmful, harmful emissions. And we have got to be smart enough to do that.

Janet Yellen, the Secretary of the Treasury, was before our committee today, before the Finance Committee. I found it a good exchange, with respect to the Treasury Department. They are in the process of writing guidance. Sort of like when we pass a law, the Federal Agency writes a rule or regulation to say what the law is all about now. The folks over at the Treasury Department are trying to write the guidance, if you will. They help guide us as we move to adopt hydrogen more completely. And through the process of electrolysis, we can create it.

So it is acknowledged that we sort of have our differences. Those of us in the Senate, Democrats and Republicans, are anxious to make sure we don't leave the opportunity to create hydrogen through electrolysis, using nuclear energy and using the hydropower. And we had a very good exchange, and she did express an openness and a willingness to hear us out and maybe try to find the middle in ways that create jobs, in ways that help preserve this planet so that someday these young pages, when they are old pages and they have children of their own, they will have a planet that they can be proud of and they can live on.

One of my favorite international leaders is the President of France, a guy named Macron. A couple weeks ago, our President gave the State of the Union Address. I thought he gave a really good one. But about 2, 3, maybe 4 years ago, we had another leader who spoke to a joint session of the House and Senate in the House Chamber, and it was the President of France, a fellow named Macron, who was actually a leader—I think a global leader—on climate change and how to deal with that.

And one of the reasons he is interested in this is, the last time I saw and I noticed when they had the Tour de France—I don't know if any of our young people ride bicycles, but the Tour de France is a great bicycle race. About a year or 2 years ago, when they had the Tour de France, they had to call it off in different parts. They couldn't complete the race because the pavement that they were riding their bikes on was melting. It was melting.

This stuff is real. We are not making it up. And the question is: What are we going to do about it? What are we going to do about it in ways that put people to work, keep people working? We can do that.

I drive an EV. For many, many years, I drove a 2001 Chrysler Town and Country minivan for, like, 20 years, and I had 600,000 miles on it. And my wife

says I am cheap, and I wouldn't buy a new car. Finally, I did, and I bought an electric vehicle, and I have had it for a couple of years now. And not only do I feel good about it—just recharge this in our garage. We have a place to charge it. And there are other places, these Wawa convenience stores all up and down the east coast. Wawas have charging stations all over the Atlantic coast. Sometimes we use those.

But the thing that is especially attractive about the vehicle that we drive—that I drive—is frankly the maintenance costs are de minimis. It is amazing. We have had it 2 years and spent almost nothing on maintenance costs.

The other thing is they are fun. And I remember when I was a kid, the age of these guys, how much fun it was to get my learner's permit and later on a driver's license and to be able to drive and be on my own. And I feel the same sense of joy in driving today because of what we have with the EV.

So with that having been said, I will close with comments about JOHN BARRASSO. I think the world of JOHN; he knows that. And I always look for ways to work with him. He is a strong advocate for nuclear energy, and my hope is that, although there are some things we are going to disagree on, we can agree on something called the ADVANCE Act.

The ADVANCE Act, which has come out of the Environment and Public Works Committee, is sort of the next generation of nuclear powerplants, and nuclear power can be used for a lot of good use, good purposes. We always have to do it in a way that is safe. You always want to make sure that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has the resources that they need to do their jobs, to keep us safe so we can have safe nuclear power.

I am a Navy guy. I spent a lot of years in the Navy in Alaska, before serving in the U.S. Senate, and I used to fly P-3 aircraft missions. We used to fly in and out of the Brunswick Naval Air Station, up in Maine, when the Presiding Officer was Governor of Maine.

But one of the things that Senator BARRASSO and I agree on is the need for more nuclear, and we have an opportunity to move forward on small nuclear reactors. And they are safe and provide the electricity that we need in a lot of different ways. And my hope is that we cannot just talk about it to the folks that agree to disagree, but always look for ways to agree to help save our planet and help create a lot of jobs for those who live here.

With that, I yield back. I see our colleague from Texas, Senator CORNYN, has come to the floor, who is the ranking member of the Trade Subcommittee of the Finance Committee, which I am privileged to chair.

I am going to pause for a moment and see if he is ready to take the floor before I yield.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

ISRAEL

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, following Hamas's brutal attack against Israel on October 7, some 5 months ago, Republicans and Democrats came together, along with the President of the United States, and declared our support for Israel. We all condemned the Hamas terrorists, as well as Iran, which is the main support for this proxy of the number one state sponsor of international terrorism.

We all watched in horror at the videos we saw of Hamas attacking innocent men, women, and children, and we all vowed to stand in solidarity with Israel as they did whatever they needed to do to defeat this evil.

As time passed, it seems like the roar of support among some of our friends across the aisle, including the Senate majority leader, has softened, to say the least. Some of our colleagues have even gone so far as to cast blame on Israel for the violence that is unfolding in the Middle East. They are blaming the victim, not the perpetrator. More than two dozen Senate Democrats have even joined with liberal activists to demand a cease-fire.

The quickest way to a cease-fire is for Hamas to lay down its weapons, but we know they are not going to do that because they are committed to the eradication of the State of Israel. "Wipe them off the face of the planet" is their goal.

This once rock-solid support on a bipartisan basis has slowly eroded, and it reached a new low last week when the Senate majority leader came to the floor to excoriate not Hamas, not Iran, but Israel and its leadership.

Israel, we know, is our single closest friend and ally in the Middle East, one of the very few democracies. Yes, they have messy politics. By the way, we have messy politics, too, here in this country, but we respect—we should respect—the sovereignty of that nation and their ability to make hard decisions on their own behalf without being lectured by the President of the United States and by the Senate majority leader.

The majority leader criticized Israel's response to the October 7 attack. He condemned Prime Minister Netanyahu's leadership, and he called—get this—he called for an election in Israel to replace him. In my time in the U.S. Senate, I have never seen anything quite like this. The majority leader's comments mark a sharp departure from his previous stance solidly in support of Israel. And, unfortunately, I presume for political reasons, he has decided to undermine our support on a bipartisan basis for Israel and to make it a partisan issue and to attack the leader of a sovereign ally and one dealing with the horrific aftermath of a terrorist attack.

Can you imagine, in the wake of 9/11, if our closest allies had called upon the American people to change our Presi-

dent to align with their political preferences? We would have been insulted. We would have been offended and completely outraged. The suggestion that the leader in a foreign country knows the needs of a country better than its own citizens is appalling.

On top of that, it undermines Israel's most critical job at this moment, which is to eliminate the terrorist threat against its own people. This is not like al-Qaida, thousands of miles away across an ocean. This is in the backyard of Israel. By browbeating Israel and criticizing its leaders, the majority leader has undermined the trust and confidence Israel needs in our commitment to continue to help them complete this job of eliminating the terrorist threat.

Yes, innocent people are getting hurt, but that is not the fault of the victim. That is the fault of the perpetrator of this violence. And, yes, maybe some of us would like to see different tactics chosen on the battlefield, but that is not our call. We have to trust our friend and ally Israel to make the best decisions in defense of its own sovereignty and its own existence. And, yes, we can all have private opinions about how they are going about it.

But the truth is America's role in this conflict should not be confused. We should not be saying: Well, on one hand, we support Israel. On the other hand, we think they are being too tough on Hamas.

We need to support our closest friend and ally in the region. It is just that simple. It is the choice between good and evil.

If you watch the videos of Hamas's attack against Israeli civilians on October 7—as I know the Presiding Officer has, and all of us have been exposed to it—you will recoil in horror as babies are killed, where women are sexually assaulted. I, actually, for the first time in my life, saw a video of a Hamas terrorist behead an innocent Israeli civilian—behead.

That is what we are dealing with. That is what Israel is dealing with.

There should not be confusion. We should be approaching this with complete clarity. For those of us who said we stand with Israel, we ought to lock arms on a bipartisan basis and reaffirm their right to exist and their right to make choices for their nation and their people, and we ought to support them as they go through what has to be a horrible experience for Israel.

It is not just Hamas. Again, as the Presiding Officer knows and we know, in Lebanon, in the northern part of Israel, Hezbollah—another proxy for Iran—is shooting into Israel and attacking Israeli Defense Forces. We know that Houthi rebels in Yemen are also supported by Iran. Iran is the octopus. Hamas, Hezbollah, and the Houthis are the tentacles or the proxies they use to do their evil. Then there are the Shia militias who have attacked American troops hundreds of times in Iraq and Syria.

There should not be any confusion about this. There is the right side and the wrong side. There is the good, and there is the evil. America stands with Israel. The vast majority of Americans feel exactly as I do. We should trust the people of Israel to make decisions, certainly, about their own leaders.

I mean, we don't like it when foreign countries try to interfere with our elections. What is the speech of the majority leader but an attempt by a leader of a foreign government to interfere with their elections? We need to maintain our position that Israel has a right to defend itself against Hamas, against Hezbollah, against any Iranian proxy or any entity or country or group that wants to destroy the Jewish State.

So I regret the fact that this has become, it seems, like a partisan issue. This is the last thing that our Israeli friends and allies would want. They don't want this to be partisan politics because we know what happens here when things become partisan. One side supports an action, and the other side reflexively opposes that action. We can't afford to play politics with the U.S.-Israel alliance. Our support for Israel must remain unwavering regardless of whom they choose for their own leaders. We must support democracy. We must support sovereignty. We must support the enduring bond and the common values shared between our two countries.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 5 minutes, followed by Senator TESTER for up to 10 minutes prior to the scheduled rollcall votes.

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

S.J. RES. 62

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, in November of 2023, the Biden administration released a new rule to allow for beef imports from Paraguay, a country that has historically struggled to contain outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease in their cattle herds.

The United States has been blocking beef imports from Paraguay since 1997. Paraguay last reported cases of foot-and-mouth disease in 2012. The USDA's decision to resume Paraguayan imports relies on an analysis that was completed in 2018, but American inspectors have not conducted a site visit to Paraguay since 2014.

American producers work tirelessly to produce the safest, highest quality, and most affordable beef in the entire world. Our consumers should be able to confidently feed their families beef that has met the rigorous standards required within the United States. The United States has not had a case of foot-and-mouth disease since 1929. We want to keep it that way by reversing this rule until a working group has had an opportunity to evaluate the threat to food safety and animal health posed