

provoking a wider conflict in the Middle East, and we cannot have that. So I am pleased that many nations banded together and held the line against the Iranian regime.

Third, Israel's attack underscores the best way to help Israel is for the House to swiftly pass the Senate's bipartisan national security supplemental. The House must rush to Israel's aid as quickly as humanly possible, and the only way to do that is passing the Senate supplemental ASAP. In fact, there is no reason for the House not to move on the Senate's supplemental as soon as today.

Yesterday, I got on the phone with the President, with Speaker JOHNSON, Leader MCCONNELL, and Leader JEFFRIES and made it clear that the uncertainty and delay over the supplemental has to end. We all had consensus that we need to aid both Israel and Ukraine.

If House Republicans put the Senate supplemental on the floor, I believe it would pass today, reach the President's desk tonight, and Israel would get the aid it needs by tomorrow.

Let me say that again. If House Republicans put the Senate supplemental on the floor, I believe it would pass today, reach the President's desk tonight, and Israel would get the aid it needs by tomorrow.

If the House could finish the job by the end of the day, why wait?

Now, the Senate supplemental not only gives Israel the tools it needs to repel future attacks, but it also provides Ukraine the aid it needs against Putin. I spoke with the U.S. Ambassador to Ukraine yesterday, who told me the situation in Ukraine is beyond desperate. With few air defenses, there is little stopping Russian drones from targeting Ukrainian powerplants and leaving more and more residents without electricity. And the danger here is that these power outages will become a long-term problem. She told me the equipment that was destroyed is so large—the kinds of transformers and other machineries—that it takes a long time to rebuild them and replace them.

The U.S. Ambassador reiterated President Zelenskyy's point that Ukraine will lose this war unless it gets the defense materials, the ammunition, and the anti-aircraft resources it needs immediately. Those powerplants are taken out because Ukraine is running out of the ability to defend itself from these vicious attacks.

At this treacherous moment for global security, it would be a grave mistake to think the conflict in the Middle East is unconnected to the conflict in Europe. That is why the best way to help Israel and to help Ukraine is to pass the Senate supplemental this week. I have called on Speaker JOHNSON to do that.

Enough with the delay. Enough with the uncertainty. Enough with promises to take action. I urge the House to get going today on the Senate supplemental. It is vital for the future of

Israel, for the future of Ukraine, and for the future of the West and democracy.

SENATE AGENDA

Madam President, now, on the Senate agenda, the Senate has a very busy few days in store this week. Before April 19, the Senate must finish approving legislation to extend FISA's 702 authorities. The House is expected to send us an extension sometime this evening, after they address a few minor procedural delays.

Once the House sends us the FISA reauthorization, I plan, as early as tonight, to take the first procedural step for the Senate to begin consideration. With less than a week to go before FISA authorities expire, time is a luxury the Senate doesn't have. Republicans need to work with us in a bipartisan way to ensure this program with important implications for our national security does not lapse.

Now, as the Senate works on FISA authorities, we will also have to deal with the House vote to impeach Homeland Security Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas. For now, we still expect the Articles of Impeachment to arrive in the Senate sometime tomorrow afternoon. Should that happen, the Senate will swear in Members as jurors the day after the articles are presented.

As I have said repeatedly, impeachment should never be used to settle a policy disagreement. That would set a horrible precedent for the Congress.

Nevertheless, the Senate's plan has not changed since last week. We are ready to go whenever the House sends us the articles. We want to address this issue as expeditiously as possible.

TAX DAY

Madam President, now on Tax Day, today is Tax Day, and thanks to reforms Democrats passed in the Inflation Reduction Act, tax filing season has become smoother than ever for more and more taxpayers. For the first time, an unprecedented number of Americans, including thousands of New Yorkers, were able to file for free directly with the IRS using the Direct File pilot program. Next year, we want to expand the program even more.

But, sadly, Republican obstruction on the tax bill meant that this year, millions of families and small businesses continued to face higher tax bills. If Republicans drop their obstruction and work with us, we could expand the child tax credit for 16 million families, enable the construction of 200,000 affordable homes, deliver tax relief to disaster-stricken communities like East Palestine, while also restoring incentives for innovation and capital investment.

The House overwhelmingly passed the tax bill with bipartisan support at the end of January. It should be no different in the Senate. This Tax Day, I urge my Republican colleagues to join Senate Democrats in supporting this bill so we can deliver this relief to American taxpayers.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IRAN

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, some years ago, I had the privilege of visiting our American servicemembers stationed in the U.S. Navy Fifth Fleet in Bahrain—an impressive group keeping a close eye on Iran.

Despite a relatively pro-Western population, Iran's hard-line leadership regularly has threatened the United States' interests and its allies.

Iran has long funneled money and weapons to some of the region's worst proxies— Hamas, Hezbollah, and the Houthis—some of whom have attacked U.S. personnel in Iraq and Syria. That is why I supported the Iran nuclear agreement under President Obama—not because it would stop Iran's belligerence in the region but because it would prevent it from doing so armed with a nuclear bomb.

Well, this weekend, we saw the Iranian threat in a massive attempted attack on Israel—one that Israel, with the help of the United States and other allies, was thankfully largely able to thwart. I hope cooler heads will prevail and keep this conflict from escalating in an already unstable region of the world.

But make no mistake, because former President Trump petulantly withdrew the United States from the Iran nuclear agreement—an agreement that was working to contain that dangerous program—Iran is inching ever closer to a nuclear weapon. Iran has also cozied up to Vladimir Putin—surprise—who is desperate for weapons from any rogue regime to fuel his disastrous war in Ukraine.

So it seems to me it is long overdue for House Republicans this week to stop doing Russia's bidding by blocking the Senate-passed national security supplemental.

MAYORKAS IMPEACHMENT

Madam President, I would like to speak on an unrelated topic now—about the partisan charade House Republicans have made of the impeachment process.

The two impeachment articles filed against Secretary Mayorkas are nothing more than an attempt to politicize this solemn constitutional tool to distract from the very real fact that the House Republicans are struggling to govern.

The Senate only has the power to convict, remove, and disqualify officers whose conduct meets the constitutional standard for impeachment. Listen to the standard very closely as spelled out in the Constitution: "treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors." Neither article that

we have been in receipt of from the House of Representatives contains any evidence that Secretary Mayorkas has been guilty of any of those specific elements in the Constitution or that he has failed in the exercise of his duties. Instead, the Articles of Impeachment sent to us by the House of Representatives lay out policy disputes through regurgitation of Republican talking points on immigration.

It is simply not a constitutional crime worthy of impeachment for the current President and Secretary of Homeland Security to implement immigration policies that are entirely within the limits of the law and the discretion of the executive branch.

The articles sent to us by the House Republicans claim that the Secretary has willfully and systematically refused to comply with the law because he failed to detain every individual who crossed the border. Remember that standard—he failed to detain every individual who crossed the border. The simple fact of the matter is, all Presidents, Republican and Democrat, would be found guilty under those elements.

Existing law does not require the DHS Secretary to detain every person who crosses the border. Congress left it to the discretion of each administration to decide how best to use their limited resources to implement immigration policy.

The articles also attack the Secretary's use of discretion to decide who to arrest and remove from the United States even though the Supreme Court has routinely upheld these discretionary decisions.

I think it is outrageous to allege that Secretary Mayorkas's decisions to reverse Trump policy "breached the public trust." A decision to change a previous administration's positions is fundamentally a policy decision, not a matter of trust.

If congressional Republicans are genuinely interested in improving the situation at the border, I have a suggestion. Why don't we put together a bipartisan group of Senators? Why don't we let the Republicans choose their participant in that? Why don't they consider someone like JAMES LANKFORD, the Senator from Oklahoma—conservative, highly respected? Why don't they have JAMES LANKFORD meet with at least one other Senator, a Democrat—maybe CHRIS MURPHY of Connecticut—and then perhaps KYRSTEN SINEMA, an Independent? Why don't the three of them put together a proposal to make changes—significant policy changes—on the border to give the President more authority to stop the crisis we face? Why don't we call that for consideration on the floor of the Senate, and why don't the Republicans back that?

That is exactly what happened. We have been through this exercise. JAMES LANKFORD—and I respect him very much—did what he was asked to do: represent the Republican side of the

aisle and move forward with a proposal that is bipartisan. We have to be bipartisan in the Senate. We need 60 votes for anything serious. We have a 51-to-49 Democratic majority. Bipartisanship was built into this package of compromises, but what happened? Why didn't that become the law of the land? Why didn't that become the change in the border policy that we are all looking for? The reason is one man. His name is Donald Trump, and he came out publicly and said: I am instructing my followers to kill this bipartisan effort from Senator LANKFORD on the Republican side. And then former President Trump said: You are going to hear from people that they want to blame me. Go ahead and blame me for stopping this effort of border reform.

Well, I am blaming him.

Now we have this exercise against Mayorkas instead of a constructive bipartisan exercise that Senator LANKFORD, a respected conservative Republican, Senator MURPHY, a Democrat, and Senator SINEMA, an Independent, put together and brought to the floor of the Senate. That is how you change the policy, not with some sham process of consideration for impeachment that is not warranted.

Unfortunately, the vast majority of Republicans recently blocked a bipartisan border bill that I just described. Despite repeatedly referring to the border as a crisis, congressional Republicans' opposition was based purely on Donald Trump's insistence that Congress not pass immigration legislation. He wants to use it as a campaign issue in November. He doesn't want a solution—a bipartisan solution—that perhaps Joe Biden would get some credit for, so he stopped the whole process and stopped the bipartisanship.

This partisan hackery is not lost on me or the American people. Instead of doing their job and working to find legislative solutions to complex and challenging problems, too many Republicans have decided that the impeachment of a Cabinet official for actually doing his job is a better exercise of time.

The Framers anticipated that partisan politics would result in meritless impeachment efforts like this one and designed the Constitution to withstand the baseless efforts. During the constitutional convention, the Framers explicitly—explicitly—rejected a proposal to include "maladministration"—they used that word—as an impeachable offense, despite its use in many State constitutions at the time.

Second, the division of impeachment power between the House of Representatives and the Senate was meant as a safeguard against the danger of impeachment inevitably becoming politicalized.

In Federalist 66, Alexander Hamilton wrote that the division of impeachment powers between the House and the Senate "guards against the danger of persecution, from the prevalence of a factious spirit in either of those

branches." To translate that into 21st century terms, what he is saying is: We want to stop them from using impeachment for politics. In order for the Senate to uphold the Constitution and fulfill its impeachment obligations, it must dispose of these baseless impeachment articles that we receive from the House.

The Constitution provides that "[t]he Senate shall have the sole Power to try all Impeachments" and places very limited requirements on how we are to exercise that authority. Chief Justice Rehnquist noted during the impeachment trial of then-President Clinton that "the Senate is not simply a jury; it is a court in this case [of impeachment]."

Both the House and Senate have a history of quickly disposing of impeachment investigations and impeachment articles that do not meet the standard of high crime or misdemeanor. This one doesn't.

In the 72nd Congress, two impeachment resolutions were offered against President Herbert Hoover. After the reading of the resolution was completed, the House successfully moved, by an overwhelming vote, to table the impeachment articles. Since 1986, the Senate has considered motions to dismiss brought by either the impeached officer or a Senator in six impeachments and has twice dismissed impeachment articles in the past. So to say this has never been done is just not true. We should follow that example.

I urge my colleagues to uphold the Constitution and the intentions of the Framers and quickly dispose of these unjustifiable Articles of Impeachment.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MAYORKAS IMPEACHMENT

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, tomorrow the House of Representatives is expected to do something that is not normal but which is actually a rather extraordinary act, and that is to transmit Articles of Impeachment against the Secretary of Homeland Security, Alejandro Mayorkas. Over the last 3 years, Secretary Mayorkas has presided over an unprecedented security crisis at our southern border; the numbers vary but roughly 7.4 million migrant encounters, more than 1.8 million "got-aways"—people simply evading law enforcement and melting into the great American heartland—untold amounts of fentanyl and other deadly drugs pouring into our country that killed 108,000 people last year alone.

Then there are the children: 400,000 children placed with sponsors in the interior of the United States that have