

leisure, is only kidding themselves. As I have said before, this isn't a matter of philosophical differences. The truth is plainly evident.

If you want to see the world the way our adversaries do, trace the trade of Chinese cash for sanctioned Iranian energy. Watch the trainloads of North Korean artillery arrive at the frontlines of Putin's onslaught in Ukraine. Follow the flows of Shahed drones to the Russian military. They are the same ones that Iran launched at Israel this past weekend. Or pay attention to the words and actions of America's friends. Listen to the way our Indo-Pacific allies describe the stakes of Ukraine's defense for the prospects of deterrence in their own region. Watch the way they invest their resources both in modernizing their capabilities and in helping Ukraine beat back aggression halfway around the world.

Now, America can choose, as it has nearly done before over the course of our history, to stick our head in the sand, to refuse to invest seriously in our own defense and in the alliances and partnerships that underpin it, to deny that a century of prosperity was purchased by American leadership and vigilance, but to do that now would be to ignore the basic fact that expanding America's defense industrial base and equipping our friends to resist and deter aggression are not competing policies but complementary ones.

Helping Ukraine has accelerated important programs to arm our allies and partners in the Indo-Pacific. It has called the attention of Pentagon officials, defense industry leaders, and Members of Congress to glaring gaps in our own capability and production capacity.

The Senate-passed supplemental would further expand the capacity of the arsenal of democracy. Of course, this isn't a one-off responsibility. The supplemental will not magically fix decades of underinvestment, and the administration and Congress will need to commit to taking our military requirements for missile defenses, long-range fires, and other critical military capabilities much more seriously.

But to continue to neglect the task in front of Congress right now would only compound the problem. Hesitation and indecision have prevented Ukraine from taking the fight aggressively to Putin's invaders. And if our friends are digging new defensive fortifications today, it is because they are starving—starving—for the munitions that would have helped them hold the ones they had already built on their frontlines.

Addressing the linked threats to America's national security interests isn't about cooking up "bogus justifications"; it is about dealing with the world as it actually is. Our House colleagues will soon record whether they are prepared to do exactly that.

#### INFLATION

Mr. President, now on one final matter, last week, cumulative inflation

since President Biden took office hit 19.4 percent. Since January of 2021, gas prices are up 47.8 percent. Car repair costs have increased 6.7 percent. In barely 2 years, car insurance premiums have increased—listen to this—45.8 percent.

Americans know that stable prices and basic safety shouldn't be much to expect from their new leaders. As one woman recently told reporters, "What can you do? You need insurance. You can't have a vehicle or a house without them. So you have to . . . figure out where you can cut other things to make sure you can drive around."

Of course, the soaring cost of insuring a car has a lot to do with the dangers of driving one in blue cities across America where soft-on-crime policies let violent offenders run free. Today, drivers are more likely than ever to become victims of crime, as 2023 saw rates of car theft tick up by 29 percent in 34 cities across the country—more than double since 2019. And 2023 was also the second year in a row that car thefts surpassed 1 million in the United States.

Here in Washington, local residents and Members of Congress alike have fallen victim to an unchecked surge of carjackings. And the city's response? Hand out free tracking devices.

Millions of Americans are waiting eagerly for this fever of incoherent policy to break. They are recalling woke prosecutors, and I suspect they plan to fire many more of their local, State, and national leaders this fall. Bidenomics isn't working, and neither is soft-on-crime radicalism.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PADILLA). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### IRAN

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, this weekend, Iran and its proxies in Syria, Yemen, and Iraq fired a barrage of missiles and drones against Israel. The direct attack was a marked escalation on Iran's part. And it is time for the United States, our allies, and nations that support peace and freedom to make it clear to Iran that we are not going stand idly by while Iran threatens Israel and foments terror in the Middle East.

This weekend's attack was a notable escalation on Iran's part because weapons were fired from Iran and not just by Iran's proxies. Iran has been threatening Israel and undermining peace in the Middle East for decades—Hezbollah, the Houthis, Shia militias in Iraq and Syria, Palestinian Islamic Jihad, and, of course, Hamas.

Hamas gets approximately 90 percent of its military budget from Iran, and there is reason to wonder whether

Hamas would even have had the capability to carry out its October 7 attack without the support it receives from Iran. There is certainly reason to wonder what the Middle East would look like today if Iran hadn't spent decades funding and arming terrorist organizations.

Enough is enough. There have been a lot of redlines drawn for Israel lately. It is past time to draw some for Iran. Unfortunately, the U.S. posture toward Iran under President Biden has too often been one of appeasement. It was President Biden's attempt to reinstate the Obama administration's flawed Iran nuclear deal. Then there was the Biden administration's attempt to unfreeze \$6 billion in Iranian assets as part of a deal to free American prisoners. Thankfully, the administration ultimately refroze those funds in the wake of Hamas's October 7 attack against Israel. But unfreezing them in the first place was a serious mistake.

Just last month, for the second time since the October 7 attack on Israel by Iran-backed Hamas, President Biden renewed a sanctions waiver giving Iran access to \$10 billion from energy sales. And now, this week, President Biden was quick to take options off the table for what U.S. assistance to Israel might look like in the wake of Iran's bold attack. This only suggests to Iran that there are limits to the United States-Israel partnership at the very time we must be making good on our ironclad relationship with Israel, not telling our ally it has to go it alone.

It is alarming when President Biden seems more intent on preventing Israel from responding to Iran's attack than on making it clear to Iran that there can be no more of these attacks and that Iran needs to cease all of its terrorist operations. Unless President Biden wants to continue to see Israel in danger, American troops threatened, and commerce through the Red Sea disrupted, he has to find a much stronger posture when it comes to Iran.

The United States should be making it clear to Iran that the United States will not allow another Iranian attack like the one that occurred this weekend and that we will not tolerate any more aggression from Iran. And it shouldn't be just the United States drawing this redline. As I said, it is time for the United States, our allies, and nations that support peace and freedom to resoundingly reject Iran's malign agenda.

The United States has an important role to coordinate action to back up the G7 statement and to press members of the U.N. Security Council to take a position on Iran's flagrant attack. The United States must also press forward to broker a deal for the normalization of Israel and Saudi relations, the prospect of which normalization many believe motivated the October 7 terrorist attack by Iran-backed Hamas. And, of course, the United States must continue to push for the return of all the hostages in Gaza and help Israel in its

vital mission to dismantle the threat of Hamas.

Mr. President, there may be no easy solution to peace in the Middle East, but standing up to Iranian aggression would be a good start. Iran spends at least \$800 million per year supporting terrorist groups in the Middle East. I ask, again, what would the Middle East look like without the terrorist funding? I suspect it would look more peaceful and prosperous and that our ally Israel and innocent people around the Middle East would be able to sleep more easily at night.

So it is time for President Biden to step up. Continued appeasement and half measures on Iran will only prolong the cycle of violence in the Middle East and increase the risk of large-scale attacks against Israel like the barrage over the weekend. If President Biden steps forward with strength, perhaps the legacy of his Presidency can include something more than an inflation crisis and a national security disaster at our southern border.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Texas.

#### FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I would like to speak about the most important law that most Americans have never heard of, and that is section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. Last week, the House of Representatives passed legislation to reauthorize this important law before it expires at the end of this week.

FISA, as it is known—the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act—and section 702 in particular, is one of the most important and consequential laws we use to keep our country safe from adversaries overseas.

Congress enacted section 702 in 2008 in response to the threats posed by terrorist groups in the wake of 9/11. It tore down some of the walls that prevented the sharing of information that could be used to keep our country safe, and there is no question that it has been a success.

Information acquired through section 702 has helped to identify threats against U.S. troops and to thwart planned terrorist attacks abroad and here at home. It has enabled the Federal Government to stop components of weapons of mass destruction from reaching foreign actors. It has also helped disrupt our adversaries' efforts to recruit spies on American soil and send their operatives to the United States. It has helped to understand and combat fentanyl trafficking, identify foreign ransomware attacks, like the Colonial Pipeline ransomware attack,

and uncover war crimes and gruesome atrocities in Ukraine.

For virtually every national security threat that America faces, section 702 is an invaluable asset. There is a reason why it is known as the crown jewel of America's intelligence gathering capabilities.

The President is briefed daily, in something called the President's Daily Brief, on these intelligence threats that are collected for the President's briefing, as I said, on a daily basis. A full 60 percent of the information contained in the President's daily classified intelligence brief is derived from section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

Everyone knows that this authority has not been without controversy. In recent years, the public has learned about extremely concerning misuses of this authority that go far beyond what Congress has authorized. But I want to make clear that the targeting of American citizens here in the United States is expressly prohibited under 702, so any targeting of an American citizen is illegal and should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

Just to be clear, this authority grants the intelligence community—by that I mean the CIA, the NSA, the DIA, the FBI—it grants authority to the Department of Justice and our intelligence community to get intelligence on foreigners located outside of the United States—in other words, if it is foreign nationals inside the United States, you cannot use section 702—but more importantly, foreigners outside of the United States who are deemed to be a threat to our national security, agents of a foreign power, for example. It cannot be lawfully used to target U.S. citizens, whether on American soil or elsewhere.

But this is where the issue gets a little bit thorny, and sometimes there is misunderstanding about exactly how this works. So let me go through some of the details. Where this becomes a little more confused is when there is incidental collection of U.S. persons. For example, if you are targeting a foreigner overseas and they are communicating with a U.S. person in the United States, that could be a citizen, that could be a lawful permanent resident. Well, if it is a lawful communication, lawful 702 targeting of the foreign national, and they are talking to a U.S. person, invariably there is going to be information—known as incidental collection—involving the communication with that U.S. person. In other words, both sides of the conversation will be revealed in that lawful targeting of a foreign person overseas.

Here is an example: Let's say the intelligence community is monitoring the communications of a Hamas terrorist in Gaza who is believed to pose a danger to our national security. He is not an American, and he is not on U.S. soil, but he is using U.S.-based communication networks. Let's say in this example that one of the people the

Hamas terrorist is communicating with is an American on U.S. soil. Even though the American is not a target of the data collection, his side of the conversation would be visible because he is the one communicating with this foreign target.

But let me be clear. The intelligence community cannot target anyone they believed to be a U.S. person, nor can they target a foreigner with the pretext of getting American citizens' data. For that, you need a warrant. You need to go to court and show probable cause because that is a constitutional right granted to Americans under the Fourth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

The Fourth Amendment of the Constitution protects our people from unreasonable searches and seizures by the government, and an unchecked surveillance authority would directly violate that right. That is why we have guardrails. That is why we have protections to minimize the chances of that happening.

I know there has been some confusion. Some of it is from a misunderstanding. Some of it is people, frankly, just misrepresenting exactly what this authority does and does not do. But section 702 does not violate the Fourth Amendment. Every court that has considered the lawfulness of the 702 program has found that it complies with the Fourth Amendment. So when people stand up and say "Well, section 702 allows the government to spy on Americans," that is, frankly, not true. If they say it violates the Fourth Amendment, well, you have at least three courts that have considered the issue and they have said no, it doesn't. So they need to come up with another argument.

To be clear, this is very targeted, very narrow surveillance authority. As a matter of fact, under the reforms passed in the House bill, there are very few circumstances under which the FBI, for example, can exploit or query the 702 information.

So once the information is lawfully collected—targeting a foreign national overseas; that is lawfully collected—it is in a database which can then be queried by the FBI, for example, but there are very limited circumstances where that can happen. They can only search that database if they believe the query or question would return foreign intelligence information or evidence of a crime. The Agency does not have carte blanche authority to probe or go fishing in 702 information.

Unfortunately, there have been some mistakes made by the FBI due to the lack of guardrails and reforms that are in the current bill passed by the House of Representatives. I applaud the House for passing important reforms that will minimize the chances of this inadvertent collection of U.S. persons' information, because it is a violation of the law.

In response to some of these reports of inadvertent collection of U.S. persons' information, in 2021, FBI Director