

border security, the safety of the United States people, and the Constitution if allowed to remain in office, and has acted in a manner grossly incompatible with his duties and the rule of law. Alejandro N. Mayorkas thus warrants impeachment and trial, removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States.

ARTICLE II: BREACH OF PUBLIC TRUST

The Constitution provides that the House of Representatives “shall have the sole Power of Impeachment” and that civil Officers of the United States, including the Secretary of Homeland Security, “shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors”. In his conduct while Secretary of Homeland Security, Alejandro N. Mayorkas, in violation of his oath to well and faithfully discharge the duties of his office, has breached the public trust, in that:

Alejandro N. Mayorkas has knowingly made false statements, and knowingly obstructed lawful oversight of the Department of Homeland Security (hereinafter referred to as “DHS”), principally to obfuscate the results of his willful and systemic refusal to comply with the law. Alejandro N. Mayorkas engaged in this scheme or course of conduct through the following means:

(1) Alejandro N. Mayorkas knowingly made false statements to Congress that the border is “secure”, that the border is “no less secure than it was previously”, that the border is “closed”, and that DHS has “operational control” of the border (as that term is defined in the Secure Fence Act of 2006).

(2) Alejandro N. Mayorkas knowingly made false statements to Congress regarding the scope and adequacy of the vetting of the thousands of Afghans who were airlifted to the United States and then granted parole following the Taliban takeover of Afghanistan after President Biden’s precipitous withdrawal of United States forces.

(3) Alejandro N. Mayorkas knowingly made false statements that apprehended aliens with no legal basis to remain in the United States were being quickly removed.

(4) Alejandro N. Mayorkas knowingly made false statements supporting the false narrative that U.S. Border Patrol agents maliciously whipped illegal aliens.

(5) Alejandro N. Mayorkas failed to comply with multiple subpoenas issued by congressional committees.

(6) Alejandro N. Mayorkas delayed or denied access of DHS Office of Inspector General (hereinafter referred to as “OIG”) to DHS records and information, hampering OIG’s ability to effectively perform its vital investigations, audits, inspections, and other reviews of agency programs and operations to satisfy the OIG’s obligations under section 402(b) of title 5, United States Code, in part, to Congress.

Additionally, in his conduct while Secretary of Homeland Security, Alejandro N. Mayorkas has breached the public trust by his willful refusal to fulfill his statutory “duty to control and guard the boundaries and borders of the United States against the illegal entry of aliens” as set forth in section 103(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Alejandro N. Mayorkas inherited what his first Chief of the U.S. Border Patrol called, “arguably the most effective border security in our nation’s history”. Alejandro N. Mayorkas, however, proceeded to abandon effective border security initiatives without engaging in adequate alternative efforts that would enable DHS to maintain control of the border and guard against illegal entry, and despite clear evidence of the devastating consequences of his actions, he failed to take action to fulfill his statutory duty to control the border. According to his first Chief of the U.S. Border Patrol, Alejandro N. Mayorkas “summarily rejected” the “multiple options to reduce the illegal entries . . . through proven programs and consequences” provided by civil service staff at DHS. Despite clear evidence of the devastating consequences of his actions, he failed to take action to fulfill his statutory duty to control the border, in that, among other things:

(1) Alejandro N. Mayorkas terminated the Migrant Protection Protocols (hereinafter referred to as “MPP”). In *Texas v. Biden*, 20 F.4th 928 (2021), the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit explained that “[t]he district court . . . pointed to evidence that ‘the termination of MPP has contributed to the current border surge’ . . . (citing DHS’s own previous determinations that MPP had curbed the rate of illegal entries)”. The district court had also “pointed out that the number of ‘enforcement encounters’—that is, instances where immigration officials encounter immigrants attempting to cross the southern border without documentation—had ‘skyrocketed’ since MPP’s termination”.

(2) Alejandro N. Mayorkas terminated contracts for border wall construction.

(3) Alejandro N. Mayorkas terminated asylum cooperative agreements that would have equitably shared the burden of complying with international asylum accords.

In all of this, Alejandro N. Mayorkas breached the public trust by knowingly making false statements to Congress and the American people and avoiding lawful oversight in order to obscure the devastating consequences of his willful and systemic refusal to comply with the law and carry out his statutory duties. He has also breached the public trust by willfully refusing to carry out his statutory duty to control the border and guard against illegal entry, notwithstanding the calamitous consequences of his abdication of that duty.

Wherefore Alejandro N. Mayorkas, by such conduct, has demonstrated that he will remain a threat to national and border security, the safety of the American people, and to the Constitution if allowed to remain in office, and has acted in a manner grossly incompatible with his duties and the rule of law. Alejandro N. Mayorkas thus warrants impeachment and trial, removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States.

Mr. President, that completes the exhibition of the Articles of Impeachment against Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security.

The managers request the Senate take order for the trial, and the managers now request leave to withdraw.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That would be “Madam President.”

Thank you, Mr. GREEN.

The Senate will duly notify the House of Representatives when it is ready to proceed.

You may proceed to depart.

The managers were thereupon escorted by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, Karen Gibson, from the well of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

PROGRAM

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, for the information of all Senators, under impeachment rules, Senators will be sworn in as jurors tomorrow at 1 p.m.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

REFORMING INTELLIGENCE AND SECURING AMERICA ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

NATIONAL SECURITY SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, in light of the unprecedented attacks by Iranian forces on Israel over the weekend and on the 64th day since the Senate passed a bipartisan national security supplemental bill, I come to the floor to once again call on the House to pass critical funding for Ukraine, for Israel, for the Indo-Pacific, and, importantly, for our own national security needs here at home.

Over the past 6 months, I have worked with Senators from both sides of the aisle to urge the passage of supplemental funding to support our national security, and I am beyond disappointed that Speaker Johnson and

House Republicans have delayed much needed critical aid, especially given the Senate bill that passed here with 70 bipartisan votes. I believe and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle believe that that would pass the House if only the Speaker would bring the bill to the floor. Now, we hear this week that House Republicans may be nearing a vote on this aid, and while I am encouraged by that, it is way past time for us to help the courageous Ukrainians who are fighting, literally, for the life of their country.

As chair of the European Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, like so many in this Chamber, I have met with President Zelenskyy, traveled to Ukraine, and met with the women and men who are on the frontlines of this war. I know the dire state of affairs right now against Russia. We have heard from our Nation's top four-star generals and every single combatant commander. They have stressed the importance of what happens in Ukraine to operations elsewhere around the world.

Fortunately, Ukrainians remain fearless in the face of the brutality and aggression from Russia, but what the United States and our allies must do at this critical juncture is provide the military and economic support to help Ukraine win and define victory on its own terms. We must act now to ensure Ukraine's continued survival. We have heard testimony that, right now, for every shell that is being fired by the Ukrainians, five are being fired by Russia; and if we wait another month or more, it will be 10 for every shell that Ukrainians are firing.

Ensuring Ukraine's survival is not just about Ukraine; it is about pushing back on Vladimir Putin's campaign to return to the days of Soviet occupation and aggression. We have seen this movie before with Vladimir Putin. In 2008, he invaded Georgia. In 2014, he illegally annexed Crimea and parts of the Donbas in Ukraine. Then, of course, 2 years ago, he launched his full-scale, unprovoked invasion of Ukraine. If he wins—if the West fails to support Ukraine—we know that Vladimir Putin is not going to stop.

We have heard from the leaders of the Baltic nations of Poland, of other states in Eastern Europe, their fears for what happens if Vladimir Putin is successful in Ukraine.

Instead of letting Putin rewrite the rules of the road, we should put an end to his thinking that he can do as he pleases without consequences.

Delays by the House of Representatives to pass this supplemental have enabled Putin's delusional agenda. We have already heard from the Republican chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, MIKE TURNER, and Chairman MIKE McCAUL from the House Foreign Affairs Committee, who have already said that a third of the Republican caucus is listing and spouting Russian disinformation.

This isn't just about Ukraine; American aid and support deters other bad

actors from initiating conflict in other parts of the world.

Six months of inaction by Congress has enabled our adversaries. We saw it as recently as this weekend, when Iranian forces fired off hundreds of drones and rockets toward Israel. Now there is the potential for a broader war in the Middle East that could imperil more innocent lives and make the world more dangerous.

It is more important than ever that we take action in Congress because these episodes—Ukraine, the attack in Israel, what is happening in the Indo-Pacific—they don't happen in silos. Our adversaries are connected. They are sharing weapons and reveling in our inability to act. Iran is currently supplying more than 70 percent of Russia's drone capabilities. A top Chinese official was just in North Korea for the highest level talks in years. The Secretary General of NATO branded this partnership as a "dangerous authoritarian alliance," and he is right. This group of dictators, autocrats, and adversaries threatens democracy. It is a threat that is very much like what we saw in the lead-up to World War II.

If we don't pass this supplemental, our adversaries, like Iran, will expand their own campaigns of aggression. If you are concerned about what China is doing, if you are concerned about what Iran is doing, the best way to deal a blow to these authoritarians is to support the Ukrainians in their effort to defeat Putin.

We have a chance to take a stand for freedom and democracy, if only our House colleagues would finally pass the national security supplemental.

I just got back from the Indo-Pacific with a congressional delegation that included six Members of the Senate and one Member of the House. It was bipartisan and bicameral. What we heard in the nations that we visited in the Indo-Pacific was that they understand the connection between what is going on in Ukraine and what is happening with China, with great power competition, with the aggression in the Indo-Pacific and the South China Sea, and against Taiwan.

If the House would pass the national security supplemental, we could degrade Russia, we could degrade the Iranian military capabilities, and we could do it without costing American lives. We could boost our economy through our defense industrial base.

Support for Ukraine and our allies isn't a blank check. It is not charity. The United States is providing Ukraine with critical equipment to defend itself and its territory. This equipment is pulled from U.S. stocks, which also means that it is putting people to work back at home.

Despite misinformation from too many House Republicans, a majority of the funding in the bill the Senate sent over more than 60 days ago is spent in the United States. It would be spent to replenish our own military stocks so that we can continue to meet our mili-

tary requirements. It would shore up our military readiness and ensure that the U.S. industrial base can keep up with demand.

A destabilized Europe as a result of Ukraine losing this war would be a disaster for the U.S. economy. In my home State of New Hampshire alone, we export about \$3 billion each year to Europe, which is our largest trading partner.

Putin poses a serious threat to our security and a peaceful, prosperous future. Our allies know this, and that is why, by the end of this year, 18 NATO countries will meet the 2-percent defense spending goal set by the alliance. This historic investment in our collective security shows that the United States is not shouldering this burden alone.

We can depend on our allies, and they must be able to depend on us. Let's remind ourselves that our NATO allies stood by our side after September 11. Right now, leaders from around the world are looking for the United States to step up and pass this bill. What message does it send to our allies if we ignore their pleas for support to save lives and ensure our collective security? What message does it send to our grandchildren if we tell them that we are willing to gamble sending them to fight in another war in Europe? There is one thing we know—that Putin is not going to stop in Ukraine.

America doesn't back down when it is called upon to defend freedom—at least we never have. Ukraine is now on the frontlines of the fight for democracy and freedom. We have the resources to act here. We have the ability to act. Now it is time for everyone in the House to find the courage to act because failure is not an option.

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

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

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, last week, we saw terrible flooding in parts of Louisiana. Here, as the charts will show—water shouldn't be up to the bottom of a vehicle. Here you see people getting on a bus, wearing waders. So people's lives were disrupted, just like with any serious flood. Now families are turning to FEMA, the National Flood Insurance Program, to help lift them out of the hole that last week's storms have left them in.

Moments like these are why people buy insurance. But what about after we have recovered and the Sun shines once more? There is increasing concern among Americans that they will not be able to afford their flood insurance for when the next storm hits.

A house is the biggest purchase most people make in their lifetime. Unless

you are among the wealthiest, you are taking out a mortgage to make that purchase. After you have bought your home, imagine if FEMA changes the rules and your flood insurance now costs more than that mortgage? No American should have to pay more in flood insurance than their mortgage, but that is the story I am hearing frequently from people in Louisiana.

There is a cost-of-living crisis being fueled by the inflation created by this administration. Inflation is costing Louisiana families \$884 more a month compared to 2021. Everywhere they turn, they are frustrated with the fact that they are paying more and getting less.

When I speak to folks back home, they are not only worried about how to put food on their table but also how to pay for gas. They are worried about how they are going to be able to afford to stay in their homes and about how they can afford a good education for their children.

I would like to do something about some small part of it. Congress has the power to do something about it, and that is to make flood insurance affordable.

The National Flood Insurance Program was created as a safety net for the most vulnerable Americans. It covers 4.7 million American homes, but those millions of homes are at risk of losing their protection because of skyrocketing premiums caused by FEMA's new risk assessment system, Risk Rating 2.0.

Let's briefly talk about the history of NFIP Risk Rating 2.0 and how we got here. FEMA introduced Risk Rating 2.0 in October of 2021. It was slated to take effect in 2022 for new policies and in 2023 for existing policyholders.

Since then, Americans who rely on flood insurance have been held in a state of uncertainty. Before they were hit with that first bill, many families didn't know if their premiums would jump up; if they did, how much; and when the rate hikes would end.

FEMA told us that 77 percent of policyholders would see a premium hike but refused to publicly disclose how the Agency calculates individual policy rates. So now FEMA is sending Americans a bill and won't tell them how they came up with the price. If you were the American getting that bill, you would be incredibly frustrated. You wouldn't accept it if your mechanic stuck you with a crazy bill but didn't tell you what was wrong with the car. Why should we just accept from a government Agency that same kind of model? Theoretically, the government Agency is here to serve us.

Louisiana is one of the States getting hit the hardest. NFIP premiums in Louisiana are expected to go up by 234 percent, with some ZIP Codes seeing as much as an 1,100-percent increase—that is 1,100 percent. In real terms, some ZIP Codes will see an increase from around \$600 to more than \$8,000 annually. Couple that with the homeowner's

insurance crisis. Couple that with inflation across the country. Couple that with the cost to heat your home. Couple that with the cost to go to the grocery store. It is clear why Americans feel they cannot keep their heads above water.

Insurance, just like everything else, has become less affordable. When folks can't afford flood insurance, they begin to drop that coverage, and the pool of policyholders shrink. The amount of risk is then placed on a smaller number of policyholders, which increases their premiums, which makes them drop their policies, and then we enter what is called an actuarial death spiral.

FEMA itself forecasted that over 20 percent of policyholders will leave the program because of higher premiums within the next 10 years. We are setting the program up for collapse and leaving Americans and American taxpayers holding the bucket.

Some groups will be hit even harder than others. FEMA won't tell us how they came up with the numbers of what they expect Americans to pay, but we do know they do not factor in income or the ability to pay. There is no discount or consideration for an elderly couple who is retired and living on a fixed income, bought their home in 1957, never had it flooded, and now their insurance premiums are rising. This is a real human condition.

Congress has the power to address it, and we need to step up now. If my colleagues and our friends in the House of Representatives wish to honor the people we serve, let's start with the 4.7 million policyholders being—I don't know if the word is "mistreated"—mishandled by the National Flood Insurance Program, certainly poorly served.

I urge my colleagues to read our NFIP Reauthorization and Reform Act. Come talk to us about it. It is something which is bipartisan, which is reasonable and sensible, and which will actually address this need. Our goal is to make the National Flood Insurance Program more affordable for the homeowner, more accountable to the taxpayer, and more sustainable for society. Our bill does that, but we can only do so by working together.

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

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

MAYORKAS IMPEACHMENT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, with me today is one of my colleagues from my office, Mr. Matt Turner.

I want to talk about the woolly mammoth in the room: impeachment. I want my colleagues to just put aside for a second the legal aspect of this. Let's stop thinking for a second about how many lawyers can dance on the

head of a pin, and let's just think for a moment what is about to happen over the next 2 days.

A few moments ago, the managers from the U.S. House of Representatives came over—every Member of the Senate was here and seated—and read their Articles of Impeachment, their charges, about Secretary Mayorkas. The U.S. House of Representatives—did you notice I said that? Representatives of the U.S. House of Representatives came over to us.

As I said the other day, we are not talking about some snow bro who likes chicken McNuggets and weed and has an opinion. We are not talking about some game boy who is living in his parents' basement and has an opinion—though both of them are entitled to their opinion because this is America.

We are talking about the U.S. House of Representatives. For months, they investigated the open, bleeding wound that is the southern border and why it is open and why it is bleeding. And after investigating it—not for days, not for weeks—for months, the U.S. House of Representatives voted two articles, two charges, in an impeachment of Secretary Mayorkas.

And those are serious charges. They are as serious as four heart attacks and a stroke. The first one is willful and systemic refusal to comply with the law—not negligence—willful and systemic refusal to comply with the law. The second charge is breach of the public trust—breach of the public trust. Serious, serious charges.

Now, this doesn't happen every day or every week or every month or even every year around here. Our country is almost 250 years old. This has only happened 22 times. Twenty-two times has the U.S. House of Representatives impeached a public official. And every single time—check it. Go Google it. Every single time—you can write this down, take it home to mama. Every single time, except when the public official has quit, the U.S. Senate has done its job, through thick and thin, whether the Democrats were in the majority or the Republicans were in the majority. It didn't matter who the President was. We did our job because we respect the institution of the Constitution; we respect the three branches of government; we respect the U.S. House of Representatives. We respect them enough to do our job. We held a trial every single time, except when the public official quit.

Now, in the next 2 days, you are going to hear one of my colleagues—the majority leader—say we don't need to hold a trial. He is going to say the evidence is insufficient, that it is not worth our time. I want you to think for a moment. Just ask yourself this question: How does he know the evidence isn't sufficient? How does he know? He hasn't heard the evidence.

What you are about to see, folks—it breaks my heart to say this. Over the next 2 days, what you are going to see is not about the evidence. It is not

about the law. It is not about the process. It is not about what should be 250 years of precedent in history. It is about raw, gut politics—raw, gut politics.

Some of my colleagues in this body do not want us to talk about the border in an election year, and we all know that. You know that. I know that. Everybody watching knows that. The American people know that. They may be poorer under President Biden, but they are not stupid. They can see that. And that is not right. It is vacuous. It is fraudulent. Regardless of what you think or you may think you think without having heard the evidence, the U.S. Senate should do its job. We should hold a trial.

Now, my Democratic friends have the votes. They can do pretty much what they want to. When you have got the votes, you know, you can—what is the old expression? You can make a koala bear eat hot peppers and like it if you have the votes. They have the majority, and I believe in the rule of law, and the rules are the rules. But sometimes—sometimes the majority just means a lot of the fools are on the same side. That is why we have a Bill of Rights in our Constitution: to protect our rights that the majority can't take away.

And I want to say this as respectfully as I can because I understand politics. I have been in this business for a while. The Presiding Officer has too. I have seen the dark side of it too. I have seen the good side, but I have seen the dark side. And what I am seeing right now is the dark side. I am seeing the dark side.

This is a political decision, and it is an insult to the Senate. And it is one more step of the U.S. Senate rotting from within, where we don't do our job for political reasons. So I am asking my Democratic colleagues—I say this gently, with as much respect as I can muster: Pretty please, pretty please, pretty please with sugar on top, let's do our job. Just because you have the votes, don't dismiss these impeachment proceedings summarily, like it is spam in your inbox. The U.S. Senate needs to do its job.

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

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

HEALTHY KIDS ACT

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, tens of millions of kids in America are anxious, depressed, angry, lonely, sedentary, sometimes insecure, and sometimes suicidal. And just about everybody—whether they are parents, teachers, mental health professionals, or even the kids themselves—points the finger at the same culprit: social media.

We do not need more data to tell us what is so painfully obvious in schools and homes across the country. Social media platforms, with their wildly powerful, covert, and addictive algorithms are driving our kids deeper and deeper into a sea of despair that they can't find their way out of. Kids are being unwittingly sucked into rabbit holes that leave them in a constant state of panic and outrage—ashamed of their own bodies, lacking meaningful friendships and connections.

The idea that a young kid—a kid—can feel so unhappy and so unfulfilled at the tender age of 8 or 9—so much so that they seriously contemplate self-harm—is appalling. And it is a uniquely modern crisis created over the past decades by profit-chasing tech companies for whom nothing and no one is off-limits, not even very young kids. The math for them is very simple: Attention means money. And the best way to hold people's attention is to make them upset and keep them upset.

You talk to any parent—whether they are raising a toddler or a teenager, whether they are a voter or non-voter, a Democrat or a Republican—they are worried and they are frustrated about all the ways that social media is harming kids, but they don't know what to do about it or if they can do anything at all. Some might work two jobs and not have the time to monitor what their kids are up to online. Others might lack the technical literacy to operate parental controls and set limits on screen time.

All they really want is for their young kids to be off social media altogether, because there is no good reason that a 9-year-old should be spending hours every day scrolling through TikTok that has been programmed with no concern for whether the content is age-appropriate or not. There is no First Amendment right for an 11-year-old to be on Instagram while algorithm targets them with content glorifying starvation and fueling insecurities.

By the company's own admission, social media was never meant to be used by young kids. Yet any parent, or anyone who knows a parent, knows that young kids are on these platforms anyway. And the only way that it will stop is if the Federal law finally mandates that companies keep young kids off of their services.

Over the past year, my team and I have worked extensively with a broad range of advocates and stakeholders, as well as the Senate Commerce Committee leadership, to update my bill to protect kids on social media. Our updated bill, called the Healthy Kids Act, would do two simple things: It would prevent kids under 13 from being on social media at all; and it would ban algorithmic targeting on these platforms for kids under 17.

Delaying the onset of social media use is a straightforward and common-sense way to protect our youngest kids from the very worst of the internet's

ills. Let them have a normal childhood in the real world—play a sport, learn an instrument, read a book, go to the park, walk around with friends. And once kids are on social media at 13 or 14 or whenever, they need protection, particularly from the algorithmic targeting.

Just last year alone, social media companies made \$11 billion from ads targeted at kids under 18 in the United States—\$11 billion. So it is no wonder that they have no appetite to change their business model without a Federal law. It is working great for them—just not for the millions of young kids who are sad and lonely and angry because of it. Kids need help, and they need protection. And because the companies have shown time and time again that they will not step up, Congress must.

I am glad that we are seeing renewed momentum and urgency right now with a number of different proposals on this issue in the U.S. Senate. All of them, my bill included, share the same goal of keeping our kids healthy. But at the heart of this effort is an essential question of when our kids ought to be allowed to be on social media. At what age is it appropriate to use? If we are going to protect these kids online and act as a counterweight to the rich and powerful tech companies, answering that question and establishing an age minimum is essential. And that is what the Healthy Kids Act does.

It is our job here in the Senate to consider any number of difficult challenges facing the country and the world and to debate what to do about them. What is more fundamental to the role of the Federal Government than to protect the most vulnerable Americans, especially our children?

If you think what is happening to kids online is unclear, look at the data. The percentage of high school students surveyed who experienced persistent feelings of sadness or hopelessness in the past year is 36 percent to 57 percent females; 21 percent to 29 percent males in 10 years—in 10 years.

It might be the phones. It might be the phones. You can consult the data. You can ask the Surgeon General of the United States. You can ask all of the people who have studied this. And they know it is early use of social media where—look, we all use social media, and our adult brains are not powerful enough to overcome the negative impacts. You are 13, you are 9, you are 7, you are going to be overpowered by these algorithms. We have to protect these kids.

And if you don't believe the data, talk to any parent—Democrat, Republican, parent of a 2-year-old, parent of a 12-year-old—everybody wants this tool in their toolkit. And the idea that we should pass a Federal law mandating that all the social media companies have to do is have a little thing in settings where you can turn the dials on all the different aspects of your social media account is ignorant. It is ignorant. The idea that all we really

need to do is precipitate a conversation between a parent and child about social media use—no. What parents need is to be able to say: I am sorry. That is illegal. I am sorry. You may not use these social media platforms.

I think it gets really tricky and really complicated once a kid is 13, 14, 15, 16, 17. I understand that. And we narrowed the bill to be more precise because there is no First Amendment right, there is no public policy upside for a 9-year-old to be on TikTok. Nobody can make that argument with a straight face.

And so as we consider our options going forward on tech policy—but specifically protecting children online—the threshold question is, At what age is it appropriate for a child to use social media? If I had my druthers, I would have set it at 16, honestly. But, certainly, we can all agree that there is no advantage to a child's life, a pre-pubescent child's life—a 9-year-old, a 4-year-old, an 11-year-old—being on social media.

I am confident we will get this done. I am confident that if this ever received a Senate floor vote, that it would be a resounding bipartisan majority. And I am confident that the American people support us in this.

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.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. 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 Tennessee.

MAYORKAS IMPEACHMENT

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, we gathered just a couple of hours ago to receive the impeachment articles on Alejandro Mayorkas, who is the Secretary of Homeland Security. How interesting that, as we look at going through this impeachment, we have Senator SCHUMER, who is the majority leader, who has decided he wants to change his tune when it comes to dealing with impeachment.

Now, in 2019, right before the Democrats started in on President Trump and an impeachment trial for President Trump, Leader SCHUMER stood right here in this Chamber, and he said:

We have a responsibility to let all the facts come out.

We [have] to remember our constitutional duty to act as judges and jurors in a potential trial.

Now, those were his comments at that point in time. He was all for an impeachment trial, and it is our constitutional duty. You can look at article I, section 2 and section 3. Section 2 lays out the responsibility of the House in impeachment. Section 3 pertains to the Senate and how we are to proceed with a trial of impeachment.

But, as I said, Leader SCHUMER has decided that he wants to change his

tune, and all of a sudden, he is not wanting this even though we actually have a public officeholder who deserves to stand for an impeachment trial, and that is Secretary Mayorkas. Now that the shoe is on the other foot, if you will, and now that it is about a Democrat, Leader SCHUMER wants to change the rules and say no. He is even willing to take unprecedented actions that this Chamber has never taken when it comes to the issue of impeachment.

I believe this should incense every single American. I know it incenses the people of Tennessee because what we have learned in the last 3 years about Secretary Mayorkas—even though his title is “Secretary of Homeland Security,” he does not believe in securing the homeland, and he has refused to fulfill his duty of securing the homeland.

I know that Secretary Mayorkas is doing the bidding of Joe Biden and the Biden administration. He is just doing what they tell him he has to do. That in and of itself tells you a lot about what this administration thinks about the security and sovereignty of this country. Here is why: On the Biden-Mayorkas watch, you have more than 9.4 million illegal aliens coming into this country. That is in less than 3 years—9.4 million.

We know that there are between 1.7 and 2.5 million “got-aways.” Some of those “got-aways” are included in that 9.4 million number, and others are not because they didn't see them as they were coming through and couldn't get to them. They found things they left on the roadside or in the woods, in the brush, later on.

Out of this 10 million or so who have illegally come into the country—by the way, just to help everyone have the right context, that number of 10 million is greater than the population of 38 of our States—38. That is how many people are coming in who are illegally entering the country.

Out of this number, you have thousands who are from countries of interest. That would be places like Pakistan, Uzbekistan, Iraq, Iran. And look at China. Look at what is happening there. You also have 300 known terrorists. As we heard in the impeachment articles today, under President Trump, you had no more than a dozen total over 4 years who were coming into the country. What do you have under Joe Biden? You have over 300 suspected terrorists. Even last week, we had an issue where DOJ and DHS and FBI and the other Agencies were admitting they had lost track of a terrorist from Afghanistan, and he was free-roaming the country for a year.

In addition to the terrorists and the people from countries of interest, fentanyl is coming across our borders. It is being smuggled in by the cartels. Fentanyl is the leading cause of death of Americans age 18 to 45. Fentanyl is a drug that—China has the precursor chemicals, and they are manufacturing this in labs that they have set up with,

oh, by the way, the cartels in Mexico, and the cartels are the distribution hub for fentanyl. I talk to parents regularly who have a child who has lost a life or become addicted because of fentanyl.

In addition to all the fentanyl, you have the human trafficking. What is really so sad to me when you look at human trafficking—and for the cartels, human trafficking is a business. It has grown from a business that was \$500 million a year in this country in 2018, and today it is a \$13 billion-a-year business.

If you don't think the cartels are big business, if you don't think they are global entities, look at this. Globally, human trafficking is a \$150 billion-a-year business. Where do these people want to come? Right here. They want to come into our country.

On top of this, there are more than 400,000 migrant children. Many of them have been recycled and abused by the cartels. Yes, indeed, the cartels are so into this human trafficking now that they have devised a scheme. It is child abuse. They take a little child. They write their name and the phone number to contact on that child's back. They put that child with a cartel member they are trying to get into the country. They pose as a family for the purpose of claiming asylum. Once the cartel member is across the border, what does he do? He lets the child go—the child go—and the child is sent back to Mexico.

So we add to all of these issues with the terrorists, with the people from countries of interest, with the drugs, with the human trafficking, with the sex trafficking, you look at what is happening to these children. Tens of thousands of these 400,000 children have been forced into really horrific, exploitative situations, including child labor and sex trafficking.

Across the country, you have dangerous, illegal alien criminals—they are called criminal aliens—who should never have been able to come into this country in the first place. They have harmed and they have murdered innocent Americans.

So all of these reasons as to why we should move forward with this impeachment, and on top of it you add that Secretary Mayorkas has repeatedly lied to Congress about our border being secure. He likes to say he has done everything to prevent this, but we know he has done everything to allow it and to allow the flow to continue.

Last year, DHS, his Agency, deported less than 5 percent of all migrant encounters at the border. In 2022, only 10 percent of all criminal illegal aliens in the United States were arrested.

While a border wall would do so much to help end the border crisis, Secretary Mayorkas stated:

From day one, this Administration has made clear that a border wall is not the answer.

His words. From day one, they have made clear that a border wall is not the answer. Well, let me tell you something: Walls work. Throughout history,

walls have worked. The evidence is overwhelming.

Secretary Mayorkas has refused to uphold his constitutional duty of securing the homeland, and the American people are suffering the consequences.

Five years ago, Leader SCHUMER was all too happy to lead a partisan, baseless impeachment trial against President Trump. Yet, today, when faced with a Secretary who is unfit for office, Leader SCHUMER is trying to prevent a Senate trial and dismiss the House's Articles of Impeachment.

(Mr. WYDEN assumed the Chair.)

Never before has the Senate dismissed impeachment charges without holding a trial.

When I talk to Tennesseans, they talk about their frustration with Washington, DC, and their frustration with two tiers of justice. It seems there is a tier for the Democrats and the elites and illegals and another for Republicans and President Trump and people who are conservative.

It is important that Secretary Mayorkas be held to account. For 3 years, he has done President Biden's bidding by opening the border to millions of illegal aliens. If this Chamber upholds its constitutional duty to hold a trial, I will vote to convict Secretary Mayorkas and remove him from office.

While the Biden administration is working to make illegal immigration legal, border States such as Texas are stepping up to do what this administration will not do, and that is to secure the border.

Over recess, I spent time in El Paso, TX, to see firsthand how Governor Abbott and authorities in the Lone Star State are working to keep communities safe. Now, it is a part of the efforts in Texas to deter illegal immigration, and Texas is taking this seriously to make certain that they secure property there along the Rio Grande.

What they have done is to place buoys in the river, shipping containers on the embankment, razor wire behind that, and fences behind that. They did this along the Rio Grande there in El Paso to prevent illegal aliens from coming in through El Paso.

Texas has bolstered its barriers, and what you are seeing now is that the illegal aliens are traveling farther to the west. They are going to New Mexico. They are going to Arizona. They are going to California. Why? Because they are looking for somewhere easier that they can get into the country illegally.

(Mr. WELCH assumed the Chair.)

Bear in mind, the coyotes, they are working hard for all of these groups and for the cartels, and nobody enters without paying a coyote.

Now, when you look at what Texas is doing, taking this into their own hands—and you have got the State, you have got local counties—they are spending billions at the State level and millions in these counties. And as a result, illegal immigration in Texas dropped by 54 percent between Decem-

ber and January. And in the Del Rio Sector, which includes Eagle Pass, illegal entries fell by 76 percent.

This shows you border walls work. The Border Patrol has been telling us for decades: We need a barrier; we need better technology where we cannot have a barrier; and we need more officers and agents. So while the Biden administration pretends otherwise, knowing that walls work should not be a surprise. Border walls from ancient Athens to the Great Wall of China, they protected cities. They protected nations for thousands of years. Border barriers are used on nearly every continent on Earth to protect countries from illegal entry, from drug smuggling, and from terrorism.

But instead of supporting Texas and its successful efforts to deter illegal immigration, this administration and this Secretary of Homeland Security, they think it is a good thing to go sue Texas and try to make them remove their border barriers. While Texas has accomplished a lot in securing their border, protecting families, and saving American lives, President Biden's attack on our border security has placed a tremendous burden on our border States and communities. Indeed, every town has turned into a border town, every State a border State all across this country because of what is happening with the drug trafficking, with human trafficking, with sex trafficking, with crime in communities.

While I was in Eagle Pass, I sat down with some ranchers and farmers who have had their property destroyed, stolen, broken into by illegal aliens crossing into our country from Mexico. In one instance, two migrants broke into a rancher's home while his 16-year-old daughter was studying at home alone.

Texas law enforcement also warned about the ways cartels are using new technology to aid their smuggling operations, including by using Chinese-owned TikTok to recruit Americans into their human trafficking rings. At the same time, cartels are flying drones into the United States to scope out the location of border agents and redirect their smuggling routes.

More than anything else, authorities in Texas told me that they need more border wall construction, better technology, and more agents.

So if Secretary Mayorkas and President Biden refuse to help them, Congress has to step in. That is why I introduced legislation called the CONTAINER Act, which would empower border States such as Texas to place temporary barriers on Federal land to protect their communities.

No State or locality should face lawsuits from the Federal Government for trying to secure our border and to protect the sovereignty of the United States of America.

I also introduced the CLEAR Act, which would reaffirm the authority of State and local governments to enforce Federal immigration laws by apprehending, detaining, and then transfer-

ring illegal aliens to Federal custody. Among its important measures, this legislation would require the Department of Homeland Security to provide grants to State and local governments to help them enforce immigration law and construct detention facilities. It would also require DHS to take illegal aliens into custody within 48 hours after receiving a request from a State or locality and provide the Justice Department with essential information about illegal aliens who have overstayed their period of stay in this country.

After my visit to Eagle Pass, I know these pieces of legislation would do so much to support our border security along these border States, and I am hopeful that this President and his Department of Homeland Security will have a change of heart and will move forward with securing our southern border, just as this Chamber should move forward with an impeachment trial on Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

FISA

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise in strong opposition to this FISA bill. And, to begin, there is a central question before the U.S. Senate, and that is: Who should be forced to help their government spy?

The legislation coming from the other body gives the government unchecked authority to order Americans to spy on behalf of their government. This was slipped in, Mr. President, in the last minutes in the House of Representatives' bill, and this is the first time this language has ever been considered here in the U.S. Senate.

Under current law—section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act—the government can order the phone companies and email and internet service providers to hand over communications. This bill expands that existing power dramatically. It says: The government can force cooperation from "any other service provider who has access to equipment that is being or may be used to transmit or store wire or electronic communications."

Now, the language I just read to the Senate means that, if you have access to any communications, the government can force you to help it spy. That means anybody with access to a server, a wire, a cable box, a WiFi router, a phone, or a computer.

So think for a moment about the millions of Americans who work in buildings and offices in which communications are stored or passed through. After all, every office building in America has data cables running through it.

These people are not just the engineers who install, maintain, and repair our communications infrastructure. There are countless others who could be forced to help the government spy, including those who clean offices and guard buildings. If this provision is enacted, the government could deputize

any of these people against their will and force them, in effect, to become what amounts to an agent for Big Brother—for example, by forcing an employee to insert a USB thumb drive into a server at an office they clean or guard at night.

This can all happen without any oversight whatsoever. The FISA Court won't know about it. The Congress won't know about it. Americans who are handed these directives will be forbidden from talking about it. Unless they can afford high-priced lawyers with security clearances who know their way around the FISA Court, they will have no recourse at all.

Now, importantly, Mr. President—and you and I have talked about this—supporters of this provision will say that this doesn't change the fact that section 702 only targets foreigners overseas. But if the government thinks that those targets are communicating with people in the United States, they can go right to the source: the WiFi, the phone lines, the servers, the transmitters that store those communications.

If the government has an interest in those foreign targets, well, the Americans whose communications get collected are just plain out of luck.

Supporters of this provision will also say this was necessary because of a FISA Court opinion. I disagree. That opinion didn't gut section 702. This provision is not necessary, and there certainly is no justification for this vast expansion of surveillance authorities.

Supporters also claim that the provision has a narrow purpose and that the government doesn't intend to start tapping into everybody's phone line or WiFi, but that is not how this provision is written. It is not reflected in the actual legislation.

And I would say, respectfully, that anybody who votes to give the government vast powers under the premise that intelligence Agencies won't actually use them is being pretty darn naive.

Supporters also point to a handful of exceptions that were tacked onto this provision, excluding things like hotels and coffee shops. Anybody who reads the text will see that these provisions clearly are not designed to work. Even the coffee shop exception is meaningless because it wouldn't cover a company that maintains the coffee shop's WiFi. And the fact that there are a couple of random exceptions further proves my point.

This provision is going to force a huge range of companies and individuals to spy for their government.

Supporters have even argued that the bill had to be broadly written because what the government actually wants to do is secret. That is some "Alice in Wonderland" logic.

First, the American people deserve to know when the government can spy on them and when it can't. If you clearly can't explain to American voters why you need new powers, then you shouldn't have them.

And the distinguished Presiding officer of the Senate from Vermont, he has asked questions about this as well.

Second, it doesn't matter what the government might be secretly intending to do with these authorities at the moment. There is a statutory authority that will be in place for years, during which time the government may very well decide to dramatically expand its surveillance activities.

Now, some of my colleagues say they aren't worried about President Biden abusing these authorities. Well, last time I looked, the law applies to Presidents, regardless of their political power—excuse me—regardless of their position. In that case, how about President Trump? Imagine these authorities in his hands. If you are worried about having a President who lives to target vulnerable Americans, to pit Americans against each other, to find every conceivable way to punish perceived enemies, you ought to find this bill terrifying.

The bill expands 702 authorities in other ways. For example, it includes a dramatic increase in the use of 702 in vetting travelers to the United States. It requires that the Attorney General enable searches on all travelers, tens of millions of people who come to the United States annually. This is a dragnet search of every work colleague, neighbor, and classmate who is here on a visa; every grandparent visiting for a wedding or a funeral.

So what I have done in the last 10 or 12 minutes is point out that these are just some of the ways in which this bill expands warrantless surveillance authorities. On top of all of that, it fails to reform section 702 in any meaningful way.

I will start with the warrantless searches of Americans' communications swept up in section 702 collection. These searches have gone after American protesters, political campaign donors, even people who simply reported crimes to the FBI. The abuses have been extensive and well documented.

Now, supporters of this bill are going to argue: Well, the FBI has taken care of things. They have cleaned up their act.

But even after the FBI made changes to its internal policies, abuses continued, including searches for a U.S. Senator, State senator, and a State judge who had complained to the FBI about police abuses.

But the broader concern is that, without checks and balances, there is nothing preventing a rapid increase of abuses after reauthorization.

Supporters of this bill will say that it codified the FBI's internal changes. But what I would say is: Without real checks and balances written into the law, what good are these changes?

Reformers have put forward extremely modest, commonsense solutions. Warrants would not be required for all U.S. person searches. Reform proposals allow the government to see whether an American is commu-

nicating with foreign agents. A warrant is required only when the government wants to read the content of these communications—a situation that arises less than 2 percent of the time. Our provision also allows for emergency searches and has exceptions for imminent threats of death or injury, preexisting law enforcement or FISA warrants, consent, and access to malware in cyber attacks.

This modest reform should be debated and voted on in the Senate.

There are other commonsense reforms to section 702 that also are not in this bill. For example, it doesn't protect Americans against reverse targeting, and it doesn't prohibit the collection of domestic communications.

Finally, the bill should have been an opportunity to pass meaningful protections for Americans' privacy from abusive government subpoenas targeted at the most vulnerable groups in our society, including women, religious and racial minorities, and LGBTQ people.

Mr. President, 15 States have now banned abortion, with more on the way. When States enforce bans on reproductive health access, they will use everything from location data generated by connected cars and the smartphone in the patient's pocket to the Google search that the patient used to find the reproductive health facility or online telemedicine service. All of that can be obtained without a court order.

Congress needs to safeguard Americans' privacy, not give the President new surveillance powers. Congress has the time to draft comprehensive privacy and cybersecurity legislation, including a 702 reauthorization. My own view is that Chairman DURBIN's SAFE Act and my bipartisan, bicameral Government Surveillance Reform Act are both bills that have support across the aisle, across the Capitol, and they are ready for consideration.

I am going to close with this: This Chamber has the time to do the right thing. Senators do not need to rubberstamp a disastrous surveillance bill just because the Senate is, once again, considering it at the last possible moment. Once again—you can set your clock by it—the Senate considers FISA at the last possible moment.

The FISA Court recently renewed the court's annual 702 certifications, which authorize surveillance until April 2025. Let me repeat that. The FISA Court recently renewed the court's annual 702 certifications, which authorize surveillance until April 2025. That means there is no need for Congress to offer up a rush job. But under no circumstances should the U.S. Senate be cowed by those who say Senators have no choice except to sign off on whatever piece of paper the executive branch requests.

Reformers on both sides of the aisle here in the Senate have been ready and willing since last fall to have this debate; yet the status quo crowd wouldn't pick up the phone until the last possible minute to ensure that this body

wouldn't have time for anything but a last-second vote on what I believe is a dangerous bill. The only way this body is going to have a real debate about reforming government surveillance is by rejecting the House bill and standing up for the Senate's independence and Americans' constitutional rights.

As I have said on this floor before—and I think I will do it—throughout my time in public service, Ben Franklin got it right: Americans don't have to sacrifice liberty for security. The reality is, security and liberty aren't to be mutually exclusive. We can have both. The Congress has a duty to deliver a FISA law that does both, and I urge my colleagues to pursue exactly that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The Senator from North Carolina.

TRIBUTE TO DEBRA JARRETT

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I come here today to commemorate the retirement of one of my longest serving staff in my time in the Senate, Debra Jarrett.

She has been my administrative director for the last 9 years. She has worked in the Senate for 29 years. I was looking it up on the internet earlier today. To give you an idea of how long ago 29 years was, that was the year that ladies were getting "Rachel" haircuts because "Friends" was one of the most popular shows on. Jennifer Aniston was rocking the "Rachel" haircut. Boyz II Men was topping the charts. It was a long time ago. Debra really quickly demonstrated that this was probably the right place for her to start her career; and, today, we are looking at her turning another chapter.

My staff put together some comments that I am being loosely advised by. They said it was a bittersweet moment. Well, I personally think it is bitter. I am sure it is sweet for Debra, the person who is going to be retiring. I think it is probably a violation of the rules to point back here where Debra is sitting, so I am not going to do that. But if it wasn't a violation of the rules, I would point there. That is Debra, sitting here behind me on my wing, which she has been several times before.

When you come to the Senate, the amazing thing about coming to the U.S. Senate—I came in 2015—is they say, you know, "Congratulations." They swear you in. They give you an allocation of money to run your operations. North Carolina has got about—almost 11 million people, so that dictates how much money you have to set up a State operation and a DC operation, but that is it. Your personnel practices, who you hire, how you provision computers—basically the whole running of the business operation; there is not some special department there—that is something you have to do. So one thing you learn very quickly is to find a highly competent person to do that, and I was blessed to have the opportunity to bring Debra in.

I said she has been in my office for 9 years, and she has been in the Senate for 29 years. I should start by saying she was born and raised in St. Joe, IN, population 460. Then she started to work for Dan Coats, the Senator from Indiana, as his legislative aide back in 1995. Then, in 1999, she joined Senator Judd Gregg as a special assistant. She was promoted to office administrator a year later, and she worked for Senator Gregg for 12 years. Then, when Senator Gregg retired, New Hampshire adopted her; and Kelly Ayotte, who was also a Senator from New Hampshire, brought her in as the director of administration. She did that for 4 years and then finally came to work for me.

Debra is somebody—and I do mean this. Even as a U.S. Senator, there are some people who scare me, and Debra is one of them because she is so on point for everything that we do whether it is the efficiency of our office or our fiscal conservative policy. We spend just enough, and we do return some of our office proceeds to the Treasury every year. We don't spend all of the money that we are allocated. Debra oversees all of that, but she oversees so much more.

You will hear—and I don't know. This may be common in other offices, but everybody in my State operation, about half my staff—about 30 of the 60 staff that I have working full-time are down in North Carolina—are as likely to have an endearing comment to make about Debra as people who see her every day up here in DC. And I mean everything. I mean, it could be telling staff, including my chief of staff, to understand our retirement system and how you can get the Federal match; getting these young people to think about their futures at such a young age; making sure that they go through open enrollment and get their health plan options renewed. With all the sorts of running of the office, Debra is on top of all of that.

But I think what makes her really interesting or makes it even more interesting is how she is, on any given day, likely to come up to me or my chief of staff or my legislative director and say: You need to check in on—fill in the blanks. You know, this person has just come in. They look like they are trying to get used to working in a Senate office—getting them settled down. She is watching every single aspect of this office and the health and hygiene of all the staff.

She has decided to retire after being vested for—almost 2 years now? You are not supposed to talk to me, but thank you for that—for almost 3 years now.

So 3 years—I got her to break a rule of the Senate floor, which is probably the coolest thing I could have possibly done if you know how rules-oriented Debra is. But she has been working with us, having the option to leave. She has just continued to work, and thank goodness, because we have gotten so much more out of Debra over

the last 3 years and, certainly, over the last 9 years that she has been in my office.

I have staff up in the Gallery. I don't think I am supposed to recognize them either, but they are here as a testament to how special and how important she is to our Senate office.

Now, Debra is going to retire, but she is young, and I expect that she is going to go off and do other things. One thing I hope she does, if she decides to go back to Indiana, is to make sure that she is still a part of the TILLIS family.

And I thank you for your service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

MAYORKAS IMPEACHMENT

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, on February 2, 2021, DHS Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas took an oath that all of us in the Chamber have taken, an oath that many of us have taken who have served in the military—an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic. Yet here we are, 3 years later, with the worst border crisis our Nation has ever seen.

I rise today because we find ourselves at a critical moment in our Nation's history—a moment when the integrity of this very Chamber and its leadership is being tested, a time when we will see if our colleagues across the aisle are willing to do the right thing and hold Alejandro Mayorkas accountable for his dereliction of duty that has left our country a shell of what she once was.

Now with over 11 million border crossings, including 2 million unvetted "got-aways" now living here on U.S. soil—and amongst those are an unknown number of terrorists, violent gang members and drug cartels—Mayorkas has broken his oath, resulting in this dangerous and deadly invasion of our country. All you have to do is read your hometown news, and you are going to find a person in your community who has died from fentanyl or who has been physically abused or murdered by one of these unvetted illegal aliens.

From the moment Secretary Mayorkas took office, he has skirted the Constitution and broken the law as outlined in the Secure Fence Act of 2006, which clearly states he must maintain "operational control" and "prevent unlawful entries into the United States."

In the past 3 years alone, we have had nearly 2 million known "got-aways" successfully evade capture and enter our country—a number that includes hundreds of violent gang members and terrorists. To put that into perspective, the scale of this issue, today, over 800 "got-aways" illegally crossed into this country; yesterday, over 800 unvetted "got-aways" escaped into our country; and, tomorrow, 800 more unvetted aliens will end up here on U.S. soil, living in communities around the country. Maybe that is why law enforcement officers recently told me back home that we cannot arrest ourselves out of this crisis; that they are

so overwhelmed by crime now related to these illegal crossings that we cannot arrest ourselves out of this predicament.

Secretary Mayorkas has given free rein to drug cartels to smuggle in illegal aliens and deadly drugs like fentanyl, resulting in the deaths of 300 Americans every day, with a total of over 250,000 fentanyl-related poisoning murders—deaths—occurring under his watch. That is three times more than the number of brave soldiers we lost in the Vietnam war—three times more.

The Secretary has turned a blind eye to the exploitation of our borders by terrorists, Chinese nationals, and other high-risk individuals, causing the largest influx of terrorist border crossings in our Nation's history.

And let us not forget the abuse and weaponization of parole and asylum. Secretary Mayorkas has illegally admitted nearly 800,000 aliens per year—800,000—under this parole compared to just 5,000 per year under President Obama or President Trump—800,000 versus 5,000 a year.

There is no question that the situation at our borders is dire and that the responsibility of this historic crisis lies squarely at the feet of those who have failed to address it.

Instead of fulfilling his obligation to the American people, Secretary Mayorkas has unraveled our national security, unleashed our border into chaos, and launched an unmitigated disaster and culture of lawlessness that has left Lady Liberty vulnerable to exploitation. His actions—or lack thereof—have endangered the safety of every American, and there must be consequences.

Congress must step in and do the job that President Biden refuses to do and fire Secretary Mayorkas. Enough is enough. Americans deserve better.

We are here today because we take our oath seriously. With the House managers delivering the Articles of Impeachment to the Senate Chamber today, I hope our colleagues across the aisle, who also took an oath to protect and defend our great Nation, will do the right thing. Let's bring this to a trial, let's debate his record, and for the sake of America's safety and security, let's impeach Alejandro Mayorkas.

Taking this decisive action will send a clear message to this administration: They will be held accountable for orchestrating this deadly invasion.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, earlier today, we heard a very convincing case laid out by the House managers of why the Senate should fill its constitutional duty and proceed to a trial on the impeachment of Secretary Mayorkas.

If we were to hold that trial—and we should do so—this chart that I have been developing since I became chairman of Homeland Security in 2015

would basically be the irrefutable DNA evidence of the crime.

What I have tried to lay out in this chart is the cause and effect of an ongoing set of illegal immigration crises faced by the last three administrations. What I would like to do briefly here on the Senate floor is to go through that history dating back to 2012 and show the impact of certain actions, certain court decisions, certainly the lack of faithfully executing the law in this administration that has now resulted in an invasion of our country.

Let's go back to 2012. That is where this chart begins. Even before that, I had developed a chart just showing on an annual basis the number of unaccompanied children coming into this country. It averaged for many years somewhere between 2-, 3-, 4,000 a year.

Then, in June of 2012, President Obama issued his what I would consider lawless, unlawful deferred action on childhood arrivals. That is what has sparked all the succeeding illegal immigration crises, is that unlawful order, which, by the way, was a complete misuse of prosecutorial discretion, which is supposed to be meted out or administered on a case-by-case basis. For the first time, President Obama and his administration granted prosecutorial discretion to hundreds of thousands of people, and the world took note.

What happened over the intervening years is that people realized America's law has changed. We have reports. When people come to this country illegally, they would get their notice to appear before an immigration court. Well, that was used by human traffickers down in Central America. They called that their "permiso"—their permission slip—to come to this country.

A couple of years after that unlawful order—deferred action on childhood arrivals—President Obama faced his border crisis. He actually called it a humanitarian crisis when, in May and June of 2014, they averaged about 2,200 encounters per day—2,200. That seems like the good old days. That is that little bump in comparison to President Biden's crisis at the border.

President Obama actually took action. He started detaining family units with children who came across the border, and it worked. He brought down the number of people crossing into our country illegally because there was a consequence to it.

Unfortunately, in February of 2015, pro-immigration groups—pro-illegal immigration groups—took the Obama administration to court under the Flores settlement, which was basically—back in the 1990s, there was a court case with a young immigrant girl named Flores, and the result of that settlement said that DHS could not hold an unaccompanied child for more than 20 days—again, an unaccompanied child.

The Obama administration interpreted that as, well, we can certainly hold a child when they are detained

with their family. Again, these pro-illegal immigration groups took the Obama administration to court, took Secretary Jeh Johnson to court, and they reinterpreted the Flores settlement and said: No, you can't detain a child even if they are accompanied by their parents.

So the Obama administration faced a real decision: Should we detain the parents and release the child into HHS custody? They chose not to do that except in some situations where they felt that wasn't a real family unit and those parents may be a danger to that child. You can see the result of that. Basically, catch-and-release is what that resulted in. You can see the numbers started increasing prior to President Trump taking office.

If you remember, President Trump, during his election, made the open border—that catch-and-release—a huge issue in the campaign. When he got elected, again the world noticed. They felt there was going to be a real crack-down on illegal immigration, and they stopped coming. There was a huge reduction from the end of the Obama administration to when President Trump first took office.

Unfortunately, the law didn't change. That Flores reinterpretation stood. So President Trump was faced with trying to figure out how he could utilize what laws existed, what authority he had, with no help from Congress, to address this situation. He wasn't able to address it immediately. As a result, you can see the increase of not only single adults but family units exploiting that provision, and unaccompanied children, to the point where, in May of 2019, he hit his high point: almost 5,000 people per day.

You will notice that President Trump did something about it. He enacted the migrant protection program. He instituted safe third country agreements with countries in Central America. He had to threaten the President of Mexico with tariffs so the President of Mexico would cooperate with us in securing our border.

Over the next 12 months, President Trump by and large secured the border, to hit a low point in April of 2020, when a little more than 500 people per day were trying to come into this country illegally.

President Trump also had, starting in March of 2020, during the pandemic—remember, all of this reduction in illegal immigration occurred before the pandemic, but once the pandemic was in full swing in March and April of 2020, President Trump used his authority under title 42 and used that health emergency to start deporting people coming into this country illegally.

So you see the purple bar is the people expelled using title 42 authority.

Even though the number of single adults was rising—by the way, the reason it was rising is that during the Presidential debate of 2020, every Democrat Presidential candidate said they were going to end deportations and

offer free healthcare. That is a signal. The world listens to what elected officials or potential elected officials say, and they believe them. They also believe their eyes when, once people start coming in here, they are either detained and expelled or they are not detained.

Anyway, so people started coming into this country again, assuming that President Biden was going to win the election and the border would be opened up. Of course, that is exactly what happened, because once President Biden took office, he used the exact same Executive authority that President Trump used.

Let me just quickly cover that. Even after the Flores reinterpretation, the Supreme Court, in a ruling in 2018, said that existing law—even though it was weakened by that reinterpreted Flores decision or settlement—that the current law exudes deference to the executive branch. President Trump used that deference. President Trump used that Executive authority and pretty well closed the border.

President Biden came into office and, with literally hundreds of Executive actions, completely reversed President Trump's successful border security measures using that exact same Presidential authority, all that deference.

The point that is important to understand is that President Biden wanted an open border. He caused this crisis. He could end it if he wanted to. He still has the authority. Republicans in the Senate would be happy to strengthen that authority, to overturn this Flores reinterpretation.

By the way, Secretary Jeh Johnson opposed that reinterpretation. He didn't like that Court decision.

We would have been happy to strengthen President Biden's authority, but he doesn't really need us to to secure the border. That is the point.

Again, here is the DNA, the irrefutable DNA evidence of the crime. This didn't have to happen. President Biden didn't have to reverse President Trump's successful border security Executive orders, but he reversed them, and he opened up the border. The result now is that probably more than 6 million people have come into this country illegally and stayed. That is a number greater than the population of 31 States. That is the order of magnitude of the problem.

The impact of this open border policy is devastating. It is a catastrophe. Not only does this open border policy facilitate the multibillion-dollar business model of some of the most evil people on the planet—the human traffickers, the sex traffickers, the drug traffickers—how many hundreds of thousands of Americans have died of fentanyl overdoses?

President Biden and Secretary Mayorkas said that they are reversing all of Trump's border security provisions because they said it was inhumane. There is nothing humane about facilitating human and sex and drug trafficking.

Of course, the migrants come into this country—it is true, Venezuela is emptying their jails, their mental institutions. There are some bad people, there are some criminals coming into this country. Of course, we see evidence with these migrant crimes, horrific crimes—people who no longer are alive because of President Biden's open border policy, because of Secretary Mayorkas executing President Biden's open border policy.

I am not a lawyer, and I am not a prosecutor, but I believe it is a crime to aid and abet other crimes, so from my standpoint, I think the House managers ought to be allowed to make their case. Again, they laid out very compelling—very compelling—Articles of Impeachment today. It is a pretty simple case. It probably won't take that long for them to make their case, to present it for the Senate. Why won't Majority Leader SCHUMER allow the House managers to make their case? Why won't he allow the Senate to fulfill its constitutional duty to try impeachments?

Listen, impeachments are not that regular. The least we can do is fulfill that constitutional duty and listen to the evidence and allow the House managers to make their case. I think their case is overwhelmingly convincing.

The repercussions of President Biden and Secretary Mayorkas's open border policy will be felt by Americans for years, if not decades, to come.

About the only thing Congress can do when a President or a member of the executive branch is not faithfully executing the laws, when they are completely derelict in their duty, when their dereliction of duty or the lack of faithfully executing the law is resulting in the deaths of Americans—again, the open border policy is resulting in the deaths of American citizens. It is resulting in young women being forced into the sex trafficking trade. It is resulting in higher levels of fentanyl overdoses. That evidence needs to be heard. That case needs to be made. The Senate should hold a trial.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

ISRAEL

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I will get to the issue of Secretary Mayorkas's impeachment in a moment, but I would first like to speak to Iran's attack on Israel this weekend.

We all saw what happened on Saturday evening. Israel is once again under attack—this time, under direct attack from Iran—and the United States must clearly and strongly stand with our great ally and fully support its right and obligation to defend itself by any means necessary.

I was just in Israel, a few weeks ago, to meet with Prime Minister Netanyahu and see the terror and devastation that Iran-backed Hamas terrorists unleashed on the Jewish State on October 7, firsthand. More than 1,200 were murdered, and hundreds are still

being held hostage by Hamas just for being Jewish. Americans are among the hostages and those murdered that day.

The horrors of that attack are difficult to describe and can never ever happen again. Today, I continue to pray for the safety of the Israeli people and call on every Republican and every Democrat to stand unequivocally with Israel as it fights for its very existence against evil terrorism.

Again and again, Democrats have blocked the passage of aid for Israel. Democrats have blocked Israel aid four times in the U.S. Senate.

The House has passed a good bill that is ready for Senate passage right now. I urge Majority Leader CHUCK SCHUMER to immediately put the House-passed Israel aid bill on the floor, as well as my Stop Taxpayer Funding of Hamas Act, tonight. Nothing before the Senate is more important, and I will do everything in my power to make sure that vote happens as soon as possible.

Let us all remember who the enemy is here and has always been: the evil and terror-supporting regime in Iran.

Since its first days, the Biden administration has emboldened Iran with appeasement, freeing billions upon billions of dollars to fuel Iran's support of terrorism and turning its back on Israel.

Israel is the only democracy in the Middle East and one of America's strongest allies, but it took President Biden months to meet or speak with Prime Minister Netanyahu after he took office. And, unfortunately, the world took notice.

Since October 7, President Biden and Democrats in Washington have continued to undermine Israel's fight against Iran-backed Hamas terrorists, further isolating our ally in its greatest time of need.

And here is where what has happened in Israel ties into the impeachment of Secretary Mayorkas that we are dealing with here at home this week.

MAYORKAS IMPEACHMENT

America and the freedom-loving nations of the world are less safe and secure because of President Biden's weakness and appeasement of evil regimes and the terror each support. That is a fact that the FBI Director confirmed when I questioned him in the Homeland Security Committee, last year.

And the terrifying truth is that, while President Biden's weakness has emboldened our enemies, Secretary Mayorkas has shown that he will do absolutely nothing to stop evil people from invading our country through our southern border and launching attacks on the U.S. homeland.

This isn't some hypothetical nightmare. The possibility of an attack by terrorists on U.S. soil is something that the FBI and U.S. intelligence community are terrified about.

The threats are all up. We know terrorists are coming into America because of the wide-open southern border.

That is a fact. America is a more dangerous place because Mayorkas and Biden have allowed criminals, drugs, terrorists, and other dangerous people into our communities.

There are real consequences to this failure to secure the border, and each victim has a name. Real Americans with families are being killed. Real American families are being torn apart by vicious crimes and deadly drugs because we have a wide-open border. Innocent Americans like Laken Riley are paying the ultimate price for Mayorkas's failures.

Ten million people have illegally crossed, and 6 million have been allowed to stay and had the red carpet rolled out for them, courtesy of the American taxpayers. There have been sexual assaults and murders committed by illegal aliens all across this country—even in my home State of Florida, where a young man was recently killed. The man charged with his death is an illegal alien.

Now, because of these failures, the Republican majority in the House has voted to impeach Mayorkas for violating his oath of office. They took their time. They got the evidence. They made the decision to impeach. Whether anyone in this Chamber believes it was right or wrong, that happened, and we should now hold a trial to let Mayorkas make his case. That is our constitutional duty.

But unlike what happened in 2019, when Democrats alone voted to impeach the President and Republicans controlled the Senate, Majority Leader CHUCK SCHUMER is going to deny Secretary Mayorkas the ability to defend himself in a trial. He will not have the ability to defend himself in a trial.

It seems to me that the majority leader doesn't want to let Mayorkas defend himself in a trial for one of two reasons. The majority leader is either acting out of pure political interests to protect his incumbent Members who don't want to talk about Mayorkas's record and the wide-open border he has created and all the crime, drugs, and illegal immigration it is allowing; or the majority leader is just terrified of a trial exposing Mayorkas's failure to a degree that acquittal would be extremely painful for the Democrats to explain to the American people.

Here is what I don't understand. Democrats voted against a bill to stop illegal aliens from getting on a commercial flight with no verifiable ID. You have to; they don't. Democrats voted against deporting illegal aliens who hurt police. And Democrats voted against the Laken Riley Act, which simply requires ICE to take illegal aliens who commit crimes into custody before tragedies strike.

So it seems to me that Democrats have no problem voting to keep this border crisis going and blocking every attempt the Republicans make to stop the crime and secure the border. But when it comes to Secretary Mayorkas, they shut everything down and don't let him speak.

Secretary Mayorkas is a former prosecutor. Surely, he knows how to handle himself and defend his actions. He must believe that he has a case to present to the American people on why he should not be found guilty, but he is not going to get that chance. And Senate Democrats are setting a dangerous precedent and destroying the rules and traditions of the Senate to keep Mayorkas silent.

I have one question: Is Mayorkas being silenced because Democrats are terrified of his record and unable to defend him or because they don't trust him? Whatever the answer might be, I urge my Democratic colleagues to get over the discomfort that it is causing them and do what is right for the safety of American families.

The events of this weekend have shown, once again, that the world is a much more dangerous place under President Biden's failed leadership. If Democrats put politics over the safety of American families and the security of our great Nation, I fear the consequences will be devastating beyond our worst fears.

I want everybody to stop for one moment—just stop and think about their families; think about their mom or their dad or their sister or brother or their wife; think about their children or their grandchildren or their nieces and nephews. Since Biden took office, people like that, just like your family that you love and cherish—people like that—here is what has happened to them: Some have died in drug overdoses. Some have been raped. Some have been murdered. Some have been sold into slavery, basically.

It is devastating. I don't know how anybody could sit there and not care about people just like their mom, their dad, their brother, their sister, their spouse, their children, their grandchildren, or their nieces and nephews. But that is exactly what is going on here when we do not have the opportunity to hold Mayorkas accountable.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, the House managers have officially delivered the letters of impeachment for Department of Homeland Security Secretary Mayorkas to the Senate. Now is the time for every Senator to go on record.

Do you think Mayorkas has done a good job at the border? Has Mayorkas fulfilled the oath he swore before this body to protect and to defend our country against all threats, foreign and domestic? Is our border secure?

The answer is simple. Mayorkas has intentionally failed to do his job.

Now, Senator SCHUMER and the globalist Democrats have the opportunity to conduct a full and a fair trial before the entire Senate and the public. Unfortunately, that is not how this is going to play out. Democrats are going to try to table the Articles of Impeachment, which has never been done in the

history of the Senate. They are going to attempt to sweep the border crisis that President Biden has created under the rug.

Every single House Democrat voted to save Mayorkas's job. They endorsed our wide-open borders that have allowed terrorists, drug traffickers, and murderers into our country. The Democrats are lying to themselves and risking the lives of every American. Senator SCHUMER and the Democrats can't say they want to fix our border while voting to save Mayorkas's job.

Mayorkas has been derelict in his duty to secure the border in the 3 years he has been on the job. Our border is the least secure it has ever been. In fact, it is almost nonexistent. Our Border Patrol agents are so overwhelmed and receive such little support from the Biden administration to enforce our laws that they have been forced to release millions of illegal immigrants into the United States. And those who are released on parole, they are even given work permits.

The Biden administration is more concerned with taking care of illegal aliens than they are about protecting American citizens. We might as well start mailing every criminal, drug trafficker, and terrorist an open invitation to cross our borders.

I have spoken numerous times on this floor to highlight stories of Americans who have died at the hands of illegal aliens. Their tragic deaths are a direct result of Secretary Mayorkas's inaction. Mayorkas and Joe Biden have blood on their hands.

The most important responsibility of any sovereign nation is the safety of its citizens. Yet what did the Department of Homeland Security announce just last week? They plan on sending another \$300 million to communities receiving illegal aliens from this border crisis.

The top priority of this administration is to let as many people in as quickly as possible, regardless of how many American lives are lost in the process.

The number of people crossing into the United States who are on the Terrorist Watchlist is unprecedented. Just last week, it was reported that an Afghan on the FBI Terror Watchlist has been in the United States for almost a year. He is a member of a U.S.-designated terrorist group responsible for the deaths of at least nine American soldiers and civilians in Afghanistan. ICE arrested him in San Antonio just this past February. Unfortunately, this known terrorist has been released on bond. He is now roaming our neighborhoods.

You know, it just isn't terrorists we have to worry about. Fentanyl is flowing freely across our borders, and it is killing hundreds of thousands of Americans—not thousands but hundreds of thousands. Law enforcement officers in my State of Alabama tell me, time and again, how their officers must wear heavy equipment and carry Narcan

spray to protect themselves from the fentanyl that is pouring into our communities. And, by the way, most will tell you they never heard of fentanyl until this administration came into power.

Despite the critical need to secure our borders and discourage illegal immigration, Mayorkas has been traveling the world—yes, this Mayorkas, traveling the world—lecturing other countries about their national security, while his refusal to enforce U.S. laws has exposed his own country to an invasion. It is embarrassing.

In February, he traveled to Austria to speak with Chinese officials about counter-narcotic efforts. Did he discuss with them the flood of Chinese illegal immigrants coming to the United States through the southwest border? Since October of last year, 22,000 Chinese nationals have been arrested by Border Patrol agents at the southwest border and released into our country. Most of these individuals are single adult males of military age.

Yet, the media tries to act like all these people crossing the border are innocent women and children. Now, some of them are, but most are not.

This invasion is more than a border crisis; it is a national crisis. Yet I seriously doubt Mayorkas even brought up that point in his meeting with the Chinese officials.

In February, he was in Germany for the Munich Security Conference. The Munich Security Conference is the largest international security meeting in the world. Mayorkas was there giving speeches on strengthening global security and partnerships. Meanwhile, the border he is responsible for is wide open, and thousands of people are dying. Give me a break. Our allies must be laughing at us—absolutely laughing.

The Secretary's priority should be here in our country, securing our borders, protecting our citizens. President Biden has made the United States a joke around the world.

Under this administration, nearly 10 million people have invaded our country. Every State is now a border State—every State. This is not a gray area.

Secretary Mayorkas has intentionally failed to do his job. He has personally lied to me to my face three times in the last 3 years—a U.S. Senator. Just tell me the truth. He can't say the truth. He can't tell you the truth.

To my Democratic colleagues, have you read the heartbreaking stories of innocent Americans who have been murdered by illegal aliens? Are you concerned? Are you concerned about the safety of your spouses, your kids, your nieces and nephews? Does it worry you that hundreds of terrorists are flooding our country? Does that bother you at all? Do you know somebody who has died of fentanyl which was trafficked into our country by cartels?

This isn't about politics, folks. Our national security and our country's fu-

ture are at stake. Americans deserve to know the truth about how Secretary Mayorkas has intentionally failed to secure the border.

I will be voting to hold Mayorkas accountable.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, we have a job to do. That job is not optional. It is assigned to us by the United States Constitution—a document to which we have all sworn an oath under article I, section 3, clause 6. The Senate has the power and, I would add here, the duty to try all impeachments—not just some impeachments, not just those impeachments with which the majority party feels really happy about looking into, but all impeachments. It is the way it has always been in U.S. history.

When the House sends over Articles of Impeachment, if we have jurisdiction, which we clearly, plainly do here, it is our job to conduct a trial. What do I mean by that? Well, it is really a simple concept. In Articles of Impeachment, an accusation is made. Our job is to just decide whether that accusation is meritorious or not, whether the thing that has been accused is legitimate, whether the person who has been accused did the thing that was wrong—committed the high crime or misdemeanors spoken of in the Constitution.

We have a job to do, and it is a job that the Senate has always done when we have jurisdiction following the adoption of Articles of Impeachment.

Now, let's remember, this is a historic day. This hasn't happened very often. It is only the 22nd time in American history in which Articles of Impeachment have been adopted by the House. In this circumstance where we clearly, plainly have jurisdiction, there is no valid basis for us to do anything other than to decide whether the accusations are legitimate. We have to do that. We don't have the luxury of simply standing back and saying: Ah, we don't want to handle it.

Now, I know, I know, the Senate has found ways of shirking its responsibility over and over and over again in all of the operations of the Senate's work. Sometimes—most of the time, we sit as a legislative body, where we consider legislation. We pass law or decline to do so. Other times, we sit in an executive capacity, where we review Presidential nominations to consider them, whether we should confirm them, and also consider treaties. That is in an executive capacity. We also sometimes sit as a Court of Impeachment.

Now, in other areas, the Senate has found ways of shirking its responsibilities. We have handed off a whole lot of the lawmaking power to unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats in the executive branch. In our executive capacity, we have whittled down the number of executive branch nominees who are subject to Senate confirmation, even as

the total volume of those individuals has increased. Now it seems we are determined yet again to whittle down our responsibilities in the one area where we have an affirmative duty, an affirmative obligation, an affirmative command within the Constitution requiring us to make a decision.

In the immortal words of Rush, in one of my favorite Rush songs of all time, called "Freewill," if you choose not to decide, you still have made a choice. Yet that is what Senate Democrats are planning to ask us to do within 24 hours—ask us to not decide, ask us to take these accusations in these Articles of Impeachment duly passed by a majority of the House of Representatives, the body in the Congress that has the sole power to impeach—it is not just 218-plus random people who decided to make the accusations against Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas, who heads the U.S. Department of Homeland Security. No. It is those particular 218-plus people in the House of Representatives who have that power.

You see, there is a reason why the impeachment power belongs exclusively to the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives is within the legislative branch—the branch of the Federal Government most accountable to the people at the most regular intervals. Within the Congress, within the legislative branch, they are the body most accountable to the people at the most regular intervals. That is why they call it the People's House. They are the only ones entrusted with this power.

A majority of them, of that 435-Member body, has concluded that Alejandro Mayorkas must be impeached. Now, they didn't do it for light and transient reasons. They didn't do it because of a policy disagreement. No. A majority of the House of Representatives has chosen to impeach Secretary Mayorkas for the reason that he has affirmatively defied the commands of Federal law—the laws in particular that he is charged with administering.

They have identified at least seven or eight different provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, including section 235(b)(2)(A) and 235(b)(1)(B)(ii) and 236(c) and 236(a) and 212(d)(5)(A), just to mention a few of them.

These Articles of Impeachment outline a myriad of instances in which Secretary Mayorkas has been commanded decisively, unambiguously to detain illegal immigrants pending one action or another, pending one determination or another as to their eligibility either for immigration parole or for asylum or for something else. He is required to detain them, and he didn't detain them.

These are just a few examples of the many things that he has done in direct contravention to a direct command by the law. And it is not just that he didn't do the things that he was commanded to do; it is that he did the exact opposite of those things. He was commanded, for example, not to exercise his immigration parole authority

under 212(d)(5)(A). He is not allowed to do that categorically. He is allowed to do that only for discrete, individualized, particularized circumstances in which there is a profound, pronounced humanitarian or public need. Yet he issued all these categorical parole orders, creating categorical immigration parole programs allowing for literally hundreds of thousands of people a year to be brought into this country lawlessly, without documentation, without just cause to be brought into the United States. He made illegal immigrants legal by violating the affirmative command of the law.

It is not yet clear exactly what form the arguments presented by the Democrats tomorrow will take, but we do know this: Whether they call it a motion to dismiss or a motion to table, they want to not decide something that has to be decided, by order of the Constitution, by the Senate.

These accusations are real. They make a difference. They make a difference to the American people. These crimes—or I should say high crimes and misdemeanors—of which Secretary Mayorkas has been accused are not victimless crimes—far from it. These are offenses that have resulted in millions—on the low end, it is maybe 7 or 8 million; on the high end, it is more like 12, 13, or 14 million—of people who have come into this country unlawfully since January 20, 2021. The administration of Joe Biden has willfully, intentionally brought people into this country who aren't supposed to be here, who aren't allowed to be here. And it is not just the addition of those sheer numbers of people; it is the fact that among those people are many thousands of military-age Chinese males, many millions of military-age males from other countries, including hundreds of suspected terrorists, including thousands who come from countries that we pay close attention to because we know those countries are full of a lot of people who are bent on acts of lawlessness, violence, and terrorism against the United States of America.

This, of course, is just the beginning. This says nothing about the countless neighborhoods and schools and communities and jobs and lives that have been lost or violated or rendered unsafe or all of the above as a result of those who have been brought in not just with the acquiescence of but at the invitation of and with the assistance of the Secretary of Homeland Security, the very man whose job it is to protect us from those very things and who has very specific orders that he follows—orders that have been put into law by the Congress of the United States.

He is breaking the law over and over and over again specifically to allow for illegal immigration. So the Democrats are expected to come along tomorrow and say: Yeah, but we don't want to have to decide this. We don't want to have to decide it because, well, it is an election year, President Biden is on the ballot, and this is already an area

where he is not doing well. And we have other Members of this body, including, you know, a certain Senator from Montana, for example, or maybe a certain Senator from Ohio, for example, or a Senator from Pennsylvania, among others, who are going to be up for reelection.

Sure, they would rather not have to address this. I understand why they would rather be doing something else, anything else, other than this. They would rather reorganize their sock drawer. Some of them would probably much rather have a root canal or another painful procedure without anesthesia than focus on this. But, alas, the Constitution is agnostic as to your sock-reorganization days. The Constitution doesn't care how often you go to the dentist and whether you get a root canal with or without anesthesia. But, you know, the Constitution does care about one thing in particular and very relevant here today, and that is that the Senate is to try all impeachments.

This is an impeachment. We have to try it, particularly in the absence of the case being rendered moot by a vacancy in office or death or otherwise—circumstances that are noticeably absent here. We have the duty to do this.

What happens when we don't? What happens if they get their way and they choose either to table or to dismiss or use some other fancy word to try to avoid doing their job? What happens? Well, more deaths occur—deaths like the tragic passing of Laken Riley, who was taken from us just a few weeks ago as a result of Secretary Mayorkas's lawless conduct along the border. But for his lawless conduct and his cavalier treatment of the law—in fact, his defiant refusal to abide by the law and, in fact, his dogged determination to break the law—Laken Riley would have still been alive. Countless others who have undergone horrific events within their families—murders, rapes, sexual assaults, robberies, drunk driving—all kinds of horrific trauma that the American people have endured. Some of that is going to happen from people who live here already. We shouldn't add to that by bringing in others who shouldn't be here to begin with. This is exactly the kind of thing that our immigration laws are designed to protect against.

As one who spent 2 years living and working along our southern border—living and working among and with the poorest of the poor, including many immigrants themselves, recent immigrants, in many cases—I can tell you, there is no group of people who has more cause to fear uncontrolled waves of illegal immigration than recent immigrants themselves, including, and especially, the poor who live on or near a border. It is their jobs, it is their families, it is their schools, it is their neighborhoods, it is their homes that are most directly put in jeopardy every single time we fail or, in the case of Secretary Mayorkas, we adamantly

refuse to obey and enforce the law and we do everything that we can to undermine it as he has done.

There is no set of arguments I can imagine—I look forward to hearing what arguments might be had tomorrow, might be presented tomorrow—that could be presented with any kind of a straight face that could say we need not address the merits of this accusation—because there are none.

Perhaps, they will argue that this is an accusation amounting to mere maladministration—he didn't do a good job. That is not at all what we have here. Even if that is what we have here, that still wouldn't mean that they didn't have to try the case and come up with an answer as to whether or not he did what they said he did.

But the impeachment power goes back some, you know, two and a half centuries to the dawn of the Republic. Nearly two and a half centuries ago, when we became a country, we relied heavily on the legal systems—a tradition, in some cases—of the terminology used in England. And during the early years of the Republic, we had individuals who were familiar with our Constitution who were also familiar, having practiced in the law at the time of the Revolution and some cases before then—they knew the meaning of these words.

Supreme Court Justice Joseph Story is one of those individuals who lived, practiced, and wrote at and after the time of the American Revolution, during the early decades of our young Republic. And he explained that, among other things, an impeachment could be found, high crime and misdemeanor could be committed where, for instance, a lord admiral who was found to have neglected the safeguard of the sea. It is, perhaps, the most directly analogous comparison he makes to the Secretary of Homeland Security, that would be, you know, best described perhaps as a dereliction of duty, a failure to do one's job. If that—a lord admiral neglecting the safeguard of the sea—if that was a high crime and misdemeanor, it follows for sure—it is even more certain—that the Secretary of Homeland Security, having defied more than a half dozen direct commands of Federal law and done the exact opposite of those things, has also committed a high crime and misdemeanor.

Now, maybe some in this body disagree. Maybe some in this body believe that the facts are different than they have been alleged here. Well, that is what a trial is for. That is why we don't just take the word of the House of Representatives for it. We do our job over here. We have to review the accusation, and we have to review it against the backdrop of what arguments and evidence they present to us.

We will be sworn in tomorrow at 1 p.m. to be finders of fact and to be judges of law relevant to the impeachment accusation. If we decide not to decide, we still have made a choice. We

shouldn't do that here. Doing that here would be a dereliction of duty. Doing that here would be profoundly disrespectful to the hundreds of millions of Americans who elected us and, especially, to the families of those—like the family of Laken Riley and countless others—whose lives have been permanently and tragically disrupted by the lawlessness exhibited by Secretary Mayorkas.

We must do our job. We must hold a trial. That trial must culminate in a finding of guilt or innocence. The Constitution and our commitment to it requires nothing less.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). The Senator from Ohio.

TRIBUTE TO D. TAYLOR

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise early this evening to recognize D. Taylor, a fierce labor advocate, a key partner in our fight for workers in this country, a friend who retired from his role as President of UNITE HERE earlier this month. Everything D. has done—and I have watched him closely; I have worked closely with him. Everything D. has done over the course of his career comes back to the dignity of work, the idea that hard work should pay off for everyone, whether you punch a clock, whether you swipe a badge, whether you work in an office, whether you work for tips, whether you are raising children, or whether you are caring for an aging parent.

The dignity of work has guided D. Taylor through his whole career as he fought to unionize industries that have long been overlooked with workers who have long been underpaid and ignored.

For the past 12 years, D. served as President of UNITE HERE, a union that represents workers across the hospitality industry. Its members work in airports, in food service, in hotels. They make textiles; they serve on Amtrak trains; they cross the Nation.

It is not a coincidence we have seen momentum in the labor movement while D. has been at the helm of UNITE HERE. So often, where we have seen unprecedented union growth, D. and his members have been on the frontlines organizing, invigorating, calling for change. This generation—this youngest generation now—is quantifiably, certainly, the most pro-labor generation of our lifetimes.

Under D., UNITE HERE has become one of the fastest growing trade unions in the country. Despite a pandemic that devastated workers in hospitality, D. has actually expanded UNITE HERE. He focused on southern States and right-to-work States—much harder States to organize than the Presiding Officer's State of Maine or mine in Ohio—not that it is easy in those States with Federal law but even harder in those southern States.

Workers, traditionally, haven't had a seat at the table. During his time as president, D. oversaw the union's organizing of 140,000 service and hospitality workers in over 1,000 workplaces across

the country. Because of D. and UNITE HERE, these workers now have a union card. That means higher pay; it means better benefits; it means safer workplaces; and it means something that many don't think about: It means more control over your schedule.

I remember being in Nevada at the Culinary Workers Union Local 226, which D. built into a powerhouse. That union is an inspiration for workers everywhere. They had a massive banner on the wall that said "One job should be enough"; that workers should not have to have two and three jobs to support their families.

"One job should be enough."

I remember—this wasn't directly about D., but I will never forget this discussion I had in Cincinnati. I was at an AFL-CIO dinner. There were a number of people—probably 300 people there. And there was one table where there were four or five middle-aged women. I sat down—they had an empty seat and said: Join us. And I sat down at the table and said: Tell me your story.

They said: We just organized custodial workers. We had our first contract—1,200 custodial workers negotiating with the downtown business owners in Cincinnati. They said: We signed our first contract.

I said: What does that mean to you?

A woman said: I am 51 years old. It is the first time I have a paid one-week vacation.

Those are the workers so often that D. Taylor organizes—workers who are generally low-paid, workers sometimes without healthcare, workers often without vacations, workers that have no say over their schedule. Those are the people that D. worked with. D. always said: One job should be enough. That is what he fought for.

He first got involved as a college student while working in a local restaurant. He joined the union. He eventually became the shop steward for that local. After graduation, he moved to Nevada to work on a UNITE HERE strike. He quietly moved up through the ranks, eventually leading the union in a 7-year—the famous 7-year Frontier Casino strike, one of the longest successful strikes in labor history. D. became a key player in negotiations with some of the largest casinos on the strip.

He became an institution at UNITE HERE. As a head of the Culinary Union, he built a coalition of service workers. He showed the country there is no reason a service job can't be a good job where you are respected, make good wages, and build a career.

As Gaming Division Director, he led casino workers across the country to victory, organizing new members and leading new strikes. He went on to be the general vice president of UNITE HERE before being elected as union president.

All along the way, he became known for that constant refrain: "One job should be enough." Let me say that

one more time: One job should be enough. For everybody in this institution, that is kind of the way it is. But for far too many low-paid workers, they have to work a second job or third job to pay the rent, to support their kids, to just get along every day.

He has fought to make that rally cry a reality by transforming standards for work in hospitality and services. It has meant securing higher pay. It has meant fighting for contracts with affordable, quality healthcare that workers have access to and can navigate their way through. It has meant standing up to layoffs. It has meant helping tens of thousands of workers get their jobs. Because of D., workers across the country are in better jobs with better pay and better benefits.

I have had the privilege of working with D. on many issues, including fighting for the Senate's dining workers. Believe it or not, the people who served us in this institution were making very suboptimal wages—some, barely enough. One man I met when I was involved in this actually lived and worked here all day and lived and worked at a homeless shelter all night. Imagine that.

One job should be enough.

They served the Senate during a pandemic, during a violent insurrection. Every day, they fed Senators and staff and tourists from Ohio and Maine and all over the country. Yet fewer than one in five of them, at that time, could afford the health insurance plan that was offered to them.

Together, we fought to make sure the new contract honors the dignity of work with the pay and the benefits and the respect that Senate dining workers deserve and have earned—that all workers deserve and have earned. It wouldn't have happened without D., without UNITE HERE, without the Senate dining workers who used their voices and their collective power to secure a better contract. That is just one example.

In every role, at every opportunity, D. has fought to turn jobs that traditionally have come with low pay and minimal benefits into careers where people can build a life and see a future—simply the dignity of work, where their work has dignity. For that, we are grateful for D.'s tenacity, for his advocacy. And for his leadership, we are grateful.

In retirement, D., of course, will keep fighting for workers as chair of UNITE HERE Health, and he will support the union and gaming industry. He will never fully retire.

I look forward to working with his successor, Gwen Mills, the current secretary treasurer of UNITE HERE, the first-ever woman president in this union's history to be elected to an international union; the first-ever woman in this union's history to ever be elected international union president in a union that has a huge number of women, as you know.

If you love this country, you fight for the people who make it work. That is

exactly what D. has done his whole life. It is what UNITE HERE has done. It is what I will continue to work with my colleagues to do in this body.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

ISRAEL

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, it has been just 6 months and a week since October 7. The whole world was shaken as a flood, as they actually called it, an Al-Aqsa flood of Hamas terrorists came through the wall separating Gaza and Israel in multiple places, and over the next several hours, they murdered 1,200 Israelis. They took 253 hostage, including 133 who are still hostage still today—6 months and a week.

Last week—now, I guess, 9 days ago—I was in Israel. I spent time with Israelis to meet with multiple different leaders and get a chance just to be able to talk to different folks in different parts of the country to see what is going on, on the ground.

This is a painful moment for the entire world but definitely a painful moment for Israel and for the entire region. We think back just 7 months ago and all the conversation was normalization between Saudi Arabia and Israel. And then a group of Hamas terrorists stepped in and killed as many people as they possibly could in an effort to also kill that normalization that is happening around the entire region, to do whatever they could to be able to drive a wedge, and so that peace could not continue to advance in the region.

What has happened since then has been painful for the entire world to watch, but it has been really painful for the people in that region more than anyone else.

I traveled to the far southern tip of Israel, along the border with Egypt, to be able to meet with some of the folks who are in that area, to be able to talk about the relationship between Egypt and Israel and what is happening day to day. I traveled to the kibbutzes that literally are right on the border with Gaza that are now vacant and empty and devastated.

I can't even begin to explain to this body, unless you have seen it before, the pain of walking through a large kibbutz where there were hundreds of people who lived just a few months ago and now to see every building shot up with bullet holes, burned, destroyed, and think at 6:38 that morning, during a Jewish holiday, on that Saturday morning, October 7, many people were still asleep when a group of Hamas terrorists came into their homes and murdered many in that village and took many hostages from that kibbutz.

We could literally walk by the doors, and the person who was walking with us could say: That family died, that family is a hostage, that family died, and go door-to-door as we walked around to be able to see it.

The person who was walking us through could even walk us through

his own home, which was obliterated, and his son's home right there who died, and then he could point to Gaza and say: My other son is over there in Gaza right now.

At the same time, flowers were blooming and the grounds were beautiful and you realize the irony of this moment. Hostages being held in Gaza, families who are struggling every single day trying to make sense of this craziness and trying to figure out why a peaceful kibbutz, living their lives, farming, manufacturing, was overrun by a group of terrorists.

Right up the road we stopped by the Nova festival site, which is an absolutely beautiful location for outdoor concerts, for venues, for gathering, and has been for years. The trees and the setting, it is just beautiful. But the day that we were there, there were echoing noises of artillery that was being fired off literally within hundreds of yards of us as we were meeting with some of the folks who survived the Nova festival.

One person in particular whom we got a chance to be able to chat with and to be able to pick her brain about the "what happens next" was in one of the bomb shelters because there was a launch of missiles coming at them, but then those bomb shelters became places where literally they were sitting ducks for the terrorists as they came in with gunfire.

We traveled all the way to the north, had the opportunity to be able to visit with some of the mayors who are right along the border with Syria and with Lebanon, where whole towns are evacuated, whole towns where people can't survive the onslaught of artillery coming at them constantly.

We lose track of the fact that there are about a quarter million Israelis right now who are internally displaced as well, who live along the border with Gaza or live along the border with Lebanon or Syria. Those folks have also had to flee because while the world in the last several days has talked about 330 drone strikes, missile strikes, ballistics and cruise missiles that have come from Iran directly, for some reason, the world has lost track of the fact, not about the 330 bombs and missiles that have come at Israel in the last week, but the 12,000 rockets that have been fired at Israel since October 7—12,000.

Mr. President, 9,100 of those rockets have come in from Gaza launching at civilians in Israel; 3,100 of those rockets have been launched from Lebanon, from Hezbollah, into the north of Israel; and 35 rockets have been fired from Syria at Israel.

And I asked people: How many rockets would be fired at your house before you would respond in a way to be able to make it stop? Israel has had 12,000 fired at them since October 7. The United States has never ever put up with that without responding in a forceful way to say we are going to make it stop.

There has been a lot of conversation about Rafah, so I had a lot of conversa-

tions with Israeli leadership to be able to talk to them about the plan and what they are going to do.

You see there are Hamas brigades. Now, when we think about terrorism, often it is just random terrorists who are gathering. But Hamas actually has a military structure with brigades that they have actually put together of fighting brigades. Most of those brigades have been broken up. The remaining brigades of Hamas terrorists are all living underground at Rafah.

And while we need to do everything we can—and I had great conversations with Israelis about everything that they are doing to protect civilians and protect civilian lives that have nothing to do with this onslaught of terrorism, they are also keenly aware that the people who are living underground in Rafah are making public statements on social media that as soon as this war is over, they are coming again to do another October 7. And the Israelis are being very, very clear: We are not going to allow that to happen. We are not going to allow our Israeli citizens to be slaughtered in their beds early on a Saturday morning again.

So they are doing everything they can to be able to prepare for that moment, to be able to stop the group of terrorists who are living underground. It is interesting to me when I think about the Hamas terrorist organization. In the United States, our military trains and prepares itself to get between violence and civilians. Hamas does the opposite. Hamas actually trains and equips to put civilians between its military and violence.

They put the civilians on the top layer while the safe shelters underground are occupied by the terrorist armies. It is stunning to me just the mental difference between the two and how jarring that that really is.

Interesting conversations I had with some of the Israeli leadership, as well, just to be able to chat with them, to say: You can't eliminate Hamas by trying to be able to attack them over and over again to be able to eliminate all people who think like Hamas and who are actually a part of Hamas.

And their response was interesting to me. Their response was that we fully understand we are not going to obliterate everyone who is in Hamas. We want to stop the threat that is coming at us, but we understand that there will be members of Hamas in the future who will still think that way. And their response to me was there are still Nazis in the world right now. There are still people who claim to be a Nazi or a neo-Nazi right now, but the difference is, they don't run Germany. And their first goal was that we want to end Hamas's rule, a terrorist organization having the capacity to run the entity right next door to us.

We understand that there will still be people who think like that, but we want to show them there is a better way. And we still want to be able to have peace with our neighbors.

You see, this connection between Hezbollah and Syria and Hamas is Iran's plan and has been for a long time to build what they are calling a ring of fire around Israel. It was their way of protecting themselves—for the Iranian regime—that if they made it so violent around Israel, Israel would never actually attack Iran. That was their plan.

What is interesting was Israel has been working to be able to build a ring of ice around Iran. That is the Abraham Accords. As Iran is trying to make the region more violent, Israel is trying to make the region more peaceful. It is stark when it is side by side, isn't it? Israel is working to build relationships and has with UAE and with Bahrain.

They have had longstanding relationships with Jordan and with Egypt. They are working in their relationship with Saudi Arabia as they have even added Morocco into the Abraham Accords.

They are building a ring of ice into the region to bring the temperature down in a violent, hostile area, and for the folks who are in Hamas, they hate the thought of that because they don't want normalization; they want violence and control. And as they scream, "from the river to the sea," they mean the death of every Israeli, and, quite frankly, every Jew worldwide. And they have been clear about that.

Now, what do we need to do as Americans? I think we need to be attentive in several areas. One is, Russia has formed an alliance with Iran. Many of the weapon systems that are being shot right now at Ukrainians are actually Iranian weapon systems, and we should not ignore that. This alliance between Russia and Iran continues to grow. In just the past several years, Russia has dramatically increased its number of military bases in Syria.

They have now gone over 100 there, and there are 103 bases now in Syria that are Russian active bases. We should pay attention to that.

For Iran, we have seen clearly what they are doing, how they continue to attack. Again, there is this focus on 330 drones, cruise missiles, and ballistic missiles that were fired at Israel just this past week. What people may not be tracking is what continues to happen from Lebanon, with the Iranian-backed Hezbollah continuing to attack Israel.

Just in the past 24 hours, Hezbollah has attacked northern Israeli communities and cities six times in the last 24 hours. But, of course, no media is covering that. But if you are in one of the communities that is now vacant in northern Israel—and that they fled and they are living in hotels or with relatives or fled to some other location from northern Israel—they are keenly aware of what continues to happen there.

We have got to deal with the continued threat and awakening from Russia, but we have got to also think seriously about what is happening with the re-

gime in Iran. We, as a nation, have tried to pacify Iran. We tried to isolate them diplomatically.

Now, I don't call for a military attack on Iran. No one wants violence and war. We are not interested in our sons and daughters being involved in another conflict. But to think that Iran is going to suddenly be peaceful, when their regime is intent on trying to destroy Israel at the time, should awaken all of us to the reality of where Iran really is.

It was also good to be able to see, when 330 projectiles were coming at Israel this week, that the Americans stood by their side. They shot down a lot of those. The Israelis obviously shot down the majority of them. But the British also were engaged in shooting those down. We had French that were engaged. But also the Jordanians were engaged. The Saudis were engaged. The region is pushing back on a violent Iran that is intent on making the region worse and more unstable, not better.

Iran has used the vacuum of what has happened in Syria to move in their radicalism across Syria, and they continue to make it a more and more toxic place in Syria and in Iraq.

We, as the United States, should turn up our sanctions even more. We, as the United States, should isolate Iran even more. We, as the United States, should use every leverage that we have to isolate not only their economy but to be able to be focused in on that regime, because, quite frankly, that regime is oppressing its own people.

Our problem, as a nation, is not the Iranian people. They are living under the oppression of the Iranian regime as well. It is the regime that is there. And while some Members of this body have called for a change in leadership in Israel, I would call for a change in leadership in Iran, because that is really the problem in the region.

And we should find ways to be able to apply as much pressure as we can on that regime and to be able to message to the people of Iran, as often as we possibly can: We see you in the oppression that you live under every single day, and we wish better for you—for well-educated young men and women who live under the oppressive thumb of that leadership.

Something else we can do as the United States is to stop allowing our soil to be the place where the Iranian regime can spew their hatred. This Thursday, the Iranian Foreign Minister is flying to the United States to be able to speak to a group of people at the U.N., and our administration has given him a visa.

I have called on Secretary Blinken to say, literally: This is one of the Iranian leaders who is a leading voice in the IRGC, who is a leading voice in the attack, in the preparation for October 7, who is a leading voice of hatred toward the United States and the West and our ally Israel. We should not extend a visa while Iran is attacking actively from

their soil and from all of their proxies. We should not extend a visa to the Iranian Foreign Minister to come stand on our soil, in our country, and spew his hatred. If he wants to do that internationally, he can.

Now, I understand the U.N. is a body and a place where we have allowed voices from all over the world to come speak. But do you know what? There was a moment when President Obama denied a visa to Iranian leaders because of where they were. There was a moment when President Trump also denied some visas to some of the Iranian leaders because of what they were actively doing.

This is a moment when President Biden and Secretary Blinken should tell the Iranian Foreign Minister: Not this week, not right now, not at all.

When you are attacking our friends, we should not loan them bits of our soil to do it from our territory. We should make it clear that the Iranian leadership that oppresses its own people and attacks our allies—and, by the way, uses their proxies to murder Americans who are also serving in the region—we should make it very clear: We will not allow that on our soil.

I made it clear when I was in Israel that the people of the United States see the people of Israel. We understand what they are living under. And, as a nation that has faced terrorism in our Nation, we understand the emotion that they have at this point, and we understand their tenacity.

We, as the United States, should be very clear: We have an ally, and it is Israel. We are going to walk with her. We are going to help Israel in every way that we can because she has been attacked and is in the middle of the war.

And when you walk through the streets of Tel Aviv or Jerusalem, you feel it. Just like when you are walking through the streets along the border with Gaza and Lebanon and Syria, you feel it. They are ready for peace. And Israel is actively building a ring of ice in the region to bring down the temperature of the region to push back directly on Iran's ring of fire.

We, as a Nation, should be clear on which one we support—those who are bringing peace or those who are bringing violence and hatred? We should make that continually clear and continue to be able to act on it diplomatically and, when we need to, to protect our allies in every way we can, like we did this week with Israel.

Let's pray for the peace of Jerusalem, but let's also stand by her.

With that, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma.

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

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

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. WARNOCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions: S. Res. 645 and S. Res. 646.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. WARNOCK. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. WARNOCK. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

ISRAEL

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, as most everybody knows, Iran recently launched several hundred drones and missiles at Israel. Fortunately, there were no fatalities. This attack was Iran's response to an Israeli airstrike on their consulate in Damascus, Syria, on April 1—an attack which killed seven Iranian officials. I applaud President Biden for doing what he can to make sure that this conflict does not get out of hand, does not escalate, and does not create what would be a disastrous regional war.

But while we pay attention to this developing Israeli-Iran crisis, I hope very much that we will not lose sight of the unprecedented humanitarian disaster now taking place in Gaza. We must not lose sight of that disaster.

As I am sure all Americans know, the war in Gaza began on October 7, when Hamas, a terrorist organization, invaded Israel, killed some 1,200 innocent men, women, and children, and took over 230 people into captivity, many of whom are still being held.

It has always been my view that Israel had a right to defend itself, respond to this attack, and to go after Hamas. It is also my view that Israel does not have the right to go to war against the entire Palestinian people, which is exactly what the Netanyahu government is doing.

Let us take a deep breath and understand that what is happening right now in Gaza is horrendous, it is inhumane, and it is in gross violation of American and international law. It is driven by extreme, rightwing Israeli Government officials and a government which is increasingly dominated by religious fundamentalists. That is who is driving this humanitarian disaster in Gaza.

What should be most troubling to the American people is that we as Americans are complicit because it is U.S. taxpayer dollars that have helped create this unprecedented humanitarian disaster.

Let me briefly describe what is going on in Gaza because it is so easy, in a world full of problems—the media focuses on this, focuses on that. Congress focuses on this and that. It is so easy to turn away from the tragedy in Gaza, but we must not do that.

There are about 2.2 million people living in Gaza—2.2 million—mostly poor and struggling people. Before the war—before the war—Gaza was a very poor and desperate area. Let us not forget the important fact that before the war, some 70 percent of young people in Gaza were unemployed. That was before the war.

Since this war began, over 33,000 Palestinians have been killed and 77,000 wounded. Unbelievably, 5 percent—5 percent—of the residents of Gaza have been either killed or wounded in a 6-month period—5 percent of their entire population. Two-thirds of those who have been killed or wounded are women and children.

Since the war began, 1.7 million people—over 75 percent of the population of Gaza—have been driven from their homes. Let me repeat it. Three-quarters of the population have been driven out of their homes. These people—poor, and many of them are children—do not know whether they will ever return; pushed out, not knowing where they are going to go, where they are going to sleep—three-quarters of the people of Gaza.

Over 60 percent—60 percent—of the housing units in Gaza have been damaged or destroyed. This housing destruction is unprecedented in the modern history of the world—60 percent of housing units damaged or destroyed.

But it is not just housing. Israel has systematically destroyed the healthcare system in Gaza. Gaza had 36 hospitals before the war. Now just 11 are partially operational despite the tens of thousands of injuries and hundreds of thousands of ill people. Persistent attacks on healthcare facilities have killed more than 1,200 workers.

I have spoken with several American doctors who have returned from missions to Gaza. They tell of operating for hours on end in crowded hospitals with little electricity or clean water or medical supplies. They have had to perform surgeries—including on children—without anesthesia. They have to try to sterilize and reuse medical gauze. Thousands of women have had to give birth in these inhumane and dangerous conditions, and healthcare workers report a major increase in miscarriages. It is a healthcare nightmare.

But it is not just housing and the healthcare system that are being destroyed by the Netanyahu government; it is the physical civilian infrastructure in Gaza as well. More than half of the water and sanitation systems have

been put out of commission. Only one of three water pipelines is operating. Clean drinking water is severely limited. Sewage, raw sewage, is running through the streets of Gaza, spreading disease. As we speak tonight, there is virtually no electricity in Gaza.

But it is not just housing and healthcare and infrastructure that are being destroyed. There are 12 universities in Gaza—12 universities. Unbelievably, each and every one of them has been either damaged or destroyed—universities. In addition, primary and secondary schools have also been completely disrupted. Over 600,000 children have no access to education.

As horrible as all of this is, there is something happening now that is even worse, and that is what these photographs speak to. Hundreds of thousands of Palestinian children face starvation. The people of Gaza are struggling to survive from day to day, foraging for leaves, eating animal feed, or splitting the occasional aid packages amongst their family. Even in Rafah, where aid is consistently distributed, people are desperately short of basic supplies, including food and water. In the north, the situation is far more desperate. At least 28 children have died of malnutrition and dehydration already—28 children—but the real toll is likely much, much higher.

Without food and clean water, with sanitation systems destroyed, and with little healthcare available, hundreds of thousands of people in Gaza are at severe risk of dehydration, infection, and easily preventable diseases.

Let me repeat once again. As we speak, hundreds of thousands of children are at risk of terrible deaths.

Let us be very clear. The conditions that the people in Gaza are experiencing today are the direct result of Israel's arbitrary restrictions on the aid getting into Gaza. This is not a matter of debate; it is an obvious reality that numerous—numerous—humanitarian organizations have repeatedly confirmed.

Israeli leaders themselves admit it. At the start of this war, the Israeli Defense Minister declared a total siege, saying:

We are fighting human animals, and we are acting accordingly. . . . There will be no electricity, no food, no fuel, everything is closed.

In January, Prime Minister Netanyahu said openly that Israel is only allowing in the absolute minimum amount of aid necessary.

Tragically, the Israeli Government has lived up to those words. For months, thousands of trucks carrying lifesaving supplies have sat just miles away from starving children, prevented from reaching their destination by unreasonable Israeli restrictions and a military campaign conducted with little regard for civilian life. Trucks with food a few miles away from children who are starving—Israel is stopping those trucks.

The world saw evidence of that several weeks ago when seven aid workers