

true for generation after generation, until a MAGA group of Republicans decided that they were anti-immigrant.

Let's not forget, President Reagan, President H. W. Bush, and President George W. Bush were all pro-immigration until this 180-degree reversal by the Republican Party to be anti-immigrant, which hurts America.

Of course, we need to secure our borders—of course. No one denies that. But to just bash immigrants is bad for America, bad for America.

Fighting for Dreamers and pushing for comprehensive immigration reform is one of the issues that has burned strongest inside me since I joined the Senate. I was proud of leading the Gang of 8—bipartisan—with John McCain over 10 years ago to pass comprehensive immigration reform, which passed the House with strong bipartisan support. I think it got 68 or 69 votes before House Republicans killed the bill—House Republicans poisoned by the thinking of the MAGA Republicans in their midst.

I celebrate today's announcement. But Congress must do its part. Republicans must stop getting in the way of meaningful, comprehensive immigration reform and getting in the way of border security. They wouldn't even support our tough border bill, put together with bipartisan efforts.

We are going to keep working until we get the job done, both in securing the border and in making America welcome to many immigrants who will work hard and become American citizens eventually.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, it has been a few weeks now since most of America's college students went home for the summer. The outbreak of organized hate that swept the campuses of the Nation's so-called elite universities has somewhat quieted down. Apparently, even the most zealous of Hamasnik tent-dwellers had summer plans to attend to. Some, no doubt, expect to join the radical road show for a reunion tour of Chicago during the Democratic National Convention in August—as if Chicago's own soft-on-crime politicians haven't done enough to damage what used to be a thriving city.

But even as places like Berkeley and George Washington University are cleaned and repaired after their occupation by Marxist vandals, the shameful events of this past spring have left deep and lasting scars. At Columbia, the task force responsible for investigating rampant anti-Semitism on campus in the wake of October 7 has

released a new report, and the findings are chilling. On top of well-documented outbursts by student radicals, members of Columbia's faculty turned classrooms into safe spaces to indulge the world's oldest form of hate. So I would like to share with our colleagues some of the initial coverage of the report.

One professor encountering a Jewish-sounding surname while reading names before an exam asked the student to explain their views on the Israeli government's actions in Gaza. Another told their class to avoid reading mainstream media, declaring that "it is owned by Jews." A third revealed a student's complaint about an offensive comment regarding Jews by publicly displaying their email to fellow students.

This isn't coming from the professional activists who swept in to occupy the academy. It is coming from the heart of the academy itself. The rot runs deep. It is impossible to ignore. The scourge of anti-Semitism is a blight on once-prestigious institutions across our country, and unfortunately it reaches from college campuses right here to the U.S. Capitol.

Next month, a growing list of elected Democrats will boycott a joint session of Congress welcoming the duly elected leader of the world's only Jewish State and the only democracy in that region.

Their plans, of course, are predictable. When Prime Minister Netanyahu last addressed Congress in 2015, nearly 60 Members refused to attend. In the years since, Washington Democrats have ceded more and more influence to despicable causes like the Boycott, Divest, and Sanction movement and to high-profile newcomers who traffic in unvarnished anti-Semitism.

I am proud to live in a country that, as our former colleague Ben Sasse has put it, protects people's rights to make abject idiots of themselves, and far too many powerful people have taken the horrific attacks of October 7 as an invitation to do exactly that. But I am also proud to live in a country that the world expects to stand with our allies, and the President's conduct towards America's closest ally is straining that expectation. Unfortunately, so is the conduct of other elected Democrats.

Grotesque attempts to interfere in Israel's politics by calling for the removal—the removal—of its Prime Minister have lowered the bar for outrageous behavior, and micromanagement and withholding assistance have repeatedly made Israel's task to restore its security and bring terrorists to justice even more difficult.

Next month's joint session ought to be an opportunity to demonstrate to the world that America's commitments to allies facing existential threats cannot be held hostage by the loudest fringes of our politics, that they are not at the mercy of our lapses in moral clarity.

The last thing a sovereign democracy under siege needs is a public tongue-lashing from the White House or a

scolding speech from the floor of the Senate. Israel needs the weapons the President has withheld. It needs the time and space to finish the job against terrorists trying to destroy it. It needs the freedom to operate on its own timetable based on tactical reality in the Middle East, not on the political whims in Washington. And Americans should be united in support.

NOMINATION OF NANCY L. MALDONADO

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, now on another matter, I need to return today to another of the Biden administration's unfit judicial nominees: Judge Nancy Maldonado.

Alongside a crop of nominees distinguished by their radical views and affiliations and ties to dark money groups, Judge Maldonado's claim to notoriety is the historic backlog of unfinished work she has accumulated in her time on the district court in Chicago.

Earlier this month, I pointed out that with 125 motions pending for more than 6 months, Judge Maldonado sits behind more than 99 percent of all district judges nationwide for her ability to clear casework in a timely manner. She is the worst in her circuit, and it is not even close.

Our Democratic colleagues on the Judiciary Committee don't seem all that concerned about the alarming aspect of her record. Perhaps they think there is more to being a judge than deciding cases, such as, perhaps, checking diversity boxes. In any case, they voted in lockstep to advance her nomination this spring.

But listening to some of our colleagues' comments from more recent committee meetings, you might wonder whether they made a terrible mistake. The senior Senator from Connecticut, a seasoned prosecutor familiar with the frustrations of the judicial process, recalled:

I can remember waiting literally years for a decision from a district court judge, and there is nothing anyone can do . . . other than seeking mandamus from the Circuit Court of Appeals, which is . . . close to a death sentence for any litigator.

Our colleague described such delays as "frustrating and . . . costly." In no uncertain terms, he said that ending those delays is essential to "achieving swifter, more expeditious justice."

But just a couple of months ago, he voted to advance the nomination of a judge with a demonstrated inability to deliver swifter or more expeditious justice. With every other Democrat on the committee, he voted to give Nancy Maldonado and her Biden backlog lifetime tenure on the court of appeals.

It is incredible how clear-eyed our colleague sounds when he is not burdened with the uncomfortable responsibility of rubberstamping a favorite of the left's dark money royalty. His fellow Democrats should take note.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Oler nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Katherine E. Oler, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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.

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

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

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about why the funding decisions we make here in this building matter and how the Fiscal Responsibility Act spending caps will continue to hold America back, undercutting our economy, competitiveness, and future, unless the Senate can come together and take action.

The Appropriations Committee has now held nearly 40 hearings on the resources that we will need in fiscal year 2025. We have discussed exactly what our Nation needs to stay strong, safe, and competitive, and there is a big, obvious takeaway from those hearings: The FRA caps for fiscal year 2024 are already causing serious pain and serious challenges, and the caps for fiscal year 2025 are grossly inadequate.

In fiscal year 2024, the FRA froze nondefense funding while increasing defense funding by nearly 30 billion more, to say nothing of the billions in the supplemental. In fiscal year 2025, the caps mean just a 1-percent increase for nondefense and defense alike. Needless to say, that does not begin to keep pace with inflation or other rising expenses. That means net cuts in terms of real resources across the government.

Let's all remember why we have these caps in the first place. House Republicans took the debt ceiling hostage and demanded funding caps and cuts in exchange for not destroying our Nation's credit. I warned at the time that we passed the FRA—and I have warned repeatedly since—that these caps undermine our country's future in a really serious way. That is not speculation. I am speaking from experience.

Back in 2011, the last time a large group of Republicans leveraged the full faith and credit of the United States to extract spending caps under a Democratic President, we got sequestration, which both parties quickly recognized was a disaster, and we got a decade of harmful caps. The effects of that still echo today.

Nondefense funding, except veterans' medical care, is down 6 percent from 2010 when you adjust for inflation and down 14 percent when you adjust for inflation and population growth. That is not just a number on a page. That is less support for families, fewer research grants to keep us on the cutting edge, fewer officers cracking down on crime in neighborhoods. It is just so many opportunities lost, and I can't, for the life of me, understand why we would want to go through something like that again.

Now, I am glad so many of my Republican colleagues are in strong agreement, at least when it comes to defense, but every Senator calling to boost defense spending alone is seriously missing the point. And any Senator who thinks I will let us leave non-defense spending behind is seriously misreading the situation. There is a simple reason I pushed for the principle of parity when I struck the budget deal that ended the worst of sequestration with Paul Ryan in 2013, and it still applies today.

Nondefense investments matter to families. They matter to our economy, our competitiveness, our future, and, yes, it matters to national security. I can't emphasize that enough.

Here in Washington, DC, we call it nondefense discretionary spending, or NDD—very wonky. Back home, we call it making sure parents have childcare, helping families put food on the table, supporting quality affordable healthcare in our communities, fixing our roads. Back home, we call it clean water, safe food, fresh air, affordable housing.

When air traffic controllers keep our planes operating safely, that is NDD. When the FDA pulls an unsafe product off the shelf, that is NDD. When kids go to a public school or get a Pell grant that makes college possible for them, that is NDD. NIH researchers working to cure cancer, weather forecasters warning us of a disaster, agents cracking down on the flow of fentanyl and going after criminal organizations, fighting wildfires, enforcing sanctions against Russia, negotiating tough agreements with allies and adversaries alike—that is NDD.

So I hope I have made my point. What we are talking about here is spending that is, by no stretch of the imagination, the largest portion of our budget—just about one-eighth of our total budget. But that makes a real tangible difference in family's lives and our country's safety and success every single day.

We are also talking about things Americans overwhelmingly support.

Seriously, I encourage my colleagues to go ask your constituents in any part of this country—conservative, liberal, Washington to Kentucky: Do you care if you have clean water? Do you care if your kids get sick from foodborne illness? Do you want to wait longer when you call the Social Security office, if you can reach anyone at all? Do you want someone making sure that the bridges that you drive across are safe? Do you want to stall our progress on cures and treatments for cancer or Alzheimer's or other deadly diseases?

And yet NDD has been consistently underfunded, and it is a constant target for cuts by House Republicans, as we are now seeing.

I am here to say: Enough is enough. If we keep cutting and stretching and shortchanging those programs, something is going to snap—something important.

But more cuts are exactly what a 1-percent cap actually means—not treading water, not keeping up. A 1-percent cap means pain.

If we let families down, that means we let our competitors get ahead. It means we leave our Nation vulnerable. That is not politics; it is cold, hard math. One percent is not enough to keep up with rising costs, growing needs, and new challenges.

The issue here isn't whether we can make more tough choices. It is whether we are going to be honest about the tough realities of a 1-percent cap. There are so many priorities lawmakers on both sides of the aisle care about that just can't happen with a 1-percent increase.

Here is what 1 percent means in practice: 1 percent means letting families go hungry. WIC, a literal lifeline for nearly 7 million mothers and babies is going to need a nearly 10-percent increase next year. Anything less will force us to choose which moms, which babies are getting the food they need and which are getting put on a wait list. Think about that.

One percent means we are letting rural families lose their homes. We need a 5-percent increase for rural rental assistance alone. Falling short means thousands of rural families will lose assistance and may face eviction.

How is that right?

One percent means losing law enforcement. The FBI already can't fill about a thousand open positions because of what happened in fiscal year 2024. At 1 percent, in fiscal year 2025, it would have to trim another 1,300 positions. That is far fewer agents going after transnational criminal organizations, fentanyl traffickers, violent crime, cyber attackers, and more.

Meanwhile, DOJ would have to lose or freeze nearly 5,000 positions. We are talking about attorneys and agents that defend our civil rights, prosecute dangerous criminals, and keep our Nation safe.

Do Republicans really want to defund law enforcement?

One percent means slashing pay for our Federal firefighters. Any family