

have reached out to us and who have said to us: He does not deserve this seat.

I would urge all of my colleagues to oppose this reckless, unqualified nominee.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mrs. CAPITO. I would ask that we proceed with the rollcall vote.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 649, Kevin Gafford Ritz, of Tennessee, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Debbie Stabenow, John W. Hickenlooper, Sheldon Whitehouse, Tina Smith, Alex Padilla, Tammy Baldwin, Tammy Duckworth, Christopher Murphy, Patty Murray, Jack Reed, Angus S. King, Jr., Gary C. Peters, Peter Welch, Margaret Wood Hassan, Brian Schatz.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Kevin Gafford Ritz, of Tennessee, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VANCE), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 239 Ex.]

YEAS—49

Baldwin	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Helmy	Sanders
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Schatz
Booker	Hirono	Schumer
Brown	Kaine	Shaheen
Butler	Kelly	Smith
Cantwell	King	Stabenow
Cardin	Klobuchar	Tester
Carper	Lujan	Van Hollen
Casey	Manchin	Warner
Coons	Markey	Warnock
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warren
Duckworth	Murphy	Welch
Durbin	Murray	Whitehouse
Fetterman	Ossoff	Wyden
Gillibrand	Padilla	
Hassan	Peters	

NAYS—42

Barrasso	Fischer	Paul
Blackburn	Graham	Ricketts
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Braun	Hagerty	Romney
Britt	Hawley	Rubio
Budd	Hoeven	Schmitt
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Collins	Lankford	Sinema
Cornyn	Lee	Sullivan
Cotton	Lummis	Thune
Cramer	McConnell	Tillis
Crapo	Mullin	Tuberville
Cruz	Murkowski	Young

NOT VOTING—9

Daines	Marshall	Rounds
Ernst	Moran	Vance
Kennedy	Rosen	Wicker

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BUTLER). On this vote, the yeas are 49, the nays are 42.

The motion is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, I ended up being a topic of conversation for the past month and a half or so in a lot of political conversations about immigration and the border. So I want to be able to come to this body and to say the immigration issues are still unresolved, but there has been a lot of re-writing of what actually has happened in the past year and all the negotiations.

Vice President HARRIS made a comment publicly just a few weeks ago, when she said:

Let me be clear. After decades in law enforcement, I know the importance of safety and security, especially at our border. Last year, Joe and I brought together Democrats and conservative Republicans to write the strongest border bill in decades.

I mean no disrespect to the Vice President, but we had 4 months of negotiations. She neither initiated those negotiations nor participated in a single second of those negotiations—not one second.

The Vice President's staff was never involved in any of the negotiations. The negotiations took 4 months because the people that sat down at the table all determined: We are in a very bad place. We need to resolve the chaos that is happening at our southern border.

For the first 6 weeks of those negotiations, the White House refused to participate at all in the negotiation—either from the President's staff, the President, or the Vice President or

Vice President's staff. So for the first 6 weeks of the 4 months of negotiations, the White House didn't want to discuss it. After 6 weeks, the White House then got involved in the negotiations. So it was three Senators and the White House to be able to walk through that.

Then, again for the next 3 months of our negotiations, it was a constant fight to get anything agreed to to secure our southern border. What we came up with and was the final agreement wasn't everything that I wanted, but it was enough to, at least, begin to make a change in what was happening at our southern border.

It was a pretty straightforward process. Asylum is very difficult to achieve. Only about 3 percent of the people that actually go through the hearings actually achieve asylum, but you don't find out that until usually 6 or 8 years after you have already been and have already gone through this long process.

So now we have thousands of people crossing our border asking for asylum, not because they believe they qualify but because they know they will stay here somewhere between 6 and 10 years while they wait for the hearing. And they, at least, get a decade in America, and then many of them then disappear.

So what we could get to agreement was, when you cross the border, you would cross the border—first person each day, they would have a much faster screening than would take hours or days, and they would be screened at the standard that was at the end. So instead of waiting 6 or 8 years or 10 years to get that final decision, you would get it rapidly.

So the first person that would cross each day would cross, would be quickly screened under a brandnew process, and then 97 percent of them would be deported immediately because they don't qualify for asylum, and everyone knows the joke. So first day, first person: You cross, quickly screened under a new process, deported immediately.

But if we got 5,000 people crossing, we don't have enough staff to screen that many people, so we created a border emergency authority that if you cross the border and you have got 5,000 people flooding the border and we don't have the staffing to do it, no one gets screened; you just get arrested and deported. So first person: cross, screened, deported. If we are overwhelmed by the cartels with high numbers, you just are deported immediately, and no one is screened. That is what we could finally come up with as an agreement.

Now, I have to tell you, I felt like that would dramatically slow the flow at our southern border and it would deal with the core issue that is the abuse of asylum. But there were a lot of issues I couldn't get agreement on that, quite frankly, many of my colleagues on the Republican side were very frustrated that we couldn't make progress on, some of those very commonsense things; for instance, if you are going to request asylum, you have to request asylum at a port of entry.

You can't come across the border between the ports of entry in the open desert or swim the river and then say when you get caught: Oh, I want asylum. It was obvious you were trying to sneak into the country.

And we were saying: If you are a true asylum seeker and you believe you are requesting asylum, come to a port of entry. We thought that was a pretty commonsense thing to say: We will expedite your process to asylum if you come to a port, not if we have to chase you in the desert. I couldn't get that agreement. My Democratic colleagues would not agree to that. That was a great frustration on the Republican side.

We wanted to be able to require the "Remain in Mexico" program. The Supreme Court had already spoken and said that had to be done. It was not being done. So that if we were flooded with people, they are not waiting for 8 or 10 years here; they are actually waiting in another country to be able to come through the process. They would still get their appointment. My Democratic colleagues would have none of that.

We also wanted an end to the two big parole programs that the Biden administration has created. One of them is called CBP ONE. That is, if you come to a port of entry and tell DHS ahead of time "I'm coming," then DHS, when you arrive at the port of entry, will quickly give you paperwork, will give you a work permit that day, and will release you into the country for a decade as you await your hearing.

It was a fast-track process into the country that was actually inviting more people to illegally cross into the country. We now have 1,500 people a day that are coming through that process. We have no idea if they qualify for asylum because they are not being screened for asylum.

We wanted an end to that process because we felt like it is actually inviting more illegal immigration rather than trying to deter it. And it is not just us saying that. The inspector general for the Department of Homeland Security made this statement. They felt that CBP did not gather intelligence or conduct sufficient analysis of data generated by CBP ONE appointments to protect against fraudulent applications and misuse and public safety threats.

That is not us saying that; that is the inspector general saying that. We wanted an end to that program. Through the negotiations that were long and hard, I got agreement that that program would end, that we would put a stop to that program.

But there was a second program called the CHNV program. This is 30,000 people a month that are coming in. These are folks from Cuba, Haiti, Nicaragua, and Venezuela—30,000 a month. This was another program that was wholly created out of the Biden administration that has never existed in any other administration. It was a parole

authority to say: If you will contact us before you come from one of these countries and someone here in the United States will "sponsor" you or at least say "I know them," then you can get into the country and be paroled into the country. This is not even an asylum request. This is just you are just released into the country.

We wanted to have a stop to that program as well because there are all kinds of issues with that program. But that one, my Democratic colleagues would not agree to and said: No. We will stop the CBP ONE parole program. We won't stop the slowdown of Cubans, Haitians, Nicaraguans, and Venezuelans coming in, in very high numbers.

By the way, the deal was supposedly that we would take in 30,000 of those folks and Mexico would take in 30,000 of those folks. The problem is, we have asked for the numbers that Mexico has taken in; and, so far, the State Department won't give us an answer, and DHS won't give us an answer. As far as we can tell, the Mexican side has been zero while we have been 30,000.

Now, we felt there was a problem with the way the program was being run. And by the way, again, we are not the only ones that think that. DHS itself shut down that program for part of this summer because they found what they called egregious fraud problems; that is, some sponsors sponsoring dozens of people to be able to come in and an overflow of individuals not being properly screened. There are major problems with the program. Unfortunately, the program has restarted again.

Now, why do I walk through this? I keep hearing this rewrite of history that it was President Trump himself that told all Republicans: It is a great deal, but don't do it. Now, there is no doubt President Trump made a statement that it is not enough. He wanted everything in it, and he said: Don't do it. No question that statement was made, but no question that belief was already shared by several folks on my side of the aisle saying we wanted an end to all these parole programs. We also want to stop applying between ports of entry and, if you are going to apply, only at ports of entry.

And several of my colleagues said the House bill—that was H.R. 2—it was that or nothing. They wanted everything or nothing. And suddenly, this whole system falls apart.

I stood here at this exact same spot saying to my colleagues on my side of the aisle: We should do as much as we can do. This is as much as we can get right now with a Democratic Senate, with a Democratic White House. Let's do all we can to be able to stop it.

Obviously, I didn't win that part of the debate, but I also don't want people rewriting history and what actually occurred in the debate because there were serious issues that were unresolved in the bill that are still out there.

My frustration is, all of it is still out there. We still have the same issue

with asylum that this bill would have fixed. We still have the same issue between ports of entry. That is still unfixed. And we still have not one of those parole programs but both of those parole programs happening.

Interestingly enough, in the last couple of months, the numbers at the border have started slowing down. It has been very interesting. I don't know if you noticed even during the Presidential debate that happened earlier this week, ABC News asked Vice President HARRIS: The number of border crossings for illegal immigration was very high during your first 3 years, but they seem to have slowed down the closer we are getting to the election. Why?

She actually didn't answer that question at all. She totally skipped it. And ABC News didn't follow up with her, shockingly, to be able to do a followup question to say: You didn't answer the initial question. You said everything else but why.

Well, I can give you a couple of things on that. Two things have occurred in the past few months: Mexico has had their elections, and we are having ours. So suddenly, Mexico is starting to enforce their border a little better, and this administration is enforcing the border a little better with the authorities they already have.

Now, when I say "a little better," it has gone from 5,000 people illegally crossing a day to about 3,400 people illegally crossing a day. That number is still five times what were crossing during the Obama administration.

My request has been the same for President Biden all along: If you won't enforce the border the same way President Trump enforced it, at least enforce it the same way President Obama enforced it. Under President Obama, we had half a million people illegally crossing a year. Now, we have 2½ million people illegally crossing in a year. Same law—same exact law, enforced completely differently.

Why is this an issue? It is not just an issue in our economy. It is not just an issue in our schools. It is not just an issue in crime in our communities. It is also a national security issue.

In June, the FBI picked up eight ISIS-affiliated individuals that were in our country, that had come across our southern border and had asked for asylum. They were from Tajikistan. And they had gotten the quick review at the border and had been released, like hundreds of thousands of others had that same month. But these eight were different. They are ISIS-affiliated. And they scattered around the country to Philadelphia, New York, and Los Angeles and began their flight. Thankfully, our FBI picked them up. But of the 2½ million people that have crossed just last year, how many did we miss?

I have been very outspoken on this issue. We moved from the border issue being just an issue about how do we manage our own border and illegal immigration to a national security issue.

Madam President, 3,400 people a day illegally crossing our border is still an epic high number. And while the media has looked away because now it is no longer 5,000 a day, 3,400 a day is still way too high. Our system is still overwhelmed, and we still have tens of thousands of people coming in of what this administration calls special-interest aliens. That is folks that, by their own definition, are considered a national security threat. But there are so many, we don't have the opportunity to be able to follow all of them.

That was those eight that were picked up that were ISIS-affiliated. They had been designated as special-interest aliens. Thankfully, we were later able to find them and pick them up, but there are thousands of them currently in the country. Hopefully, they mean us no harm, but currently we have no idea.

That is something that needs to change. National security should not be a partisan issue. I understand it is an election year. This should not be a partisan issue. This should be a how-do-we-fix-this issue; this should be a how-do-we-resolve-this issue. And if the numbers are going down after I was told that the numbers were sky-high because of climate change—that was really what I was told by DHS. In fact, the White House, in 2021, put out a report on climate change and migration, saying that we have dramatically increased numbers because of climate change, not because of lack of border enforcement.

My response to them now is: Well, if the numbers are going down at the border, apparently the climate is getting better worldwide because the numbers are coming down. It is not an issue of climate migration; it is an issue of enforcement at our southern border. If that occurs, the numbers go down. If it doesn't, the numbers skyrocket because we are the United States of America, and people want to be able to be in the greatest country in the world. And I don't blame them.

We, as Americans, though, also have the right to be able to know we live in security and the people that are coming into our country, we know who they are, we know where they are from, and we verified any kind of criminal background that may or may not be there. That is not an unfair request to be able to make.

One last thing. Currently, the House has passed what they call the SAVE Act, and there is an ongoing debate in the House right now how this will fit. The SAVE Act is a pretty simple thing. The SAVE Act just says if you are not legally present in the United States, you can't vote.

Now, it is already Federal law that no one who is a noncitizen can vote in Federal elections. That is already the law. That is the trust part though. There is no verify portion of this. One of the basic principles of trust is verify. Right now, we are all trust. It is against the law, but there is no verification.

The SAVE Act just says we are not going to just trust that people that are not legally present here don't vote; we are going to verify that. You can't register to vote until you can show that you are actually a citizen of the United States. That shouldn't be a radical concept. It should be straightforward.

I have been one of the folks that have asked the current Attorney General: Can you show us any prosecutions or even any attempts to be able to prosecute individuals that were not legally present in the United States that attempted to vote? Because we know some stories. There are some newspaper stories scattered around the country of a few of those stories. We just asked a simple question: Can you tell us any prosecutions?

In Oklahoma, we have about 40 people every election across our State—about 40 people vote twice. They will do absentee voting and then they will show up and vote again. Do you know what they get? They get a knock on the door from law enforcement a couple of months later saying you violated State law; you voted twice. We actually enforce our law that discourages people in the future from then coming and trying that again because they know they are being enforced.

We thought it is a reasonable question to ask the Attorney General: How are you enforcing Federal law in this area? It is not that we are asking for something new. It is how are we enforcing what is existing. So far, the Attorney General, after months of asking the question, has given us no answer.

I look forward to the day that this body can sit down with each other and say: Let's solve the national security issues because we all know they are there. We all see it. We all go through the same briefings. Let's solve those, and let's have an immigration system where we honor legal immigration and deter illegal immigration. That is what most countries do. But for some reason, our politics have gotten in the way of us solving this.

Let's find a way to be able to solve this in the days ahead. I have no delusions that it is going to get solved in the next 2 weeks, but we do need to sit down and resolve this in the days ahead.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). The Senator from California.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MAXWELL SCHOOL OF CITIZENSHIP AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to congratulate Syracuse University's Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs on its 100th anniversary.

One Hundred Years. A remarkable milestone. A remarkable legacy. A remarkable school.

The Maxwell School is the oldest school of its kind in America and was once again ranked the No. 1 school for public affairs in 2024 by U.S. News & World Report.

Success and excellence is the norm for the Maxwell School: It has held the No. 1 spot every year save one since these rankings began more than 30 years ago.

Founded in 1924, thanks to the investment and vision of Syracuse University alumnus and entrepreneur George H. Maxwell, the Maxwell School is dedicated to supporting impactful research and preparing students to become leaders who seek evidence-based solutions, encourage civil discourse, and commit to leaving the world better than they found it.

You can get a sense of what the Maxwell School stands for by pondering the words of the Athenian Oath, which is inscribed on its foyer wall. It encourages us to ever strive to "transmit this city not only not less, but greater, better and more beautiful than it was transmitted to us."

And the Maxwell School does live up to those ideals.

The school's more than 38,500 graduates are living and working across the globe, helping to inform public policy, including key legislation that has come before us here, helping to forge compromise amid divide, bringing aid to those in need and defending democracy.

Its alumni include foreign ambassadors, legislators, journalists, economists, and numerous familiar names such as former Congresswoman and HHS Secretary Donna Shalala, New York State Governor Kathy Hochul, Syracuse Mayor Ben Walsh, and former Detroit Mayor Dave Bing.

The school is home to 15 interdisciplinary research centers and institutes focused on pressing societal issues. One especially dear to me is named for the late Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan; the Moynihan Institute of Global Affairs serves as a critical hub for collaboration, research, and examination of complex global issues.

The Maxwell School offers a rich mix of undergraduate, graduate professional, and scholarly M.A. and Ph.D. programs across the social sciences.

Though it is based in Syracuse, it has a strong presence here in the Nation's Capital, offering programs and internship opportunities and world class instruction through a partnership with the Center for Strategic and International Studies.

Thanks to a unique relationship with the Council of Europe and Syracuse