

The Senate should not be complicit. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am sorry to hear the objection. I would like to correct the one thing that Senator SCHUMER said, that Patrick Davis didn't have a hearing before the committee. We did hold a hearing on Patrick Davis.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I continue to object for the many reasons that I have listed.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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 assistant bill 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. 119, Michelle Bowman, of Kansas, to be Vice Chairman for Supervision of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of four years.

John Thune, Dan Sullivan, John Barrasso, Mike Rounds, Todd Young, Cynthia M. Lummis, Tom Cotton, James Lankford, Bernie Moreno, John R. Curtis, Ted Budd, Mike Crapo, Katie Boyd Britt, Jim Banks, Markwayne Mullin, Jon A. Husted, Steve Daines.

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 Michelle Bowman, of Kansas, to be Vice Chairman for Supervision of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of four years, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. SHEEHY).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 288 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Banks	Graham	Moran
Barrasso	Grassley	Moreno
Blackburn	Hagerty	Mullin
Boozman	Hawley	Murkowski
Britt	Hoeven	Paul
Budd	Husted	Ricketts
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Risch
Collins	Johnson	Rounds
Cornyn	Justice	Schmitt
Cotton	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cramer	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Crapo	Lee	Sullivan
Cruz	Lummis	Thune
Curtis	Marshall	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Tuberville
Ernst	McCormick	Wicker
Fischer	Moody	Young

NAYS—46

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Sanders
Baldwin	Hirono	Schatz
Bennet	Kaine	Schiff
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schumer
Blunt Rochester	Kim	Shaheen
Booker	King	Slotkin
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Smith
Coons	Lujan	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Markley	Warner
Duckworth	Merkley	Warnock
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Fetterman	Murray	Welch
Gallego	Padilla	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden
Hassan	Reed	
Heinrich	Rosen	

NOT VOTING—3

Capito	Ossoff	Sheehy
--------	--------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RICKETTS). On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 46.

The motion was agreed to.

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 assistant bill 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 Calendar No. 129, Edward Walsh, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ireland.

John Thune, Pete Ricketts, John Barrasso, Tim Sheehy, Bernie Moreno, Steve Daines, Eric Schmitt, Roger Marshall, Tommy Tuberville, John Hoeven, Marsha Blackburn, Bill Cassidy, John R. Curtis, Jim Justice, James E. Risch, Thom Tillis, Markwayne Mullin.

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 Edward Walsh, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ireland, 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. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO)

and the Senator from Montana (Mr. SHEEHY).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 60, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 289 Ex.]

YEAS—60

Banks	Grassley	Moreno
Barrasso	Hagerty	Mullin
Blackburn	Hawley	Murkowski
Boozman	Hoeven	Paul
Britt	Husted	Reed
Budd	Hyde-Smith	Ricketts
Cassidy	Johnson	Risch
Collins	Justice	Rounds
Cornyn	Kaine	Schmitt
Cotton	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cramer	King	Scott (SC)
Crapo	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cruz	Lankford	Sullivan
Curtis	Lee	Thune
Daines	Lummis	Tillis
Ernst	Marshall	Tuberville
Fetterman	McConnell	Warner
Fischer	McCormick	Welch
Gallego	Moody	Wicker
Graham	Moran	Young

NAYS—37

Alsobrooks	Heinrich	Sanders
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Schatz
Bennet	Hirono	Schiff
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schumer
Blunt Rochester	Kim	Slotkin
Booker	Lujan	Smith
Cantwell	Markley	Van Hollen
Coons	Merkley	Warnock
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warren
Duckworth	Murray	Whitehouse
Durbin	Padilla	Wyden
Gillibrand	Peters	
Hassan	Rosen	

NOT VOTING—3

Capito	Ossoff	Sheehy
--------	--------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MULLIN). On this vote, the yeas are 60, the nays are 37.

The motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward Walsh, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ireland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

BORDER SECURITY

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, what we have come to realize is, under the last administration, the American people really suffered from open borders, crime, and lawlessness. And they spoke out about this, and, in November, they issued a mandate to President Trump. And, of course, we talk a lot about the economic impact of that. We talk about the health, but we also focus on the "Make America Safe Again" provisions.

And I will say this. Since he was elected in November and sworn in, in January, President Trump has done exactly that. He has worked to make this country safe, to make our communities safer. And what we have seen in operations across the country is that the Trump administration has committed

to getting criminal, illegal aliens out of our communities and off of our streets. We have seen that in Tennessee.

Now, in recent weeks, the Department of Homeland Security has worked with the Tennessee State Highway Patrol, and they have arrested 196 criminal, illegal aliens in Nashville, TN. Now, these are people that ought not to have ever been in the country. They are violent criminals, members of Tren de Aragua, members of MS-13. They are drug dealers. They are sex traffickers. They are human traffickers.

And do you know what? People said: I can't believe we had that many drug dealers, sex traffickers, gang leaders, gang clubs that were here in our community.

And when you start to look at the crimes of some of these people, people are aghast at what they have learned, and they are grateful that President Trump, Secretary Noem, Tom Homan—who is our border czar—decided to come into Nashville and get these people off our streets and out of our communities.

Now, here is what we know about some of these. One of them is a Salvadoran national who is affiliated with MS-13. Now, he probably left El Salvador because he has been wanted for murder in his home country. That is the charge against him, murder.

Tennesseans are saying: Look, we want to make certain we get these individuals deported, and I was talking to one of our local law enforcement officers—they are in Middle Tennessee—and I said: Tell me what you think about ICE and Homeland Security and the work they are doing?

He said: I am happy to see them here. We welcome them. We are glad they are working with the Highway Patrol because when you get these criminals and these gang leaders off our streets, you make the community safer, and you make our jobs a little bit safer.

And we are seeing the benefits of these deportations of criminal illegal aliens on a nationwide scale. I give you the example of Nashville because I represent Tennessee. But we know that, nationally, since inauguration day, ICE has arrested more than 66,000 criminal illegal aliens. The vast majority have prior criminal convictions and charges, including—as I have mentioned—violent MS-13 and Tren de Aragua gang members. Thousands more were charged or convicted of assault, weapons offenses, sex crimes, and murder.

And when these criminals are taken off the street, do you know what happens, Mr. President? Crime goes down. Safety improves.

Now, in February—and I think this is a great example result. So in February, ICE targeted more than 100 Tren de Aragua gang members that had taken over an apartment complex in Aurora, CO. Many people saw this. I am certain many of my colleagues saw this reporting on the news.

Now, that same quarter, that first quarter of the year, overall crime in

the city declined by 22 percent. That is what happens when you go after people that are breaking the law, that have come into the country illegally, and came in with ill intent.

Now, despite the success that we have seen—whether it is Nashville or whether it is Aurora, CO—my Democratic colleagues are still demonizing these efforts and law enforcement and demanding an end to arrests and trying to stop deportations, and some are even working to undermine our brave and courageous law enforcement officers.

Now the mayor's office in Nashville has been one that has tried to obstruct these, and they were claiming that ICE's detainment of violent gang members and rapists is "making [it] harder" to keep people safe.

So the mayor's office and the mayor doxxed Federal law enforcement officers who were involved in these operations. They released their names; they released details about different operations. So they were doxxing and unmasking the operation and the investigators or the agents' names.

So what happens when the mayor does that is basically you are serving up a treasure trove of information to the gang leaders. You make the officers less safe, all law enforcement officers. You make the communities less safe, and you encourage—encourage—people to target the operations or the officers.

So what we have seen is this makes the job of law enforcement more difficult. It undermines President Trump's efforts to make our Nation safe, and, in essence, it has turned Nashville into a sanctuary city.

And, interestingly enough, in the State of Tennessee, it is illegal to have a sanctuary city. And because of the actions of the Office of the Mayor and Mayor O'Connell, DHS has deemed Nashville a sanctuary jurisdiction.

And all of this, we need to realize, is happening as ICE agents have seen over the past couple of months a 413-percent increase in assaults. I will tell you I think that our law enforcement officers, our Homeland Security investigators, and our agents deserve our support for removing criminal illegal aliens from our communities.

So on Friday, I sent a letter urging AG Bondi to investigate the mayor's actions and the actions of his office and determine whether he is using taxpayer dollars to aid illegal aliens and to obstruct our Federal law enforcement efforts.

I will also use every tool in the Senate to investigate the mayor and his office and hold him to account for threatening the safety of Tennesseans.

And make no mistake, if the mayor is found by the Department of Justice to be working outside of the rule of law, he should resign his position.

And, unfortunately, he is not the only Democrat mayor that needs DOJ to investigate them. We have seen the mayors of Chicago and Boston and their offices, they have repeatedly stat-

ed that their police departments will refuse to cooperate with ICE to apprehend criminal illegal aliens.

Now, think about this. These are criminals that are robbing people. They are doing carjackings. They are assaulting people. Many of them are abusing children. They are wanted in their home countries. And you have elected officials that are siding with and trying to protect criminal illegal aliens instead of siding with and trying to protect law-abiding citizens.

While this obstruction makes it harder for Federal law enforcement to do their jobs, they are still working to remove these criminals from the streets of Chicago and Boston and, of course, Nashville. Just last month, ICE announced that they arrested the Tren de Aragua gang members who shot and killed three people at a house party in Chicago in December. Criminal illegal aliens shot and killed three citizens. And in Boston, ICE agents apprehended nearly 1,500 illegal aliens during "Operation Patriot" last month, making the largest ICE operation to date in our Nation's history. More than half of those 1,500 have major criminal convictions—not just charged but convictions and charges—murder, rape, drug trafficking, abuse of children, all among that number, 1,500. These are horrific crimes committed by illegal alien criminals who are roaming free in American cities until ICE comes in and apprehends them.

While they continue to side with criminals—these Democrat mayors and those city councils—Republicans are supporting the President's efforts to maintain the rule of law so that there are no more innocent victims like Larisha Sharell Thompson, a South Carolina mother of two, who was allegedly murdered in cold blood last month by six illegal aliens who were trying to steal her car.

Or Ava Moore, an 18-year-old Air Force cadet candidate who was killed while kayaking in Texas over Memorial Day weekend by an illegal alien who, according to authorities, hit her with a jet ski and then fled the scene.

Or the 12 people, including a Holocaust survivor, who were set on fire on Sunday in an anti-Semitic terror attack; the suspect, an Egyptian national who overstayed his visa after entering under Biden's open borders. This has to come to a stop.

And Tennesseans say: What can we do about this? Well, I have the CLEAR Act, which we have had for a time. It would ensure that State and local law enforcement officials have the explicit authority to assist the Federal Government in our immigration enforcement efforts. Basically, it would codify the 287(g) Program.

And this week I am introducing legislation that is backed by the White House that would establish a deportation shot clock, which would require the Federal Government to deport an illegal alien within 15 days of a court order for removal. Right now, it takes

90 days. We think the deportation shot clock will empower the Trump administration to expedite deportations of these criminals and get them off our streets.

And following the dangerous actions of Nashville Mayor O'Connell and his office, I am also introducing legislation that will make it illegal to doxx Federal law enforcement officials who are working to get these criminal illegal aliens off the streets. We realized after this occurrence that they were not included in the "covered persons" provisions.

So I invite my Democrat colleagues to join us in this. If not, I invite them, come down here. Talk about why they would choose to support criminal illegal aliens instead of working to make our community safer and to uphold the rule of law.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—RECESS

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess following the cloture vote on the O'Neill nomination until 4 p.m. today.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

BUDGET RECONCILIATION

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, no one asked for this. No one asked for the biggest wealth transfer in American history from the poorest people in the country to the richest people to ever exist. No one asked for the biggest ever cuts to Medicaid, to kick 14 million people off of health insurance, and raise out-of-pocket costs for 20 million people. No one asked for food assistance to be slashed for millions of children and low-income families. No one asked for higher prices at the pump or on their electricity bills. No one asked for students across the country to lose Federal financial aid.

No one asked for any of this—and I really mean that. That is not just a rhetorical flourish. I don't think Trump voters asked for this. I know Harris voters did not ask for this. I don't think anybody really wants this.

I think the reason that all of these crazy, harmful policies are about to be enacted is for one simple reason, and that is to generate enough revenue to satisfy the insatiable desire for tax cuts for people who make more than \$4 million a year. They are literally taking money out of food assistance and Medicaid and Affordable Care Act monthly subsidies.

By the way, you don't know if you get a subsidy or not. You just go on the exchange, and you pay the thing. The thing is, that thing is probably \$400 or \$500 or \$600 a month less than it used to be because of the subsidies.

It is one thing to say 14 million people are going to get kicked off of Medicaid—and they will. It is another thing to say, because of those Medicaid cuts, a bunch of clinics and hospitals in rural communities are going to shut down—and they will.

I think what is a little underrated is many, many more millions of people

are going to pay not \$50 more a year, not \$100 more per month, but many hundreds of dollars more per month. Why? Because when you yank that money out of the system, it is what is called a pay-for. It means it generates a ton of revenue.

How does it generate that revenue? By screwing regular people.

They are racing to pass a bill that does all of these things and that raises the debt by many trillions of dollars.

I think the problem some of us have—and I really appreciate the Presiding Officer. And when we agree, we work really well together, and when we disagree, we are at least able to stay civil. So I am trying to take the edge off of this. But one of the reasons that it sounds like I am frothing at the mouth and saying a bunch of partisan talking points is that it is kind of hard to believe that any political party would actually do this on purpose.

It is quite hard to believe that you would cut food assistance and cut healthcare and cut help for regular working people in order to shovel money to people making more than \$4 million a year. But that is exactly what they are doing.

It is as if they designed this bill in a lab to make the maximum number of people angry. It is unpopular. It is unnecessary. And they are doing it anyway.

Hospitals serving rural and low-income communities will be forced to shutter because they won't be adequately compensated for their services—by the way, again, not a talking point. Go and visit any rural clinic or hospital. Ask them what percentage of their payer mix comes from Medicaid and what would happen if they lost a big chunk of that. A lot of them say—the big ones—big is relative. But in the State of Hawaii, our big institutions say: We could stay afloat. We just have to deliver a lot less care. And then everybody would end up in the ER, right?

The Queen's Medical Center, the sort of No. 1 trauma center in the middle of Honolulu, is already bursting at the seams. You have multiple people in the hallways. All of the rooms, all of the beds are taken. It was just a couple of months ago that they finally figured out a way not to release the psychiatric emergencies right onto Punchbowl Street in their hospital gowns.

That is before they do this to the hospitals.

After the ACA passed, you would go on the exchange, select a plan, and pay a fraction of what you used to pay. I think one of the things is that ObamaCare is now so old that people forgot how horrible it was before then—really horrible. So now you just go on, and you are kind of irritated because it is still money, and it still feels like too much, and it feels like your HMO or provider nitpicks you and doesn't cover a bunch of care, and copays are too high. But it is way, way better than it used to be.

So this whole enterprise is for one single purpose, and that is to generate

enough money to cut taxes for billionaire corporations and people who make \$4 million or more in revenue. It is very, very few people benefiting and tens of millions of people being screwed.

There is little in this bill that will help regular people who are already struggling to meet their monthly obligations. But there are plenty of rewards for the ultrawealthy. Millionaires stand to gain roughly \$70,000 in tax cuts, while billionaires in the top 1 percent receive close to \$300,000 in benefits.

And how did they find that money to shovel to the millionaires and billionaires?

I don't mind a millionaire or a billionaire. I know, like, two billionaires. We are not close, but I have met them. I am sure I know many millionaires. There are a number of colleagues in the Senate who are in that category. So it is not like—I am not trying to demonize anybody.

I am saying: Do they need \$300,000? I know people who need \$300. I know people who actually won't be able to stay on any healthcare at all if these subsidies go away.

This is not the closing of loopholes. This is not fiscal discipline. I want to make this point as clearly as I can. We would be in a harder position to argue against this bill if it were actually deficit-neutral because, traditionally, the accusation against Democrats is they want to bust the budget, and Republicans want to be responsible.

But this one is weird because this is under the guise of "We have got to do austerity; we have got to do tough stuff; we have got to cut." Then they come up with a bill that actually increases the deficit over baseline, even when they do their kind of nonsensical accounting where they basically have stopped counting the tax cuts that are in place because, you know, that is the baseline.

And so the whole enterprise—and everybody needs to understand this. They are making everything more expensive. That is food. That is medicine. That is groceries. That is gasoline. That is electricity. And the reason they are making it more expensive is because they are either indifferent to the suffering or, more importantly, they just need the money.

And they don't need the money to—you know, we raised taxes in the past, as a country, to fight a war, to beat Nazism; or we raised taxes in the past to shrink the deficit; or we raised taxes and raised costs for people to invest in something important. That is not what we are doing here. We are blowing up the budget, and we are harming regular people in order to provide tax cuts for people who literally didn't ask for it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1943

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here to ask unanimous consent on