

the United States of America to the Czech Republic

Calendar Number 405: Roman Pipko, of Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Estonia

Calendar Number 406: Thomas Rose, of Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Poland

Calendar Number 407: William White, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Belgium

Calendar Number 408: John Giordano, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Namibia

Calendar Number 409: Anjani Sinha, of Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Singapore

Calendar Number 411: Sean O'Neill, of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Thailand

Calendar Number 412: Julie Stuftt, of Ohio, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Kazakhstan

Calendar Number 413: Dan Negrea, of Connecticut, to be Representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations

Calendar Number 414: Sergio Gor, of Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of India

Calendar Number 415: Stephanie Hallett, of Florida, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Bahrain

Calendar Number 416: James Holtsnider, of Iowa, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan

Calendar Number 417: Jacob Helberg, of Florida, to be an Under Secretary of State (Economic Growth, Energy, and the Environment)

Calendar Number 418: Benjamin Black, of New York, to be Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Development Finance Corporation

Calendar Number 419: Thomas DiNanno, of Florida, to be Under Sec-

retary of State for Arms Control and International Security

Calendar Number 420: Paul Kapur, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of State for South Asian Affairs

Calendar Number 423: Sarah Rogers, of New York, to be Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy

Calendar Number 424: Michael DeSombre, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (East Asian and Pacific Affairs)

Calendar Number 426: Riley Barnes, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor

Calendar Number 427: Todd Wilcox, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Diplomatic Security)

Calendar Number 428: Neil Jacobs, of North Carolina, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant 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, and the provisions of S. Res. 412 (119th Cong.), do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Executive Calendar numbers: 62, 86, 92, 126, 127, 128, 143, 155, 158, 159, 160, 163, 164, 168, 169, 170, 178, 181, 196, 252, 253, 255, 256, 265, 268, 270, 272, 284, 299, 300, 304, 306, 307, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 323, 341, 342, 345, 347, 348, 349, 355, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 363, 364, 367, 368, 369, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 423, 424, 426, 427, 428, en bloc.

John Thune, John R. Curtis, Tom Cotton, Chuck Grassley, Bernie Moreno, Marsha Blackburn, Mike Rounds, Eric Schmitt, Tommy Tuberville, Todd Young, James Lankford, Roger F. Wicker, Rick Scott of Florida, Jim Justice, John Barrasso, Mike Crapo, Cindy Hyde-Smith.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislation session.

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

The Senator from Missouri.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS

Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the following bills en bloc: Calendar No. 77, S. 180; Calendar No. 79, S. 419; Calendar No. 80, S. 539; Calendar No. 82, S. 1316; Calendar No. 83, S. 1563; further, that the committee-reported substitute amendment to S. 1563 be agreed to, the committee-reported amendment to S. 1316 be agreed to, the

committee-reported substitute amendment to S. 539 be withdrawn, and the Cornyn substitute amendment at the desk to S. 539 be agreed to; finally, that the bills, as amended, if amended, be considered read a third time and passed en bloc and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

I rise to request unanimous consent here on the bills that were just mentioned, to call up and pass this year's Police Week bills. These are bipartisan bills. These are common sense. Most importantly, particularly in light of recent events—and you can turn on the television right now and see what I am talking about—they would give this Chamber the chance to demonstrate its commitment to the men and women who wear the badge and to the laws they serve to protect.

This is not a time to mince words or blur lines; this is a time to speak clearly with full moral force.

In cities across the country, our law enforcement officers are beset from below and above. From below, on our streets, they face an emboldened criminal element and a resurgence of organized political violence. From above, in the halls of power, they face a political class which seems hell-bent on undermining and attacking them at every turn.

We have watched this unfold for years now. The press has smeared and defamed our police officers, seeking to incite hatred and violence against them. Fringe academic ideas about defunding police and shuttering prisons have moved from the classroom, to the courtroom, to the legislature, and then to codified laws. Riots. Lawsuits. Slashed budgets. Malicious lies blared through the largest megaphones in our country.

Time and time again, the system has sided with the criminal over the cop, the looter over the law. The result of this system could be seen in unprecedented waves of violence that ravaged our cities in the wake of the George Floyd riots in 2020. It can still be seen today on the streets of cities overtaken by antifa. These are not rhetorical or theoretical concerns; we watched it happen in real time.

It is not the product of social conditions or inequity or systematic this or that; it is the inevitable result of a civilization that has lost its moral nerve, a civilization that is too wracked by guilt to punish its criminals, to enforce its laws, or to confront its enemies—even when those enemies are beating police officers and firebombing Federal buildings right before our eyes.

When a government loses the ability or the will to defend its own cities, its own institutions, its own people, then it ceases to be a government worthy of its name.

The path back to justice is simple. It requires laws like the ones we are going to consider here today.

It requires protecting the people who protect us, like the bill to equip first

responders with protective gear against fentanyl exposure, keeping them safe from the very poisons they are trying to fight.

It requires ensuring that our police officers are healthy in body and in spirit, like the bill to reauthorize critical mental health services for cops and their families. Every single year, more police officers die by suicide than die in the line of duty. This is profoundly a policy failure and one that is on us to fix.

It requires hunting down the predators who seek to prey upon our kids from the darkest recesses of the internet, like the bill to reauthorize and modernize the Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force. This bill funds and enhances our ability to catch and convict the very worst kinds of criminals—those who target and abuse children.

It requires building strong police departments with officers who know the neighborhoods and the people they protect, like our bill to send local recruits to police academies if they agree to serve in the precincts in their own communities.

It requires wisdom and experience, like the bill to give State and local agencies the ability to rehire retired officers in civilian law enforcement roles.

If you stand on the side of justice and our first responders, these votes should be simple and easy.

With that, I would ask to move forward.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request?

Mr. BOOKER. To the esteemed Presiding Officer, I am going to reserve the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. I am really grateful that this is one of the areas where we have a lot of bipartisan support because this body I would say unanimously believes that we have to do more to help local law enforcement.

I see it in my State. We have real challenges—challenges with recruitment, challenges with officers who are in incredibly stressful situations for their mental health, and even empowering officers to be able to do their job, which is a job that everyone wants our officers to do.

I say this all the time: If you polled my city, which is a majority minority city, a majority African-American city, and asked them “Hey, do you want more police, less police, or the same amount of police?” undeniably, they would want more law enforcement.

When I talk to the law enforcement officers in not just my city but up and down the State, they want more resources. That is why I have multiple bills to actually fund our police departments around our country and specifically in New Jersey to empower them on everything from closing out murder

investigations all the way to mental health.

In fact, the legislation that is being brought forward—it is right, it is bipartisan legislation. I am the cosponsor of some of the bills we have right now on the floor. We should be united in this body, all 100 of us, to stand up for public safety and to fund our police, get them the resources and the equipment they need to do their job.

Unfortunately, that is not what is happening. President Trump, through an arbitrary Executive order, has told this body: Your intentions will not be followed.

The legislation that is being proposed today—the President has already said that those DOJ grants will not go to certain States—Illinois, California, New York, New Jersey—that they are not eligible for these grant programs. That is not a bipartisan way of going about it. That is singling out certain States over other States. That is actually defunding the police departments in certain States for other States when you say that these States that have gotten many of these grants in years past can no longer get them. None of us in this body should support that. All of us in this body should join together and say: When Congress passes a grant program, the President of the United States cannot arbitrarily decide which States receive those grants and which States don't.

I feel a driving sense of urgency that we must support our police officers. They are facing greater and newer challenges in this country. I feel a deep urgency to support mental health issues in particular because I lost one of my dear childhood friends, who died by suicide in uniform.

I want to make a simple adjustment to this legislation—very simple. What it would do is basically say that when this body has approved these grant programs, the President can't undermine the Founders' intention that we hold the purse strings, that the President can't undermine that and these grants have to go out as Congress intended them.

That is all I am asking from my colleague across the aisle, and it is all I am asking from this body, is that we, together, say: We need to get resources for police officers in all of our country. We shouldn't be picking out some departments and not others.

This is just simply making sure that this is a bipartisan effort to fund local police officers.

So I ask my colleagues to pass these bills as I amend them so that we can refocus on the urgent work of reopening the government and then providing all law enforcement agencies with the resources they need, ensuring every law enforcement agency has a fair opportunity to secure funding to support their work, to support the men and women, to support their sacred and noble duties. We should work in a bipartisan way.

So I ask that the consent be modified such that my amendments to S. 180, S.

419, S. 539, S. 1316, and S. 1563, which are at the desk, also be agreed to, with all the other provisions that my colleague is asking for remaining intact, so that we can fund all of police and stop our President's attempt to defund police departments in blue States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification?

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SCHMITT. Reserving the right to object, let's be clear about what this provision does from my friend from New Jersey. It is attempting to throw a lifeline to these sanctuary cities that are openly defying the law. In order to receive Federal grant dollars, you can't withhold information from Federal law enforcement. That is what they are doing. That is what it means to be a sanctuary city.

What you are saying is, we are not going to work with ICE or any other Federal Agencies because we want to protect illegal immigrants in our cities.

That is what is happening. That is deeply unpopular with the American people. And that is why the President is taking this action to try to get these cities to come along and be part of the program with the rest of the country to say: We are all going to work together to keep our communities safe.

This provision is a direct attempt to undermine the Trump administration's attempt to do that and their renewed enforcement of our immigration laws.

I know some people got used to the last 4 years, where 20 million people came here illegally and Federal law enforcement was handcuffed by the Biden administration to actually enforce our immigration laws—so much so that the rhetoric that had been exhibited at that time now has carried over, and you see fire bombings, and you see attacks on ICE officials, attempts to dox them, to destroy their families and their reputations and their finances, because they have been led to believe by many with the loudest microphones that somehow everyone is entitled to be here for as long as they want, that Federal laws don't matter, that borders are arbitrary lines on a map and we are all global citizens.

The white papers from the sixties and the seventies found their way into the highest offices in government in the Biden administration. These Ivy League grads who wrote these white papers or read these white papers or were indoctrinated by these white papers were suddenly in charge. Well, there is a new sheriff in town who actually believes in law and order.

So I would hope that city leaders who defy our Federal laws shouldn't be entitled to Federal tax dollars. Federal grant dollars are not entitlements. They are not unconditional welfare for far-left activists. If you want Federal funds, you have to comply with Federal law.

Sanctuary cities are in open defiance of Federal law. They actively prohibit their officials from cooperating with

Federal immigration officers. They release violent offenders, suppress gang databases, and do everything in their power to prevent the men and women in law enforcement from enforcing our laws. That is what they are doing in sanctuary cities right now.

Every one of the Police Week bills that I have offered for unanimous consent—and my friend from New Jersey is indeed a cosponsor—are very, very bipartisan. I can't actually believe we are in a place where we are going to be holding up that kind of bipartisan legislation when you see the violence against law enforcement officers in our country every single day. This is a lifeline to them, the help they need not just to do their jobs but to be able to seek the services so they can be healthy, physically and mentally.

So let's be clear about what is happening. My friend has, you know, a few moments here to reconsider this. These are common sense. If there is anything from last November we can take away, it is that the American people voted for a return to common sense.

With that, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. Yeah, I just—again, I have so much respect for my colleague that I want to respond to some of the things he said, because, again, I just want to affirm that he is right on the urgency to help our police officers. He is right that States should abide by Federal law that passes from this body. But what we have now is a President who, in his first term, didn't ever try something like this, which is undermining the will of Congress. This is really unprecedented. It has never happened—Republican President, Democratic President—including Donald Trump's first term, where he suddenly said: I am going to turn off the spigot of support to local law enforcement agencies because I don't agree with your policies.

I think that is a threat to the independence of our branch of government. I think that is in so many ways violative of our shared values on both sides of the aisle. But let me go further than that. What the President is doing is saying: Not only am I going to stop funding from going to the State of New Jersey, I am going to go to red counties in New Jersey, red counties in California.

I actually went out and talked to people. Republican legislators in States, Republican police officers, a Republican union leader told me this as well: This is ridiculous. This is insane that we would hold grants back from the entire State. He said: I don't agree with Democrats' policies, but we are out here putting our lives on the line, and Republicans in Congress want to stop resources coming to our police departments.

One of the union leaders said to me: My guys are out there sacrificing their

lives, and we can't get help that both sides of the aisle agree on?

So, yes, my colleague and I disagree on domestic immigration policies. One thing he and I don't agree on—because I was the mayor of a city that basically said: In order to keep my city safe, we are going to cooperate with the police department. It was an overbroad generalization that was made on the Senate floor that we are not supporting ICE and immigration activities. I know this up and down the State of New Jersey. Not only do we support them, but we detailed officers with Federal immigration enforcement. I did it when I was mayor.

You want to talk about cooperation. Anybody who knows local government from the FBI to the ATF to ICE, all over New Jersey, we are cooperating with Federal authorities. What we have simply said is we are responsible for local law enforcement. We are not going to do things that create such fear in our communities that immigrant communities are afraid to come to local police to report crimes. And that somehow—not in Trump's first term—but somehow in this term of office, that is a bridge too far.

Let me tell you right now, the way immigration is being pursued in our neighborhoods, where masked agents are coming out of unmarked cars or going to court appearances and schools and hospitals—my local police officers are telling me how much more dangerous this administration is making communities because people who are the victims of crime now are afraid to go to local police officers and report those crimes.

Again, this is not coming from politicians in New Jersey. This is coming from law enforcement officers that have said that we have created such a climate of fear in our country that just solving crimes is getting harder and harder because people are afraid to come to the police.

So, yes, we have policies that say there are certain things we won't do to maintain a community of trust within our communities.

I understand there is a lot of rhetoric. I could turn on shock news and all of that, but when you talk to the law enforcement officers in many of the most Republican parts of my community, they are outraged about what is happening right now.

Again, we can debate policy on immigration, but, to me, for a Senator to allow a President to undermine the power of the purse relegated by the Constitution to this body is outrageous. It has never been done before, not in Trump's first term, not by Bush, not by Reagan, not by Clinton, not by Obama. We are in new territory here in our country where we see a President encroaching upon our powers. I can't be complicit in that.

Everybody in this body—I would never question any of my colleagues on either side of the aisle. We all want our local police departments to not only be

able to do their job, we all want to have more equipment and resources. That is why these bills are bipartisan. How can we allow bipartisan bills passed out of the Senate to then be stopped, in a partisan way, by a President who is then going to choose red States and hurt blue States, even though my State has millions of Republicans who deserve to have their communities safe as well?

I am standing today just to say, let's use common sense and help our police officers together; get the resources desperately needed out to our communities now and not let this fall victim to something that wasn't even an issue in Donald Trump's first term.

So I object. I object. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

#### GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, well, the shutdown melodrama continues. I love the smell of melodrama in the morning. It smells like the U.S. Senate. I said the other day that this shutdown is just further proof that human evolution is a slow, slow process. With this shutdown, what you are witnessing now is just further proof about why it took human beings thousands of years to learn how to stand upright. This shutdown is bone-deep, down-to-the-marrow stupid.

Some shutdowns are based on policy. Some shutdowns are based on politics. Some shutdowns are based on a combination of both. This one is pure. It is as pure as Ivory Snow.

This shutdown is based on politics. Let me tell you what is going on. I believe in the two-party system. Why? Because two parties create competition, and competition makes all of us better. It does. The Democratic Party—the opposite of my party, the Republican Party—the Democratic Party is competing within itself right now, and there is a distinct wing of the Democratic Party that is winning that competition. If I wanted to use a pejorative suppression, I would call it the loon wing of the party, the loon wing of the Democratic Party or you might call it the Bolshevik wing of the Democratic Party.

I think a more accurate description is to call it the socialist wing of the Democratic Party. I think that is fair. I am not saying that all of my Democratic friends are socialists, but there is clearly a wing of the Democratic Party that can only be described accurately as the socialist wing of the party. And that party is in ascendance. That party is in control.

My friend Senator SCHUMER is the leader of the Democrats in the U.S. Senate. And he, of course, has instructed his colleagues to vote to shut down the government. And Senator SCHUMER has been criticized for that, and I understand. I don't agree with him. I think he made a mistake.