

Since day one of his administration, President Trump has been fulfilling his campaign promise to crack down on illegal immigration and secure our border. And it is good to see.

Immigration is a key part of our country's story, and immigrants have made untold contributions to our country. But we need to ensure that immigration is done legally, for both the safety of our country and to preserve respect for the rule of law. The chaos of the last 4 years was unsustainable, and it was dangerous.

We had 10 million individuals flood across our southern border. We had millions—millions—of undocumented individuals take up residence in our country, more than the population of a number of U.S. States. Law enforcement officials were overwhelmed, and officers were pulled off of essential work of guarding the border just to process the flood of migrants.

Border cities and other cities across the United States struggled to deal with the influx. And all of this chaos was an invitation to terrorists, to smugglers, to drug cartels, and other dangerous individuals to enter our country.

So I am tremendously proud and grateful for the incredible amount of work the President has done so far to make it clear that illegal migration will no longer be tolerated. There is a lot more work to do, and some of that is going to require Congress's help.

Mr. Homan, President Trump's border czar, made clear to Senators yesterday that Border Patrol and Immigration and Customs Enforcement are going to need additional resources to continue the good work they have been doing to secure our border and to get criminals off of our streets. We intend to deliver.

Today, Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM, the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, is kicking off the committee markup of a budget resolution that will lay the foundation for a transformational investment in border security and immigration enforcement and in our national defense. We will provide resources to increase the number of Immigration and Customs Enforcement officers and Border Patrol agents, expand detention space, facilitate deportations of dangerous individuals, and obtain the barriers and technology that we need to secure the border.

Mr. President, for too long, our country has tolerated rampant illegal immigration. That ends now. I am grateful for everything the President is doing to protect our streets and uphold the law. And the Republican-led Congress will ensure that the administration has the resources needed to continue this important work.

TRUMP CABINET NOMINATIONS

Mr. President, in a few minutes, we are going to be voting on a couple of nominees. The first one is Tulsi Gabbard to be the Director of the DNI. The second one will be a cloture vote to proceed to the nomination of Bobby

Kennedy to be the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

What I observe—it is interesting about both of these nominees—is that both are former Democrats. In fact, a year ago—a year ago—they were Democrats. I would argue they have seen the light. They have become Republicans and now they have been nominated by President Trump to fill important roles within his administration.

But I made that observation only because there is a lot of talk these days about loyalty oaths and allegiance and saliva purity tests for people to be considered good enough to be in the so-called MAGA movement—in other words, the Republican Party.

Yet when it comes to Democrats, a very different standard seems to be applied here because both of these people were former Democrats. In fact, frankly, they probably agree with the Democratic Party here in the Senate on a lot of positions that they hold.

And yet they have the temerity to come out and support positions that, perhaps, run contrary to some of the positions held by, particularly, the progressive wing of the Democrat Party in this country—in the case of RFK, coming out for positions that run counter to the orthodoxy of the healthcare so-called establishment, or in the case of Ms. Gabbard, different views, perhaps, about national security matters than those held by a lot of Democrats, certainly here in this Chamber, and progressive movement in the country.

It harkens back to two other Democrats who pretty much got pushed out of their party here in the U.S. Senate for holding views that ran contrary to the majority view of the progressive wing of the Democrat Party. Those two Democrats were Joe Manchin and Kyrsten Sinema.

In the case of Kyrsten Sinema, she was viewed, I think, by Democrats as, perhaps, too free market. She was viewed as pro-business, as pro-investment, and as pro-jobs, lighter regulatory touch, lighter tax policy, pro-energy policy.

In the case of Joe Manchin, he had—I should say he had what I would say are accurate views with respect to energy development in this country—in other words, making America energy dominant, a view shared by many in our party, including our President. And for that, he was viewed as too conservative to be a true Democrat.

So Joe Manchin and Kyrsten Sinema ended up getting pushed out of the Democratic Party here in the U.S. Senate.

Their ultimate cardinal sin, however—in the case of Manchin, as I said, he was pro-energy in a party that is dominated by climate, green, all those—whatever adjectives you want to use to characterize it or describe it—his views ran contrary. In fact, he tried to cut a deal with the Democrats in the Inflation Reduction Act only to find out they kind of went back on it, and the deal wasn't what he thought he had agreed to.

So his views were out of step, out of the mainstream of the Democratic Party, as were Kyrsten Sinema's. But their cardinal sin—their cardinal sin—was that they voted against getting rid of the legislative filibuster, a view that was held by—up until just a few years ago—a majority of Democrats here in the U.S. Senate. There was a letter signed, which I shared the other night, that had 32 Democratic signatures on it pleading with the leadership here in the Senate not to abandon the Senate tradition and heritage with respect to the Senate filibuster; to maintain the heritage and tradition that the Senate has for open debate and for representation of the minority; for the requirement of collaboration and bipartisanship when it comes to moving consequential legislation. Those are the things that the filibuster traditionally was about.

And up until a few years ago, most of my colleagues on the other side—a majority on the other side—signed a letter articulating their views that it ought to be the position of the U.S. Senate.

Well, they tried to push it because they weren't getting the outcomes they wanted on a couple of pieces of legislation when they had the majority a couple of years ago. And they forced a vote on changing the rules—breaking the rules—to get rid of the legislative filibuster and be able to map an agenda that is more consistent with their liking.

There were two people that voted against it on their side, Kyrsten Sinema and Joe Manchin. And for that cardinal sin, they were essentially ostracized. And to this day, the Democratic Party continues to hold a position now, very contrary to the one they held just a few years ago, about getting rid of the legislative filibuster.

Why do they want to do that? Because they want to enact an agenda—a progressive leftist agenda—which the American people voted against in November.

As recently as last summer at the Democratic convention, the Democrat leader basically laid out the things they want to do. First he said: We are going to get rid of the filibuster because we have the votes now. Manchin and Sinema are gone. I talked to the Democrats that we think we are going to elect, and we will have 51. At that time, he was predicting a clean sweep—they were going to win the House, the Senate, and the White House. They would get rid of the legislative filibuster, and the first thing they would do is they would Federalize our elections. That was the first thing they would do.

Then they said they would enshrine abortion rights in law. That was one thing they would do. There were many on their side who talked about packing the Supreme Court, about allowing statehood for Puerto Rico and for Washington, DC—all elements of the agenda they want to accomplish through getting rid of the legislative

filibuster. That was articulated by the Democrat leader as recently as the Democrat convention last summer—intentions that they had to get rid of the legislative filibuster so they—their party is in control—they could do the things they wanted to do that they felt that the American people were asking them to do.

Well, it turns out there was an election between last summer and now in which the American people spoke otherwise. And they had a very different view than the Democrats on a whole range of issues; issues on which, I think, the left and Democrat Party are completely out of step with the American people, not the least of which is allowing boys to play girl sports. That is a 90-percent issue with the American people.

The House passed legislation on it. We will vote on it at some point in the future. And I just can't imagine—I speak as a dad of daughters who were both female athletes, one of whom is in her high school and college hall of fame. I don't know how anybody—this is where I say I think there is just a certain intuitive common sense the American people have, and they voted for that, and made that abundantly clear in the election just this last fall.

So I say to that, again, just to remind people, when you hear this perspective about how Republicans don't have any room for dissent, they all have to be in lockstep—believe me, we have a lot of dissent on our side. Try leading the Republican conference. The Democrats, on the other hand, if you have a dissenting view, particularly on something like the filibuster—sorry, you are out of here.

Mr. President, today, it is ironic to me that we are going to vote on two nominees—President Trump's nominees—to be Secretary of Department of Health and Human Services and to be Director of National Intelligence who are former Democrats. And I will be surprised—I would like to be surprised—but I don't believe there is going to be a single Democrat that votes for either of the two people who, less than a year ago, were members of their party—in some cases, members of their party that go back decades. The Kennedy family—the Kennedy family—Democratic politics in America.

You have two nominees who were Democrats a year ago, but because they articulate views now or demonstrate a dissent from the ideology of the Democrat Party, no longer can get even one Democrat to vote for them here on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

Again, I am hoping to be surprised. That vote is going to happen in about 30 minutes on Tulsi Gabbard to be Director of National Intelligence. And then shortly after that, we will have a cloture vote on Robert F. Kennedy to be Secretary of Department of Health and Human Services.

In each of those cases, you have Democrats in good standing as recently as a year ago who have been pushed

out, come now—their nominees brought by President Trump for positions within his administration—and you are not going to see a single Democrat vote for them. But we will confirm them, and we will get these people into these positions as soon as possible. And in answer, I think, to the mandate that was given by the American people in November—and that is they want a different track in this country, a different direction. They have a different set of priorities than is being articulated here in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, we also had just recently a vote on Laken Riley. That was probably the most glaring example, again, of Democrats' willingness to filibuster, something they wanted to get rid of 2 years ago. They wanted to get rid of the legislative filibuster.

We get the majority, first time we put a bill on the floor, what do they do? They filibuster. Here we are, slowing down these noms—full 30 hours on Tulsi Gabbard. I assume they will do the same thing on RFK. But these are people that are going to be confirmed and going to be, again, working in this administration to implement the agenda that the President of the United States has articulated and the one that he carried to the voters in this last election, an election in which the voters gave him a decisive majority at the polls.

Mr. President, I hope, again, I am wrong. I hope we have a bipartisan vote today on either or both of these nominees. But I will tell you that based on my assessment of where the party is, the Democratic Party in this country, it would come as a great surprise to me if that is the case.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, let me begin with a quote from President Trump during his campaign for the Presidency.

He said:

When I win, I will immediately bring prices down, starting on Day 1.

Well, today is day 23, and prices are up 3 percent. Let me reiterate that Donald Trump said during his campaign that prices would come down starting on day 1. It is day 23, and prices are up 3 percent.

Donald Trump is already breaking his promise to the American people. Inflation is the No. 1 concern of most Americans, and Donald Trump said he would fight inflation, but he hasn't. Groceries are up 0.5 percent. Chicken, pork, steak are all more expensive. Egg prices are up 15 percent from last month. Gas prices are up 2 percent from last month. The prices of used cars are up. The price of heating your home is up. Housing costs are through the roof even though Republicans are racing to privatize Fannie and Freddie.

Well, welcome to the age of Trumpflation. Donald Trump is break-

ing his promise to lower costs. This was the No. 1 issue in the campaign to most people. Donald Trump said: Starting on day one, prices are going to start coming down. Well, they are up 3 percent, and it is day 20. Welcome, again, to the age of Trumpflation.

Donald Trump knows that he doesn't have real solutions to bring costs down despite his campaign promises. So what is he doing?

He is distracting and diverting the American people or trying to—with issues that have nothing to do with bringing prices down. He is distracting and diverting with issues like changing the name of the Gulf of Mexico; talking about changing the chairman of the board of the Kennedy Center; talking about building hotels in Gaza; talking about the Panama Canal; talking about annexing Canada.

These are not the things Americans signed up for. No way. If there is one mandate Donald Trump had, it was to fight inflation on day one like he promised to do, but he is not doing that. He is focused on everything else except what Americans want most.

Meanwhile, Americans woke up this morning to bad news for their bank accounts. They woke up to the grim reality that Donald Trump is not going to keep his promise to lower costs. They woke up—Americans woke up—to an era of Trumpflation, and, unfortunately, this is only the beginning.

DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENT EFFICIENCY

Mr. President, on DOGE, we all agree—I have said it many times—that cutting waste in government and increasing efficiency is a good thing, but what DOGE is doing is something else entirely. DOGE is taking a meat-ax and attacking vital programs indiscriminately. Of the programs that he cuts, some may be wasteful; many, clearly, are not. Cut now, says DOGE. Ask questions later.

Meanwhile, of course, Trumpflation continues to get worse. If Donald Trump and DOGE want to focus on efficiency, they should do it as the Constitution maintains and the Founders wisely prescribed—through Congress. The Founders knew we needed debate; we needed sunlight; we needed transparency so we can see what programs can be improved or changed and what should be maintained. Instead, DOGE is taking a meat-ax and cutting vital programs that virtually no one outside of DOGE would call wasteful.

Cut now. Ask questions later.

I was in Albany and Syracuse on Monday, visiting community health centers. These centers throughout the country—CHCs as they are known, community health centers—are among the most effective and efficient users of government funding, and they rely on Federal dollars to provide high-quality, affordable healthcare for working people—far cheaper than for the people who would show up at a hospital. They are particularly important in rural areas where people have no option, but