

Fourth of July recess—the Senator from Oregon thinks that is too long. We would even be OK with a 45-day extension, which would give us until about the middle of June. Yet here he is proposing 3 weeks, which in reality is 2 weeks, given the Senate and the House calendar, because we are out of session next week.

Now, he has said to me: Well, we can talk about this over the phone, which I guess reflects his usual lax indifference to security matters.

This is not a tax bill. This is not a healthcare bill. This is a highly classified intelligence program. We can't just text and chat about it on our phones. We need to be here in Washington, in secure spaces, where we can talk about highly classified details. For that matter, we need to be here in Washington so we can talk with the operational figures in the FBI, in the CIA, and in the NSA who run this program, who have the knowledge to tell us: This reform will work; it preserves operational viability. That reform won't work.

So when he asks for a 3-week extension, just realize that is a 2-week extension, not a 3-week extension.

Now, he says: I just want to do business as usual, and that is why I waited this long.

Let me add that one of the key figures here is the vice chairman of the Intelligence Committee, who, everyone knows, just suffered a terrible family tragedy. We held off introducing our bill, in part, out of respect for the vice chairman and his family grieving about that terrible tragedy.

I would suggest that we owe him a little bit of decency, respect, and grace, and that we can get to a good result if we take a little bit more time to actually have a thorough negotiation when everyone is ready to do so.

Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, so let me repeat the central business in a key area, and that is: I am prepared today to pass a short-term extension of section 702. I am doing that because I have listened to colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

I don't think it is really necessary because of the FISA Court ruling recently, but in the interest of comity and working together—which is something I have tried to make a priority—I want to state again: I am prepared to pass a short-term extension of section 702 today.

What I am also extraordinarily concerned about, though, is there is a classified ruling of the FISA Court that found troubling abuses of section 702 that violate Americans' constitutional rights.

Let me just repeat that. That is a finding that the court found of troubling abuses of Americans' constitutional rights.

What I am beginning to get a sense of is the Trump administration is now so

desperate to keep this ruling secret they would rather let section 702 expire than make it public, which I believe is the key here—make it public before the vote.

The American people deserve to know what the Trump administration is up to. Before the Congress votes on whether to give Americans greater protections, Congress must use a short-term extension to openly debate the critical issues in front of the American people, and I am disappointed that instead, it sure feels right now that the other side of the aisle is covering the abuses up.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, again, let's be specific on what we are talking about here. The Senator from Oregon keeps talking about a short-term extension. I think most people with some common sense—the people sitting in our Gallery—would say: You know what; a 45-day extension is pretty short term when the House just voted for a 3-year extension.

Is 45 days not short term in the context of a 3-year extension, versus what the Senator from Oregon has proposed, a 3-week extension which is really a 2-week extension, because, again, we are in recess next week? We cannot discuss these matters on our cell phones or by text message or by anything else.

So if we are open to a short-term extension, I would suggest that 45 days is fairly short term.

The Senator from Oregon also speaks about comity. I would suggest that comity also counsels that we have a little bit longer than 2 weeks for a grieving colleague who just had a terrible family tragedy.

And, finally, about this FISC matter, it is the Senator from Oregon continuing his longstanding practice of grossly misrepresenting classified material in public for his own ideological ends.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, my colleague on the other side of the aisle is now ducking the issue that I have brought to light. I am clear that I am for a short-term extension. I have said it now three or four times.

But I also believe that the government, which is already required to declassify the ruling I am seeking, it ought to get out to the American people. That is what this is all about. I would just say to my colleague the chairman: Let's let the American people decide whether it is not a big deal as my colleague has said.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I am ducking nothing. I am pointing out the Senator from Oregon's longstanding practice of distorting highly classified material in public. And one of these

days, there are going to be some consequences, and it may be when I am chairman of this committee.

I yield the floor.

#### 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 Executive Calendar No. 5, S. Res. 690, an executive resolution authorizing the en bloc consideration in Executive Session of certain nominations on the Executive Calendar.

John Thune, Ted Budd, Mike Crapo, Mike Rounds, Kevin Cramer, Bill Cassidy, Katie Boyd Britt, Ashley B. Moody, John Boozman, Jon Husted, Roger F. Wicker, Tom Cotton, John Barrasso, James E. Risch, James Lankford, Steve Daines, John Hoeven.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the mandatory quorum call under rule XXII has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on Executive Calendar No. 5, S. Res. 690, an executive resolution authorizing the en bloc consideration in executive session of certain nominations on the Executive Calendar, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) is necessarily absent.

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 112 Ex.]

#### YEAS—51

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

#### NAYS—46

Alsobrooks	Durbin	Kim
Baldwin	Fetterman	King
Bennet	Gallego	Klobuchar
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	Lujan
Blunt Rochester	Hassan	Markey
Booker	Heinrich	Merkley
Cantwell	Hickenlooper	Murphy
Coons	Hirono	Ossoff
Cortez Masto	Kaine	Padilla
Duckworth	Kelly	Peters

Reed	Shaheen	Warren
Rosen	Slotkin	Welch
Sanders	Smith	Whitehouse
Schatz	Van Hollen	Wyden
Schiff	Warner	
Schumer	Warnock	

NOT VOTING—3

Moran	Murray	Tuberville
-------	--------	------------

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

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE RESOLUTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the executive resolution.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

An executive resolution (S. Res. 690) authorizing the en bloc consideration in Executive Session of certain nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in 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.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—  
H.R. 4371

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to seek unanimous consent that the Senate pass H.R. 4371, the House companion to my Kayla Hamilton Act, which passed the House with bipartisan support.

This bill is named in honor of Kayla Hamilton, a young woman who was viciously murdered by an MS-13 gang member. This criminal entered the United States as an unaccompanied minor and was released into the custody of an unvetted sponsor.

Kayla's death is a tragedy. I had the honor of meeting her mother Tammy Nobles—one of the Angel Moms who came and testified at a hearing I held last summer.

Kayla's murder highlights how irresponsible the Biden administration was in handling unaccompanied minors entering the United States during President Biden's 4 years in office. By some accounts, there were as many as a half a million unaccompanied minors who came into the United States during the Biden administration's open border policy and then were placed with sponsors, many of whom were unvetted. Many of these so-called unaccompanied children were 17-year-old boys—almost fully grown men.

Unfortunately, many of the children—the more vulnerable children—

were released to unvetted sponsors, and that should be illegal. If we are going to care about our children who are the most vulnerable among us, which is really how a society is judged—how we treat the most vulnerable people in our society—then releasing children to unvetted sponsors should be a crime. While Health and Human Services has reformed its policies under President Trump, the careless and, I would say, reckless way that unaccompanied minors were handled by the Biden administration was shameful.

My bill requires HHS, Health and Human Services, to obtain information about potential sponsors and any person who lives in the sponsor's household before a child is placed with them.

It was common practice for the Biden administration to so call vet the named sponsor but yet not everybody else living in that household who could be a sexual predator or could have another criminal record or could be a threat—an immediate and real threat—to that child.

But this bill requires HHS to obtain information about potential sponsors and any person—all persons—who live in that sponsor's household before a child is placed with them, and it bars criminal alien sponsors from being allowed to assume custody of these children.

This bill also requires Health and Human Services to conduct mandatory checks on all unaccompanied children, including considering whether an unaccompanied child poses a danger to themselves or the community—contacting the consulate or embassy or their home country and vetting them for ties to criminal organizations. As I said, some of these children were very vulnerable, but others were almost grown men in many instances. And without proper vetting of these unaccompanied children—a child, of course, is anybody under the age of 18—that, in and of itself, is a danger that should stop.

It is only common sense that we should not place our children in the custody of criminals, and we should also vet the unaccompanied minors themselves, including for ties to gangs and existing criminal histories.

I urge the adoption of this legislation.

Mr. President, I would ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 4371, which was received from the House; and, further, I ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object. I think Senator CORNYN and I share a goal—actually, multiple goals—one is to adequately protect children who are crossing the border by themselves to make sure

that they are in adequate, humane, and appropriate placements; but also to vet individuals, including young unaccompanied minors who are crossing the border to make sure that they are not a danger to themselves or to others.

I am going to object to this bill today. It is a pretty comprehensive rewrite of a lot of the laws relative to the detention of minors. And while I think we can probably come to some common ground here, as I read this bill in preparation for the Senator's unanimous consent request, it looks as if it has a number of measures that would actually be seriously detrimental to vulnerable kids, kids who pose no threat to themselves or to others.

Let me just give you one example, and it is a pretty significant problem with this bill that maybe we could clear up. This bill does not allow for unaccompanied minors to be immediately reunited with their biological parent if their parent is a TPS holder, if their parent is applying for asylum, if their parent is a refugee, if their parent is here on a student visa. And so there are going to be a whole bunch of kids who are not going to be reunited with their parent—which I think we have always agreed is the proper course, if possible—because of some of the underlying provisions in this bill. So I just think that this has to go through another round of edits and work before it is ready to come to the floor.

I will also note that this administration sold us on their new immigration policy based on the fact that they were going to be going after "the worst of the worst." They are going to be going after immigrants who pose a danger to the community. I think that is what Senator CORNYN's goal is here, to make sure that we aren't bringing into the country young people that might present a danger to others.

But, of course, the facts do not back up the administration's claim. What we have learned after a year and a half is that this administration is not going after "the worst of the worst." Eighty-five percent of the people they are detaining have no criminal history at all; 95 percent of the people they are detaining have no history of violence at all. They are roaming American streets just looking for anybody with an accent.

So I am all for an immigration policy that tries to target the very, very small number of people entering this country who may pose a danger to Americans. The reality still is that immigrants commit crimes at rates lower than natural-born citizens.

But we are in league on the underlying goal. I just think this bill doesn't get there; and, in fact, this bill may do a lot of harm to kids who pose absolutely no threat to themselves or to others. And for that reason, I would object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Texas.