

to keep the process moving and to keep people focused on taking what they were doing seriously without taking themselves too seriously.

I can tell you from personal experience that she also was pretty fun if you wanted to get together after all that work for a margarita.

As a legislator and eventually a speaker of the Minnesota House, Melissa approached her work in this way: by leading with compassion and respect, always staying in touch with our shared humanity. And, of course, she was unafraid to demand the same respect in return, both for herself and for others.

She was a woman leader, a leader who was a woman in a time when, sometimes even to this day, women are sort of not paid as much attention to as they deserve.

And Amy was referring to this. Once on the house floor, Melissa called out a group of male legislators who were playing cards in a back room rather than paying attention to women legislators that were speaking on the floor about how a criminal justice bill was going to impact their communities.

And so Melissa called them out. And, I mean, they were pretty pissed. They were unaccustomed to being confronted by their rude behavior, and they actually demanded an apology. And Melissa's response was characteristically honest and simple. She said, "I'm really tired of watching women of color, in particular, being ignored. So [I will not apologize]."

And this became kind of a thing. The next day, all over the Minnesota State Capitol, people were wearing T-shirts that said, "I will not apologize." It was quite—it was quite a moment.

Melissa stood up for others. She spoke truth to power, and she insisted that we treat each other with dignity and respect because public service should be—you know, even in a climate like we are in today, public service is serious business, unlike some of the nonserious activities that we see every day here in Washington.

So here is Melissa's true legacy: Millions of Minnesotans are better off because Melissa Hortman did the work that she did.

They have healthier drinking water because Melissa secured the funding that will eliminate lead water service lines in Minnesota.

Minnesotan schoolchildren will be able to focus on their learning. They won't be hungry because Melissa helped pass free breakfast and lunch for all Minnesota families with their kids in school.

Starting this year, Minnesotans will have access to paid leave. Every Minnesotan will have access to paid medical and family leave to care for their new babies, to take care of a loved one who might be ill because Melissa never gave up on that project and believed that that should be something that everybody has.

One year after her death, I still can't quite believe that she is gone. We had

our big party dinner just last Friday night, and I kept looking around and wondering—forgetting that she wasn't there.

And I know this summer, this fall, when I am out door-knocking, that I and a lot of people will be thinking about how she was always out there, doing the organizing of politics.

But, today, I am really focused on what Melissa and Mark meant to me and to all of us who had the privilege to know them. And my heart is with their family and their friends and especially their children Sophie and Colin. I know that they are comforted by the fact that so many people loved Mark and Melissa so much.

And I think that we would all do well to follow the advice of their children Sophie and Colin. And when they were asked so many times in the days after Melissa and Mark were killed, what people could do to help, this is what they told us. They said:

If you would like to honor the memory of Mark and Melissa, please consider the following: Plant a tree. Visit a local park and make use of their amenities, especially a bike trail. Pet a dog. A golden retriever is ideal, but any will do. Tell your loved one a cheesy dad joke and laugh about it. Bake something—bread for Mark or a cake for Melissa, and share it with someone. Try a new hobby and enjoy learning something [new]. Stand up for what you believe in, especially if that thing is justice and peace.

That is a good inspiration for all of us every single day.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BANKS). The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THEODORE ROOSEVELT NATIONAL PARK WILD HORSES PROTECTION ACT

CROSS-BOUNDARY WILDFIRE SOLUTIONS ACT

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to ask unanimous consent to pass two bills—S. 1377, my Theodore Roosevelt National Park Wild Horses Protection Act and Senator GALLEGOS's Cross-Boundary Wildfire Solutions Act. I want to thank my colleague for joining me here today and for his work on this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support the passage of these bills today.

In the case of my bill, for generations, horses have been a living, breathing part of the Theodore Roosevelt National Park in North Dakota. Their presence in the Badlands pre-dates the establishment of the park

itself and traces back to the region's early ranching heritage. Today, the horses remain one of the park's most recognizable and beloved features, enjoyed by more than 700,000 visitors annually when they come to the Theodore Roosevelt National Park.

But the horses are much more than just a visitor attraction; they are an important part of the historic landscape that reflects what Theodore Roosevelt himself experienced during his time in the Dakota Territory. His years in the Badlands helped shape his character, and they inspired the conservation ethic that would later define his Presidency. He was a rancher, so he was on horseback all of the time. He really credits North Dakota in that experience for rounding out his strength and vitality, which are some of the attributes that he needed to go on and be elected President. As a result, the horses of the Theodore Roosevelt National Park have become an enduring symbol of that legacy.

Yet, despite their importance, there have been repeated efforts to remove them from the park, including as recently as in 2022. Each and every time, those efforts are met with overwhelming public opposition not just from people in North Dakota but from people across the country who recognize the contributions the horses make to the park's incredible and colorful history. That is why we have introduced this legislation.

S. 1377 provides a balanced, common-sense, and durable solution. It ensures the National Park Service will continue to manage a healthy horse herd while providing permanent protection for an important part of the park's identity. Specifically, the bill directs the National Park Service to maintain a herd of not fewer than 150 horses—a population level consistent with the need for responsible management of a genetically diverse herd.

I greatly appreciate my colleague from Virginia Senator KAINE for joining me in introducing and sponsoring this legislation. Senator KAINE understands firsthand the important role of the wild ponies of the Chincoteague and Assateague Islands on Federal lands in his own State.

I also appreciate the support from the Department of the Interior and the National Park Service and their willingness to provide certainty for the future of horses in the Theodore Roosevelt National Park.

This bill is about ensuring that future generations can experience the same landscape that helped shape one of our Nation's greatest conservation leaders. By passing this bill, we can ensure the future of wild horses at the Theodore Roosevelt National Park.

I would also like to thank Chairman LEE, Ranking Member HEINRICH, and the Energy Committee's staff for their work in helping us advance this important legislation.

I am also pleased to work with Senator GALLEGRO to pass his Cross-Boundary Wildfire Solutions Act today, and I appreciate his partnership.

Therefore, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be discharged from further consideration of S. 1377 and that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the following bills en bloc: Calendar No. 430, S. 2033, and S. 1377.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bills by title.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2033) to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study on existing programs, rules, and authorities that enable or inhibit wildfire mitigation across land ownership boundaries on Federal and non-Federal land.

A bill (S. 1377) to ensure the maintenance of a herd of horses in Theodore Roosevelt National Park, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged of the relevant bill (S. 1377), and the Senate proceeded to consider the bills en bloc, (S. 2033) which had been reported from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert the part printed in italic, as follows:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Cross-Boundary Wildfire Solutions Act".

SEC. 2. STUDY ON WILDFIRE MITIGATION ACROSS LAND OWNERSHIP BOUNDARIES.

(a) *STUDY REQUIRED.*—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on—

(1) *the existing Federal programs, rules, and authorities that enable or inhibit wildfire mitigation from being completed across land ownership boundaries on Federal and non-Federal land;*

(2) *whether changes to any program, rule, or authority identified pursuant to paragraph (1) would allow Federal land management agencies (as defined in section 802 of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6801)), the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Natural Resources Conservation Service, the Secretary of Homeland Security, acting through the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the U.S. Fire Administration, States, local governments, and Tribal governments increased capacity or access to funding to mitigate wildfires; and*

(3) *the activities carried out pursuant to subsection (e) of section 103 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6513), including—*

(A) *how to improve the efficacy of such activities with respect to mitigating wildfire; and*

(B) *whether the enactment of such subsection has increased the access of Federal land management agencies and States to funding to mitigate wildfires.*

(b) *REPORT.*—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that contains—

(1) *the results of the study required under subsection (a); and*

(2) *recommendations to simplify cross-boundary wildfire mitigation between Federal land management agencies and State, local, and Tribal governments.*

Mr. HOEVEN. I further ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment to S. 2033 be agreed to; that the bills, as amended, where amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 2033), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The bill (S. 1377) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:
S. 1377

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Theodore Roosevelt National Park Wild Horses Protection Act".

SEC. 2. MAINTENANCE OF HORSES IN THEODORE ROOSEVELT NATIONAL PARK.

Section 5 of the Act of April 25, 1947 (61 Stat. 54, chapter 41; 16 U.S.C. 245), is amended—

(1) by striking the section designation and all that follows through "The Administration" and inserting the following:

"SEC. 5. ADMINISTRATION, PROTECTION, AND DEVELOPMENT.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The administration"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(b) MAINTENANCE OF HORSES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior (referred to in this subsection as the 'Secretary') shall maintain a genetically diverse herd of horses in the South Unit of Theodore Roosevelt National Park (referred to in this subsection as the 'Park'), with a population of not fewer than 150 horses.

"(2) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall develop a plan to provide for the management of horses in the Park.

"(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The plan developed under subparagraph (A) shall provide for the cost-effective management of the horses in the Park while ensuring that natural resources within the Park are not adversely impacted.

"(3) REMOVAL.—The Secretary shall not remove, or assist in or permit the removal of, any horses from Federal land within the boundaries of the Park—

"(A) unless the removal is carried out as part of a plan to maintain a genetically diverse herd of horses; or

"(B) except—

"(i) in the case of emergency; or

"(ii) to protect public health and safety.

"(4) MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary shall annually monitor, assess, and make available to the public findings regarding the population, structure, and health of the horses in the Park.".

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, with that, again, I want to thank my colleague Senator GALLEGRO and turn to him for his comments.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GALLEGRO. Mr. President, I rise today to mark an important step in the fight against wildfires with the passage of my Cross-Boundary Wildfire Solutions Act.

Like many Western States, my home State of Arizona is a patchwork of Federal, State, Tribal, and private lands. The fires do not stop at property lines. That is why we need an all-hands-on-deck approach to reducing wildfires and improving wildfire mitigation across land ownerships no matter who owns that land.

When fires move faster than governments can coordinate, the fire has the advantage. The Cross-Boundary Wildfire Solutions Act takes a practical step to fixing that. The bill supports the kind of collaboration between Federal, State, Tribal, and local partners that we know works. By studying and identifying the gaps in current Federal rules that present coordination between land ownership boundaries, we can bolster our firefighting efforts.

This couldn't be more timely. The West is getting hotter and dryer every year. In Arizona, we watched more than 200,000 acres burn across the North Rim of the Grand Canyon and the Kaibab National Forest.

The Dragon Bravo fire, one of the largest in Arizona's history, devastated iconic landscapes and the local businesses that depend on them.

In the face of these conditions, it is vital we have the research and coordination tools to ensure effective wildfire management.

At the same time, funding for the Forest Service's State, Tribal, and private forestry program is at risk. That is the funding that enables exactly the kind of cross-boundary collaboration this bill is designed to work with.

Congress needs to send a signal that we know this work matters, and we have the chance to do so today.

As we approach peak wildfire season, I have heard from people on the ground that cross-boundary collaboration is a top priority to keep our fire season from growing more dangerous and more expensive, and they are right.

The cost of inaction in lives and lands and dollars keeps climbing. So thank you, Senator HOEVEN, and his team for helping me lead this effort. Today we take a very important step in that direction.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, also known as FISA, is a critical national security tool. Well over half of every item in the President's daily brief is derived from section 702.

It has stopped terrorist attacks. It has stopped the flow of deadly drugs into our country. It has protected our troops overseas. It has allowed us to rescue troops overseas.

Regrettably, the Democrats, led by the two minority leaders, are going to allow this critical authority to expire tomorrow night.

Again, this program, which has been on the books for almost 20 years, is one of the most important intelligence tools that we have.

And why are they going to let it expire? I guess the minority leader is mad about who Donald Trump chose to run an intelligence Agency on an acting basis—an Agency that, by the way, has very little to do with section 702.

To the extent it does, legislation I proposed with Senator WARNER and other leaders in this Senate would impose more guardrails on that Agency.

And, by the way, if the law expires tomorrow night, all the guardrails on that, and every other Agency, expire as well.

So even though we haven't been able to pass the legislation that Senator GRASSLEY and I coauthored with Senator WARNER and others, the responsible next step is to have a short-term extension of this legislation, especially as we begin welcoming literally millions of foreigners to this country for the World Cup and for the America 250 celebrations right around the corner.

If we don't extend it for at least a few weeks while we continue to try to work on our differences, the consequences could be severe. The consequences, to be frank, could be fatal. Americans should not have to face that risk because of partisan game playing by the minority leader of the Senate and the House.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask for unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the bill at the desk. I further 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 Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Reserving the right to object is particularly relevant here, because I am sure my colleague is aware that the bill—the 3-week bill—was just defeated in the House on a strong, bipartisan vote this morning.

The House is not back until the 23rd. So my understanding is you can't do anything.

Bipartisan majorities in both the House and the Senate have now rejected what I consider to be the surveillance status quo. I believe there just have been too many abuses of Americans' rights across multiple administrations, and Members of Congress are now standing up and saying: No more.

The only viable path forward is one that leads to real reforms. The Congress has already punted on section 702 twice this year. Every day that 702 is in

effect without reforms is a day that Americans' rights are under threat. I believe Americans deserve new guardrails. If Congress is going to extend these authorities—and that is what we are talking about—those guardrails are essential. And, at a minimum, Americans deserve transparency about how these surveillance powers have been abused.

For those reasons, Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, let me try to respond to that fog of misunderstanding and misleading statements.

Section 702 does not surveil Americans. It is, to put it simply, about foreigners in foreign countries: so, say, an IRGC leader in Iran talking to one of his operatives in Lebanon; or a Russian in Moscow talking to a Russian in Mexico—all of whom are usually up to no good. The government is not permitted to use section 702 to target Americans, either here or in other countries.

It is called section 702 because, as is usually the case, laws have other sections to them—like title I has sections of the law that govern any targeting of an American—and those sections require a probable cause warrant, which is the Senator from Oregon's great crusade.

So-called reverse targeting of Americans, using section 702, is prohibited. Requiring a probable cause warrant for this information is akin to requiring a police officer to get a new warrant every time he goes into the evidence room to review lawfully collected evidence.

Now, for all the talk about transparency and oversight and privacy protections, I would point out that the legislation I have introduced has more than a dozen additional measures to include, for instance, criminal penalties for any abuse, to include more congressional involvement in the FISA Court's processes, more reporting to the committees on which the Senator from Oregon sits—just like the law we passed 2 years ago had many additional transparency measures and privacy protections.

And, as I pointed out, if this law is allowed to expire tomorrow night, so do all of those transparency measures and all those privacy protections.

So it is regrettable that we have reached this point, Mr. President. I just hope that the American people don't pay the consequences for the Democrats' reckless intransigence.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, again, like yesterday, I am making what I believe is a real offer now. I am offering, again, to extend section 702 of FISA for 5 weeks and give the public more facts about how these surveillance powers have been abused.

Defenders of the status quo seem to think that there is already enough

transparency around government surveillance. So let me be very specific about what the bill that I am now proposing would do. It would require more public disclosure about violations of our surveillance laws, including section 702.

It would require more public disclosure about warrantless searches targeting politicians, journalists, and religious leaders. This particular category of searches more than tripled in 2025, and the FBI has refused to explain why.

It would require more public disclosure about warrantless surveillance of Americans outside of FISA, which the public knows virtually nothing about. And it would require the executive branch to redact and release a March 2026 FISA Court ruling that found serious violations affecting Americans' rights.

The executive branch is already required to release this ruling eventually. The chairman and the vice chairman of the Intelligence Committee, in fact, asked them to release it by May 15. But, unfortunately, they just brushed off the chairman and the vice chairman's request.

Mr. President, so as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 4740; 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 Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. You bet there is, Mr. President.

Mr. President, all of these ideas are totally unworkable and also beside the point.

The Senator from Oregon has never voted for section 702. He is an implacable, ideological opponent of this law.

These measures, too, are for what—a 5-week extension that he would then extend permanently? That doesn't sound like a very reasonable offer to me.

But almost every one of them is designed to make this program unworkable and to expose Americans to grave risk.

There are already, again, dozens of transparency measures and privacy protections in place under a law passed, just 2 years ago, by a Democratic Senate, signed by a Democratic President.

The legislation that Senator GRASSLEY and I drafted with another Democratic Senator, the vice chairman of my committee—the Intelligence Committee—has nearly two dozen more. It is never enough for the Senator from Oregon.

So perhaps the minority leaders of the Senate and the House will eventually come to their senses and vote to support legislation that key leaders in their party have drafted to protect this country. But it will never be enough for the Senator from Oregon.

So I, of course, object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, just very briefly on this last point, the proposals I made yesterday and the proposals I made today are longer than anything else on offer—5 weeks—and I think that is the relevant fact.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. A 5-week extension for permanent, radical unworkable reforms. That is a farce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, what the Senator from Arkansas and chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee just said is absolutely accurate: The Senator from Oregon has consistently tried to kill this program and has never believed in it, has never voted for it. And it is a program that makes Americans more safe. That is a proven fact.

You ask any intelligence expert, any military planner in this country, the intelligence derived from the 702 program is something that has saved American lives in theaters of conflict, preventing terrorist attacks, preventing drug runners from getting drugs into this country.

Mr. President, 90 percent—90 percent—of the fentanyl disruptions coming into this country were stopped because of this program. This is a program that saves American lives.

And I have to ask the question. I mean, I can't, for the life of me, figure out why the Democrats continue to support policies that make this country less safe. TSA agents, I think, this year have worked without pay for almost as much time as they have worked with pay because Democrats have wanted to shut the government down, shut TSA down.

More recently, Border Patrol and Immigration and Customs Enforcement, two Agencies that are critical to keeping this country safe—they don't want to provide a single dollar—zero—zero dollars for ICE and CBP, making this country less safe.

And so what did we have to do? We had to use reconciliation to do something that ought to be a no-brainer around here: protecting the American people, keeping our borders secure, protecting people in our communities in this country from criminal illegal aliens.

I just don't understand this. And now this, blocking something that was negotiated on a bipartisan, bicameral basis, House and Senate—the chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, his Democrat counterpart; the same thing on the House side—with reforms, a lot of reforms. Something was negotiated in a bipartisan way to get a bill on the floor that we could use to extend this program and continue to keep Americans safe.

The ranking Democrat on the Senate Intelligence Committee made some public statements earlier today, and one was that having this shutdown is “obviously a high risk proposition.” That is a quote. He went on to say that he believes it is “dangerous”—“dangerous”—for section 702 to lapse.

And what this is all about is a temporary acting position at DNI. So Democrats have decided to block a vote against something that many in the past have supported, that is keeping this country safe, because they don't like the person that President Trump is putting into a temporary acting role. These aren't linked.

This is a program that works, and it works effectively to keep Americans safe. And the reforms that have been proposed, the legislation that has been agreed upon by Democrats and Republicans in the House and the Senate, ought to be able to pass the U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, 100 percent of the President's intelligence priorities are informed by the 702 collection—100 percent. I am just really—I don't get it. I just don't get it.

So what I am going to do is suggest, because this acting temporary person doesn't even get into the acting temporary position until a week from tomorrow, June 19, I am going to suggest that we do at least a 1-week extension to keep the lights on at this Agency, at a time when we are hosting the World Cup. We have got 250th anniversary celebrations going on around this country.

This is a time of risk for the American people, and Democrats here in the Senate said: Well, sorry. We don't like this guy in the acting temporary position, and so we are going to shut the lights off on this program and put at risk the American people. It is an untenable, irresponsible position.

But since he doesn't take that position until a week from Friday, I think we ought to at least extend this program through a week from Friday and allow for some more time for people to figure out the long-term solution, if there is one.

So, Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I am going to ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the bill at the desk. I will further ask that that 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 objection?

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. President, as the majority leader knows, the bill that came up in the House had a strong bipartisan vote this morning. It was not something that one party simply tried to jam something through on the other; it was a strong bipartisan vote. It was defeated. The House is gone until the 23rd, so they can't do anything.

Now, with respect to a couple of the details made by the majority leader, I have already indicated that on offer is my proposal, which is longer than anything that has come up in the last day. It is a real offer.

By the way, it is not changing any surveillance powers at all. All my proposal does is offer some transparency, and I think transparency information is relevant when there has been evidence of Americans being spied on, and I think that is why it is important.

So for those reasons, Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. THUNE. Let me just, again, say for the record, because the Senator from Oregon's proposal is designed to kill the bill—and there was a vote in the House. And I want to say there were 190 Republicans in the House who voted for a 3-week extension. And there would have been a lot of Democrats if they hadn't been told by their leadership, like they have been told here, not to vote for an extension.

This is an extension. This is an extension of current law. We have a proposal that has been negotiated by both sides that would be a longer term extension.

So if you are rejecting the 3-week extension, what I am suggesting here, and what you just objected to, because my understanding is—correct me if I am wrong—that the reason all the Democrats went south on this, in both the Senate and the House, was because of the nomination of a gentleman named Bill Pulte to be the acting temporary Director of the Office of National Intelligence.

If that is true and if he doesn't take office until a week from Friday, what objection could there possibly be—possibly be—to extending this program's authority until at least next Friday, so that we don't have a period where this program lapses, this program goes dark, at a time when there are literally hundreds of thousands of people coming into this country for the World Cup.

A 1-week extension, that is all we are saying. And the Democrats are going to object to that.

So, again, I will simply say this is, on its face, an irresponsible position that makes America and Americans less safe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MORENO. Mr. President, I will make my remarks very, very brief.

For those watching on TV, wondering what their government did this week, what you just witnessed on the floor of the U.S. Senate is one Democrat, at least, who is willing to have his position stated. The other ones are hiding because they know what they did today was so wrong.

At the end of the day, the most important job we have is to protect the American people. And because of Democrat political posturing, they made this country less safe.

And I hope and pray to God that nothing happens in this country where an American is killed or something happens to this Nation as a result of what we just witnessed here today.

This is another low point in the history of the U.S. Senate.

WAIVING QUORUM CALL

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum call with respect to the Smith nomination.

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

Mr. MORENO. I ask unanimous consent for the previously scheduled roll-call vote to commence.

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. 742, Justin D. Smith, of Missouri, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit.

John Thune, Tim Sheehy, Pete Ricketts, Mike Rounds, John Barrasso, Ted Budd, Jim Banks, Rick Scott of Florida, Todd Young, David McCormick, Shelley Moore Capito, Jon Husted, John Boozman, Mike Crapo, Katie Boyd Britt, Eric Schmitt, John R. Curtis.

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 Justin D. Smith, of Missouri, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), the Senator from Florida (Mrs. MOODY), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) would have voted "yea" and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 47, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 171 Ex.]

YEAS—47

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

NAYS—43

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

NOT VOTING—10

Bennet	Hagerty	Shaheen
Blackburn	Moody	Tillis
Coons	Moran	
Graham	Rosen	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORENO). On this vote the yeas are 47, the nays are 43, and 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 Justin D. Smith, of Missouri, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

CHICAGO BEARS

Mr. BANKS. Mr. President, before we leave town for the week, I wanted to comment, share some really good news for the great State of Indiana. You might have seen the news late last week, but last Friday, June 5, the Chicago Bears board announced that they voted to officially advance the process of building a new stadium not in downtown Chicago but rather in Hammond, IN. I am a lifelong Indianapolis Colts fan, but today I want to talk about the Chicago Bears.

The No. 1 question that I have received over the last week is, Will the Chicago bears change their name to the Indiana Bears? And I have been assured that that will not be the case. They will remain the Chicago Bears, but their board, as I mentioned, voted to start this process to build their stadium in Hammond, IN.

Hammond is a part of, in Indiana, what we call "The Region"—Northwest Indiana, Lake County. Communities like Gary, East Chicago, and Hammond are blue-collar, working-class commu-

nities, rich from those steel-producing jobs that have been in that part of my State for generations, that have employed so many Hoosiers.

This is big news for Indiana. It is a shot in the arm for a part of my State that can really use it. And a lot of people are going to benefit from the development that will occur around this new site that is just 18 miles to the east of where the Chicago Bears are currently located, Soldier Field in downtown Chicago. It is only about a half-an-hour drive from the current site to where this new site will be in the community in Hammond.

And the reason I want to come and talk about this today is this isn't just about sports. This is about the tale of two cities, the tale of two States—a State with leadership, vision; a State that is open for business; and a State that is bankrupt, literally a State that has gone bankrupt with failed leadership, with blue-State policies that we have seen around the country, in other States like California. But Illinois, they take the cake in Illinois for liberal, leftwing policies.

And there is a lot—a lot—to unpack here about why the Chicago Bears—this iconic, over 100-year iconic football team and their ownership—made this decision to come to my State and abandon the policies of Illinois and the city, the once-great big city, great city of Chicago, that they are fleeing from.

I just want to suggest to you today that when it comes to States like Illinois—a liberal State, a high-tax State, an anti-family State, an anti-business State—it is a State that is destroying itself inside out. And then talk about a Republican, low-tax, pro-family, pro-business State like my State is thriving, and this great news just goes to prove it.

Now, I wanted to point out a few statistics that I have recently become aware of. According to CNBC data from last year, Indiana is the second-best State in the country when it comes to cost of living; Illinois, 34.

Indiana is ranked, according to CNBC—the same data—the best State in the country when it comes to the cost of doing business. We are open for business in Indiana. Illinois ranks among the worst States in the country for doing business.

Indiana, the ninth best State in the country for businesses—period—and that number keeps getting better for our State because we passed right-to-work laws. We have reduced our property taxes, income taxes, the tax burden in our State.

And by the way, in Indiana, we actually pass balanced budgets at our State legislature every 2 years. Illinois is a bankrupt State. They have so much debt in their State that the taxpayers are holding the bag for it.

So when it comes to cost of living and the cost of doing business, Indiana is a far better environment for families and businesses than Illinois.

But you also have to look at crime statistics because this tells a big part