

But if my colleagues want to reauthorize section 702 quickly, there is a simple solution, and my colleague Senator WYDEN of Oregon made this point on the floor last week. We can bring reform to section 702 and give larger numbers to support it and its reauthorization. Support these commonsense, bipartisan reforms supported by a majority of American citizens to prevent 702 from being used to violate basic constitutional rights.

Unfortunately, our demands for reform have received no help from the President. He is more concerned with pushing the SAVE America Act, changing every election—his bill to make it harder for Americans to vote.

Over the weekend, President Trump announced that he opposes any FISA reauthorization that does not include Save America, as I mentioned. This act would slap undue burdens and excessive costs on Americans seeking to exercise their most fundamental right—the right to vote.

So why would the President support adding this measure to critical 702 reauthorization? Because he is afraid of the next election. That is what it comes down to. He is afraid his party is going to lose in November. He saw when he went to Texas and argued that the Republicans in control there should redraw all the congressional maps for the November election on the chance that the Republicans will pick up more seats. We will see what happens.

Section 702 must not be linked to President Trump's efforts to suppress the vote. Instead, Congress should reauthorize it with reasonable reforms, bipartisan reforms that protect our national security and safeguard America's constitutional rights.

Trump's campaign of retribution and attacks on America's ability to vote make this mission all the more important. We cannot allow a President consumed by vengeance to monitor Americans' private communications with no external checks or limits.

Our Nation's Founders understood this well, which is why they created the Fourth Amendment to safeguard Americans from government overreach into their lives. For too long, section 702 has jeopardized those protections, but we have a chance to end that abuse now.

Let's not wait any longer. Congress should reauthorize section 702 with sensible reforms and finally put an end to the unconstitutional surveillance of innocent American citizens.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEEHY). The Senator from North Carolina.

AV-8B HARRIER

Mr. BUDD. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a significant milestone in Marine Corps aviation history. Earlier this month, on June 3, the AV-8B Harrier aircraft retired from combat after four decades in service.

Since the aircraft's introduction in 1985, the Harrier has symbolized the Marine Corps' elite operational mobility. Its vertical and short takeoff, combined with its landing capabilities, have enabled marines to operate from remote locations and ships around the world. From supporting missions in diverse environments, including Afghanistan and the Persian Gulf, the jump jet has proven itself to be a reliable aircraft time and time again.

The Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point in Havelock, NC, is home to the 2nd Marine Aircraft Wing, and it has served as the center of the Harrier community for over 40 years. Under the command of Lt. Col. John Cumbie at VMA-223—the final Harrier squadron—all pilot training and daily operations have taken place in Havelock, making the Harrier a familiar presence.

Earlier this year, I had the opportunity to fly over Eastern North Carolina in a Harrier jet with Maj. Lucas Pumphrey, Maj. Eric Scheibe, and Brig. Gen. Shannon Brown. Experiencing the aircraft's capabilities firsthand offered a powerful reminder that behind every mission are exceptional marines whose skill, discipline, and dedication to duty make these operations possible and help preserve the security of the United States and our allies.

The AV-8B Harrier has retired from service, but it will be preserved at STARBASE STEM education center at Cherry Point, where it will be on display for the public. This transition from a warfighting aircraft to a prominent piece of military history will continue to inspire generations to come.

Mr. President, please join me in honoring the Harrier, its storied history at Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, and the brave marines that flew the AV-8B.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

21st CENTURY ROAD TO HOUSING ACT

Mr. RICKETTS. Mr. President, Nebraska is the best place in the world. Nebraska is where Americans want to be. And just recently, U.S. News just said Omaha, our largest city, is the second best place in the country for recent college grads. This is a wonderful recognition of what great quality of life we have in Omaha.

And as we welcome all the new college grads, it also reminds us that we have got more work to do with regard to housing. Housing is something that we need to make more affordable for Americans. Just 10 years ago, the average age of a new homeowner was 31 years old. Today, the average age of a new homeowner is 40.

About 25 percent of the cost of a new home is regulation and redtape. And, actually, for an apartment building it is even worse—it is 40 percent. I was talking to an apartment builder in Omaha, and he described to me how when he first got into building apart-

ment buildings, he could build an apartment for about \$15,000 and now the cost is well over \$200,000.

Now, this is not a new issue. When I was Governor of the great State of Nebraska, this was something we worked on as well. In fact, I worked with my legislature to introduce the Rural Workforce Housing Act. We put about \$7 million into a grant program which allowed rural communities to be able to partner with developers to be able to help build homes or apartment buildings.

The way it often worked is that the community would create a low-interest fund that developers would apply to—oftentimes using it, for example, as a bridge loan—build the housing development and then pay off the loan so the money could be recycled back into the next loan to help build more houses.

It was very successful, and we ultimately added more money to that program and then created the Middle Income Housing Fund as well to be able to help out cities like Omaha.

Here in the Senate, I continue to bring this Nebraska solution to the rest of America. We are working on our ROAD to the 21st Century Housing Act. In fact, this is something that has passed both the Senate Banking Committee and on the House side as well, and I want to commend Chairman SCOTT for the great work he has done working with both sides of the aisle to receive their input to create the ROAD to the 21st Century Housing Act.

This is a bill that will help cut that regulatory redtape I was describing earlier. It includes several of the bills that I have introduced, including the Streamlining Rural Housing Act.

So this bill, in particular, what it does is requires Housing and Urban Development and USDA to work together. Both these Agencies will have grant money to help build homes. And a homeowner won't be able to take money from both of those, but what happens is—they both have their own permitting and review process, which often will be done in serial and creates more regulatory redtape and bureaucracy. What my bill does is require them to work together to streamline that process to be able to make it faster.

And this is something that, again, is part of the theme of many of the bills that we have put together into this ROAD to 21st Century Housing to be able to make the process easier. If we can build more homes faster and there are more homes available, that will help bring down the cost of housing. It is a pretty simple concept.

In addition to the Streamlining Rural Housing Act, I have got a number of bills that are also included in the ROAD to the 21st Century Housing Act, including the Rural Housing Regulatory Relief Act. This was one that MIKE FLOOD, who is the First District Congressman from Nebraska, brought up in the House.

Also Improving Housing Access Act; Housing for America's Middle Class

Act; Rural Housing Service Reform Act, which I am a cosponsor of. All of these are included here to be able to help us cut the regulatory redtape, make housing more affordable, and be able to help reduce the costs for Nebraskans and Americans across the country.

We have passed this out of our side; the House has passed their side. Right now, we are working to take the best of both of those bills to be able to get something that we will, again, both vote on and then send to the President's desk.

This is, again, how we are working in the Senate to be able to reduce the costs of living for people across the country. I am very proud to be able to work with my colleagues on the ROAD to 21st Century Housing Act. I look forward to being able to get this to the President's desk for signature.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. KAIN. Mr. President, I thank you and my colleagues for being on the verge of a vote on a matter I placed before the Senate to give Senator DURBIN S.J. Res. 190. I think Senator DURBIN has already spoken, and I believe Senator PADILLA will follow me and then we will move to the vote.

But I just want to explain why I think this is such an important matter. The resolution would repeal a regulation that the Trump administration has put in place concerning the appeal of immigration cases.

So immigration cases, as we all know, that are heard in immigration courts by administrative law judges often involve very, very momentous matters for the applicant. And, traditionally, immigration cases are able to be appealed to an appellate administrative process in case a judge gets something wrong.

And the appellate process is designed in all court systems to enable the correction of error. No judge is infallible. Judges make mistakes. Sometimes judges make mistakes because the quality of the lawyering before the judge is not that good.

But whether it is a civil matter or a criminal matter or an administrative matter, a real hallmark of the American legal system—and I think it is something we can be proud of—is there is an appeal process to correct mistakes.

The regulation that President Trump's administration has put in place that I challenge in the resolution that will come up is a regulation that dramatically limits immigration appeals. So, for example, prior to the Trump regulation, somebody who got an immigration decision from an immigration court would have 30 days to appeal. The Trump administration regulation that I challenge has shrunk that amount of time to 10 days.

What is the problem with that? Oftentimes, the immigration judge signals a ruling but hasn't even done a written opinion within 10 days that an individual or lawyer could know whether there is a basis for appeal or not.

And so the reduction of the time to appeal to 10 days is certainly going to have the consequence—and I think it is an intentional thing—to dramatically limit people's ability even to appeal. The absence of a record, the absence of a written decision would severely challenge somebody's ability to appeal.

In some ways, the more serious concern I have about the regulation is it also gives the immigration judges a massive ability to summarily dismiss appeals without any hearing whatsoever. So even if you file your appeal within the 10 days, the new regulation allows the immigration court to summarily dismiss those appeals 10 days later unless a majority of the appellate body wants to hear the case. And so there is almost a default that the appeals will be summarily dismissed.

And, again, if you look at the time deadline: 10 days to file the appeal and then you can summarily dismiss within 10 days. A total of 20 days. Again, you may not even have a transcribed court record from the immigration hearing or a written opinion from the immigration judge by the end of that 20-day period.

And so this is an effort to essentially make the appeals process meaningless by imposing such tight time deadlines on the filing of appeal and encouraging the dismissal of appeals on a summary basis as to render the appeals process completely unworkable.

All right. What does that mean? Let's talk about what this means to immigrants in immigration courts. And I want to use two kinds of cases that are really common in the everyday work of our immigration courts.

The first is asylum cases. The United States has had a practice—and other nations have it as well. And, again, it is a practice that I think we should feel proud of—that we will offer asylum to individuals who are able to prove that they have a well-justified fear of persecution if they return to their country of origin.

And this has been used to protect people from torture, protect people from imprisonment, protect people from death, protect people from all kinds of grievous harms in their countries of origin because they are a political opponent, because they are a member of a religious minority or an ethnic minority, because they have been subjected to domestic violence, because they have been pressed into service in the military as a child soldier in countries that force people into the military at a young age.

And the United States, along with nations around the world, has always allowed someone to come in and make this case: I will be subject to persecution—even to torture and death—if you

send me home. And the United States has allowed people to make that case. And my belief is that is a good thing, not a bad thing.

Maybe the standard should be a tough standard; but if you meet that standard, you should be allowed to remain here rather than be sent back to suffer horrible consequences in the country where you come from.

Let me give you a couple of examples of this that are sort of topical and recent examples. President Trump authorized military action in Nigeria on Christmas Day to bomb certain areas and target certain groups that were persecuting Christians.

Christians being persecuted in this part of Nigeria led the President to say: This justifies use of the United States military to try to eliminate the threat whereby people practicing their Christian faith will be targeted for torture and even death.

So the President has acknowledged that this is a serious concern. And so what if somebody from Nigeria seeks asylum status in the United States and says: I am a Christian; I am being targeted because of my religion; President Trump believes this is such a serious thing that he authorized United States military action to target terrorist groups in Nigeria to protect Christians; I would like asylum status in the United States based on President Trump's recognition that I am subject to religious persecution?

If you force essentially the evisceration of an appeals process, you run the risk that individuals who are subject to persecution of this kind would be returned home and thereby face the very persecution that President Trump has spoken out against.

Here is another one: Iran. Iran's regime is one of the grossest violators of human rights on the planet to political opponents, to religious minorities.

There are Iranians in the United States right now who have active asylum cases and are attempting to demonstrate: Please don't send me back there. The work that I have done in Iran against the regime will immediately get me imprisoned or worse, should I be sent home.

And so if you are going to have a protection for asylees, if you are going to say: We don't want to send people back to a place where they are going to be tortured or killed for an illegitimate reason—you shouldn't turn the immigration appeals process into essentially a worthless process that does not provide protection for people who have a high risk of suffering if we make a mistake in an immigration case.

So that is one kind of case, and it is an asylum case. It is a standard, everyday case in our immigration courts. And I think there is a pretty strong motive that we not make mistakes in these cases but we get them right. And an appeals process that is substantive and significant increases the chance that we will make the right decision, and eliminating the appeals process or