on, 10 million baby boomers a day become eligible for, and in 6 years, if Congress does nothing, by law, their benefits will be cut almost 29 percent. So let's just say that once more. If Congress does nothing, in 6 years, by law, benefits going to 75 million Americans—and more at that time—will be cut by almost 29 percent.

We have known this is coming. It is because there has been a continued drawdown from the Social Security trust fund. By law, Social Security cannot pay out more than it receives. Currently, it is receiving money from payroll taxes but also from the trust fund. When the trust fund goes belly up in 6 years and the only income is that which current workers are paying, then the amount going out has to fall, and it will fall 28.5 percent if we wait until then to fix things.

I am pleased to say, though, that there is now momentum on both sides—Republicans and Democrats—to find a solution and to preserve benefits for those who have spent their lifetime earning them.

By the way, people ask: How is Social Security going bankrupt? I have been paying into it my whole life. Everybody I know has been paying into it their whole life. So why is it going bankrupt now?

I point out to people that when Social Security came along—I don't know—there were like five kids per family, and now there are like two kids per family. And when Social Security was first enacted, you didn't get benefits until you were 65, but the average age of death was 62. Now people live until they are 82, and they are getting their hips replaced when they are 75 to go bungee jumping in New Zealand. So the point being is that people are living far longer and they are living more actively, and as a result of that, we are drawing down that trust fund.

So my Democratic colleague from Illinois DICK DURBIN, he and I just introduced the PROMISE Act, along with a group of colleagues, Republican and Democrat. And the PROMISE Act sets up a process. It doesn't dictate a policy. It sets up a process that puts Congress on the clock to save Social Security.

What the PROMISE Act does, it says that Congress shall come up with multiple options to present to the Senate Finance Committee or to the Ways and Means Committee in the House in order for them to consider it, have it scored, and be delivered to Congress in order to deliberate. And then it says that the relevant committee—say, Senate Finance—has 7 working days to consider it and then it comes to the floor and then we have a vote on it.

That begs the question, Why do it now? Why not wait until next Congress? Because every year we wait, it gets harder and harder to fix Social Security. The amount of cuts required or the amount of taxes to be raised are more dramatic, more drastic, and more likely to harm an individual's personal finances.

We are not dictating a policy. We are just setting up a process.

Now, by the way, in full honesty, I have a policy I have been working on, but my policy will be just one of several policies that will be considered. My policy, we have something in it which we call the big idea. In our big idea, we look at pension funds that are doing well, that are not going bankrupt, that are growing in line with the needs of the people whom they cover. This will be the kind of pension fund that Exxon or Google or Deloitte & Touche has—it is called a pension investment fund—in which dollars are invested at an early stage, allowed to grow, and as those dollars grow over time, they meet the need of the retirees as the retirees become eligible for pulling those dollars down.

We have actually done that in the Federal Government. Under George W. Bush, the Federal railroad retirement system was going insolvent, and so Congress voted to allow to diversify the investments of this pension fund. I think every Democrat voted for it in the Senate. Three Republicans voted no, and the concerns they had have been proven to be wrong because what has happened now, in the Federal railroad retirement system, we still have more and more retirees relative to fewer workers, but that system is in the black because it invests in the strength of the U.S. economy, and the strength of the U.S. economy has been able to pay all future obligations.

That is our big idea: What has the Congress already done successfully with the Federal railroad retirement system? What is being done with major corporations to meet their pension benefits? And kind of what do you do with your own 401(k)?

So if we can set up this investment fund to supplement the payroll taxes that are the primary source for funding Social Security, we can meet that future obligation.

By the way, let me go back to the PROMISE Act. I am not dictating my proposal will be the answer. We are dictating a process that can be considered so that any proposal can be brought up. The Presiding Officer has a proposal with Senator WARREN. His proposal can come up. So it might be his proposal. More likely, it is going to be some sort of amalgamation.

But the only option that should not be an option is to do nothing. Congress is—I am searching for the right word. Congress is being irresponsible—destructively irresponsible—if we don't address Social Security. It is driving the national debt. And if we cut benefits by 28 percent, that will double poverty among the elderly. The promised benefit will not be delivered. By the way, if all we do is borrow, it is going to tank our credit rating.

By the way, going back to my particular plan, folks say: Well, what if the stock market goes down?

Under our plan, all risk is borne by the investment fund; no risk is borne by the individual. That individual gets all the benefits she has been promised even if the market goes up and down.

They ask me: Is it putting the trust fund into the stock market?

No way. We have a separate investment fund, separate from the Social Security trust fund, and that is where the investment goes.

And one more thing. Folks want to say: Well, wait a second. I don't trust the Congress, and I don't trust the President. If you put a pot of money there, it is like honey to a bear; they are going to reach in and grab it.

We have guardrails all over the place, including an annual audit of how the money is invested and how the money is spent or not spent, and that audit is put online so the American people can keep track of what is happening with their trust fund.

I will finish by saying this. I like my plan. I think it is a good plan. I think it is going to make it a lot easier to address the problem. But the PROMISE Act is not about my plan. The PROMISE Act, which DICK DURBIN and I introduced, is only setting up a process by which Congress is forced to take action before it gets any worse. My proposal may be the one considered. It may be the Presiding Officer's. It may be somebody else's. The only option that should not be taken is the option of doing nothing. We need to do something.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks prior to the scheduled rollcall vote.

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

IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, on Monday, we saw yet another example of what has become disturbingly common, and that is an act of far-left terrorism. Outside the Jacob K. Javits Federal Building, a man poured gasoline on the entrance, set it ablaze, and tossed fireworks into the raging flames.

Thankfully, law enforcement responded swiftly to apprehend the suspect, who was armed with two axes, a hammer, a machete, and three knives, but not before he injured four innocent people.

Authorities believe the attack was motivated by the suspect's hatred of Immigration and Customs Enforcement. The Federal building he targeted is home to New York's ICE field office and other Department of Homeland Security offices. Before the attack, he allegedly pushed a cart with a sign reading ''ICE Off Our Streets'' and made anti-ICE statements.

This attack did not come out of nowhere. It follows a monthslong campaign by Democrats to demonize ICE and our brave Federal law enforcement officers who are simply doing their job. They have likened them to ''secret police,'' the Nazi Gestapo, the Soviet

KGB, and ''slave patrols.'' They have called them a ''clear and present danger,'' a ''reign of terror,'' and ''nondescript thugs.'' They have accused them of ''mayhem and death,'' ''terror and violence,'' and ''scar[ing] the American public.''

These are not statements from fringe figures. This is what is so astounding. These are statements from prominent Governors, Senators, and lawmakers calling our Federal law enforcement and ICE these names. The vilification of Federal law enforcement is now central to the Democrats' identity and their messaging.

Look at the proposals by the Democrat Socialists of America. They would do away with ICE. They believe that by attacking our officers, they can get at President Trump. And in reality, what they are doing is putting a target on the officers' backs.

I have to admit that I was surprised when New York's far-left socialist Mayor Zohran Mamdani called Monday's attack ''deeply disturbing.'' In many ways, he has led the attack on ICE. He has called ICE a ''cruel agency that does nothing to further the interests of public safety'' and ''too rotten to reform.'' He claimed that they are ''terrorizing people'' and should be abolished. He even signed an order to block ICE officers from arresting criminal—criminal—illegal aliens in schools, shelters, and hospitals.

While Democrats bow to their radical base, Republicans are continuing to stand for the rule of law. Under President Trump's leadership, we have focused on ensuring that our Federal law enforcement Agencies have all the resources they need to do their jobs.

It is why we passed the Secure America Act. That is a landmark law that will fund ICE and Border Patrol through the end of President Trump's term. That way, Federal law enforcement officers can continue to track down the violent criminal illegal aliens that Joe Biden brought into this country through that porous southern border.

It is important to remember that every single Democrat voted against the law. Every single one voted against funding ICE and Border Patrol.

Whenever they have the chance, they put illegal aliens in front of American citizens. They keep working overtime to try to make illegal legal.

They want to return to Biden's open border. But as long as Republicans are in charge, that will never happen.

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 senior assistant executive 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. 827, Daniel Mack Traynor, of North Dakota, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit.

John Thune, Tim Sheehy, John Barrasso, Pete Ricketts, Thom Tillis, Chuck Grassley, Ted Budd, Shelley Moore Capito, Bill Hagerty, Kevin Cramer, Cynthia M. Lummis, Marsha Blackburn, Tim Scott of South Carolina, Tom Cotton, John Hoeven, Darline Graham, Ted Cruz.

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 the nomination of Daniel Mack Traynor, of North Dakota, 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) is necessarily absent.

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 206 Ex.]

YEAS—51

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

NAYS—46

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

NOT VOTING—3

McConnell	Murkowski	Warnock

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JUSTICE). On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 46. 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 Daniel Mack Traynor, of North Dakota, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, Americans are worried that the money in their pockets will not cover the increasing costs of gas and groceries and housing or healthcare. Meanwhile, the President of the United States, Donald Trump, is worried that the money in Americans' pockets doesn't currently have his face or his signature on it.

You know, in 2020, Congress passed a law to produce new coins to celebrate America's 250th anniversary. In that law, we wrote that the coins should be emblematic of our 250th anniversary—the U.S. semiquincentennial celebration of 250 years of the vision of a democratic Republic—of a government by and for the people; of our values as a free people, with the rights of free speech and free assembly and free expression. Well, certainly, this we know—that the symbol of putting a sitting President or leader on a coin is not a symbol of a democratic Republic; it is a symbol of an authoritarian strongman.

If we turn the clock back to the year 44 BC, Julius Caesar was Emperor and he decided to have a coin with his face on it. He was the first to do so. It was a radical departure from Roman tradition, and it alarmed the Senate. It was viewed widely as a blatant display of personal power—of personal authoritarian power. And if you missed the point, on the backside of this coin, it had the words ''dictator perpetuo''—''dictator in perpetuity'' or ''dictator forever.'' That is what it represents to put your face on a coin.

Then, at the time our Nation was founded—and, again, we are celebrating the 250th anniversary of that vision—King George III put his face on a coin, on the silver sixpence, and it was viewed, as it was with Julius Caesar and the Emperors who followed him, as an expression of authoritarian personal power.

Does our Constitution provide for an authoritarian structure of government, where power flows down from the King to the people? I think not. It flows up from the people through elections.

That is why putting your face on a coin just is absolutely wrong and why it violates the very premise of the law that created the permission to have this 250th anniversary coin. The design that Trump has come up with—that of a fake gold coin with his face on it—violates the law that we passed. It is widely out of sync with the values of our Nation. It is widely out of sync with our history and our best traditions. So these coins should never be made, and, if made, they should never be distributed.

It is part of a long list of this authoritarian, would-be strongman, dictator President, who is trying to stamp his name onto every public place available.