

calling “deportation judges.” The name says it all. These changes are not about efficiency; they are about finality, the end of the road for people who have been following the law every step of the way. They are finished. They are about dismantling due process and destroying any means by which an immigrant might have a fair chance at making their case.

Make no mistake, this policy has Steve Miller written all over it. He may be the President’s closest adviser, but I will also tell you he is relentless in his war against immigrants. Whether they are here legally or illegally makes no difference to him. He wants them gone.

Just take the Board of Immigration Appeals’ recent decision in “Matter of Santiago.” It confirmed what we already knew: Even though DACA is supposed to protect Dreamers from immigration enforcement, this administration wants to find a way to deport Dreamers.

Well, of course, they are going after the worst of the worst: the rapists, the murderers, the terrorists, the criminally insane, the child predators. They snuck across the border, and now they have to go.

But wait a minute; that is not DACA. DACA is about kids, children, infants brought to the United States, living their whole life in the United States, who go through a background check, which includes serious efforts to determine whether there is any criminal activity in their background. Then they pay a \$600 filing fee. Then they are protected for 2 years to work in the United States without fear of deportation.

Does that sound like the worst of the worst criminals?

They are teachers. They are nurses. They are doctors. They are police. They are members of our military. But they have to be gone in the world of Steve Miller. They might have an accent or something or maybe look like they are Hispanic, which tends to be, for Mr. Miller, just enough to deport them. And that is what we are up against.

This decision paved the way for immigration judges to issue deportation orders to DACA recipients who grew up in this country and are legally protected from deportation. But even that is not enough for the Trump administration.

I urge my colleagues to reject the attempt to cut due process in our immigration court system and vote in support of this resolution.

How many times have I heard my Republican colleagues say: Oh, well, I am not against immigration; I am just against illegal immigration.

Really? If you eliminate the legal process where an individual who is seeking status in America can assert their rights under the law, it seems to me you have already prejudged the case.

I am happy to join with Senator KAINE in supporting this measure on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW RELATING TO “APPELLATE PROCEDURES FOR THE BOARD OF IMMIGRATION APPEALS”—Motion to Proceed

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague from Illinois so much, who has been such a great champion on these issues, and I now move to proceed to Calendar item No. 425, S.J. Res. 190.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 425, S.J. Res. 190, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Executive Office for Immigration Review relating to “Appellate Procedures for the Board of Immigration Appeals”.

VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS), and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 173 Leg.]

YEAS—46

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

NAYS—48

Armstrong	Capito	Curtis
Banks	Cassidy	Daines
Barrasso	Cornyn	Ernst
Blackburn	Cotton	Fischer
Boozman	Cramer	Graham
Britt	Crapo	Grassley
Budd	Cruz	Hagerty

Hoeven	McCormick	Scott (FL)
Husted	Moody	Scott (SC)
Hyde-Smith	Moran	Sheehy
Johnson	Moreno	Sullivan
Justice	Paul	Thune
Kennedy	Ricketts	Tillis
Lankford	Risch	Tuberville
Lee	Rounds	Wicker
Marshall	Schmitt	Young

NOT VOTING—6

Bennet	Hawley	McConnell
Booker	Lummis	Sanders

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ARMSTRONG). The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator PADILLA and I be permitted to speak prior to the scheduled recess.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4791

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, we are going to speak on eliminating Trump’s slush fund.

Now, the only way—the only way—to ensure Trump’s \$2 billion taxpayer-funded MAGA slush fund and his family’s sweetheart tax fraud deal with the IRS—the only way we are going to ensure that they never see the light of day is to ban them permanently by law. Republicans need to stop playing dumb and realize Trump has absolutely zero intention to table his slush fund.

Just listen to him. Just this month, Trump said:

Personally, I think the weaponization fund is a great idea, and so do many other Republicans.

“So do many other Republicans.”

I repeat. Trump said:

I think the weaponization fund is a great idea, and so do many other Republicans.

I invite Republicans to prove Trump wrong, support this bill, outlaw this corruption, say it is a terrible idea on the floor so that we can eliminate it permanently, once and for all.

Republicans have passed up opportunity after opportunity to ban these corrupt cash handouts for Trump, his billionaire friends, and his cop-beating January 6 insurrectionists.

That is what he wants to do, Americans. Instead of using money to reduce your healthcare costs, instead of using money to reduce your electric costs, your housing costs, your food costs, he wants to give it to his corrupt friends and probably, somehow, to himself.

Will Republicans listen to the empty promises of Trump’s personal fixer, Todd Blanche, or to the outraged cries of the American people, who despise—despise—this corruption?

Will Republicans help Trump and family cheat on their taxes or will they stand up for American taxpayers?

Will Republicans funnel billions of dollars to Trump, MAGA billionaires, cop beaters, convicted criminals; or will they work with Democrats to lower costs for working families?

That is the question before us today, plain and simple. Trump’s slush fund,

his permission slip for tax fraud, and his nonstop grifting are a running tally of corruption's cost and proof that Trump hasn't drained the swamp; he has just slapped a pool liner on it. In short, Trump isn't draining the swamp. He is swimming in it, and he likes it.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 4791, submitted earlier today. Further, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read three times 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 Tennessee.

Mr. HAGERTY. Yes, there is, Mr. President.

Reserving the right to object, the President made clear that he would not seek any compensation from the anti-weaponization fund, and, for my own part, I have made it clear that I won't seek any compensation from the anti-weaponization fund.

Acting Attorney General Todd Blanche, under oath, has said:

We are not moving forward with the fund, period.

Why is that not enough for my colleagues from across the aisle? Because they have a deeper and much darker motive. They want to erase the Biden Justice Department's unprecedented weaponization by abolishing every means of holding it accountable. I am not going to stand for it.

Has there ever been a more systematic effort to surveil and oppress the political operation of a sitting President's opponents than under Joe Biden?

We all know the answer. In fact, my esteemed colleague from Iowa Chairman GRASSLEY has called it "arguably worse than Watergate."

The Biden DOJ's Arctic Frost Operation involved a taxpayer-funded army of lawyers obtaining financial information on over 400 individuals and groups that happened to support President Trump in the 2020 election.

Yet, despite serious internal concerns and objections that were raised within the DOJ that this wasn't a proper basis for a search, President Trump's home was raided, at Mar-a-Lago, in a made-for-TV operation.

This witch hunt extended even to the halls of the U.S. Senate. By now, everyone is familiar with how the Biden DOJ subpoenaed the records of eight Republican Senators—myself included—specifically because of conversations that we had in anticipation of a vote that was coming up on this matter.

That is a serious affront to congressional privileges, and it was a clear violation of the Constitution's speech or debate clause.

Did the Constitution matter to the Biden DOJ or to their allies at Verizon? It seems not. The Biden DOJ and Verizon violated the constitutional

rights of numerous Republican Senators.

Several of my staff were among those with the temerity to serve in the Trump administration. Without any reason to think they were involved in any wrongdoing, members of my staff were subpoenaed, they were forced to hire counsel, and they were subjected to depositions. The costs can be ruinous.

As my staff was tortured, I saw firsthand how the process was the punishment. Think about it. If you could ruin someone's financial future, there is no need to prove them guilty. If you can set an example that working in a Republican administration will get you put on a "do not hire" list by left-leaning law firms or make you the target of taxpayer-funded investigations by a Democrat-controlled and weaponized DOJ, then you achieve another chilling objective—that is suppression.

Democrats in the last administration weren't satisfied with targeting Republican officials and staffers; they went even further. To take just one example, the DOJ under President Biden brought its enormous power to bear on the groups it hates the most. In my home State, that was pro-life demonstrators. Yes, that is right. When violent crime had skyrocketed in American cities across the Nation, the Biden DOJ devoted precious resources to criminally prosecuting peaceful pro-life demonstrators in my home State of Nashville, TN. They were letting go criminal illegal aliens, who would strike again, just so they could prosecute those whose politics they disagreed with. What a disgrace.

My colleagues across the aisle are simply trying to cover up and sweep under the rug the fact that the Department of Justice under President Biden became a tool to destroy his political opponents.

Just so there is no mistake, this is far from the first political controversy involving the DOJ's settlement authority. I won't recount all of the instances in which the Biden or Obama administration used DOJ settlement funds to funnel billions of dollars to their pet projects. Needless to say, my Democrat colleagues apparently saw no problem with that. Indeed, not a single Democrat ever cosponsored the Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act in the 114th Congress, in the 115th Congress, nor in the 117th or the 118th Congress. Yet now, when any victim of the Biden DOJ's weaponization might actually receive some recompense—well, now, they have found religion. And even that is an overstatement.

Today's bill is different in the worst way from Republicans' previous efforts to constrain the DOJ's settlement authority. This proposal by the minority leader isn't an evenhanded proposal that would constrain Presidents of both parties moving forward; it would solely invalidate a single settlement agreement involving specific parties. This treads dangerously close to the

Constitution's prohibitions against ex post facto laws and retroactive legislation, and I have serious concerns that it violates the Fifth Amendment's due process clause.

I can't stand for this unconstitutional, hypocritical bill; therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. My colleague from Tennessee talked about things being swept under the rug. Nothing—nothing—sweeps under the rug this statement of Donald Trump's:

Personally, I think the weaponization fund is a great idea, and so do many other Republicans.

He is going to do it unless we stop it. The objection is so unfortunate. It allows Trump to continue with his slush fund.

I yield the floor to my colleague from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, this past January 6, I introduced a bill we titled the "No Rewards for January 6 Rioters Act" because, as we knew, as we saw just last year, one of the very first things Donald Trump did when he came back into office was to issue pardons for every person convicted of crimes connected to the January 6 insurrection—people convicted in a court of law by a jury of their peers for trying to not just subvert an election and the peaceful transfer of power but by assaulting Congress itself, assaulting Capitol Police officers, threatening to hang the then-Vice President of the United States.

But we know that abuse of power, these pardons, were just the beginning. Since then, there has been an active campaign to raid taxpayer funds to reward those who stormed and ransacked the Capitol. So I for one was not surprised when Acting Attorney General Todd Blanche announced a corrupt settlement to create a \$1.8 billion slush fund for Donald Trump to reward the perpetrators of the January 6 attacks. And I hope you all noticed—because it doesn't happen very often—that the outrage, the pushback on this fund was bipartisan. Many in Congress on both sides of the aisle viewed it as an unacceptable abuse of power. As a result, Mr. Blanche has testified to Congress that the fund is "dead." But in the court proceedings, he, the Department, and the President refused to put it in writing. No one has been willing to confirm under penalty of perjury that the fund will never go forward. Why? What are they holding back on?

Now making matters worse, the President is still using this corrupt settlement to shield himself and his family business from review by the IRS permanently. That is right. The President of the United States sued his own government, led by an Attorney General who happened to be his personal lawyer, and they reached a settlement

to bar the IRS from ever reviewing his tax returns—not just for himself; for his family, for his trusts, and his affiliated companies.

So it is obvious to the American people that Congress needs to act to rein in this corrupt behavior.

I should underscore a point here because on the one hand, there have been these measures to block the creation of the fund. There are other ways for payments to go out from the Department of Justice. So it is not just the creation of the fund that needs to be blocked; payment to those convicted of violence on January 6 needs to be explicitly clear.

Now, I am a little surprised but not shocked at what I have seen in the last couple of weeks because now we see Republicans reverse quickly. Just a couple weeks ago, many of them were very concerned about this proposal. Yet, simultaneously, they would come to the floor to block my bill to prohibit the payouts to January 6 insurrectionists. Now, today, they have objected to Senator SCHUMER's bill to fix this once again.

So let me be clear: This fight is not over. The American people cannot and will not bear the cost of corruption that this administration has created.

While the slush fund is apparently dead for now, we have our eye on the many financial claims that were filed by January 6 insurrectionists that are still pending at the Department of Justice given other programs and pots of funding, which is why, colleagues, unless we pass my legislation, there is nothing to stop the DOJ from handing hard-working American taxpayer money out the door to January 6 rioters. And until we pass Senator SCHUMER's legislation, President Trump will continue to seek lifetime immunity from tax audits.

If our Republican colleagues will not join Democrats to address this, I guarantee you the American people will.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. HAGERTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak before the previously scheduled recess.

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

Mr. HAGERTY. Mr. President, I find it quite interesting that my Democratic colleagues are now seeking to somehow block some of the funds of the Department of Justice when they would never do this before. I mentioned earlier that Republicans put forward the Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act. In four previous Congresses, not a single Democrat was willing to join; not a single Democrat was willing to help us rein in the Department of Justice. Yet, when we find abject weaponization of the Department of Justice, when we have my own staff—and I would ask any of the staff in this room to think about it, put themselves in their shoes. If you happen to work in the White House under a Republican administra-

tion, then you can find yourself, under a weaponized DOJ, subject to subpoena, subject to depositions, and your parents are putting \$200,000, \$300,000, \$400,000 of their life savings at stake to protect and defend their children. This is exactly the conversation I had with my staff and their parents. It is heart-breaking. It needs to stop, and there needs to be accountability so this never happens again.

I am not about to stand here and just sweep this under the rug and act like the weaponization of the Biden DOJ never happened. Not in history has anything happened like this before, where a sitting President goes after his opponent and all of his opponent's allies—subpoenaing U.S. Senators' phone records, like they did mine; having a corrupt operation with—it appears Verizon and the DOJ colluded. Maybe Verizon had a particular transaction like the Frontier acquisition that they wanted to curry favor with DOJ to achieve and therefore just violated the Constitution and handed my records over, along with other U.S. Senators'.

This should not be allowed to happen. We can't, as Americans, act like it never did, and to accept Senator SCHUMER and my colleague Senator PADILLA's recommendation would somehow give credence that nothing ever did happen. Indeed, the worst weaponization of government that we have ever seen in our lifetime did happen under the Biden administration.

I will not stand for it.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:57 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m., and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. BRITT).

MORNING BUSINESS—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam President, today I rise in support of ending Donald Trump's illegal war in Iran.

Over the weekend, President Trump told the American people this conflict is over. He said that Iran had agreed to a deal.

So why take this vote today? Well, I have heard that one before from this President. From trade to peace negotiations, President Trump often claims victory without any work to show for it.

The truth is, President Trump has not reached a deal with Iran. There is no agreement to end their nuclear program, no assurances that the war won't continue, and no evidence that Americans are better off today than they were before this all started. In fact, we

are told—all just by press reports—that he has merely reached an agreement to keep talking about a deal over the next 60 days. But we have zero details and are told to just take the President's word for it.

President Trump started this war over 100 days ago without signoff from Congress, the people's branch. He cost 13 servicemembers their lives, spent more than \$30 billion in taxpayer money, and jacked up energy costs for American families by \$450, on average. President Trump has asked working families to foot the bill for a war that they did not choose and do not like, and now he is claiming victory without a permanent solution in hand. At an immense cost to the American people, we are in a worse position than when President Trump started this war. That is why Donald Trump's wink-and-nod promise is simply not enough. My constituents want a guarantee that this expensive and unnecessary war is over once and for all.

Diplomacy has always been the path forward. Passing this resolution would finally force President Trump to follow the law, listen to the American people, and end the war that no one likes.

I urge my colleagues to listen to your constituents and end this war.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam President, 3 weeks ago, this body voted to have a debate over the President's war in Iran; more specifically, whether the United States Congress should exercise its constitutional authority to declare war or to bring this conflict to an end. Since that time, the administration has announced that it has reached a deal with Iran to reopen the strait with an agreement to reach an agreement later over Iran's nuclear weapons. The President has made it clear that should Iran not agree to a deal over its nuclear program within 60 days, he will resume bombing.

I sincerely hope that this is the beginning of the end of the war and that our servicemembers will soon be coming home, but a still-secret agreement that postpones the difficult questions for 2 more months is little assurance when the President has so often during this conflict promised far more than he has delivered.

From the beginning, the President assured the country that the war would be "short" and it would be over "very soon." Just weeks after the conflict began, around 100 days ago, the President said that U.S. forces would be leaving "in the near future." He said talks were going very well and "very, very soon" the conflict would be over. "I think we won," he said.

That was on the last day of winter. This weekend will mark the first day of summer. This entire spring, the American public have stepped into the shoes