

As just one example, a victim of trafficking or domestic violence who defended themselves against an abuser would have to be detained under the law.

Most immigrants in the United States are law-abiding individuals who are seeking a better life. Studies have shown that immigrants have no impact on crime rates, and immigrants are less likely to commit crimes than ordinary U.S. citizens. But the sweeping approach in this bill would deprive immigrants of the due process that everyone is afforded to prove that they are innocent of a crime.

And I agree with many of my colleagues that we need a more orderly system to process recent arrivals at the border and assure that bad actors are detained, if they have serious criminal convictions.

Recently, a bipartisan group of Senators and the White House began negotiating a change in our immigration laws and a tough border deal. It was written by the Republican's designated negotiator, Senator JAMES LANKFORD of Oklahoma, along with two other Senators—one, an independent from Arizona, and the other, a Democrat from Connecticut. The bill that they wrote to make our border safer and to deal with immigration was endorsed by the National Border Patrol Council, which represents the men and women on the border who are risking their lives every day to keep us safe.

I had personal concerns about this bill, but I wanted to move it forward. And yet, when it came to a vote, the vast majority of Senators on the other side of the aisle opposed it, at the request of Donald Trump, who tanked the border agreement for his own cynical reasons.

What were those reasons? One House Republican said:

Let me tell you, I'm not willing to do too damn much right now to help a Democrat and to help Joe Biden's approval rating.

President Trump himself was crystal clear. He said: "Blame it on me" if the bill fails.

That bill was our vehicle and opportunity to work on a bipartisan basis, to change many of the provisions in immigration law, to make America safer, and to make our borders secure and more effective.

Some extremists have said the quiet part out loud: Donald Trump doesn't want a solution to our challenges at the border; he wants a political issue for November.

It is time that my Republican colleagues and Democratic colleagues stop talking about the border in one-off responses to it and start legislating, rather than vilifying all immigrants based upon a few bad actors.

It is a tragedy what happened to these two young women. There is no excuse for it, and those responsible should be held accountable.

I urge my colleagues to do the best that we can to come up with an immigration reform that resolves not only

this serious issue but all of the other issues we are haunted with on a regular basis.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Iowa.

Ms. ERNST. Madam President, I am very sad that we are on the floor today and that Sarah's Law has been objected to. We have been down this road before, many times over, through the years since Sarah Root's death.

Now, I do understand that ICE has discretion, and that is what we are discussing today. It is the fact that ICE had discretion and chose to allow Edwin Mejia to post bond of \$5,000 to disappear into the night. Before Sarah was even laid to rest, Edwin Mejia was long gone, and he has yet to face justice for Sarah's family.

In July 2020, a Mexican national was drunk-driving in Texas and struck and killed a Chicago resident and two retired U.S. Army officers. All were part of a pro-law enforcement motorcycle club. The Mexican national was out on bond and awaiting trial for allegedly striking a man with his truck in 2018, biting the victim's back, and biting off a portion of his ear. If Sarah's Law had been on the books, he would have been detained in 2018 to await trial.

In June 2011, a Chicago resident was killed in a drunk-driving accident. The driver, a Mexican national, was driving with a blood alcohol level four times over the legal limit. He struck and killed a Chicago resident, dragged the victim's body 300 feet, and then attempted to run away on foot. He was bailed out—again, bailed out, not held. He bailed out and fled to Mexico. He was extradited back to the United States in 2022.

If Sarah's Law had been on the books, he would have been detained and not been able to flee to Mexico.

In March 2021, a Mexican national shot and killed his next-door neighbor in Chicago. He then injured the three officers attempting to arrest him. The Mexican national was arrested in 2011 for driving with an open container. In 2015, he was arrested again for aggravated assault. In 2012, he attempted to lie his way into a visa reserved for victims of criminal activity. And he also twice unsuccessfully applied for the DACA Program in 2014 and 2015.

If Sarah's Law had been on the books, he would likely have been detained after the aggravated assault in 2015, and, again, we would have another innocent who was killed still alive today.

So these are just a handful of examples of where Sarah's Law would have made a difference.

I do understand that there is an objection to the discretionary part of this bill, and the example that was given is of those who are being trafficked for sex-type operations. Sex trafficking is very real. Because I have worked in this space of domestic violence and violence against women, I do and have

heard from those who have been sex-trafficked that sometimes the only way to break away from those who are trafficking them is actually to be arrested and pulled away from those johns or those sex traffickers. So maybe to put them in an area of safety would be the right thing to do.

So I appreciate having been heard. I will continue to work on behalf of the Root family, on behalf of the Riley family, and others who have lost loved ones to those who should not be here in our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Madam President, I believe we have 15 minutes, and just for the order of battle here, I would like to recognize Senators GRASSLEY, CORNYN, and HAWLEY to make some brief remarks. I will make some brief remarks, and we will make a unanimous consent for the bills that I have indicated we are trying to call up.

With that, I would turn it over to Senator GRASSLEY.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, first, I would like to thank Senator GRAHAM for his leadership for protecting our kids, and also I would like to thank him for giving me this opportunity to help him advance three bipartisan bills which could revolutionize child safety in the digital era.

As child predators have exploited the development of technology to harm and endanger our Nation's most vulnerable, our laws to address this grave and growing threat to our kids have fallen way, way behind.

We have three bills to talk about. One goes by the title of "STOP CSAM." It strengthens reporting requirements of suspected abuse by expanding mandatory reporting and enhancing the CyberTipline, and it also protects child victims in court.

Another bill goes by the title of "EARN IT." It modernizes section 230 to ensure that victims can secure justice.

And the last one, the SHIELD Act, would impose necessary criminal penalties for distributing illegal explicit material and hold sexual predators accountable.

I am proud to cosponsor both the STOP CSAM and the EARN IT Act and have supported all three bills in the Judiciary Committee as part of my efforts, joining with Senator GRAHAM, to protect American youth. These bills are essential to protect our children and are examples of the fine bipartisan work that this body is capable of doing when we put constituents first.

Nothing is more important than protecting our youth, their childhood, and their futures. It is time to send these bills to the House and then hopefully through the House to President Biden. The longer we wait, the more children

are victimized and more childhoods are lost. We owe it to them to do what is right.

Thanks again to Senator GRAHAM for deferring to me, and thank you for your leadership.

Mr. GRAHAM. I see the chairman of the committee, Senator DURBIN. Go anytime you like or, Senator CORNYN, if you want to go next, then we have KLOBUCHAR and HAWLEY and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, last year the Center for Missing & Exploited Children received 32 million—32 million—reports of suspected child sexual exploitation.

As we are demonstrating here on a bipartisan basis, the Senate Judiciary Committee, chaired by the Senator from Illinois, passed six bipartisan bills that aim to protect those children, and you have heard of some of them.

Two of the bills have already passed the Senate, including my Project Safe Childhood Act. Four others still need to pass, including the SHIELD Act, which Senator from Iowa just mentioned, which I introduced with Senator KLOBUCHAR, from Minnesota, to ensure that criminals who share explicit photos of children online are held accountable.

Children are our Nation's most valuable resource, and yet we neglect them far too often when they fall prey to predators on line and in our streets.

But we need to move on these bills. It is not enough for us to pat ourselves on the back and say the Judiciary Committee did its job on a bipartisan basis. We need these bills to be taken up, passed, and sent to the President of the United States without further delay.

I want to thank Senator GRAHAM for his leadership on this issue, and I hope the Senate can finally advance these bills.

Mr. GRAHAM. Before I turn it over to Senator DURBIN and the Senator speaks, Senator DURBIN has been terrific. The committee worked together to get these bills passed unanimously. Thank you for your leadership.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator for bringing us together on the floor today.

Are you worried about what your kids are looking at on those phones they carry around all the time? You try to get their attention, and they just can't take their face away from the phone. You often may wonder, What is on there? They say: Don't worry, Mom and Dad, we are just fine. Grandparents feel the same way. They look at it and think, What in the world are they looking at?

Sadly, we know that some of them are looking at horrible things that they should never look at in that stage of their life, and we also know that exploitation is taking place.

In January, we joined together on a bipartisan basis. Senator GRAHAM and myself, as chairman and ranking member of the committee, called a historic

hearing with five CEOs from Big Tech companies. That hearing demonstrated that kids' online safety has widespread bipartisan support. Perhaps no other topic—in fact, I can't think of another topic where we had a unanimous vote on these bills by every member on the committee, Democrat and Republican, all 21.

The emotion I witnessed during that hearing and the faces of survivors, parents, and family members were unforgettable. There were parents who lost their children to the little cell phone they were watching day in and day out. They committed suicide by the instruction of some crazy person on the internet. They were children then and had grown up into adults, still haunted by the images they shared with some stranger on that little telephone years and years ago.

And you think to yourself, Well, why didn't they step up and say something? If those images are coming up on the internet, why don't they do something about it? Why don't they go to the social media site? In many and most instances they did and nothing happened.

That is the reason why we need this legislation. The STOP CSAM Act will allow survivors of online child sexual exploitation to sue the tech companies that have knowingly and intentionally facilitated the exploitation.

In other words, one young woman told a story. She shared an image of herself, an embarrassing image of herself, that haunted her for decades afterward. She went to the website that was displaying this and told them: This is something I want to take down. It is an embarrassment to me. It happened when I was a little girl and still I am living with it even today. They knew that it was on their website because this young woman and her family proved it, and yet they did nothing—nothing—but continued to play this exploitation over and over again.

Why? How could they get away with it?

They asked and many people asked: I thought we had laws in this country protecting children; what is going on? Well, there is a section 230 which basically absolves these companies—these media companies—from responsibility for what is displayed on their websites on their social media pages.

That is exactly what we have changed here. We say something basic and fundamental. If the media, social media site knowingly and intentionally continues to display these images, they are subject to civil liability. They can be sued.

Want to change this scene in a hurry? Turn the lawyers loose on them. Let them try to explain why they have no responsibility to that young woman who has been exploited for decades.

That is what my bill works on. I am happy to have the cosponsorship of Senator GRAHAM and others. We believe that this package of bills should come to the floor today, and that is what Senator GRAHAM is asking for.

Let's have a debate. Let's hear the other side of the story if there is one. But for goodness' sake, for parents and grandparents across America and particularly for the kids, let's do something to protect them that is fundamental and basic.

To say that this industry is somehow beyond liability and beyond the law is not right; it is not American; and it shouldn't be allowed in this country.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAHAM. I just want to say amen and now pass it to Senator KLOBUCHAR.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I rise today to join Senator DURBIN and Senator GRAHAM—thank you for organizing this—Senator CORNYN and Senator HAWLEY and others who believe it is long past time to update and change our laws in this digital world.

As my colleagues know, I have been trying to do this in the area of competition policy. We had a setback this week with losing the increased antitrust fees that were supposed to go to the Justice Department. But we carry on and hope that won't be the same next year and then join our colleagues across the aisle to try to change the law. If we are not going to give the resources, we better change the laws.

For too long social media companies have turned a blind eye when children joined their platforms and built algorithms that pushed harmful content out to kids. Despite hollow apologies and empty promises, these companies haven't fixed the problem.

The problem has gotten worse and every single parent knows it and every single person in this room. You don't even have to have a kid or grandkid to know it. You heard it from your friends, and we certainly heard it in testimony before our Judiciary Committee.

That is why I support Chair DURBIN's bill, the STOP CSAM Act—I am a cosponsor—the EARN IT Act that Senator BLUMENTHAL and Senator GRAHAM have, and that is why I am working with Senator CORNYN to pass the SHIELD Act.

I am going to focus on the SHIELD Act because that is my bill, but I support these other bills.

In 2016, 1 in 25 Americans reported being threatened with or being a victim of so-called "revenge porn." Now, just 8 years later, studies show that 1 in 12 people report being a victim. Yet there is no current statute addressing these serious privacy violations, violations which have enormous social, emotional, and even financial impacts on victims.

According to one survey, 93 percent of victims report suffering significant emotional distress due to having intimate images shared against their will; 13 percent report difficulty getting a job or getting into school because these images are on the internet; and more than half experienced suicidal thoughts as a result of the violation.

FBI Director Wray—if you don't want to believe us—FBI Director Wray testified that the Bureau has recently reported an increase in sextortion scams, which in 2022 alone resulted in at least 20 victims committing suicide—20 victims committing suicide—including Jordan DeMay, a high school senior and straight A student who took his life after he was blackmailed with the threat of distributing nude photos over Instagram.

What happens is these kids think they have met a girlfriend or a boyfriend. They give them a photo, and it turns out to be a scam. And then they threaten them that they are going to put the pictures online, and these kids don't know who to turn to. They are just dumb kids—and they commit suicide. It is that straightforward. The Washington Post has done a review of a number of these cases.

So are we just going to sit there and let this get worse and worse and worse? I just don't think that is the answer. The Stopping Harmful Image Exploitation and Limiting Distribution, or, as it is known, the SHIELD Act, gives law enforcement the tools it needs to stand up for victims of serious privacy violations.

Our bill establishes Federal criminal liability for people who distribute or threaten to distribute others' explicit images online without consent. It also fills in gaps in existing Federal law so that prosecutors can hold all those who share these images intentionally of these kids accountable.

Let me make clear that we have—of course, as a former prosecutor and as the Presiding Officer is from the great State of Nevada—we understand that you have to narrowly define these bills and these laws. That is what we have done, and we made many changes after the markup of this bill. We listened, and we made changes to the bill. I have worked to refine the bill to address the concerns, and I continue to work with my colleagues to do so. But at some point—this was last May, and we are still sitting here. So that is why I join my colleagues in asking to get these bills through now, not tomorrow, not a month from now—now.

When that Boeing plane lost a door midflight in January, nobody questioned the decision to ground the planes to see what was wrong. No one thought that it was the mom who should have done something and checked out those bolts ahead of time or that it was the kid who should have been able to figure out that something was going wrong here.

We have laws on the books. As Senator DURBIN said, we have the ability to sue. We have laws on the books. These companies are no longer little companies that started in a garage and that should be shielded from all liability and that should have no rules applied to them. If we just want to leave the status quo and leave it to parents and see how it works out for these kids, I am not going to go that path. That is

why I am joining my colleagues across the aisle to get these bills done, and when they do their unanimous consent, I will join in that as well.

Mr. GRAHAM. I just want to say that Senator KLOBUCHAR has been tenacious in trying to find common ground and in bringing people together but also in getting a result.

Senator HAWLEY will be next. Then I will wrap it up and make the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HAWLEY. Madam President, a few weeks ago, Mark Zuckerberg and a train of other tech executives traipsed in front of the Senate Judiciary Committee, took their oaths, and answered questions.

Mark Zuckerberg did something really quite remarkable for the first time, I think, ever. Zuckerberg stood up and turned to the parents who were there that day and spoke to every parent in America and said that he was sorry for what his company has done to the young people whose lives have been lost, to the families whose lives have been destroyed, to the parents whose dreams have been dashed and shattered. He apologized.

You know, I will say apologies are good, and his apology was long, long overdue, but an apology is not enough.

Now, these tech companies—they are bad actors. We all know that. If you are a parent—I have three kids at home—you know they are. What are they trying to do to your kids? They are trying to get them to spend as much time on that cell phone as possible. They are willing to push anything to them. Child exploitation material? You bet. You bet. Whatever it takes to get them online longer so they can take their data and sell them stuff. That is their bottom line—money, money, money. Those are the companies.

But what about this body? See, I think the question today is not so much about these companies. We know what they are doing. We know what their bottom line is. What about the U.S. Senate?

I think the question we have to ask is, Is this Senate—are they going to demonstrate some independence? Because here is what it looks like to me: It looks like, to me, the biggest corporations in the world, the biggest corporations in the history of the world, have a hammer lock on the U.S. Senate. It looks like, to me, no piece of legislation that those companies don't want will move across this floor. If they don't want it, it doesn't move on the floor. If they don't want it, it doesn't get a vote. If they don't want it, it doesn't happen. They call the shots.

We have seen this before in American history. We have seen corporations try to buy this body. The railroads did it. Other companies tried it a century ago. Here we are. The robber barons of this era want to own the Senate just like they have owned it in the past. It is

time that we stood up and demonstrated that our oath is not to some corporation and their bottom line, which comes at exploiting our children. Our oath is to the Constitution of the United States and to serve our constituents—to serve the families, to serve the children, to serve the people who have no voice. That is the choice in front of us.

It is time for the Senate to show that the Senate is not bought and paid for. It is time for the Senate to show that the people are in charge of this House, not the corporations—not Mark Zuckerberg, not the people who write campaign checks, but the people. That is what we are doing here today on this floor.

I am proud to join Senator GRAHAM and Senator DURBIN and to come as many times as it takes until we can get a vote to protect our children and to reclaim the independence of the United States Senate.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAHAM. Madam President, to my colleagues, thank you for coming down. I really appreciate it.

Senator DURBIN, you have been a great partner on this journey. We have some victims groups, and we are going to keep doing this until we get the result we think America needs.

Very quickly, in 2024, here is the state of play: The largest companies in America, social media outlets that make hundreds of millions of dollars a year, you can't sue if they do damage to your family by using their product because of section 230.

Now, if you wanted to give complete liability protection to a group of people, this would be the last group I would pick. So in the 1990s, there was a law on the books that, to make sure the internet could get up and running, the platforms couldn't be sued for the content that is on their platforms.

Now these platforms enrich our lives, but they destroy our lives. These platforms are being used to bully children to death. They are being used to take sexual images involuntarily obtained and send them to the entire world, and there is not a damned thing you can do about it.

We had a lady come before the committee, a mother, saying her daughter was on a social media site that had anti-bullying provisions. They complained three times about what was happening to her daughter. She killed herself. They went to court. They got kicked out by section 230.

The sexual exploitation of children is just mind-boggling, so we have legislation to strip away section 230 absolute liability protections. One is called the EARN IT Act, and I will make a request for that to come to the floor.

All of these bills have passed the Judiciary Committee—made up of the hardest of the hard in the body—unanimously. We have seen and heard the same thing. We have different views about the way the world should work, about the role of government in our

lives, but we come together on this. DICK DURBIN and LINDSEY GRAHAM and JOSH HAWLEY and—you just name it; all of us—we see the problem the same. We hear from our constituents, who are helpless and hopeless. So we are going to keep this up until we bring these people to heel.

There are three ways to protect the consumer. If the consumer is damaged, they can go to court and seek relief. They have the burden to prove their case, but they have a chance to right a wrong that they believe has been done to them by a business. You can't do that here.

Another way to protect the consumer is to have regulatory agencies, licensing agencies, deride hurt on businesses to make sure they perform effectively and don't abuse the consumer. There is no such thing here.

The third is to have a series of laws on the books to protect consumers. There are no laws on the books. We are zero for three—you can't sue them, there is no regulatory body, and there are really no laws on the books to protect the consumer. That needs to change.

With that, I want to call up—as in legislative session, notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 70, S. 1207; that the committee-reported amendments be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate on the EARN IT Act. That is my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN, Madam President, I reserve my right to object.

I have heard this discussion about parents. My wife and I are older parents, the youngest child being a charming 11-year-old redhead. As I say, she is 11. So we are all in for protecting kids from these monsters, and there is no disputing that that is what we are talking about.

I say to Senator GRAHAM, we have talked about a lot of issues over the years—no disagreement about these people being monsters. CSAM is a toxic plague on the internet, perpetrated by people who, in my view, are evil to their core. These are real victims, and they need support. The criminals have got to be hunted down and locked up.

I want to be clear. As I have said in the Senate before, I don't take a back seat to anybody when it comes to helping kids and punishing predators. In a minute, I will talk about my approach, which I think is going to be effective. It might not sound effective, but it is going to be effective, and it has been endorsed by the National District Attorneys Association, made up of district attorneys across the land.

Now, the specific reason I oppose EARN IT is that it will weaken the sin-

gle strongest technology that protects children and families online, something known as strong encryption. It is going to make it easier to punish sites that use encryption to secure private conversations and personal devices. This bill is designed to pressure communications and technology companies to scan users' messages. I, for one, don't find that a particularly comforting idea.

The sponsors of the bill have argued—and Senator GRAHAM is right; we have been talking about this a while—that their bills don't harm encryption. Yet the bills allow courts to punish companies that offer strong encryption. In fact, while it includes some vague language about protecting encryption, it explicitly allows encryption to be used as evidence for various forms of liability. Prosecutors are going to be quick to argue that deploying encryption was evidence of a company's negligence in preventing the distribution of CSAM, for example.

The bill is also designed to encourage the scanning of content on users' phones or computers before information is sent over the internet, which has the same consequences as breaking encryption. That is why 100 groups, civil society groups, including the American Library Association—people whom I think all of us have worked for—and the Human Rights Campaign and Restore the Fourth—all of them oppose this bill because of its impact on essential security.

Weakening encryption is the single biggest gift you could give to these predators and these god-awful people who want to stalk and spy on kids. Sexual predators are going to have a far easier time stealing photographs of kids, tracking their phones, and spying on their private messages once encryption is breached.

It is very ironic that a bill that is supposed to make kids safer would have the effect of threatening the privacy and security of all law-abiding Americans.

My alternative—and I want to be clear about this because I think Senator GRAHAM has been sincere about saying that this is a horrible problem involving kids. We have a disagreement on the remedy. That is what is at issue. What I want us to do is to focus our energy on giving law enforcement officials the tools they need to find and prosecute these monstrous criminals who are responsible for exploiting kids and spreading vile, abusive materials online. That can help prevent kids from becoming victims in the first place.

So I have introduced a bill to do this, the Invest in Child Safety Act, to direct \$5 billion to do three specific things to deal with this very urgent problem.

What I have proposed in the Invest in Child Safety Act—I am very pleased to be able to say it has been endorsed by the National District Attorneys Association—is, one, give law enforcement

agencies the tools and personnel they need to catch the predators who are creating and spreading CSAM; two, fund community-based programs to prevent at-risk kids from becoming victims in the first place; and three, invest in programs to support survivors of abuse.

Any legislation that doesn't include these pieces, I would just say particularly to Senator GRAHAM because he and I have talked about this many times over the years and just have a difference of opinion, any legislation that doesn't include the three pieces I mentioned, I don't think is up to the task of protecting these kids that we all feel so strongly about.

Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. GRAHAM. Very quickly, and I will move to CSAM, Senator DURBIN's bill.

There is nothing in this bill about encryption. We say that this is not an encryption bill. The bill, as written, explicitly prohibits courts from treating encryption as an independent basis for liability. We are agnostic about that. What we are trying to do is hold these companies accountable by making sure they engage in best business practices.

The EARN IT Act simply says: For you to have liability protections, you have to prove that you have tried to protect children. You have to earn it. It is just not given to you. You have to have the best business practices in place, have voluntary commissions that lay out what would be the best way to harden these sites against sexual exploitation. If you do those things, you get liability. It is just not given to you forever. So this is not about encryption.

As to your idea, I would love to talk to you about it. Let's vote on both. But the bottom line here is there is always a reason not to do anything that holds these people liable. That is the bottom line. They will never agree to any bill that allows you to get them in court—ever. If you are waiting on these companies to give this body permission for the average person to sue you, it ain't never going to happen.

Now, CSAM, Senator DURBIN has been tenacious on this. We are talking about making sure that sexually explicit material is taken down when you notify people. Is that unreasonable?

And if they don't take it down, knowing that it is up there, you ought to be able to sue them. My God, if we can't do that, what good are we? There are millions of these photos out there.

Senator DURBIN has been terrific to empower consumers with some hope they don't have to live this over and over and over again. Is it too much to ask the company, once notified, to take this stuff down?

With that, as in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 69, S. 1199; that

the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Mr. WYDEN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, again, I have made my point that I don't disagree in the least with Senator GRAHAM on the seriousness of the problem. Unfortunately, this bill suffers from exactly the same matters that I objected to earlier.

So I am not going to repeat myself and put everybody through that. But here are the main points to make sure they are heard on CSAM, as I did with respect to EARN IT.

CSAM is a horrifying plague on the internet. Senator GRAHAM and I do not disagree on that point at all. Again, weakening encryption, though, is not going to help victims or make kids safer. And that is what this bill does.

The Leadership Conference for Civil Rights opposes this bill and the earlier bill because they threaten secure private communications that are essential for communities of color and every single family in the country.

I would only say, in terms of wrapping this up—and Senator GRAHAM and I have talked about this—my door is open in terms of talking about approaches that will work. I believe that focusing our energy on giving law enforcement, finally, the tools to lock these horrible criminals behind bars for exploiting kids is something that we ought to get on with. And we ought to invest in programs that support survivors.

The Invest in Child Safety Act that I have written, with the support of the National District Attorneys Association, is endorsed by the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children and leading child welfare groups.

That is what this bill does. It finally offers a measure of real protection for these kids who we have been talking about over the last hour or so who deserve it. Their families deserve it. The legislation that I have proposed, endorsed by influential voices like the National District Attorneys Association, the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children, with respect to CSAM, are the way to go. Again, anything less—and I don't criticize anybody's motives—just doesn't solve the problem. For that reason, I object to this bill as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. GRAHAM. We have one more. And I will just respond that I will take you up on your offer. You are a good friend and a good man. The bottom line is, there are 21 of us on the committee from every corner of the political spec-

trum, and we are not buying any of this.

Again, what does Senator DURBIN want to do? He wants to make sure companies, when they are notified that there are sexually explicit material involving you or somebody you love, that they will have to take it down. If they don't, you can sue them. Who in America is against that, except the people making money off the images?

We will keep talking, but this ain't going to stop. There will be a day when every seat is full up here because word is going to spread about what we are trying to do.

Senator TILLIS, you have been terrific. I don't think you are a lawyer, are you? You are the smartest guy on the committee, then.

He figured this out really quickly. You don't have to be a lawyer to figure this out, just common sense and human decency.

The SHIELD Act—as in legislative session, notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 78, S. 412; that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I want to thank the Presiding Officer, and I also want to thank my friend Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM, who has been a partner on so many things involving criminal justice, on so many good things involving safety, has been a partner on, obviously, many things, and foreign policy as well.

I want to object to the request by the Senator from South Carolina to pass the SHIELD Act by unanimous consent. But I really want to start by saying that I know we are talking about a deeply vital issue today that we must address as the U.S. Senate.

I believe that the Senator from South Carolina and I have a common goal, and we see eye to eye. Anytime a person's privacy or bodily autonomy is violated, we have a duty to address the harm that they have experienced and seek solution so that we prevent the same thing from happening to others. He and I have talked about this in the committee multiple times.

Congress must act when there are people who exploit others or harass them or set out to exact some twisted revenge on them by sharing nonconsensual images. They should be held accountable for the serious, emotional, psychological, and professional harm it can cause to victims. I believe this is what the sponsors of the SHIELD Act intend to do.

But the bill offered today stands to have unintended consequences that I

have discussed in committee and that need to be addressed. Many of these issues were addressed in committee in our markup of the bill. Senator KLOBUCHAR, who leads this bill, has been working with me to correct those problems. We are working diligently and in good faith to address these issues so that this Congress can pass a bill to vindicate the victims. When we were in committee, I spoke and asked for the opportunity to do that work, and I am hoping that we continue to have that now.

It is our obligation to get this right, and I am grateful to the Senator from Minnesota and her staff who are working with me to make sure we do so. Thus, I object.

As in legislative session and notwithstanding rule—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator, the objection is heard.

Mr. BOOKER. Oh, thank you very much. I was doing what I was told. Forgive me.

Mr. GRAHAM. If you want to keep going, I will yield you some time.

Mr. BOOKER. Anytime you defer to me, Senator, to give me a chance to speak to you, that is one of my higher honors in the U.S. Senate. Thank you very much.

Mr. GRAHAM. Madam President, we will be back. We will work with Senator BOOKER. We have tried in committee. Senator WYDEN will keep talking, but I think 21 of us are pretty determined that there be some consumer protection laws in this space on the books this year.

I am going to talk to President Trump. Looks like he is going to be the Republican nominee. I have known President Biden a long time. He has been on the Judiciary Committee. I hope both of them will see this as something they would agree to.

Senator DURBIN, I will let you wrap up. I just cannot thank you enough. We have our differences for sure; but on this, you have been a great leader of the committee.

No matter what happens in 2025, if we take over or you all keep the Chamber, we are going to keep doing this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I want to thank Senator GRAHAM. This has truly been a bipartisan effort.

People are saying: Why don't they work together? Why don't the two parties work together? Well, 21 members of the Senate Judiciary Committee unanimously voted for these six bills—unanimously. And we come to the floor today saying we want to bring these to the floor for consideration.

This Chamber is largely empty day in and day out. We have got plenty of time and opportunity to use these desks and these microphones to consider issues.

What are the issues we might take up? The issues that keep families up at night. Why in the world is our little girl on that telephone night and day?

What is she doing on there? She promises us she is safe and not to worry, Mom and Dad. But we don't know any better. And for goodness' sake, what is a parent supposed to do?

Now consider the worst case scenario: Someone takes advantage of your little girl or granddaughter on the internet and displays an image which is horrifying. You know it, you see it, and you can't believe it. You finally go to the media platform and say: For goodness' sakes, take that image down. This is exactly where you will find it. Bring it down. We don't want that to be broadcast anymore.

And if the media platform, at that point, knowingly and intentionally ignores the information you have given them to protect your family, then they can be held civilly liable. They can be sued. Do you think they will pay attention then? Why, of course, they will. That is why the objections are being heard.

I am going to keep working on this. I thank Senator GRAHAM for making it a bipartisan effort. He is a wonderful partner on these issues.

We are coming back. I am working on a modification of my bill to bring some more support and make sure we consider everybody's point of view. But we do not take any position on encryption. As Senator GRAHAM said, we are agnostic on that subject, but we do believe that something should be done to protect these families once and for all and to let these media platforms—these multimillion-dollar, profitable platforms—know they have a responsibility to the people of this country.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be permitted to speak prior to the scheduled vote: Senator COLLINS for up to 5 minutes and Senator MURRAY for up to 10 minutes.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

#### GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I urge my colleagues to support the six-bill fiscal year 2024 appropriations package that is before us.

I am pleased to report that the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed this bill earlier today by a vote of 339 to 85. It was strongly bipartisan. And now the Senate should follow suit.

I want to express my thanks to the Republican ranking members on each of the six subcommittees—Senators MURKOWSKI, MORAN, HOEVEN, BOOZMAN, KENNEDY, and HYDE-SMITH—for their tremendous work in assembling this package.

I also want to recognize the chair of the committee, Senator PATTY MURRAY, who has worked so hard—since she was named chair and I, vice chair—in order to bring us to this point.

I also want to salute the Democratic chairs for their work.

My point is that everyone involved, including our incredibly hard-working

staff, has worked night and day to bring us to this point.

The measure before us includes the following fiscal year 2024 appropriations bills: Interior; Commerce, Justice, and Science; Agriculture-FDA; Military Construction and Veterans' Affairs; Energy and Water Development; and Transportation and Housing.

And, again—although I wish this had happened months ago—these are full-year appropriations bills. In other words, this is not another continuing resolution, not a short-term patch, but, rather, a package of bills that will fund these important programs and Agencies and Departments through the end of the fiscal year.

This package fully funds veterans' medical care; supports our farmers, fishermen, and ranchers; protects our Nation's food and drug supply; provides critical resources for law enforcement; helps us better compete with China; advances American energy independence; and invests in our Nation's infrastructure and public lands.

This legislation also complies with the Fiscal Responsibility Act, as well as the top-line spending agreement reached between Speaker JOHNSON and Senator SCHUMER. Under that agreement, defense funding for this fiscal year will increase by 3.3 percent relative to fiscal year 2023 enacted levels, while nondefense funding will be held flat.

That is not easy to do, particularly given the impact of inflation and the 5.2 percent Federal employment pay raise, which many of these Agencies are going to have to absorb. So it took a great deal of negotiation and hard work for us to get to this point.

It certainly has not been easy, but I am proud of the legislation we are bringing to the floor today. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to move this important legislative package forward toward enactment.

I look forward to further floor discussion tomorrow, but, right now, I do urge a "yes" vote on the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I want to thank the vice chair, who spent innumerable hours with me for a very long time, through many, many different discussions and meetings and hearings, and for her incredible work to get here tonight to this vote. Thank you so much.

This week, we will, at long last, be voting on our bipartisan, bicameral full-year funding bills. In fact, this package passed the House in a huge bipartisan vote today, with over 300 Members voting in favor.

It has been a long road and a tough negotiation to get here. We are not done yet, and I will have more to say. But I come to the floor tonight to briefly talk a bit about what is actually in these bills and why this is so important to families across the country and to people in States like mine everywhere.

My focus all the way through this process, from day one, has been: How can we produce the strongest bills given some very tight constraints? And how can we get a result that will make people's lives better?

While this package may not be what I would have written on my own—and I am sure my vice chair would say it would not have been what she would have written on her own—we fought very hard to protect investments that matter to working people everywhere and to help keep our economy strong, rejecting devastating cuts to housing, nutrition assistance, and a lot more.

Importantly, we blocked countless extreme Republican policies, like efforts to restrict abortion rights, that would have set our country back decades.

This package includes investments in our economy, like cutting-edge research, renewable energy, key programs to continue rebuilding America's infrastructure, and funding for my 21st Century Cures Act to support America's world-class biomedical research enterprise.

Democrats fought hard to protect investments in rural communities in support of our farmers.

It includes investments to keep America safe, like funding for more air traffic controllers, rail safety inspectors, food safety inspectors, and to implement the law I passed, along with Senator COLLINS, starting up FDA's cosmetics oversight. That is a major achievement in this bill.

And our bills reject unthinkable cuts proposed by House Republicans to Federal law enforcement—the people who go after drug traffickers and do so much else to keep our families and communities safe.

Not to mention, these bills protect pay for Federal firefighters, boost our investments in preventing violence against women, and fund a new program to increase sexual assault nurse exam access that I have worked on.

This package also includes investments in our environment and allows Democrats to continue to deliver on historic climate action, even as House Republicans sought to gut Agencies like EPA and Interior.

We deliver in this bill investments to keep our commitments to Tribes, including by continuing to provide advance appropriations so the Indian Health Service can serve patients with certainty and hire staff for hospitals.

It also includes investments supporting our servicemembers, which is especially important to me as a daughter of a World War II veteran.

It has crucial resources for military construction projects, including childcare centers, housing, and other quality-of-life improvements for our troops and their families.

It increases funding for the Veteran Caregivers Program that I helped establish and expands and makes record investments to help end veteran homelessness, deliver mental healthcare for