



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, DECEMBER 11, 2018

No. 195

Senate

The Senate met at 10:03 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable CINDY HYDE-SMITH, a Senator from the State of Mississippi.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O God, who has stretched out the heavens and marches on the waves of the sea, Your great works are too marvelous to understand. Thank You for the glory of the sunrise and the majesty of the sunset, for Your miracles that are without number and for Your providence that sustains us.

Strengthen our lawmakers. Empower them this day to mount up on wings like eagles, running without weariness and walking without fainting. May their consistent communion with You be expressed in their thoughts, words, and actions. Lord, make them one in the common cause of justice, righteousness, and truth.

We pray in Your loving Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, December 11, 2018.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby

appoint the Honorable CINDY HYDE-SMITH, a Senator from the State of Mississippi, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

BUSINESS BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I think it is time the Senate subject itself to a bit of a reality check. Today is December 11. Here are just some of the things the Senate needs to accomplish before this Congress adjourns:

We need to confirm more of the President's nominees for the judiciary and for the executive branch, such as the well-qualified nominee to be Deputy Secretary at the Department of Treasury, whom we are currently considering.

We need to reach an agreement to fund the remaining one-fourth of the Federal Government that was not covered by regular appropriations.

We need to make a substantial new investment in the integrity of our borders and the security of American families.

We need to take up and pass the conference report for the farm bill to honor our commitments to our Nation's growers and producers.

This week alone, we need to dispense with the debate pertaining to the situation in Yemen and an attempt by some of our Democratic colleagues to undo reforms that protect Americans' private, personal information as they exercise their First Amendment rights.

In addition, at the request of the President and following improvements to the legislation that have been se-

cured by several Members, the Senate will take up the recently revised criminal justice bill this month. I intend to turn to the new text as early as the end of this week.

As a result of this additional legislative business, Members should now be prepared to work between Christmas and New Year's if necessary in order to complete our work. Let me say that again. Unless we approach all this work in a highly collaborative, productive way and take real advantage of unanimous consent to expedite proceedings, it is virtually certain that the Senate will need to be in session between Christmas and New Year's in order to complete this work.

The Senate is a consent-based institution. Expediting this work would require an extraordinary degree of collaboration from everyone. So Members should either prepare to cooperate and work together or prepare for a very, very long month.

In just a few hours from now, we will receive an indication of whether that cooperation will begin to take shape. My friend the Democratic leader and his counterpart in the House are scheduled to meet with President Trump at the White House later today.

For the Nation's sake, I hope my Democratic friends are prepared to have a serious discussion and reach an accommodation with the President on funding for border security. Otherwise, circumstances are beginning to resemble a movie we have seen before. It was only this past January when Democrats chose to manufacture a government funding lapse over the issue of illegal immigration. It didn't work out very well.

The reality is that the President's request is entirely reasonable. And before today's partisan considerations set in, I bet it might have looked reasonable to many of the majority of the Senate Democrats who joined in support of physical border security legislation back in 2006—some 12 years ago.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S7389

Senate Republicans are working with the President and his homeland security team on \$5.02 billion of targeted funding to bolster security measures in specific places where the Department of Homeland Security determines it is most needed. And make no mistake—the need is great. In fiscal year 2018, Customs and Border Patrol reported a 30-percent increase in apprehensions at the U.S.-Mexico border. Looking further back, the monthly apprehension total this past October reached its highest level in 4 years—4 years. CBP has observed over the past year a 50-percent increase in apprehensions of known gang members and a 115-percent increase in seizures of fentanyl narcotics.

Clearly, delivering border security funding must be a priority. That is because the men and women of the Border Patrol deserve to be a priority. American communities deserve to be a priority as they face down the threat of gang violence. American families deserve to be a priority as the flow of lethal drugs fuels an epidemic of addiction.

This is the right investment in the right place at the right time. There is no reason why the Democratic leader and the House Democratic leader should put the demands of far-left special interests ahead of the safety of American families. There is no reason for my Democratic friends to end this year the way they began it—with a government shutdown. It would be truly bizarre for them to decide they would prefer a partial government shutdown to reasonable funding for national security. It would signal that their party is more committed to political spite for the President than to the public interest.

I will be watching eagerly this morning to see if the Democratic leaders approach these negotiations with the productive and good-faith spirit they deserve.

LEGALIZING HEMP

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, on another matter, as I mentioned a moment ago, one key piece of our unfinished business is the farm bill. Last night, I used my very own hemp pen to sign the conference report, clearing the way for the House and Senate to pass legislation and send it to the President's desk. I am proud that the bill includes my provision to legalize the production of industrial hemp. It is a victory for farmers and consumers throughout our country.

Fighting for Kentucky hemp has been a long struggle. My State was once the national leader in the growing and production of industrial hemp, but then, for decades, a Federal ban halted that progress and shut American farmers out of the hemp field. Don't get me wrong—Hemp could still be found all over our country in all kinds of products. The problem is that it is all being grown somewhere else and imported

into America. It is time to let American growers get back in business with this versatile crop once again.

The farmers, processors, and manufacturers in my State and across the country are ready for the hemp comeback. It began in 2014 when I secured the establishment of a hemp pilot program with the help of then-agricultural commissioner Jamie Comer. States like Kentucky got the chance to explore the plant's potential and show us just what hemp could do, and the results have been nothing short of extraordinary. Now, American-grown hemp can be found in your food, your clothes, and even in your car dashboard. The results mean jobs, economic growth, and new opportunity. Last year alone, hemp products contributed more than \$16 million to Kentucky's economy, and that was just from the pilot program—just from the pilot program.

At a time when farm income is down and our growers are struggling, industrial hemp is a bright spot of agriculture's future.

My provision in the farm bill will not only legalize domestic hemp, but it will also allow State departments of agriculture to be responsible for its oversight. In Kentucky, that means that Commissioner Ryan Quarles—another champion of hemp—I will be able to help farmers thrive. And I know the occupant of the Chair is familiar with Commissioner Quarles.

When the Senate votes on this legislation in the coming days, we will also be voting to give farmers throughout the country the chance to tap into hemp's potential and take part in its future. I have been proud to work with my colleagues in Congress, such as Senator RON WYDEN, and with hemp advocates in Kentucky to get to this point. Obviously, I will be proudly voting for this bill.

PRIVACY REFORM

Madam President, now on a final matter, the Senate will soon vote on an attempt by some of our Democratic colleagues to unwind an important privacy reform the Treasury Department enacted earlier this year.

We need to stand up for privacy, stand up for the First Amendment, and reject the Democrats' resolution.

The question at hand is whether the IRS should have special power to demand that certain nonprofit organizations hand over the list of their contributors.

This raises the question: Why should the IRS have this private information? Is it for accounting purposes? No. The regulation requires tax-exempt nonprofits to maintain books, but individual donations are not tax deductible so there aren't accounting reasons why the IRS would need to track donors.

Is it for transparency purposes? No. The personal information in question is not part of any public inspection requirement. In fact, the IRS is required

to redact this information when releasing a nonprofit's public tax filings. The guidance does nothing to affect the information that is publicly available.

So why does the IRS need to stockpile this information? For safekeeping? Hardly.

Several years ago, the IRS had to settle a lawsuit. A worker broke the law and leaked an unredacted copy of a group's confidential forms. Of course, that information ended up in a leftwing organization on the opposite side of the issue.

A few years before that, California, which had begun demanding its own copy of this private information, accidentally published the private information of donors to over 1,000 nonprofits registered with that State.

These aren't isolated incidents. They are part of a disturbingly hostile climate for certain kinds of political expression and for the free exchange of ideas.

We have seen angry activist mobs deal out personal harassment and professional sabotage to individuals with whom they have a disagreement. We have seen the last administration's IRS focus hostile treatment on certain organizations whose political views ran afoul of the bureaucrat's own opinions.

This is the backdrop which makes Secretary Mnuchin's pro-privacy decision so important. The Democrats want to overrule Secretary Mnuchin's guidance. They want the IRS to resume packing filing cabinets full of the names of Americans who support different causes—even though they can't say why.

That is today. What about tomorrow? Forty-five Senate Democrats are already signed on to a more sweeping piece of legislation known as the DISCLOSE Act, which would amplify and expand this chilling effect in numerous other ways.

For one thing, this bill would cut out the middle man of the leaky IRS and enable direct ideological harassment, increasing disclosure of this private information straight to the public. That is just one example. It would also give the FEC more power to regulate Americas' speech about important issues and many public officials.

So get ready to hear a lot of lofty rhetoric about restoring democracy from the Democratic leader in the House and her allies here in the Senate, but underneath that rhetoric, get ready for legislation that will do more to undermine our constitutional freedoms and chill their exercise than any other bill I can think of in recent memory.

Let's not walk down this road. Let's not chill Americans' exercise of the First Amendment. Let's defend these freedoms today and stay vigilant tomorrow.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote

scheduled for 11:30 a.m. this morning occur at 11 a.m. this morning.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Justin George Muzinich, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of the Treasury.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee.

HEALTHCARE COSTS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 30 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, today I am asking experts at the American Enterprise Institute and Brookings Institute, as well as other leading experts, for specific ideas about how Congress and the President can work together to reduce the cost of healthcare in the United States. Here is why.

Last July, at the Senate HELP Committee's second in a series of five hearings on reducing healthcare costs, Dr. Brent James, a member of the National Academy of Medicine, testified that 30 percent—and perhaps as much as 50 percent—of all the money spent in this country on healthcare is unnecessary. That startled me, and I hope it startles you.

So I asked another witness, Dr. David Lansky from the Pacific Business Group on Health, if he agreed with Dr. James' estimate that 50 percent of all the money spent on healthcare is unnecessary. Dr. Lansky said yes.

Then, in our next hearing on reducing healthcare costs, not one witness on our distinguished panel disagreed with Dr. James. That means we are spending as much as half of all we spend on healthcare on unnecessary treatment, tests, and administrative costs.

As a country, we spend a huge amount on healthcare—\$3.5 trillion in

2017, according to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. When we use Dr. James' estimates, that means we spent roughly \$1 to \$1.8 trillion on unnecessary healthcare in 2017. That is more money than the gross domestic product of every country in the world except nine. That is three times as much as the Federal Government spends on all of our national defense, 60 times as much as it spends on Pell grants for college students, and about 550 times as much as the Federal Government spends on national parks.

For the last 8 years, most of the debate about healthcare has not been about this extraordinary fact that we may be spending up to half of what we spend on healthcare unnecessarily. Instead, we have been arguing about health insurance. In fact, really, we have been arguing about 6 percent of the health insurance market—the individual insurance market.

The truth is, we will never have lower cost health insurance until we have lower cost healthcare. Instead of continuing to argue over a small percentage of the insurance market, what we should be discussing is the high cost of healthcare that affects virtually every American.

Here is something we ought to be able to agree on. We are spending too much on healthcare, and too much of what we spend is unnecessary. The five hearings we held reminded us of something else we should be able to agree on. One major reason for the unnecessarily high cost of healthcare is that the healthcare system does not operate with the discipline and cost saving benefits of a real market.

Too many barriers to innovation drive up costs, and most Americans have no earthly idea of the true price of healthcare services they buy, which also drives up costs. Let me repeat that. One major reason for the unnecessarily high cost of healthcare is, the healthcare system does not operate with the discipline and the cost-saving benefits of a real market.

Too many barriers to innovation drive up costs, and most Americans have no earthly idea of the price of the healthcare services they buy, so that also drives up costs. As a country—American families, American Federal and State governments, and private companies—we spent \$3.5 trillion on healthcare in 2017, according to CMS, almost as much as we spent on the entire Federal Government in 2017, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

High healthcare costs impact everyone; first, the taxpayer because the Federal Government spends about one-third of all Federal dollars on healthcare. According to the Congressional Budget Office, of the \$3.98 trillion the government spent in 2017, \$1.1 trillion of that was mandatory spending for Medicare, Medicaid, and other healthcare programs.

This Federal Government runaway spending is the principal cause of the

national debt. The principal cause of the national debt is not national defense, national parks, and the National Institutes of Health. The principle cause of the national debt is the runaway government spending on healthcare, which is squeezing the budget for national parks, national defense, and basic biomedical research.

Healthcare costs also impact States, all of which have to balance their budgets. When I was Governor of Tennessee a few years ago, Medicaid was about 8 percent of our State budget. That was in the 1980s. Today, it is 30 percent of Tennessee's State budget. That means States have less to spend on fixing roads, educating children, and helping adults and high school graduates get better job skills.

Second, healthcare spending adds to the cost of doing business in the United States. Warren Buffett has called the ballooning cost of healthcare "a hungry tapeworm on the American economy."

Third and most important, the rising cost of healthcare is squeezing the budgets of American families. According to the Gallup poll, 80 percent of registered voters before this midterm election rated healthcare as "extremely" or "very important" to their vote—a higher percentage than every other issue polled, including the economy, immigration, and taxes.

I imagine every Senator has heard stories from their constituents about struggling to stretch paychecks to afford prescriptions or to cover a surprise medical bill.

Any one of us who has received a medical bill in the mail has wondered, what am I actually paying for?

Here is a story I heard recently. Todd is a Knoxville father who recently took his son to the emergency room after a bicycle accident. His son was treated. Todd paid a \$150 copay because the emergency room was "in network" for his health insurance, and they headed home. So Todd was surprised when he received a bill in the mail for \$1,800 because, even though the emergency room was in network, the doctor who treated his son was not.

Todd wrote his Senator—me—trying to figure out why it is so hard to understand what healthcare prices really are. "If I am expected to be a conscientious consumer of my own healthcare needs," he wrote, "I need a little more help."

The issue of surprise billing is a widely recognized problem. It was highlighted in a report from the White House on healthcare costs just this last Monday.

We want Americans like Todd and his son to be able to access quality care they can afford. So earlier this year, our Senate committee set out, in a bipartisan way, to see what we could find out about lowering healthcare costs. We held five hearings over 6 months.

In June, at our first hearing, we set out to better understand how much healthcare actually costs in the United

States to see if we could get some agreement on the numbers.

At our second hearing in July, we heard from Dr. James, who told us that up to half of what we spend on healthcare is unnecessary.

At our third hearing later in July, we looked at administrative tasks imposed by the Federal Government and how those burdens lead to doctors spending more time on paperwork, less time on treating patients, and all of this also increases costs.

In September, we looked at why, when you check reviews and prices before buying everything from a coffemaker to a car, the cost or the price of your healthcare has remained hidden in a black box.

This is something even the Federal Government's top healthcare official knows personally. Health and Human Services Secretary Alex Azar recently told a story of how his doctor ordered him to have a routine echo cardio stress test. He was sent down the street and admitted to the hospital, where, after a considerable effort on his part, he learned the test would cost him \$3,500. After using a website that compiled typical prices for medical care, Secretary Azar learned the same test would have cost just \$550 in a doctor's office. Secretary Azar said consumers are so in the dark, they often feel "powerless."

In an age where you can compare different prices and check a dozen reviews when you are buying a barbecue grill, you should be able to more easily understand what you are paying for healthcare.

Last month, at our fifth hearing, we heard about steps the private sector is taking to disrupt the healthcare system and what kinds of Federal barriers are preventing private companies from lowering costs. As we held our five hearings, two conclusions became clear.

The first is that we spend more on healthcare than does any other country, but we don't spend it well.

Again, Dr. James told us that 30 percent—maybe as much as 50 percent—of all of the money we spend on healthcare is unnecessary. That is really astonishing. It echoes what Dr. Ashish Jha said, who was a witness from our first hearing and is the Director of the Harvard Global Health Institute. He said this:

The popular belief has been that the reason we spend so much more on healthcare than other countries is that we just use too much healthcare. Well, it turns out when you look at the data . . . we are not using more healthcare. Why is it we are spending twice as much? There are two reasons. One is administrative complexity, [and second], every time we use healthcare in America, we pay a lot more than any other country in the world."

That was Dr. Ashish from the Harvard Global Health Institute.

Second, while it would be convenient to have a moonshot to reduce healthcare costs, this will require people other than the Federal Government.

First, as the largest purchasers of health insurance, employers are really leading the way in the effort to reduce costs. For example, let's take International Paper, which is based in Memphis. It uses a service called Best Doctors. Employees can use it for second opinions on healthcare. Best Doctors reviews an employee's records, and then it either reaffirms the treatment that has been recommended by a doctor or it recommends a different course, such as physical therapy. The use of this voluntary program saved International Paper over \$500,000 in 2017 by preventing unnecessary treatments.

Another way employers reduce healthcare costs is through wellness programs, which encourage employees to lead healthier lives. There is probably no greater consensus in healthcare than that wellness—lifestyle changes, such as eating healthier and stopping smoking—can prevent serious illness and reduce healthcare costs. It is hard to think of a better way to make a bigger impact on the health of millions of Americans than to connect the consensus about wellness and reducing health costs to the health insurance that 181 million people get on the job. About 60 percent of insured Americans get our health insurance on the job.

Second, States are taking an active role in the cost of healthcare.

In 2017, the State of Maine required health insurers to split the savings with a patient if the patient shops around and chooses a doctor who costs less than the average price the insurer pays. In Oregon, the State compiles data on insured residents and uses this information to run a tool that allows patients to compare the costs of procedures at different hospitals.

Third, private companies are creating innovative tools to reduce healthcare costs. For example, Healthcare Bluebook, a Nashville company and a witness at one of our hearings, provides a tool that helps patients find the best prices for the highest quality care in their areas by using their employer-sponsored insurance, which, as I said, 60 percent of insured Americans have. This is useful in lowering costs because, for example, the amount a patient pays for cataract surgery in Memphis can range from as little as \$2,000 to more than \$8,000.

Fourth, hospitals, doctors, and other healthcare providers have the potential to make a large impact on the cost of healthcare.

On a smaller scale, one of our witnesses, Dr. Gross from Florida, runs a practice under what is called the direct primary care model. Dr. Gross charges a flat membership rate of \$60, in cash, per patient for adults under the age of 65, \$25 for one child, and \$10 for each additional child. His practice does not bill anything to an insurance company for direct primary care members—not to ObamaCare, not to Medicaid, not to Medicare. In return for this member-

ship fee, members receive an annual wellness exam, 25 office visits per year, including same-day appointments, and some in-office testing and chronic disease management without having to pay anything additional out of pocket. This gives patients access to a defined level of healthcare at a predictable price, which ranges from about \$1,000 to \$1,200 a year.

On a larger scale, HCA Healthcare, which also testified—it has 178 hospitals and 119 freestanding surgery centers that are located in the United States and the United Kingdom—is implementing new techniques to reduce the spread of MRSA, which is a drug-resistant bacterial infection that occurs in intensive care units.

These new techniques have reduced cases of MRSA by 37 percent in HCA facilities and have been so effective that the World Health Organization and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention have added them to best practices. According to HCA, this reduction in MRSA infections saves \$170,000 for every 1,000 patients. These savings are shared among the hospitals, insurers, and patients.

Finally, information needs to be easily available so that patients, consumers, can find out the prices of their care and take an active role in choosing their healthcare and in planning for medical expenses whenever they can.

There is also a role for the Federal Government to play. The Federal Government spent, as I said earlier, \$1.1 trillion on Medicare, Medicaid, and other healthcare programs in 2017. About one-third of all healthcare spending in America is by the Federal Government, so how we spend those Federal dollars will obviously make a big difference to the healthcare system. There may also be things Washington can do or is doing to increase healthcare costs or to prevent private companies from taking steps to lower those healthcare costs.

I want to find out what concrete, specific steps the Federal Government can take to reduce unnecessary healthcare spending or to at least stop making the problem worse. For example, after our committee heard about gag clauses, which prohibit pharmacists from telling patients their prescriptions would be cheaper if they paid in cash instead of through their insurance, Congress was able to act and ban those gag clauses earlier this year. In August, the CMS began to require hospitals to post online the amounts they charge for services and to keep that information up to date. These are the types of specific recommendations I am looking for.

In working with experts, I have had some success in asking them for recommendations in priority order and then turning those recommendations into legislation.

In 2005, I was a member of the Budget Committee, and I had become concerned about the rapid increase in the

Federal debt and how it was squeezing out some of the essential programs that make our country competitive. So I stopped by a meeting of the National Academy of Sciences on American competitiveness, and I said to them: Most ideas fail in Washington, DC, for there being the lack of an idea. If you, the academy, will give Congress 10 specific ideas in priority order to improve American competitiveness, I believe Congress will enact those ideas.”

The academy immediately got busy and recruited Norm Augustine and then put together a task force of American leaders, called the Committee on Prospering in the Global Economy of the 21st Century. Under Norm’s leadership, they produced a National Academies report entitled “Rising Above the Gathering Storm.” They came up with 20 ideas, not just 10, and they were specific, such as doubling the funding for basic science research and creating an energy agency to be modeled after the Department of Defense’s highly successful DARPA agency, which would invest in the high-potential, high-impact energy technologies—what we now call ARPA-E.

Congress used most of those ideas and put together a bill that we called America COMPETES. We passed it in 2007 and reauthorized it in 2010. It was introduced by the majority and minority leaders and had a large number of Republican and Democratic sponsors.

That is an example of what can happen when experts give us specific recommendations toward an important public goal and give them to us in a way that we can actually implement them.

That is what I am looking for in the letter that I am sending to experts today at the American Enterprise Institute and at the Brookings Institution—specific recommendations, preferably in priority order, about what Congress and the President can do to reduce the staggering healthcare costs, which is a problem in America. Our witnesses from the National Academy of Sciences and all across the board tell us that nearly half of everything we spend on healthcare is unnecessary.

I also want input from other leading policy experts, including economists, doctors, nurses, patients, hospital administrators, State regulators, legislators, governors, employers, insurers, and healthcare innovators. I am asking, in writing, for as many specific legislative, regulatory, or sub-regulatory solutions as possible by March 1, 2019.

I am especially interested in policies that bring to the healthcare system the discipline and lower cost benefits of a real, functioning market. One way to do that is to remove the barriers that discourage innovators from coming up with new ways to reduce healthcare costs. A second way is to make it easier for the consumers of healthcare to know the true price of what they are buying.

I welcome suggestions of how those policy ideas could be implemented—

what law to amend, what regulation to change—and any potential downsides to the policy recommendations. I will share the recommendations with Senator PATTY MURRAY, who is the ranking Democratic member of the Senate’s HELP Committee, and with all of the members of our committee. I will share the recommendations with Senator GRASSLEY and Senator WYDEN, who are expected to be the chairman and ranking member of the Finance Committee. Our HELP Committee and the Finance Committee have shared jurisdiction over healthcare costs. It sometimes gets in the way of solutions, but there is no reason it should. We should all be able to work together in a bipartisan way to address this startling phenomenon that the experts tell us is true, which is that we are spending nearly half the money—wasting it unnecessarily on healthcare. Now we need the experts to tell us exactly what to do about it.

The Federal Government is not going to lower the cost of healthcare overnight, but I believe there are steps we can take to make a real difference to American families. It might be two or three big steps, or it might be a dozen smaller steps, but we shouldn’t let this opportunity to make progress pass us by.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter I have written and am mailing today to experts at the American Enterprise Institute and the Brookings Institution, as well as to other leading healthcare experts, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DECEMBER 11, 2018.

JAMES C. CAPRETTA,
Resident Fellow and Milton Friedman Chair,
American Enterprise Institute, Washington,
DC.

PAUL B. GINSBURG, PH.D.,
Director, Center for Health Policy, Brookings,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CAPRETTA AND DR. GINSBURG: I am writing to ask for your specific recommendations to help address America’s rising health care costs. The Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions (HELP) I chair has held five hearings on the cost of health care and heard from Americans from across the country—from Alaska to Tennessee—that health care costs are a growing burden on taxpayers, employers, and family budgets.

At a hearing in July, we heard a startling estimate from our witness, Dr. Brent James, a member of the National Academy of Medicine, who said that 30 percent, and probably over 50 percent, of all health care spending in America is unnecessary. That means that American taxpayers, patients, and businesses are wasting as much as \$1.8 trillion a year. A number of witnesses corroborated Dr. James’ estimate, pointing to causes such as excessive and duplicative federal reporting requirements on doctors and hospitals and a lack of accessible information on health care costs and quality.

I am sending this request to additional experts including economists, doctors, nurses, patients, hospital administrators, state lawmakers, governors, employers, insurers, and health care innovators, on what steps the

next Congress should take to address America’s rising health care costs as well as any steps we can recommend that the Trump Administration or state governments should take.

For the last eight years, Republicans and Democrats have been locked in a stalemate over the cost of insurance in the individual health insurance market, where six percent of all Americans with health care purchase their insurance. This is an important part of the discussion, but it puts the spotlight in the wrong place. The hard truth is that we will never get the cost of health insurance down until we get the cost of health care down.

This is why the HELP Committee has been holding hearings on how to reduce administrative burdens; how to reduce what we spend on unnecessary health care tests, services, procedures, and prescription drugs; how to reduce the prices of health care goods and services; how to make available more information on the cost and quality of care; and how the private and public sectors have been able to lower health care costs.

I am especially interested in trying to bring to the health care system the discipline and cost saving benefits of a real market. Too many barriers to innovation drive up costs. And most Americans have no idea of the true price of the health care services they buy—which also drives up costs.

I request that you provide written responses to the below questions by email to LowerHealthCareCosts@help.senate.gov by March 1, 2019:

1. What specific steps can Congress take to lower health care costs, incentivize care that improves the health and outcomes of patients, and increase the ability for patients to access information about their care to make informed decisions?

2. What does Congress or the administration need to do to implement those steps? Operationally, how would these recommendations work?

3. Once implemented, what are the potential shortcomings of those steps, and why are they worthy of consideration despite the shortcomings?

Thank you for your consideration and attention to this request.

Sincerely,

LAMAR ALEXANDER,
Chairman.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

BORDER SECURITY

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, we are faced today with an escalating crisis on our southwest border. We all know it. We see news of it every day, and it is very real.

As the chairman of the Appropriations Committee’s Subcommittee on Homeland Security, I would like to present some facts to the Senate that make the case for increased investment in our border security.

In the fiscal year 2018, Border Patrol apprehensions at the southwest border were up more than 30 percent compared with fiscal year 2017. In real numbers, over 396,000 people were apprehended.

It is getting worse because, if you look at October of 2018 compared to October of 2017, apprehensions were up 88 percent. The numbers are going up.

The facts I have laid out don't tell the entire story. Border Patrol estimates that it could be catching as little as half of the traffic that is illegally crossing our southwest border between the ports of entry, so we really don't know who we are catching, and we don't know what they are carrying.

Border Patrol apprehensions of gang members is up 50 percent from fiscal year 2017 to fiscal year 2018. Mexico is a primary source for narcotics entering the United States. This is extremely important to me as a representative from the State of West Virginia. Fentanyl seizures by Border Patrol were up 115 percent over the past year, from 2017 to 2018.

We know that a significant portion of opioids enter our country through ports of entry, but we cannot ignore the fact that we are seeing opioid smuggling between the ports of entry increase at alarming rates as well.

Similarly, methamphetamine seizures by Border Patrol have increased 75 percent since the year 2015. In more populated areas along the border, aliens and smugglers are crossing the border unimpeded and quickly vanishing into our neighborhoods, into our commercial areas, and onto highways, headed to places like Mississippi and West Virginia.

A single load of fentanyl, walked across our land border in an unassuming backpack, could threaten the lives of several thousand Americans. Failure to better secure our border will have consequences for all American communities.

I am very sad to say that my home State is an acutely affected area. In the year 2017, drug overdoses were responsible for more deaths per capita in West Virginia than in any other State. Listen to this. This is so sad. Overdoses tragically took the life of 1 out of every 1,700 West Virginians and 1 out of 46 Americans in this country. We saw a 500-percent increase in meth overdoses in West Virginia from the years 2013 to 2017. What I have learned about this is that we have gone from prescription drugs to heroin, to heroin laced with fentanyl, and now it is synthetic methamphetamines that are the threat. This is occurring while we are seeing an uptick in meth that is mass produced in places like Mexico, trafficked across our border, and then distributed across the United States. Even more troubling, these types of meth are also being laced with the synthetic and dangerous opioid, fentanyl.

In this current debate, it is easy to forget that just over a decade ago, on a bipartisan basis, Congress—and I was over in the House of Representatives at the time—was making significant investments in our border security infrastructure. What we have seen from these past investments is that physical barriers actually work at the border. The statistics show that.

In the 1990s and 2000s, we built physical barriers in four sectors: the San Diego sector, the El Paso sector, the Tucson sector, and the Yuma sector. In each of these places, the number of apprehensions dropped by more than 90 percent after the infrastructure was installed. In these areas, investment in border security has enhanced the safety and the security on both sides of the border.

Neighborhoods that were once overrun with illegal activity are vibrant. Commercial areas that were once considered dangerous and unprofitable are now flourishing with economic development. Nature preserves that were once trashed and trampled are again full of our native plants and animals.

The cartels on the other side of the border profit in places where we haven't invested. Criminals aren't going to stop smuggling humans and narcotics into the United States because we have invested in certain key places; they have simply changed their routes and shifted their tactics to areas where we haven't yet built infrastructure.

If we fail to better secure our border, we are inviting vulnerable migrant populations, many of whom may be fleeing danger in their own home communities, to subject themselves to dangerous journeys through rugged terrain. They are often doing so under the thumb of cartels who profit from the illegal human trafficking, just as they profit from drug trafficking.

We need to secure our borders and encourage these migrants to instead seek entry legally at the designated ports of entry.

This past summer, I traveled for several days to the southwest border, both in California and in Texas. I witnessed the needs that we have there firsthand. I saw the open pathways across the border and into our communities. I saw the gaps in our border security. I also saw communities that have become safer because we have provided border security. I didn't just see those things; I heard from the men and women who patrol our border each and every day. It is a tough job. It is a tough job. They expressed the need for and the value of the investments I am talking about here today.

While the need for additional investment in border infrastructure may be obvious to some, Congress has recognized that we need to be strategic in these investments. It was said on the Senate floor last week that there is no plan for these investments. I am here to tell you that is not the actual, true story.

In fact, the bipartisan fiscal year 2017 appropriations bill required Customs and Border Protection to provide us with a comprehensive border security plan, an improvement plan, to ensure that we get it right. This plan was developed sector by sector by agents in the field, and it was weighted by illegal activities that are occurring in those sectors. It was written from the bot-

tom up by career law enforcement professionals who walk the line every day, sometimes on boats on the Rio Grande—we did that too—and know where new infrastructure is needed most.

The plan was delivered in January of 2018 and provided us with a 10-year roadmap for border security investment based on operational requirements. Here is what we learned from this plan.

As traffic slowed in San Diego, in Arizona, and in El Paso, we have seen it shift to South Texas, to the Rio Grande Valley sector. This sector covers just 17 percent of the mileage of the entire border, but it now sees 40 percent of the illegal border traffic. This sector also accounts for an outsized number of narcotic seizures and a significant portion of the assaults on our Border Patrol agents.

Through the fiscal year 2018 appropriations bill enacted in March, Congress provided a downpayment of nearly \$1.4 billion toward this plan, this improvement plan.

Despite claims on the Senate floor last week to the contrary, Customs and Border Protection is executing this funding at an astounding rate. About one-third of it is already under contract. Another third will be under contract in the next several weeks, and the entirety of this funding will be under contract within a year of enactment of this legislation. They are spending it where it is needed most and as fast as we can get it to them.

In June, the Appropriations Committee, led by my subcommittee, produced a bill that recommended border security funding in line with this plan. Specifically, the bill recommended significant funding for new physical barriers along the southwest border. This is a very good bill, but over the summer and over the fall, this crisis on the southwest border has escalated.

I believe we in Congress must demonstrate that we are flexible enough to respond when the situation calls for it. The statistics I cited certainly make a compelling case.

Providing additional resources in fiscal year 2019 and fiscal year 2020 for border security infrastructure would be consistent with the border security improvement plan when viewed through the lens of an escalating crisis. This funding would go straight to the places in South Texas where we are seeing the most illegal traffic.

It is important to note that providing an appropriate level of funding is possible without exceeding any of our budget caps and without short-changing any of our other very important programs, as long as we get serious about finding a bipartisan way forward.

I will take a time out here to recognize that Senator SCHUMER and rising Speaker PELOSI are going to be meeting with the President on this very issue today, so I urge them to reach a bipartisan way forward.

I urge my colleagues here in the Senate to take a long, hard look at the undisputable facts, which demonstrate that the crisis on the border is escalating. Our law enforcement personnel have provided us with a plan to work toward improving and solving that problem, so let's work together and get this done.

I yield back my time.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

NOMINATION OF JONATHAN A. KOBES

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I come to the floor today to oppose Jonathan Kobes' nomination to serve on the 8th Circuit Court of Appeals. People across the country know how important it is that we fight back against extreme and extremely unqualified judicial nominees.

Earlier this year, during Judge Kavanaugh's confirmation, we saw just how far President Trump and Senate Republicans are willing to go to jam through extreme judges who will work to strip away women's rights.

But that wasn't all we saw. We saw millions of women and men across the country inspired to stand up and fight back against his nomination. We saw people speak out and share their own personal stories about what was at stake, about sexual assault, and how important it is that we believe survivors, and about the right to safe legal abortions, what it means for women and their families, and about what kind of country we want to live in.

We saw, without question, that people across the country want us to stop President Trump from swinging our courts far right by packing them with ideological judges—judges like Mr. Kobes, who will continue the Trump-Pence agenda of rolling back women's rights and access to healthcare.

Making sure families know exactly what Mr. Kobes would mean for women if he is seated is what I am here to do today. It means weaker rights and less access to healthcare.

He is like many of President Trump's nominees before him. Mr. Kobes lacks almost any real experience to qualify him for a seat on the Eighth Circuit Court. He has little trial experience, little appellate experience, and no record of legal scholarship to speak of.

I am not the only one concerned by that. The American Bar Association has rated him unqualified. That makes Mr. Kobes the sixth judicial nominee from President Trump who is opposed by his professional colleagues.

But the thin record he does have is disqualifying because it shows he will put extreme rightwing ideology ahead of women and science. Mr. Kobes is an outspoken advocate for fake women's healthcare centers, sometimes called crisis pregnancy centers, that seek out women looking for information about their healthcare needs and reproductive rights and then use misleading—

even blatantly false—propaganda to scare and pressure them. Mr. Kobes even went out of his way to represent some of these fake clinics free of charge.

He voluntarily defended a law requiring providers to give a lecture full of ideological propaganda and fearmongering to women seeking safe, legal abortions. The required lecture in this case actually went so far as to demand that providers lie to women and claim abortion increases their risk of suicide. It does not.

Think about that. He argued for a law that directly interfered with the relationship between a patient and her healthcare provider—a law that said women making their own decisions about their own bodies and seeking healthcare, which is their constitutional right, should be lied to, should be frightened out of a decision with fake information, including fake information about suicide. That is utterly wrong and disqualifying for any judicial nominee.

Mr. Kobes hasn't merely represented these fake clinics. He served on the board of an organization that aimed to deceive and frighten women out of getting abortions. It is clear he wasn't chosen for his bona fides in the legal field. He doesn't have them.

Women and men across the country are paying attention. They know what is at stake. Hours before the final vote on Kavanaugh, I came here to speak about how angry I was when the Senate failed Anita Hill in 1991 and confirmed Justice Thomas, how I decided to run for the Senate after that so I could fight to change things, and how I hoped everyone who was angry about Judge Kavanaugh would stay angry and keep fighting for change. I also promised right here that whatever happened, I was going to get up the next day and keep fighting, too, and I meant it.

I am going to keep standing up, speaking out, and making clear just how harmful the President's ideological nominees are.

I strongly oppose Mr. Kobes' nomination. I hope all of our colleagues will do the same.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Muzinich nomination?

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TLLIS).

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 257 Ex.]

YEAS—55

Alexander	Flake	Murkowski
Barraso	Gardner	Nelson
Blumenthal	Graham	Paul
Blunt	Grassley	Perdue
Boozman	Hatch	Portman
Burr	Heller	Risch
Capito	Hoeben	Roberts
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Collins	Inhofe	Rubio
Coons	Isakson	Sasse
Corker	Johnson	Scott
Cornyn	Jones	Shelby
Cotton	Kennedy	Sullivan
Crapo	King	Thune
Cruz	Kyl	Toomey
Daines	Lankford	Wicker
Enzi	Lee	Young
Ernst	McConnell	
Fischer	Moran	

NAYS—44

Baldwin	Hassan	Reed
Bennet	Heinrich	Sanders
Booker	Heitkamp	Schatz
Brown	Hirono	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Smith
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Manchin	Tester
Cortez Masto	Markey	Udall
Donnelly	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden
Harris	Peters	

NOT VOTING—1

Tillis

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BLUNT. I further ask that the Senate proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each; further, that at 2:15 the Senate vote on the Kobes nomination as under the previous order; finally, if the nomination is confirmed, that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXCELLENCE IN MENTAL HEALTH ACT

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I know that we have a number of things scheduled here, including some farewell speeches from some of our colleagues. I was scheduled to speak, and I do want to speak, and I will try not to take too much advantage of the time.

I wanted to speak today and this week about the importance of treating mental health and the importance of

the role that law enforcement plays in the way we treat mental health in this country. For too long, law enforcement and emergency room personnel have been, in effect, the de facto mental health delivery system for the country.

The National Institutes of Health says that one in five Americans has a mental health or behavioral health issue and that one in nine adult Americans has a behavioral health issue that impacts how they live every single day.

Two Congresses ago, in the 113th Congress, Senator STABENOW and I worked to pass legislation—the Excellence in Mental Health Act. What that did was to create eight State demonstration projects that would last for 2 years each to see what would happen if we treated mental health like all other health concerns—something that everybody knows I believe we should have been doing and something that in eight States we are doing.

The good news was that 24 States applied, a number that exceeded every discussion that anybody had about how many States would step forward and say: We would like to be the States that try to do this first. Twenty-four States applied. I was certainly proud that Missouri was one of the eight States chosen to be in the demonstration project.

We are about halfway through the 2-year project, and in our State and in the seven other States, people have access to mental health services they didn't have before. Most Missourians are within a relatively short drive of a facility that will treat their mental health problem like it was any other health problem, and as we begin to do that, I think we are going to see the kind of impact on law enforcement and the kind of help that law enforcement needs as well.

Just a couple of years ago, I rode with both the crisis intervention teams in Kansas City and in my hometown in Springfield. In Springfield what I saw there were officers dealing with a 24/7 linkup to the Burrell mental health clinic, the local and regional mental health provider.

Sixteen officers, at that time, had, in effect, iPads that linked them up to a mental health professional. It didn't take too long—and I think this would be indicative of what most law enforcement officials see almost every day—before we came on someone huddled in the alcove of a building that was vacant who clearly had a behavioral health problem. It wasn't at that point a drug problem or an alcohol problem. They were where they were because they had a mental health problem.

The officer was able to Skype back immediately with a mental health professional. What I was really most interested in is that even with a well-trained officer who knew exactly what they were doing and how to do it—even with that officer there—as that officer linked the person up with someone—in effect, a telemedicine linkup with a mental health professional—you could

tell that that person was more comfortable talking to the iPad and communicating that way than he was with the officer that was right there with him, and it wasn't because the officer was in any way intimidating or unprofessional. It was just because of what it was—a linkup with someone at another site, but someone who clearly was well prepared to deal with those kinds of issues.

So we are going to see that this benefitted the kinds of things that the mental health community can do to provide more resources to the law enforcement community. The Excellence in Mental Health Act is providing a service and, I think, producing real results.

I would also say, as I conclude my remarks on this topic, that what we hope to see is a significant number of people. Remember, I said NIH said that one out of five adult Americans has a behavioral health issue. What happens when you deal with that behavioral health issue in terms of how you deal with all of the other health issues that that individual or that community will be dealing with? What happens if somebody is feeling better about themselves—taking their medicine, eating better, sleeping better, showing up for the doctor's appointments, showing up for the dialysis appointment, doing what they ought to be doing?

I believe what we are going to find and what has been found in earlier big county studies of this kind is that actually doing the right thing winds up saving money, not costing money. But also doing the right thing for police officers, for people in emergency rooms and providing the kinds of connections and alternatives needed make a big difference.

For all of the healthcare providers and the law enforcement individuals involved, I am grateful for what they do, and I think we are seeing some real results from the bill that this body passed, President Obama signed into law, and is producing great results.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for as much time as it takes me to finish this. I promise I will not keep you here until midnight.

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

FAREWELL TO THE SENATE

Ms. HEITKAMP. In 2003, I was diagnosed with stage III breast cancer. After treatment, my oncologist told me I had a 28-percent chance of living more than 10 years. Think about that.

I knew right away that I had a chance to use whatever time God gave me for good and noble purposes—to try and do the things I have always thought needed to be done in this country.

It is an important lesson for all of you. The greatest gift you have is not

your bank account. The greatest gift you have is the amount of time you have left on this Earth and what you do with that time. I chose, for good or bad, to come to the Senate.

I think when we have a world of options and we make this choice, it is so important that we come here with purpose—not just to be named a Senator, not just for the trappings of office, but with purpose.

The truth is, I am not supposed to be here. I am from Mantador, ND. It is a town of 90 people. When I was growing up, my family was one-tenth of the population. I just had to say that.

My dad was a World War II veteran who loved education. He read the paper every day. He believed in this country. But he was never given a chance to go to high school. My family struggled to get by, and when you look at it, you think about this; you think about a country where somebody from my background could actually become a U.S. Senator.

I am a Democrat from a very conservative State, but against all odds—in fact, the prediction was it was only 8 percent—I got elected to the Senate. The fact that I got to serve in the Senate for 6 years is an incredible American story. People always ask me: At what point did you think, wow, you came to the Senate?

I have said that I was so busy after I got elected because no one thought I would ever get elected, so people who never wanted to see me during my campaign wanted to see me. I was busy taking meetings and busy putting together the office.

I remember the day I came to that Chair and the pastor came and he gavled in, and then I turned around to say the Pledge of Allegiance. I thought: Here I am from Mantador, ND, a girl, middle-aged, a pudgy Democrat from North Dakota, and I am standing in the well of the Senate where not even 2,000 people have come before.

This is a great and good and noble country with great purpose, with great opportunity. I want every child out there to understand it doesn't matter. We represent a cross section of this great country, but we also aren't that special. We are not.

Sometimes I think the American public think if you took 100 random people and put them in the chairs, they could do better than we could do. But the truth is, you all came here with that same noble purpose. You all came here to change America, to do the right thing. I don't care if you sit across there; I don't care if you sit here. You all came here for the right purpose.

The fact that I got to serve in the Senate is part of a great American story, and that story happens only in this country. Don't ever forget that. If we lose that opportunity, we will become diminished as to who we are.

Today, I want to offer a few comments. I hope they are not too preachy, but I want everyone to understand, especially my colleagues, that this has

been the opportunity of a lifetime. Think about what we did to get here. This process we go through is brutal and, quite honestly, obscene. It is obscene what we do to get here.

Having done all of that work, having taken those steps and walked that gauntlet of a campaign, we have an opportunity not just to achieve the title but to do great and good things for this country. My job here—the work I have done—has always been to remember who we are standing in this well for.

Throughout the past 6 years, I have stood here for North Dakota, for the incredible people I serve. I have stood here for the families of disabled children who were terrified they would lose their healthcare. When I took that vote on the Affordable Care Act, in that vote, I remembered their faces; I remembered their tears. I have stood here for the men and women of our Armed Forces and our veterans in North Dakota, who believe they did a great thing and deserve to be treated respectfully, honorably, and, yes, get the benefits they have earned. Too often they are denied. Veterans should not have to come to a congressional office to get the benefits they have earned, yet too many have to.

I have stood here for retirees whose pensions were threatened. I have asked a simple question: If we can spend billions bailing out the failed Wall Street bankers, can't we pay attention to the working men and women who are struggling, who are in crisis? Literally, the heartbreak of their stories, if heard across this Chamber—the reaction would be overwhelming. Many of them are veterans. Many of them worked hard and now are broken in the work they have done.

I have stood here for farmers in rural communities, and I have stood here for Native people. Many times, as you know, I have tried to do my best to educate all of you on the challenges of our first Americans, our Native Americans.

Mostly, I hope I have stood here for the children of America because, in spite of how we behave, they truly are our future. They are the people who make a difference for our future, and if we do not start respecting the challenge that we have to create a better world—a better world with more opportunity—we will not fix the problems of American long term.

These are the people who drive me every day. They are whom we serve—not a party, not an ideology. We serve Americans. I have spent my time standing and fighting for them, and, for me, that work will never stop.

With all of that said, I stand here proud of what we have accomplished.

When you look at the time and the opportunity to rise above partisanship and rancor, I have found so much common ground with so many Members of this body. I am incredibly proud of what we have been able to accomplish.

I have advocated for Native American communities, and my bill to stand

up for Native American children, which I did with Senator MURKOWSKI, was the first bill I introduced. It was symbolic for me because we have to do better. I found great partnerships with Senator MURKOWSKI, not just on this but on other issues. I know her heart, and I know that she cares. When you find people who care the way you care, you can do amazing things.

My legislation with our colleague John McCain to create an Amber Alert in Indian Country became law.

We are on our way to passing Savanna's Act, which is going to recognize for the first time the challenge and the tragedy of missing and murdered indigenous women. All of this so important.

We have bipartisan legislation to help crack down on human trafficking online. We shut down backpage. We shut down people who were, in fact, selling children for sex. Think about that. That is a noble act.

The challenge continues. Congress passed my bill to give first responders more training and resources to keep our communities strong and safe.

I led a successful effort, again, with my colleague from Alaska, Senator LISA MURKOWSKI, to lift the age-old ban on exporting oil and pair it with renewables, which we did with my other colleagues on this side of the aisle when we looked at enhancing renewable energy. It was a flaming success on both sides. We are exporting, literally, millions of barrels of oil, resulting in energy independence and helping our allies, but we also are growing our renewable energy industry because of that effort. It didn't happen without colleagues working together.

I secured a vet center in Grand Forks and a CBOC in Devils Lake. It might be small to this body, but it is huge to the veterans it serves.

I got needed funds for flood protection across North Dakota—projects we need—by working with Senator HOEVEN.

I passed my bill to secure the northern border by working with Kelly Ayotte, who is no longer here but a great friend.

I helped write legislation to provide relief to community banks with Senator CRAPO, Senator DONNELLY, Senator TESTER, and Senator WARNER, recognizing the challenges of small lenders and how we needed to address those challenges. No one thought we could get that done, but we did because we believed we could. Think about that.

I worked with Republicans and Democrats—probably the crowning achievement together in terms of bipartisanship—to deal with carbon capture. It was the first major piece of carbon legislation that has been passed since I have been here.

I can't speak to other pieces, but how did that happen? It happened when Senator BARRASSO, Senator CAPITO, and I, and by the way, Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE collaborated. We said: We can't agree on climate, but we will agree on development of technology

that will change outcomes. This technology is absolutely essential to tackling the problems of carbon emissions in this country.

Don't say it can't be done. If you can get SHELDON WHITEHOUSE and MITCH MCCONNELL on a bill that involves carbon and the coal industry, that is a good day here. That is a really good day here.

I worked to help address the detrimental impact exposure to trauma can have on children and families. This is an issue I hope you all will become better educated on—childhood trauma and the effect that it has on so many of our children. I worked with great colleagues. DICK DURBIN actually let me take the ball and run with it, for which I will always be grateful.

I worked with CORY BOOKER from New Jersey doing incredible things for children.

It is pivotal, if we are going to change outcomes for American families, that we begin to address why it is that we do everything we have always done and we expect a different result. We have to think differently about these issues.

I helped to negotiate and pass two farm bills.

Thank you, PAT, and thank you, DEBBIE, for believing in bipartisanship and believing in rural America.

I have worked with incredible folks. I thank JOHN BOOZMAN, from Arkansas, and have a great story.

A little known fact in the farm bill that we are all going to pass is that this is, maybe, the first piece of major legislation involving Cuba. In order to enhance export opportunities to the island of Cuba, we have lifted the ban of using the USDA programs. It is the first time we will have addressed Cuba in any piece of major legislation.

I don't know if Senator CARPER is here, but I care about the post office.

You guys ought to, too, as we have ignored it for way too long.

I am going to give you a shout-out, TOM, and get everybody else interested because I am not going to be your partner anymore on the post office.

For those of you who care about politics, I want you to understand that when I made a post called "Fix My Mail" and thought I would get 20, 30 hits in the little State of North Dakota, I got over 500 complaints about what was happening with the rural postal delivery.

If we can't run the post office, how can we run the country? You all need to ask yourselves that question.

I am also incredibly proud of the stuff that I have done every day for North Dakotans. In 6 years, I have held over 3,500 meetings with North Dakotans both in Washington and in North Dakota. My office has provided responses to over 205,000 North Dakotans who have reached out to me about various issues, and my office has helped over 18,000 North Dakotans who have had issues with Federal agencies—getting their VA benefits, fixing issues

with Social Security, helping to resolve immigration, and much, much more.

People always ask me: What is your greatest achievement in the Senate?

I can go through all of the things I just talked about, but I would like to talk about a Native American who is from Spirit Lake Nation. He is a pipe maker, which is a very ceremonial and honorable position within his culture. He is also a Korean war vet and was one of the first people on the peninsula. He was injured and captured, but he literally saved lives during what was called the Tiger Death March. He ended up serving in a prison camp for the entire Korean war.

When he got out, no one knew who he was. There was no documentation of the fact that he had been in the prisoner of war camp, and there was no documentation that he had been injured. Senator Dorgan was able to get him his POW Medal. Guess what. He also didn't get his Purple Heart. That bothered him because he had served and had done incredible things during that service.

In scouring the Earth, we were able to find someone in Texas who would sign an affidavit—who said: Yes, he had been injured. When we presented that Purple Heart to this veteran, who was 86 years old, he got out of his wheelchair, saluted the flag, and hugged his medal.

You all have the power to do that. You all have the power to make just one little difference. Do that. It is a great thing even though it is not big legislation. In knowing that we are doing the work of the people and in knowing that so many North Dakotans have met with me and told me about the incredible challenges they have had and the incredible obstacles they have faced, you can make a difference. You can help put food on their tables. You can help them to remain as families. You can help to get them healthcare. You can do big things, but the little things matter, too—the little things that affect each one of their lives.

Despite all of the progress we have made during some difficult times, we aren't done. Every day, I come to the floor and fight for rural America. There is a huge gap in productivity and a huge gap in economic viability. There is a huge gap. As we see the retreat of rural America, we become less in this country. As we see more and more wealth moving to urban areas, we have to address this issue. There are big clouds, I think, on the horizon that face this country and rural America. If Congress doesn't tackle them head-on, our children and grandchildren will suffer the consequences.

This is an urgency that takes center stage for me. I wake up every morning and think: What am I going to do about rural America today? Do you know why? I am one of the few people here who does that, and it is because I represent a State that is still very rural. Even if you live in Fargo—it is not a

big city to some, but it is a pretty big place to those of us in North Dakota—you are just one generation from Hillsboro or you are just one generation from Cooperstown.

I also want to say that we cannot sustain a record debt and deficit. This is a bipartisan challenge. This is a challenge of historic proportion. We are the only generation in America and in our history that has inherited from the "greatest generation"—our parents—and that is borrowing from our kids. Shame on us. Shame on what we are doing right now. The Congressional Budget Office has said that our country's debt is headed to its highest level since World War II. These actions will have serious consequences, including increasing the chances of there being a fiscal crisis, which we will not be able to ignore.

I urge you to put fact before fantasy. Open your eyes. See this challenge.

Several months ago, when I voted against the tax bill that has greatly contributed, I think, to the record deficits we now face, I ran into an older man after I had given a speech at the Veterans Day service. He came up to me—it was actually before the vote—and said: Senator HEITKAMP.

I said: Yes, sir.

He said: I want a tax break.

I said: I hear that a lot.

He said: But not at the expense of my kids.

He is still a patriot, that Vietnam veteran. He still knows what it means to sacrifice for the next generation. So the Federal Government needs to be responsible as to how it spends its money.

I am grateful that my friend JAMES LANKFORD is here because we toiled away at government efficiency. Many times, we toiled away in spite of our ideological differences. In spite of our world views on issues, we still believed that this government needed to be efficient, that it needed to be effective, and that it needed to spend money in the right way. We marveled that no one seemed to care about it any more than just to show up for an occasional meeting.

That work can't stop. I hope you will find an equal and willing partner in your work, Senator LANKFORD. I know your heart, and I know that, for you, this is a moral imperative—to spend every dollar that gets sent here in the right way, in the most efficient way, and to do things right so that we can tell the American public that we are spending their dollars responsibly and that we are making the right choices. We will have many, many more options, and we will grow the reputation of not only the U.S. Government but of the U.S. Senate.

Income disparity is at a crisis as more individuals and families get left behind. The top 1 percent of families in America make more than 25 times what families who are in the bottom 99 percent make. Think about that. Let me repeat that—more than 25 times

what families in the bottom 99 percent make. Much of the recent economic prosperity we have seen in this country has been concentrated on the coasts, but it has left much of rural America behind.

The administration's trade war is not something I have been shy in talking about, for it is causing an emergency in rural America, but I think it is going to cascade into a challenge and is going to domino into there being economic peril for this country. I am not saying that we don't need to address disparities and inequities in trade agreements. I am saying that you don't need a 17th century solution, which is called tariff, to deal with a 21st century problem.

You all have to take responsibility. Think about this. Think about the White House's unilateral ability to impose a tax on the American people and then, even more remarkably, to create a system over at the Department of Commerce that, basically, waives those taxes. How many of you would let the President decide who he is going to tax if it were income taxes and then for whom they will be waived? None of you would. Take responsibility. Congress needs to take back responsibility for tariffs before it is too late. These markets took years to develop for agriculture. They are not going to come back at the snap of a finger. When you look at the net farm income, it will be 13 percent lower in 2018 with there being no promise of an increase in net farm income in the future, and this will cascade through rural America.

I also want to sound the alarm and go to Senator BLUNT, who, I think, did a wonderful job, and I couldn't agree with him more in my being the wife of a family physician who tells me every day that if he could only get his patients to be compliant with their hypertension and compliant with their diabetes. The single biggest factor is behavioral and mental health. That leads to challenges, and that challenge leads to despair, and that despair leads to a record rate of suicides.

I don't know how many of you saw that the Economist magazine did a big story on suicides throughout the world, but in only one country of the developed nations is it increasing—the United States of America. According to the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the rate of death by suicide jumped by 58 percent in North Dakota between 1999 and 2016.

That is why, in my office, we have made it a priority to address the underpinning causes of death by suicide and the challenges that we confront in various pockets of our population whether it is of our veterans, whether it is of Native Americans, or whether it is of young people. Now there is a growing rate of suicide among the elderly. Congress has to take steps. There is bipartisan support for addressing mental and behavioral health and for looking at the comprehensive crisis of addiction.

As long as I have this soap box and you are all listening to me, can we just quit talking about opioids? Can we start talking about methamphetamines? Can we start talking about alcohol? Can we start talking about a culture of addiction and not just focus on the opioid addiction? It is the bright, shiny object that we always run to, but it is the cover story for a much bigger problem that we are not addressing in this country. So, please, please, face the addiction challenge head-on and in a broader context.

It also would not be like me if I didn't talk about Indian Country, which faces dire challenges with poverty, abuse, and addiction. Far too few Americans fully understand the challenges in Indian Country or the importance of Tribal sovereignty, treaty rights, and cultural heritage. I, along with my colleague Lisa, have worked to educate many in this Chamber about those challenges. With my colleague SUSAN COLLINS, I have also talked about the challenges of runaway and missing people. She has been a great partner on so many things that I have done.

I think that when we find people of like heart and like commitment, we can do amazing and good things for the American public, but we all need to understand that the first people—our first Americans—should not be the last Americans. They should not be ignored when you have a unique position here given that your government, the U.S. Government, signs treaties on sovereignty rights. So, when you look at the disparities, you can't believe that we have done right by the treaties.

Finally, I want to talk about the crisis of childhood trauma, which I have already addressed, but this will be just to give you some numbers. These may be things that you haven't thought about.

According to a Justice Department study, 58 percent of all American children had witnessed or had been crime victims in 2014. Traumatic experiences like abuse, neglect, witnessing a crime, and parental conflict can lead to ongoing, severe mental and behavioral health complications. For Native American children, these health risks are that much more prevalent.

When we look at the challenges ahead, there will be larger issues for Congress to confront. Members of Congress cannot just look for a quick win to talk about in their States without their taking into account the long-term consequences of their actions. We need to look up, and we need to look bigger so that Congress will be creating a solid future for our children and our grandchildren. If we do nothing else in this Chamber, that would be an important first step.

All in Congress make their own decisions about how they want to use their time, which can come down to a few simple questions: Do you want to solve problems or not? Do you want to do right by your children and your grand-

children? That means all of our children and our grandchildren. Do you want to win a reelection no matter what the cost? Do you want to be able to look yourself in the mirror and say, "I did good today"?

I implore those who are still serving and all of those who are about to join this Chamber to seriously examine those questions. I hope that you will take up this mantle of the important, needed priorities. For many of you, all of those priorities are the same.

In fact, I thought we should do an experiment. On one Tuesday—I challenge you—you should have the Democratic caucus, at its lunch, give a list of the 10 problems Americans confront that they want to solve. Then have the Republican conference do the same thing. I would bet that if you would match those two lists, they would look pretty similar. In fact, they would probably be identical. When the American public sees that you know the problems but that you can't find the will to solve the problems, then they become understandably discouraged. So my work isn't done. I will just continue to do this work from a different vantage point.

As you soon start your work in the next Congress, with all of these challenges, please consider a few things. The Senate only works if we enable it to. That means each of us needs to do our job. We may not always agree, but I know Senators can work together—as I have—to get results. I know that gridlock and partisanship do not have to rule the day. I have seen it firsthand.

I will ad-lib a little here. I also think that you, as Senators, need to take power back from leadership. Too often, leadership determines the agenda. We should determine the agenda. I have seen it firsthand. I have seen that we can come together and solve problems, such as when climate change advocates and climate deniers come together on a carbon bill. If that isn't an indicator that Congress can function, I don't know what is, but it took political courage on both sides, particularly from my colleague from Rhode Island.

I don't believe this country or the caucus is as divided as it seems. All of us—those serving in Congress and across the country—want our people to get a good education. They want affordable, quality healthcare. They want a good job that puts food on the table and retirement security. They want all those things that build an economy. Our economy is the foundation and the bedrock of the might of this country. People will point to the military, but the military cannot exist without the economic strength of this country.

I think that too often politicians create and profit from issues that divide us. It is the only profession where people are rewarded for blocking things from getting done. Think about that. It is no wonder the American public has such little faith.

I had a novel idea since I joined this Chamber. I have been determined to get results and to put my State first, above political party. There are many around here, on both sides of the aisle, who know how to get results, too, and I encourage them to speak loudly, work clearly, seek compromise, and continue to do great and good works. I hope more Senators will join them.

We also need more political courage in Congress. We need Members of Congress who are willing to take tough votes because it is the right thing to do, even if it puts their reelection in jeopardy. We need more Members who are not too scared to stand up when someone in their party uses fear and lies to win support.

There is a fine line between representing those you serve and being representative of them. They don't always align. It is why we need to use facts and judgment—not polls—to make our decisions. Then it is up to each of us to explain those decisions. Simply put, sometimes leaders are needed to move public opinion to the right side of history. Remember that the decisions you are making, especially on big policy, will have consequences well beyond today.

I want to tell you about a Native American principle. It is called "seven generations." It urges decision making in any way to look at how the current decisions that are made in this generation will affect seven generations—the next seven—and to think about how you can look to a much broader purpose.

I had a thing that I did in my office. When people would come in and they would have the issue of the day, I would say: Look up. What is on the horizon? Debt and deficit, a looming retirement crisis, a crisis in education, a crisis in addiction. Look up. What are we supposed to do? There is a crisis in infrastructure, in healthcare. Look up. What do we need to do today that seven generations later people will look back at? Don't worry about a public opinion poll because you are making decisions not just for those people today. You are making decisions for the next seven generations, and they have to be the right decisions.

All of you know that you are better than the outcomes of Congress. You are nobler than the petty rhetoric that is bantered about here every day. Importantly, your reputation is tied to the reputation of every other Member because we have no power independent of each other. The greatest power that we have is the collective power of the U.S. Senate. The success of your colleagues is your success. When great and hard things are done, you share in the satisfaction of a job well done.

It has been a true honor and a privilege to serve as a Member of this Chamber and to contribute to helping North Dakota and our country. I am grateful for that wonderful opportunity.

Over the last 6 years, I have made amazing friendships with all of you

that I can't talk about right now because it is too hard, but I want you to keep fighting for those shared dreams, for those dreams you shared with me, for those ideas that you had that will move this country forward. I want you to continue to dream and to continue to believe.

When I came here, I once came to a Member, and I said: I have this really great idea. I told him about it, and he said: Yes, that is a really good idea.

I said: Let's work on it.

He said: It will never happen.

I said: It is a good idea, right?

Yes, it is a really good idea, but it will never happen.

I said: We have to get out of the shared culture of failure, believing it can't happen. It can happen. We can do really big and great things when we believe we can, when we refuse to accept failure, and when we refuse to believe that we are somehow limited. No one is tying you. No one is limiting you. You are a U.S. Senator, and, collectively, you will make a difference.

I want to also thank other people. The first is the Capitol Police. Jokingly—only it is not a joke—some of my best friends here are Capitol Police. Some of the nicest people you are going to meet serve you in the dining room. Some of the greatest people are painting the walls out there here. Say hello. Don't just walk by them. They serve you, and they are proud. They are proud of the work they do. They are wonderful people, and I want to thank them for their friendship.

I want to thank so many more people who cared about this place.

I also want to thank my staff, who are all here. Many of them are amazing people, and they are going to go on to do amazing things.

When I sign things, I say: Go do great and good things.

You can do great things, but they may not be good things. We have seen that throughout history.

I say: Go do great and good things.

And they will. They are amazing. They have given so much.

I know you all think you have the best staff. Unfortunately, I do. A lot of them are available, I just want to say. I want them to take what they have learned into their future endeavors. I want to make sure that the legacy that we leave is a legacy of service, of whom we serve and whom we stand for.

Finally, I want to thank my family: my husband Darwin, who is toiling in the clinic as we speak; my daughter Alethea, my son Nathan, and my six brothers and sisters, who are fairly famous all across North Dakota. I would like to just say that they have been my rock.

Finally, I want to thank my mom and dad because they taught me and my siblings to stand up for what is right, to have our voices heard. I know they are watching me from above, and I want to thank them for raising a rowdy, boisterous, and determined crew who remain each other's best

friends. My mother and my father made us strong, and I hope I have made them proud.

I yield the floor.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). The Senator from North Dakota.

TRIBUTE TO HEIDI HEITKAMP

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for comments on behalf of my friend from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on behalf of Senator HEITKAMP and to thank her for her service on behalf of the people of North Dakota, as well as the people of this great Nation.

We have served together for the past 6 years, not only in the Senate but also on the Agriculture Committee, the Indian Affairs Committee, and the Homeland Security Committee.

We have been able to work together on a variety of issues important to our home State, and we have been able to make progress on behalf of the people of North Dakota, as well as the country.

Ag is still North Dakota's top industry. As members of the Ag Committee, we have had the opportunity to craft good, long-term foreign policy that will make a difference not only for hard-working farmers and ranchers in North Dakota but across the Nation. In fact, we have just released the conference report with our Ag Committee leadership, Senator ROBERTS and Senator STABENOW. I commend them for their hard work as well.

Good farm policy benefits every American, every day with the highest quality, lowest cost food supply in the world. Certainly, as a fellow "aggie," Senator HEITKAMP understands that.

I think it is really important that we continue to point out that a good farm bill isn't just about farmers and ranchers. As I said, the highest quality, lowest cost food supply in the world, thanks to our farmers and ranchers, benefits every single American every single day.

I know Senator HEITKAMP will continue to work, along with our entire delegation, to get the farm bill approved by the end of this year so we can provide certainty and security for our great producers.

As chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee, I have appreciated Senator HEITKAMP's commitment to help empower our Tribal communities and to improve the quality of life in Indian Country. Senator HEITKAMP has been an advocate for Native communities. She was able to pass bipartisan legislation to establish a commission on Native children. Additionally, the Senate recently approved Senator HEITKAMP's Savanna's Act, which is legislation to bring greater awareness regarding

tragic cases of missing and murdered Native American women.

She has helped to bring awareness to these issues. We will have a hearing on the issue this week as well. We appreciate her insight and work as a member of our committee.

These are just a few examples of the issues that we have worked on together to advance. While we may be on opposite sides of the political aisle, there is one thing we have always agreed on—that it is an honor—an incredible honor—to serve the great State of North Dakota.

In closing, I want to wish Senator HEITKAMP the best going forward and to thank her again for her service on behalf of North Dakota—a place that we are both blessed to call home.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I also rise to honor my Senator next door and my great colleague Senator HEITKAMP.

As you could see from her beautiful remarks, she is a person of true courage and strength and a friend to so many. We saw this strength when she was running for Governor while battling breast cancer. We saw it when she stood up for the people of North Dakota as their attorney general, and we see that courage every single day in the U.S. Senate, as she fights for the people of her State and the values that have defined her as a public servant.

She is simply one of the best and one of a kind. Going forward, I hope that people will listen to the speech that she just gave about those seven generations, because that is service.

HEIDI has always been true to herself and as mavericky as her red hair. When I walk into a room filled with dark suits and I see that red hair in the middle of it, I know where to go and exactly what I will find. There is her joy and her optimism, so much of it coming from growing up in a family of seven kids. There is her sense of humor, which I love, even when it is mixed with some serious trash talk, even when it is directed at my State next door. There is that friendship, which I treasure above all else. There is the example she sets of what one person can accomplish when you combine so much heart and fierce determination.

We saw it with the human trafficking legislation that she talked about today. We saw it with her work on energy. We saw it with her work for her farmers. Thanks to leaders like HEIDI, we are making progress on so many issues.

I will never forget the trip that I got to take to Mexico with Senator HEITKAMP and Cindy McCain on human trafficking. One of the most memorable moments was when we visited a shelter of girls who had seen unspeakable tragedy. We met a little girl named Paloma. That means "dove" in Spanish. That girl, unlike the other

ones, didn't say a word. All she did was cry. That is all she did. It made me think of what a refugee once said. She said that what she had seen in her life would make "stones cry."

I saw the tears going down HEIDI's face as that girl was just sitting there crying. HEIDI just doesn't watch that happen. She comes back, and she takes those tears and puts them into action. That girl had no voice. HEIDI was her voice. She has done that time and again.

As she mentioned, everywhere you go in North Dakota, you practically meet a member of her family, and somehow they all look the same.

There is also her wonderful husband Darwin, whom I adore. One of my favorite Darwin stories was the time when we took the first all-women Senators trip to Africa, and HEIDI and I were sitting next to each other with some people out in the countryside, with the elders. On one side were all the women, with the women Senators, and on the other side were all the men. I turned to HEIDI—because all of the elders were wearing these incredible hats and outfits—and I said: Who is the guy at the end with the baseball cap?

She said: That is Darwin.

There he was. He was always there, always there for her.

So that is HEIDI.

I will end with one story from that trip; that is, when we were in a hut in the middle of nowhere, and there was a woman who lived there, a widow, with her kids. We went into that hut, these women Senators, and started asking that woman who was so proud of everything she had done—all that was in this hut was one solar panel that she got for her work and one thing on the wall, which was a chart that showed all of the huts. It showed her with a star in the middle, and it showed how she had helped to make sure they had good hygiene and if they got baby care, as she was in charge of that.

One of us asked this woman, who we had learned had walked every day, an hour and a half each day, to get water: What is your biggest challenge?

This woman looked at these Senators and looked at this Senator with red hair from America and said: I have no challenges. I am a leader.

That is HEIDI HEITKAMP. She is a leader. Whatever challenges she has overcome in her life—health, representing a State that isn't always easy when you look at it politically for a Democrat, the challenges she had bucking our own party, taking things on—every single moment, she overcame those challenges because HEIDI HEITKAMP is a leader.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, as I listened to Senator HEITKAMP's farewell remarks to us today, I could not help but think of the fact that she used her final speech on the Senate floor not just to talk about her accomplish-

ments, of which there are many, but to inspire us. It was a call to action. It was a call to the better angels of ourselves to work together in the interests of our country.

Maine and North Dakota are separated by a great distance, but the people of our two States have in common the qualities of hard work, of respect for tradition, balanced by a spirit of innovation and a belief in personal responsibility, always tempered by compassion.

During her years in the Senate, HEIDI HEITKAMP has demonstrated those qualities time and again. She is passionate, as we heard today; she is energetic, as we have seen in her work; and she is a committed public servant who has worked so diligently for her State and for our country.

Senator HEITKAMP has a remarkable record of public service. As her State's attorney general, she fought to protect the people of North Dakota against drug dealers, to defend seniors against abusive scams, and to keep sexual predators off the streets.

Senator HEITKAMP has continued those causes, that fight as a Member of the U.S. Senate. Among the many issues on which we have worked together, Senator HEITKAMP's determined leadership on efforts to support victims of human trafficking and to prevent youth homelessness stand out. She and I led the charge to increase Federal funding for the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act and the McKinney-Vento Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program.

She has also been such a strong advocate for children, as you all heard today. She has worked to help teenagers who find themselves without a permanent home or on the street.

I was proud to stand with her in helping to forge the bipartisan path forward on the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, which became law and includes Senator HEITKAMP's provision to give safe harbor to victims of human trafficking. She has also shed light on the role healthcare providers can play in identifying and protecting the victims of human trafficking by authoring the Stop, Observe, Ask, and Respond to Health and Wellness Act—the SOAR Act—on which I was proud to be her lead Republican.

Senator HEITKAMP has been such a valued leader in strengthening our agriculture. In fact, the chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee was just talking about the absolutely vital role she has played working with both the chairman and the ranking member. She knows that when we strengthen agriculture, we sustain our rural communities.

The Next Generation in Agriculture Act that she authored and I cosponsored will ensure that new farmers and ranchers have the support and guidance they need.

It has been so rewarding to work with Senator HEITKAMP on so many bipartisan issues, such as improving

school nutrition, increasing access to healthcare in underserved areas, and expanding mental health services for our rural vets. She was also instrumental in the success of the Common Sense Coalition in preventing a lengthy government shutdown earlier this year.

Senator HEITKAMP has been an effective and courageous colleague, but most of all, she has been a dear friend. Our friendship transcends party lines and is rooted in mutual respect and trust.

To my friend, I say thank you for your service to our country and thank you so much for your friendship. I am so grateful that we served together, and I wish you all the best.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I want to talk for just a few minutes about Senator HEIDI HEITKAMP, but first I want to start by talking a little bit about why North Dakota is so important to me.

My grandfather and grandmother lived in Argusville, in West Fargo, and moved to the place where I farm in about 1910, so I have always had a kinship with North Dakota.

Before I came to this body—even before I got into the State legislature—I always looked at North Dakota with envy because they had two U.S. Senators by the names of Byron Dorgan and Kent Conrad. I thought they were incredibly effective people, and when I got to this body, I found out that in fact they were. Byron used to talk about Rosie the Riveter and trade and Kent used to talk about the budget.

Then there was this lady by the name of HEIDI HEITKAMP, who decided to run when Kent hung up his cleats. I remember sitting in caucus as the campaign unfolded in 2012. As a candidate, especially in a tough State like North Dakota is or a tough State like Montana is, you always worry about different issues as they are coming down the pike and how you were going to deal with them and how you were going to message them. Healthcare was a big deal in the 2012 election. I saw one of the ads HEIDI had offered up. She didn't step away from the issue. She laid into the issue. That was a sign of what was to come when she got into this body.

I remember the night she got elected and, as she pointed out, she wasn't supposed to get elected, but she did because she is a special person and a special candidate. I remember driving home the next morning, and I called Kent Conrad. I said: Congratulations. He said: You are going to love HEIDI HEITKAMP. She is an incredible person. I remember he also said: What you are going to love about her the most is that she is normal. In this body, that says a lot—because HEIDI HEITKAMP is normal. She is somebody who sees the world as it is. She sees rural America as it is. She has leaned into every issue. They have been well documented

here today. She has been incredibly effective in this body, but most importantly—and most of what this body is going to have to compensate for when she goes—every issue she brought up today revolves around rural America.

Not many people live in rural America anymore. We have all moved to the coast or we have moved to the bigger cities. She is right; Fargo is the big city. In Montana, people have moved from the rural areas to the big cities like Great Falls and Billings and Missoula. Those people and their challenges in those rural areas are real. HEIDI HEITKAMP brought those challenges to the floor, brought them to committee every single day. I can't tell you how much I appreciate that, being a child of rural America.

So as we move forward, as HEIDI has given her last speech on the Senate floor and laid out the challenges we need to take up in this Senate—and the challenges she laid out are real and they will not get solved by one party or the other, they will only get solved, as she knows, by working together. I will say this. You have been an incredible friend, an incredible ally, somebody who is normal, and I wish you Godspeed moving ahead. I am sure we haven't heard the last of HEIDI HEITKAMP.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Montana for his comments and those of Senator KLOBUCHAR, as well as my distinguished colleague and friend from Maine.

Normal; maybe “supernormal” would be a better term. Every time HEIDI HEITKAMP came into our committee room—I had the privilege and the honor of being the chairman of the sometimes powerful Senate Agriculture Committee, along with my distinguished ranking member, Senator STABENOW, whom I will yield to in just a moment. Every time she came into the committee room, it might be a little bit late, but it was like a ray of sunshine came in and a ray of commitment.

HEIDI, thank you for that speech. Thank you for those marching orders, if you will. This marine will cease parade rest and come to attention and do the best I can following your example.

I want to say something to HEIDI's staff. I don't know if the Senate cameras will do this—they obviously have me on there—but it would be a good idea to pan these young people over there.

Senator Frank Carlson, a long time ago—one of my mentors, my first boss from Kansas—said there are no self-made men or women in public office. It is your friends who make you what you are. I relate to that, saying friends, people, staff. We all think we have the best staff on the Hill, and if we don't think that, something is wrong. You have had the privilege of working for a

lady who has great admiration from both sides of the aisle, who has accomplished so much. This time is so special for you, and thank you for what you have done for HEIDI. Thank you for getting her prepared, ready. You didn't have to do too much because she does that on her own, but during this special time, see if you can take this step and then the next step in your life—and it prepares you for that next step—and shine. Represent HEIDI well. Represent yourself well.

I think you have had a rare privilege to work for somebody like HEIDI HEITKAMP. She has been a good friend to me and a good friend to so many here.

We aren't going to miss you because you are going to be back in some capacity—maybe taking time off from what you are doing in your home State of North Dakota. Everybody who knows you knows you are going to be back in public service in some capacity.

I think I will stop right there and yield to my distinguished colleague, the ranking member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, Senator STABENOW.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, today I rise to pay tribute to someone who has made a really big impression from the day she set foot in the Senate.

It might be her infectious laugh; I dare you not to smile when you hear it. It might be her hugs, which I know many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will miss. Or it might be her ever-present iced coffee, no matter how cold it is outside. I might be biased, but I think it is the hair.

Saying goodbye to Senator HEIDI HEITKAMP is hard for many of us, especially the members of the Senate Red-head Caucus. After all, we are losing a third of our membership.

In all seriousness, I will miss HEIDI, and I know I am not alone. I have had the chance to get to know her from the very beginning, back when she was first running for the Senate. I campaigned with her in North Dakota, and the thing that really struck me was her passion for the people of her State and for agriculture.

We have had the opportunity to work closely together during our time on the Agriculture Committee and especially as members of the farm bill conference committee. I can tell you that HEIDI has been instrumental in getting this deal done and in making sure that North Dakota's farmers and ranchers are well-represented.

Thanks to HEIDI, we have taken huge steps forward in trade with Cuba; it is her language in the farm bill.

She wasn't afraid to go her own way in order to stand up for North Dakota. Even when we didn't agree on issues like conservation easements, HEIDI fought for her farmers and got it done.

I would like to think her passion comes from her red hair, but in reality,

I think it is her oversized heart. Whether she was listening to the struggles of women farmers during our women's agriculture CODEL in Africa, or shining a light on the epidemic of missing and murdered Native American women, or sharing her own story of surviving breast cancer and the need to protect people with preexisting conditions, in a city where spreadsheets rule, HEIDI threw her heart into this job, and her State and our Nation are better for it.

HEIDI, thank you for your friendship, your leadership, and for putting your whole heart into fighting for North Dakota.

I join my great friend Senator ROBERTS, first of all, in indicating what a huge difference you have made on the Agriculture Committee. From the day you walked in, you hit the ground running and have made an incredible difference.

As you were talking today about some parts—and we could go through every single chapter—you made a difference. The Tribal provisions are in there. But you mentioned Cuba, and this is very historic. It took work on the Senate floor to be able to move it through. It took work for us in the conference committee. It is because of you that it is in there and opportunities for farmers are in there.

I also greatly appreciate that when we had differences—like conservation and easements—you pushed hard and were successful in getting changes for North Dakota that needed to happen. It was you who did that. Others took credit, but you did that.

When I think about our traveling together to Africa and think about the impact you have had on women and children—whether it is Native women and children, whether it was what we were doing overseas, whether it was what you have done every day for all of our children—I am so grateful.

Most importantly, I am grateful for your friendship. I am going to miss you greatly. I wish you Godspeed while you determine the future. I know it will be bright, and hopefully in some way we will all be benefiting from it.

God bless you.

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleagues in honoring and paying tribute to my friend and mentor, Senator HEIDI HEITKAMP.

I am particularly and profoundly grateful for both her trailblazing work mentoring women who want to run for public office and her remarkable ability to get things done across party lines in the Senate.

For years, Senator HEITKAMP has been at the forefront of mentoring other women and encouraging them to enter public service, recognizing that balanced representation is vital to our country's success. In fact, HEIDI HEITKAMP and I first met through a program that she helped start to encourage and prepare women to run for

office—to do more than just tell us it was possible but to help us understand that there were ways to prepare for it, to run in our own way, to be our own people. She helped demonstrate that even though you may experience setbacks—including her own setback battling breast cancer—you still have what it takes to serve your communities and to make a difference. I am incredibly grateful for those lessons, I am incredibly grateful for her efforts because they have helped inspire women all across the country.

All the issues that HEIDI just talked about in her farewell speech—there are now armies of current and future public servants who will take those issues and challenges as their own because she has helped prepare them to do that.

Then there is Senator HEITKAMP's work in the Senate. During the time we served together in the Senate, I have been so impressed by Senator HEITKAMP's ability to stand up for her priorities and her values, while also working with anybody else here willing to step up to get results, particularly on issues such as fighting for rural communities, standing up for our country's veterans, strengthening our Nation's healthcare system, and, yes, reminding our colleagues that there is a northern border that needs to be secured and attended to.

Serving together on the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, I saw firsthand her capacity to be constructive and to find compromise. In doing so, she earned the respect and trust of her colleagues, while also building a record of bipartisan accomplishments—accomplishments we all know last because of their very bipartisan nature.

Above all, Senator HEITKAMP was relentless in fighting for what she believed. Just ask any of the witnesses who testified before her on the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee.

It has been truly an honor to serve with Senator HEITKAMP, and all of us need to continue to work to emulate her example—the example that she has set of listening to others and being productive, her commitment and her recognition of the importance of getting things done while always doing the right thing for the people we serve.

Senator HEIDI HEITKAMP's voice in this Chamber will be sorely missed, but I also know that she will keep fighting to make a difference and that she will continue to do just that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I think all of us here watching Senator HEITKAMP today give her farewell address were tremendously moved. I come away, first of all, with, this is a person of character, a person we have served with who cares about doing the right thing, a person who cares deeply about the issues that are before this august body and someone we will miss very much.

By the evidence of the Republicans who turned out to listen here on the floor—and I am sure many others were listening in their offices—I think they may miss her more than Democrats because she worked with them so much. She cared about reaching across the aisle. She wasn't worried that it was going to hurt her back home because she was going to be solving problems.

One of the things I think of when I think of HEIDI HEITKAMP is that I have known HEIDI—she is my friend. She reminds me: Don't call me your oldest friend in the Senate. But she is my longest standing friend. I go back to the early 1990s with HEIDI, when we were attorneys general together from two small States—New Mexico and North Dakota—and we have been very, very good friends since then.

HEIDI is a leader of principle. She wants to do the right thing, no matter what. That is pretty special in this institution we are in. She wants to do what is right by North Dakota and do what is right by our country. She always follows her conscience, and she gives the citizens of her State and this great country her very best judgment. That is really the spirit of a true public servant—to do what is right and let the chips fall where they may. A couple issues we have had recently are good examples, and I will talk about one back when we were attorneys general together.

The Kavanaugh vote was a big vote for the Senate. I think it was probably a tough vote for HEIDI, but I think she came to it with the idea that she was going to do the right thing. She had the courage to stand up for victims—victims of sexual assault, victims of sexual harassment, all of the permutations of that. I know that for the better part of her career—whether she was an attorney general, whether she was a U.S. Senator, or whether she was working in other capacities both in and out of government—she was always working for victims. I think one of the things that helped HEIDI understand that so well was that her mother was sexually assaulted as a teenager. Knowing that—HEIDI learned from that. She learned about the prevalence of it, that it was out there and it was deep and it was hidden in a lot of ways. So I saw early on, as a State attorney general, that she was a champion—a real champion—for victims.

Shifting from the example I just gave with the vote on the Supreme Court, another example of her persistence to do what is right—nobody had ever taken on the tobacco industry, this huge industry. People talked a little bit and would say: It is so bad that people are addicted to smoking. But the attorneys general of our country in the 1990s filed a lawsuit against the tobacco companies because they were targeting our children. We found research that showed tobacco companies knew that if you get young people addicted at a very young age, they are going to smoke for life. For them, it

was all a profit motive. If you get a young person addicted, you know you are going to have a smoker for life; you know you will have somebody who is going to buy cigarettes for life. We knew that.

She was one of the leaders in the attorneys general's effort to bring this horrible, horrible scourge under control. We filed our lawsuit. The tobacco companies saw what was coming. We did our discovery. They didn't want this case in court—there was no way. They were going to lose big. So we had what was the biggest civil settlement in the history of the country. After we knew we were going to have a settlement, the smaller States knew we had to have a tough negotiator to represent us because we were afraid that larger States—California, New York, and others—would get more of the money than we would. We all felt we had participated equally. So whom did we select? We selected HEIDI HEITKAMP to be our negotiator, and, boy, did she do a good job for the smaller States.

Just to remind everybody, this year, \$34 million from that settlement flows to the State of North Dakota. It was settled several decades ago, but the money is still coming in to do prevention, to help out with tobacco addiction, and to do what is really important there.

The other quality I want to mention—and I know we are going over in terms of where we are supposed to be in our caucuses—there is a remarkable trait—and we saw this today, with everyone who turned out, and our staff knows this—HEIDI HEITKAMP is one of the most well-liked U.S. Senators by both sides of the aisle. She was so well-liked that President Trump—convinced he needed somebody in his Cabinet who was well-liked and respected—recruited HEIDI HEITKAMP to be his Secretary of Agriculture. I really think what the President was doing cozying up to her was trying to make friends in the Senate. He figured that if he got her, she was going to make a real difference, and he was hoping that her popularity would rub off on him.

I will never forget when President Trump invited her up on the stage at one of his political rallies in September of 2017. He invited her up to the stage and said:

Everybody's saying, "What's she doing up here?" But I'll tell you what: Good woman.

"Good woman." Do you know what I say? No, Mr. President. She is a great woman. She is a great woman.

I could go on forever, but I just want to comment—and HEIDI commented about her commitment to Native communities, to Native women and to Native children. She worked as a State attorney general, she worked in the Senate, and she worked in other elected offices on this. She didn't give up. She is working in the Senate until the very end to make sure we get Savanna's Act passed, which is going to protect missing and indigenous women.

We have already passed it through the Senate Indian Affairs Committee,

and she is intent on making sure it gets passed this session, and I am going to work with her on that. She has worked on VAWA reauthorization. Heidi has always broadcast the core principles in our relations with Native communities—Tribal sovereignty, Tribal consultation, strong government-to-government relations—and she has always tried to make sure Senators who don't have Native communities understand the situation we are facing.

My friendship with HEIDI has made me a better public servant and a better person. Before we came here to serve, we had already known each other for many years—since the 1990's when we both served as State attorneys general. At that time, there was only a handful of women serving as their State's attorney general. HEIDI herself was a trailblazer, serving as North Dakota's first female Attorney General.

It was then I saw the first of the innumerable examples of her commitment to serving the people of North Dakota and the public interest.

A number of attorneys general, including HEIDI and I, initiated groundbreaking lawsuits against big tobacco. Those lawsuits were met with skepticism. The disease and terrible health impacts caused by tobacco products had cost States precious resources. The tobacco companies were working to lure underage youth to buy their harmful products through targeted advertising. Like so many other times in her life, HEIDI's work helped us beat some long odds.

Our lawsuits proved highly successful. North Dakota is still reaping the benefits, having received a \$34 million tobacco settlement from those efforts just this year.

In the years since, I have seen HEIDI continue her dedication to public service and achieve great things, not least of which was 6 years ago when she became North Dakota's first woman elected to the U.S. Senate.

Although she has come far from her humble beginnings, she has never forgotten her roots. She fights for the working people of North Dakota and across the Nation.

While HEIDI is highly accomplished, she remains plain spoken, straight shooting, and down to earth.

I have been privileged to serve with HEIDI on the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs—a committee she knew from the get-go that she wanted to be on. She came to Washington ready to fight for Native communities in North Dakota, to make sure they weren't being left behind.

She is a fierce defender of tribal sovereignty and demands that the federal government meet its treaty and trust responsibilities and engage in meaningful consultation with tribes when Federal action impacts tribal interests.

HEIDI has worked tirelessly on behalf of North Dakota's five tribes and all of Indian country.

Just like when she was attorney general, I have seen her laser-focused on

protecting and empowering those most in need of a champion—like children and domestic violence survivors.

The very first bill HEIDI introduced was to tackle the systemic problems facing Native children by establishing a National Commission.

With more than one in three Native American children living in poverty, suicide rates 2.5 times higher than the national average, and one of the lowest high school graduation rates in the country, she knew we must do more—much more—for our Native youth. It was no surprise to me that she got that bill passed in short order before the end of her first Congress.

For decades, HEIDI has been on the frontlines of protecting victims of domestic violence. As attorneys general, we worked to implement the Violence Against Women Act after it first got passed in 1994.

We continued the fight together here in the Senate. In fact, one of the first things we worked on was to help pass the 2013 VAWA reauthorization. That reauthorization was hard fought. We wanted to protect key provisions that restored tribal jurisdiction to domestic violence crimes committed by non-Indians on reservations. Those cases were falling through the cracks.

At the time, opponents claimed that tribes didn't have the resources or expertise to enforce the Act. Thanks to the tireless work of HEIDI and many of my colleagues on the Indian Affairs Committee, the provisions remained in the bill, and President Obama signed it into law in March 2013.

Five years later, we know for a fact that those opponents were wrong. According to a report this year from the National Congress of American Indians, since VAWA of 2013 was enacted, 18 tribes have once again begun exercising jurisdiction over domestic violence crimes. NCAI is collaborating with 50 other tribes to develop best practices. There have been 143 arrests of 128 non-Indian abusers, with 74 convictions.

HEIDI has always prided herself on working across the aisle to get things done—whether she is tackling domestic violence or working to improve public safety.

She partnered with my good friend John McCain to make sure that Indian Country is part of the AMBER Alert child abduction warning system. That bill was signed into law last April.

Just last week, the full Senate unanimously passed one of HEIDI's bills—Savanna's Act. Savanna LaFontaine-Greywind—a member of the Spirit Lake tribe, 22 years old, and 8 months pregnant—was brutally murdered in Fargo last year. The sad truth is, reportedly more than 80 percent of Native women will experience violence in their lifetime. HEIDI is determined to do something about that.

Her bill would improve law enforcement tracking of and response to the growing crisis of missing and murdered indigenous women. HEIDI has been an incredible voice combatting this cri-

sis—working to make sure these women are not invisible. I have been touched by her commitment to this fight.

I am inspired by HEIDI's work for Indian Country and am committed to carrying on her work so that tribes in North Dakota and across Indian Country know that. Even if one of their strongest defenders is moving on to the next chapter, her mission will not be lost.

The list of all HEIDI's accomplishments is as long as her heart is big. She has worked for the people of North Dakota for decades. She has been an independent voice in the Senate, not tied to party or ideology but committed to doing what is right for the people of her State. She will always roll up her sleeves and work with all sides to solve problems. She will always fight for the little guy.

On a personal note, she is one of the most loyal friends anyone could ask for.

She never shied away from the hard votes—approaching every single one with conscience and courage. I admire HEIDI for her conviction.

All of us here will miss HEIDI tremendously. I know that her work is not done—not even close. Like so many here, I look forward to her next challenge and to seeing what more she accomplishes for her State and the Nation and the countless lives she is sure to touch.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks.

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

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I want to echo what my colleague from New Mexico said about our friend and colleague Senator HEITKAMP. I can say that everything he just said—there is strong bipartisan agreement on that front. I want to emphasize a couple of points he mentioned about Senator HEITKAMP. Certainly, she is one of the most well-liked Senators, optimistic and upbeat.

As Senator UDALL just mentioned, I think there is a certain element in the Senate—whether you are a Democrat or a Republican, if you are a former attorney general, you come to this job with a little bit of the same viewpoint, the same experiences.

I want to emphasize what Senator HEITKAMP mentioned in her remarks and Senator UDALL mentioned in his remarks, which is her strong dedication to two issues that I think really matter—certainly, they matter to my constituents, and they matter to most Americans—and that is her relentless advocacy and fight with regard to combating the big problem we have in America with sexual assault and domestic violence—it is a very big, difficult problem in my State, and I know it is a problem in many other States—

and her commitment to the Native people of our country.

One example is a bill that Senator HEITKAMP and I worked on together called the POWER Act. The whole focus is to get more legal representation for survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault. When we were working on this bill together, she was obviously a huge advocate, but she came back to me and said: We need to make this especially focused on the Native communities. That was her idea. That was in the bill. The bill was passed in the Congress and signed into law 2 months ago. I have no doubt that bill, for which she was the strongest advocate, is going to make lives better for women throughout our country who have gone through horrible experiences, particularly in the Native communities, whether in North Dakota or Alaska or New Mexico, and that was because of her hard work.

So I want to echo what so many others have said. In those areas and so many others, it has been my honor to serve with Senator HEITKAMP. I know she is going to continue to serve her community, State, and country in important ways. My best to her.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

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

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:18 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

MORNING BUSINESS—(Continued)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 2

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 3:45 p.m. today, the Senate vote on adoption of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will re-

sume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Jonathan A. Kobes, of South Dakota, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Kobes nomination?

Mr. ROUNDS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 258 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Alexander	Gardner	Paul
Barrasso	Graham	Perdue
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heller	Roberts
Capito	Hoeven	Rounds
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Collins	Inhofe	Sasse
Corker	Isakson	Scott
Cornyn	Johnson	Shelby
Cotton	Kennedy	Sullivan
Crapo	Kyl	Thune
Cruz	Lankford	Tillis
Daines	Lee	Toomey
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young
Fischer	Murkowski	

NAYS—50

Baldwin	Harris	Nelson
Bennet	Hassan	Peters
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Booker	Heitkamp	Sanders
Brown	Hirono	Schatz
Cantwell	Jones	Schumer
Cardin	Kaine	Shaheen
Carper	King	Smith
Casey	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Coons	Leahy	Tester
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Udall
Donnelly	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkeley	Whitehouse
Flake	Murphy	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murray	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 50. The Senate being equally divided, the Vice President votes in the affirmative, and the nomination is confirmed.

Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PORTMAN). The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

SENATE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, the 115th Congress is drawing to a close, and it has been a good 2 years. Our goal 2 years ago was simple: to make life better for American families—which is exactly what we have done. We knew that

a huge part of making life better for American families was in the expanding of opportunity and putting more money in their pockets, so we passed a historic reform of our outdated Tax Code that slashed tax rates for families and removed barriers to economic growth.

It is already producing results. Since we passed tax reform a year ago this December, we have seen unemployment drop to its lowest rate in almost 50 years, and we have seen job openings reach a record high. For the past 7 months, there have been more job openings than there have been Americans looking for work. We have seen company after company dispense raises or bonuses or boost benefits for their employees. We have seen the best wage growth since the great recession and more.

Most importantly, the economic benefits of tax reform are reaching the people who need them the most. During the Obama administration, what economic prosperity there was tended to be concentrated in large metropolitan areas, but under Republican government, growth and prosperity are reaching small cities and rural families and communities. Thanks to tax reform, a lot of families are finding it easier to pay their bills and to put a little bit away for the future.

Yet, of course, tax reform is far from the only thing we did in this Congress to improve the lives of the American people. Along with the White House, we lifted burdensome regulations. We enacted legislation to improve career and technical education programs. We passed legislation to make it easier for Main Street banks and credit unions to lend money to small businesses and farmers and ranchers. We passed the largest pay increase in nearly a decade for our men and women in uniform.

We delivered real reforms for our veterans through the VA MISSION Act. This legislation streamlined the VA's community care programs to help ensure veterans receive efficient, timely, quality care. Once fully implemented, it will also expand caregiver assistance to disabled pre-9/11 veterans—an overdue benefit for generations of our heroes. We also modernized the Veterans Benefits Administration's appeals system to develop a quicker, more responsive system for veterans.

On the national security front, we have reinvested in our Nation's military to ensure that our troops are equipped not only for today's missions but to meet the threats of the future. A recent report from the bipartisan National Defense Strategy Commission outlined how dangerously our military superiority has eroded—to the point at which it would be difficult for us to win a war against two major powers. This alarming reduction in our military's readiness is why Republicans have made rebuilding our military such a priority in this Congress. There is no better way to ensure peace for our country than to make sure that the

U.S. military is the strongest, best equipped fighting force in all the world.

On the healthcare front this Congress, we passed the SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act to address the nationwide opioid epidemic. This bipartisan legislation reflected ideas and input from no fewer than 72 of our Members here in the Senate to support prevention, treatment, and recovery efforts.

We repealed ObamaCare's individual mandate tax, which forced patients to buy insurance that they didn't want and couldn't afford. We also eliminated ObamaCare's Independent Payment Advisory Board, which would have empowered a board of unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats to make substantial changes to Medicare.

We passed legislation to give terminally ill patients access to experimental care.

In February, we also passed the longest extension of the State Children's Health Insurance Program in the program's history.

Then, of course, there are the many excellent judges we have confirmed to the Federal bench—judges who can be relied on to uphold the law and the Constitution and to give anyone who comes before their benches a fair shake.

TRIBUTE TO ORRIN HATCH

Mr. President, as usual, more than one of our accomplishments this Congress would not have been possible without the leadership of Senator HATCH. He spearheaded the historic tax reform bill that is putting more money in the pockets of the American people, and he is also responsible for the longest extension of the State Children's Health Insurance Program in the program's history.

In his 40-plus years of public service, he has been a powerful voice for the people of Utah and for all Americans. He has fought for economic growth and job creation, for trade policies that benefit American companies and American workers, for judges who will uphold the Constitution and the rule of law, and for fiscal responsibility and intellectual property rights.

Senator HATCH has long been a leader on the issue of religious liberty. Together with the late Senator Ted Kennedy, he authored the Religious Freedom Restoration Act to protect Americans' First Amendment right to live in accordance with their religious beliefs.

A stalwart conservative, he has nevertheless known how to reach across the aisle to get things done for the American people. No legislator alive today has had as many pieces of legislation that he or she has sponsored signed into law by the President.

It is difficult to imagine the Senate without ORRIN HATCH. I have been privileged to serve with Senator HATCH throughout my time in the Senate, including on the Senate Finance Committee, which he chairs. It is hard to imagine his not being there, but the impact he has had on the Senate will

not soon be forgotten. He leaves a record of legislative achievement and an example of character and leadership, of fierce conviction paired with a consummate gentlemanliness. There are few people to whom the word "statesman" can be applied more fittingly.

I wish him the very best in his well-deserved retirement. I know he will enjoy having more time to spend with Elaine, his wife, with his children and his numerous grandchildren and great-grandchildren, as well as, hopefully, having some extra time to follow the Utah Jazz.

I yield the floor.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

AGRICULTURE IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2018—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session, that the Chair lay before the Senate the conference report to accompany H.R. 2, and that the final 10 minutes before the vote be equally divided between the managers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Chair lays before the Senate the conference report to accompany H.R. 2, which the clerk will report by title.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2), to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes, having met, have agreed that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment and the Senate agree to the same: Signed by a majority of the conferees on the part of both Houses.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of December 10, 2018.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for as much time as I may consume.

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

FAREWELL TO THE SENATE

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, I rise today for the final time representing the great people of Indiana here in the U.S. Senate. My 6 years representing Hoosiers in this body and the 6 years I spent as a Congressman for the Second District of Indiana before this have been among the great honors of my life.

I am the grandson of immigrants—immigrants who came here with nothing except the dream of America—a dream that says that any opportunity can come true, that if you work hard, you can accomplish anything.

My dad was in the CCC. For all of our young pages here who have no idea what the CCC is, it was the Civilian Conservation Corps. It was for teenagers your age, back in the Depression, who were asked to go and try to help raise money for their family so that the other family members could eat.

My dad was shipped to Idaho to build bridges. Today we call that infrastructure. Back then, we said it was building bridges. He built bridges all throughout the Pacific Northwest, having grown up in the Lower East Side of New York City and having never been west of the Hudson River in his life until that point. It was America that gave him that chance.

My brothers and sisters were the first generation to ever go to college. That is how America works. You work hard, and each generation builds on the next. We are so lucky to live in this country that is so blessed and that gives us this opportunity, but we have a responsibility here to meet the challenges that have been given to us.

I want to take this opportunity to discuss some of the things I have learned in my time in Congress and to share a few thoughts on how the work that happens here, and how it will happen in coming years, is going to be absolutely essential to how our Nation moves forward and succeeds.

In my 12 years here in the Capitol, I have prided myself on the relationships I have built and on the bipartisan nature of working together. I have been found to be one of the most bipartisan Members. My friend HEIDI, who is down the aisle here, who gave a wonderful speech this morning, was my partner on so much of this. I would never have been able to achieve for Hoosiers so much of this without working together in a bipartisan fashion.

My friend TODD YOUNG is across the way. He is the other Senator from Indiana. Our focus has been on how to make life better, whether it meant assisting constituents or resolving an issue with a Federal agency.

In one case, a pizza parlor owner came up to me. He was 90 years old. Now he is 93. He said: My streetlight is out. You are my Senator. It needs to be fixed before the big game this weekend.

I called the mayor, and it was fixed. He was asked that weekend, and he said: Of course, I got it fixed. I called my Senator. That is what I did.

We are multitasking in this job. It is to make lives better.

I was blessed to work with my friend RON JOHNSON, the Senator from Wisconsin. We worked on legislation called the Right to Try Act. It means giving people who are sick the chance to get medication they need.

We were told: There is no shot. This can't get done.

We had zero votes at the time. When it was done, we had 100—100. A young man from my State, Jordan McLinn, has the chance to get the medication he needs now. People all over the Nation do. Other kids with Duchenne

muscular dystrophy can also get help, and other people with ALS can also get help. That is the purpose of this job—that we work for them.

I was able to get more than 50 provisions signed into law over the past 6 years. It was only possible because I worked together every day with every Senator. There are friends like SUSAN COLLINS and LISA MURKOWSKI who, when the government shut down, we worked to end it. It became like a regular group that we had. Every time it shut down, we would work to open it back up again.

You learn from other Members, like ROGER WICKER, who I worked together with to end military suicide. We have not been able to end it yet, but we sure worked on it every day.

We learn from others Members in hearings about the difficulties people in their States are facing, and we work together to address common challenges. You can be from Idaho, you can be from North Dakota, you can be from New Hampshire, or you can be from Indiana, but we all have the same challenges.

All of us worked hard to get here. Our jobs should not be worrying about politics but worrying about making lives better. Partisanship gets us nothing. Division gets us nothing.

I was thinking: What is the best way to explain this? It is this. When a fire department goes to a house, they don't ask if the person living there is Democrat or Republican. They are just there to help their neighbor. No soldier has ever asked, when they are in a foxhole fighting their way out: Where do you come from? Which party are you? What is your religion? What is your ethnic background?

You are Americans. You are in this together. You have each other's backs.

As an institution, the Senate must be a place that we are all proud of, that promotes that ideal, and that sets the example that we want our children and grandchildren to follow. It means getting to know one another. It means listening to other perspectives and to other experiences.

One of the things that amazed me the most—and when I was out campaigning and going to town halls, I never failed to be astounded—was when folks came and said: You didn't do the one thing I wanted; so I am really mad at you, and I will never support you again.

I said: But we did 19 other things.

They said: But I didn't get that one.

I said: Apparently, you are not from a family of five children, like I am.

There were five children and two dogs. So when there were seven pork chops, I was the last to wind up with one.

So if you are someone who wants 100 percent of what you want every time, this is not the place. This is a place where we can get 70 percent to build America, to make it a better place.

The rhetoric—the divisive rhetoric—and the political campaigns, increasingly funded by tens of millions of dol-

lars of anonymous, dark money interests, are really doing damage to this country.

I have always been for campaign finance reform. The reason I wasn't very good at raising money—which I wasn't very good at—was because people ought to have a right to know who is talking to them, who is standing up for what they have to say. I have always believed that if you have something to say, you should be willing to put your name on it.

I am concerned by our inability here to tackle serious, long-term issues. My friend Heidi touched on it. Our obligation, as public servants, is to leave a country for our children and grandchildren that is in better shape than we got it. It is the most basic promise that we make.

My wife Jill's dad was a Guadalcanal marine. He was wounded in the South Pacific. I told him: You are our hero.

He said: No, I was born at the wrong time.

I said: But you are still our hero.

He said: Look, I did my job, which is to leave for the next generation a better country than was given to me.

That is what we are supposed to do. My friend MICHAEL BENNET has talked about this a lot, but we have a deficit right now of \$21.8 trillion. I had to look because it was, I think, \$21.7 trillion yesterday. This deficit is going to destroy everything we are trying to do in this country, and we have done next to nothing to address it.

My friend CHUCK SCHUMER can probably relate to this the best, but there is an old cartoon. It was Popeye. Popeye had a friend named Wimpy. Wimpy loved hamburgers, but Wimpy never had any money. So Wimpy's saying was this: "I will gladly pay you Tuesday for a hamburger today." That is the American government today. We do things, and we don't pay for any of them—but someday we will. That someday is now.

My friends Jordan and Peter Hanscom just had a baby boy about 5 months ago. You know what he was born into? \$67,000 of debt. It is because we didn't have the responsibility to pay for our bills.

At the end of next year, 2019, the deficit is going to \$23 trillion. Unless we do something here, it is on an unstoppable course to be at \$30 trillion.

So what did we do here?

We passed a tax cut, because what is another \$1.5 trillion? It is a tax cut at a time when we have a full-employment economy, a strong economy. We passed a tax cut, and we are now running, in a great economy, over \$1 trillion in deficits every year.

If we can't balance our books now, when are we ever, ever going to do this? Right now we are on a course that, within 10 years, the interest payment will be almost \$1 trillion a year, which is unsustainable.

Admiral Mike Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, was asked in 2010, when the deficit was \$14 trillion: What is the most dangerous thing to our na-

tional security? China? Russia? He said: The debt, because we can't pay for anything, and if we can't pay for anything, how am I going to protect the men and women who serve this Nation?

We have serious, serious work to do.

At my church back home, St. Anthony's Church in South Bend, IN—I know, an Irish kid going to St. Anthony; you have to question it sometimes—we were running up a debt, and we were solving it by adding more debt to fix the debt we had. A new pastor came in. He came to the pulpit one Sunday, and he said: Here is the deal. We are not spending anything we don't have anymore. We need to have the revenue to match what we want to do, and the things we want to do and can't pay for, well, we will continue to want to do them, but we will not do them.

Magic occurred. We balanced our books. The parish went on. It got stronger, and all of a sudden, we were in the black.

As a body here, we do not have the right to tell CJ, that little boy, and children being born today—we don't have the right to financially cripple the country they will be inheriting.

We had ancestors who fought for this Nation. I think of my Uncle Tom, who fought with Patton in North Africa and who gave everything he had. His Purple Heart is in my office. It has been there every day while I have been there. They sacrificed everything. The least we can do is to pay our bills, not to give out crazy tax cuts that we can't pay for, and to make sure that we balance our budgets.

We are better than this. Sometimes we just have to have the ability to say no—to say no to things that, by common sense, you would never do with your own checkbook, or if you did, the end would not be very, very pleasant on that kind of thing.

If we continue doing these things, this amazing and wonderful place that I have been a part of, with the most amazing colleagues—that is the part that has been so great. It is every colleague, and one is better than the next. But this is a long-term threat to our democracy and to our country's success. We can do better, and every one of you can lead on this.

Too often, what we watch in our politics doesn't reflect the spirit or the values or the diverse coalitions of Americans that have made this country so successful. It is not the type of example we want to be leaving for our kids.

I will tell you the kind of example we want to leave. It is when we do great, great things when we have looked up and have seen our country in trouble. I had the privilege to represent Kokomo, IN, back in 2008, 2009 when the economy collapsed, and we had a transmission plant. We built all of the transmissions for all of the Jeeps in the country there. That is why I drive a Jeep. But those wonderful people—we went from over 5,000 to less than 100. They counted on us. We came together, and we

said: We can do big things. We can get this done.

President Obama—I told him: Chrysler is going to make it.

He said: How do you know?

I said: I lit a candle at Mass. Does that work?

He laughed. He said: Well maybe not, but I will give it a shot.

You have to have faith in the people of this country, that if you give them a fair shot, they can get it done.

As an institution, we came together, Democrats and Republicans, including my friend FRED UPTON from Michigan, who is right across the line, and together we got it done. That plant, which had over 5,000 people working there and then less than 100 when we crashed, has over 9,000 there today because we looked at each other and said: It is not about Democrats or Republicans; it is about making sure that mortgages can be paid, that these people will not lose their houses, that we can continue to make great products here in this country.

I think of healthcare, and I often think maybe this is why I wound up here. A friend of mine, Al Gutierrez, who is the CEO of St. Joseph Regional Medical Center in Mishawaka, called me after we had so many problems getting it started a couple of months later, and he said: I just want to fill you in on something that happened. We had a big meeting of all of the brain trust. It is because we have had so many terrible heart cases come in, so many people who were sick who had come in, and we are trying to figure out what has gone wrong that so many people have had bad heart cases recently. So we had the CFO, the surgeons, the this, the that, and one person raised their hand 5 minutes in and said: This is the first time they have ever had insurance. They could never afford it before.

These are our working families. Moms and dads, who would be really sick, had this amount of money, and it either went for the tuition for their daughter at Ball State or to get well, and parents always take care of their kids first. They looked at each other and said “Well, that is the end of the meeting” because they could get healthcare for the first time.

Every townhall I have gone to—and it is not unique to me; it is to everybody; it is to all our Members, Republican and Democrat—I have people come up and say: The healthcare bill saved my life. I wouldn’t be here otherwise. I have one family, triplet girls. They were born at 6 months, came out of the hospital at the 10th month. Their hospital bill, when they came out, was \$5 million. The mom and dad said: We would have lost everything, and we don’t know if our kids could have made it, but the healthcare bill saved us. The healthcare we had saved us.

It is big stuff that we do right, and it is not perfect. That is where we have to come together, not to attack things

but to fix things, to make things better. Almost nothing in this world started out perfect. You fix it a little bit here, you fix it a little bit there, and you can get there.

So when I saw those families, I thought of all of you because you gave them healthcare; you gave them a chance.

I think of my friend John McCain, who is not with us anymore, who stood up and said: I am not going to worry about party. It is country first. When he did that, he made sure those people could still get healthcare.

It is every Senator’s job to work toward those goals until they are reality. I know it sounds naive—constantly working together—but we can, and we must, and we know from recent experience there are a lot of things we can work together on, to be more functional, to be more productive.

One of them is the chance I have had to work with our men and women in uniform. As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, serving with Chairman LEVIN, Chairman McCain, a wonderful ranking member, JACK REED, who is here with us today—chairman ad hoc—being able to advocate for those servicemembers is one of the most amazing responsibilities we could have, ensuring that they have everything they need. They are mostly in their twenties. They are defending freedom in every corner of the globe. They give us the ability to be safe, to live in our houses.

I remember going to Coast Province in Afghanistan, right by the Pakistan border. The Indiana National Guard was there. I said: What message do you want me to take home to your families?

They said: Tell them we got this. We know how to do this. And tell them we are going to make sure they are safe.

That is what these men and women were about.

I had the privilege of going to Iraq with KIRSTEN. We got the same message from amazing people who gave everything they had—everything.

I think of my first 8 months in Congress. It was in 2007, and things were in flames, and in our district in Indiana, as in many of our other States, we have a lot of people who serve. Per capita, we are about first in National Guard people, and in 8 months, I lost eight young men. We were losing one every month.

Last year was 10 years later. If you want to know the awesome responsibility we have, all of those young men we lost—those children who were 2 and 3 and 4 and 5—they were 13 and 14 and 15. I saw their folks; I saw their moms, and their moms would say: They want to know what their dad was like because he is not here anymore. I would tell them what a hero their dad was, what an amazing person he was.

We have tried to work to not only keep them safe, but to stop military suicides.

I worked with the dad and mom of a young man, Jake Sexton, who took his

life on his second tour when he came home for R & R. His home is near Muncie, IN, and he just couldn’t go back and took his own life. His dad called me and said: Can we do something? I want Jake’s death to mean something.

So all of you helped me, and we all worked together, and we made it so that every servicemember would get an annual mental health assessment, and they wouldn’t be punished for doing it. What I mean by that is they wouldn’t worry that they wouldn’t get the next promotion, that they wouldn’t get the next step up.

I remember four-star GEN Joe Votel, who came before our committee and said: I want everybody to know that I have sought mental health. I am a four-star general, and we are in this together.

So in every branch of every service, every member can now get an annual mental health assessment. You helped me give them the chance to do this. We have to also make sure that as we do this, we help them transition back to civilian life.

One of the other things the Indiana National Guard told me in Afghanistan—as I was leaving, I said: What do you need? Trucks? Vests? Better MREs?

They said: No, we just need a job when we go home.

We need to make sure they have that chance, that we stand up for our veterans.

We have been able to get new veterans centers in a number of places around our States because we promised them we would be there for them, and we have an obligation to keep our word. I know that JOHNNY ISAKSON and JON TESTER work every day to make sure they can get it done.

The work that has been done by all of these people takes your breath away. They don’t get paid much. They are in the most difficult places in the world. And when they come home, all they ask for is a decent job, decent healthcare, and a chance to see their family survive and do well.

As I said, I think of those young men and women every day. When you want to know what progress you have helped us make—when KIRSTEN and I first came in together in the House, we were losing almost one every month. Now, it is not perfect; the world isn’t perfect. But most of our young men and women are home. We do the best we can to keep those countries safe, to keep our country safe, and together we can continue to improve on it.

One other thing I want to mention is—and HEIDI talked about it today—this past year we have lost 70,000 young people to drug addiction—70,000. It has become more than car crashes. It has become more than anything else you can think of—70,000 people to opioids, meth, fentanyl; it is the whole batch. We can try nonstop to help them, to provide hope and purpose and dignity where they may not be feeling it—one kind word, one bit of assistance, one bit of encouragement.

I went to an event in Indianapolis, and it was an event for families who had lost someone and families who have someone in rehab. A young man came up to me from one of the wealthiest families you could think of—doing really well, the whole family. I saw him there, and I said: Mike, who are you here for?

He said: Me.

He had gotten hurt, had received an opioid in treatment. He was in a spiral that was nonstop.

His mom was there with him. She said: I don't think I have slept a night since.

So we can do this together. One of the things we just did, we just passed a law that would allow the FDA to give early approval to nonaddictive painkillers so that when somebody is hurt, they don't wind up getting addicted.

I am telling you that this is a five-alarm fire. In my State, well over 1,000 died last year from this in all parts of the State, all towns, all areas, Bridgeport—it doesn't matter, your religion, your race, anything. This is the great danger that parents need to be worried about, that we can stop. We can provide hope and purpose and dignity; that is what we have to do. These are moms and dads and brothers and sisters and sons and daughters, and when you lose one, your family is never, ever the same again.

I have seen the faces, I have met the families, and I spend time with them. The Senate can be a place in which we work together as a team—PAT has seen it in Kansas; JOHNNY has seen it in Georgia. When we work together as a team, when we leave name calling out, there is no division, and there is no agenda, other than making it so that every kid can come home safe every night.

Before I finish, I would also like to thank so many wonderful people. I have met so many friends and had so many opportunities. I have traveled to places I could never imagine. You know, we used to have a saying in Indiana: The only places you could go to in a CODEL are places where you could get killed. I was able to go to Afghanistan, to Iraq, to South Korea. I say the first part as a joke. The second part is, it is because our young men and women were there, and they were there keeping us safe. All they ever wanted was a chance to represent this Nation that they love so much—those wonderful people.

I want to thank the folks who work here in the Senate, who have done so much for all of us—the ones who, when you talk too loud, will lean over and tell you “The whole country is hearing what you are saying right now,” and then quickly move away to the back—for their hard work and dedication. I want to say thank you to the committee staffs who help shape policy and ensure we can have robust debate and oversight on the big issues of our time; to the Capitol Police, our friends, who have been so amazing to all of us, who

protect us and keep us safe; to the cooks and the cleaning teams and the building maintenance folks. I think my office was painted every month for the last 6 years. To the whole gang, you make this place work. You make this Nation work.

I also thank my staff, who are here on the floor with me—no, HEIDI, you were wrong; this is the best staff in the Senate—who have done amazing work and who have every day made me look better and smarter than I am. I am incredibly grateful to them. They have resolved thousands of cases. In 2016, we received about 350,000 faxes, emails, letters, and combinations. We had an election. In 2017, we received 1.5 million—five times more—with the same amount of people, who sent out every letter, who followed up on every call, who repeatedly were there for the people of our State so that they knew their government cared about them and loved them and wanted their lives to be better. I couldn't do this job without them.

I also want to thank my family, who are in the Gallery—my children: Molly, her husband Mike, my son Joe, and my wife Jill—who have been through all of this.

I remember we had a family dinner, one of those summits you have around the table. This was back when I decided to run for Congress.

I told my family: What do you think? I have been asked to run for Congress.

My son said: That is the worst idea I have ever heard.

He was close. But they have been on this journey with me for 12 years, and it has been an amazing journey.

I want to thank everyone from my State. What an amazing privilege to represent them.

I remain optimistic about the future of our country. We have to take these issues seriously. Our country is filled with hard-working, decent people who just want us to do commonsense things. I have been privileged to travel all 92 counties all over my State, all corners of the State, and I think Indiana's best days are ahead and our country's best days are ahead.

May God bless all of my colleagues here in the Senate with the wisdom and courage you will need, because we don't just lead the Nation; we lead the world.

May God bless and protect this institution, Indiana, and our country that we all cherish and love so much.

This has been the privilege of a lifetime for a person whose family came off the boat at Ellis Island. My grandmother's passage documents said she had \$10, and her occupation was “maid.” But she believed in America. She believed in this amazing country. We have been privileged to help lead it, and it has been one of the greatest privileges of my lifetime.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I have had the privilege of serving with both

speakers I have heard today, Senator HEIDI HEITKAMP of North Dakota and Senator JOE DONNELLY of Indiana. They represent the best of the Senate. All of us are proud to be here. All of us are proud of the opportunity to serve. But they are two special people. They are special because they have a smile on their faces. They are special because they are very smart. They are special because they know how to play the game in a bipartisan way—not block things but help them pass.

I have enjoyed getting to meet JOE. I have enjoyed getting to know HEIDI. I am going to miss them a lot. America is very proud to have a great son like JOE and a great daughter like HEIDI. I am very lucky to have had the chance to have them cross my way so I can become a friend of theirs.

God bless both of you. Thank you for your service. Thank you very much.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I, too, rise to recognize my distinguished colleague, JOE DONNELLY, for his years of dedicated service to the State of Indiana. I also want to commend his family for their dedication. I know this is a team effort in public life to work on behalf of our country and our States and our constituents. They have been all in for the people of Indiana, and I just want to rise them up during this important time as they turn to a new chapter in their lives.

JOE DONNELLY has a heart for service, clearly, from his service on the school board, to serving as a Member of Congress—our terms overlapped—to the last 6 years he has spent in the U.S. Senate. I have to say it has been a real privilege to have JOE as my partner in the Senate over the last couple of years.

Back home, he describes himself as the hired help. Throughout his time in public life, JOE has never forgotten whom he works for. That is because he genuinely likes people—not in the abstract; he likes individual Hoosiers and individual Americans and servicemembers and veterans and our seniors and young children. That is why he has such a magnetic personality. That is why he is beloved by colleagues on the right and the left, who represent red States and blue States. That is why I have enjoyed working with JOE as well. Hired help.

JOE touched on the casework and the challenges he has been able to resolve on behalf of the people of Indiana, individual problems people have had with this vast government maze that sometimes we have to navigate. He does have a reputation for having done very well on that front. I think that is a reputation he is rightly proud of. He has also been able to get some important legislative initiatives done on behalf of the people of Indiana, and I would like to emphasize a couple on which we had an opportunity to work together—again, consistent with his bipartisan nature.

JOE and I worked together to ensure that our brave law enforcement officers have greater access to mental health services. Actually, truth be told, JOE was really the champion of that effort. That is certainly one of his legacies during his time in the Senate. I can think of no more important legacy as I look at his record of achievements.

We worked to make sure that we properly commemorated the Landmark for Peace Memorial in Indianapolis, where Robert F. Kennedy delivered some stirring words the evening of Martin Luther King's assassination. It was a moving moment for all present, Black and White and people of modest means and wealthier means. They all came together that evening because of that stirring speech. JOE and I worked together to make sure that memorial park is tastefully recognized from here into the future. It is a nice piece of legacy, and it wouldn't have happened but for the efforts of JOE DONNELLY.

JOE and I worked on a resolution to designate August 3, 2018, as National Ernie Pyle Day. We are proud of that in Indiana. Ernie Pyle is a celebrated war correspondent and Hoosier journalist who deserves memory in the consciousness and imagination of future generations of journalists. There, again, JOE and I had an opportunity to work together.

We worked together on perhaps the most consequential issue of our time—fighting this scourge of opioid abuse. We have worked on multiple bills on that front.

One of the more fun areas we worked together was actually one of the first things JOE and I did after I was sworn in to the Senate. We struck from all government publications the word “Indianan.” We don't use that back home. Because of JOE DONNELLY and our work together, the word “Indianan” will never appear in government publications. Instead, it will forever hereinafter be the word “Hoosier.” The word “Hoosier” is the proper word and will now be used to describe someone from the State of Indiana.

I think JOE would characterize himself as a regular guy. I actually think he is an extraordinary guy in so many ways. He is uncommonly approachable for a U.S. Senator. That is very important in this democratic republic in which we live. We want to make sure that the people we hire to help us—we want to make sure our elected representatives are people we can talk to and people who will listen. He has developed a reputation that I think he should be very proud of as being regarded as someone who is really approachable.

JOE is refreshingly plainspoken. There is not a lot of flowery language that he brings to bear. He is who he is, and he is very comfortable with that, and he speaks in such a way that is equally accessible to all Hoosiers and all Americans. That is really important, too, and I think it is something that others will seek to model moving forward.

You have been an example on that front.

Perhaps most important to me, he is a really good guy. He is authentic. We don't want our public servants to be phony-baloney, plastic figures. JOE is not. JOE will tell you what is on his mind and how he is feeling. He is just a really good guy. He is somebody you might want as your neighbor.

I know JOE has an incredible future. I know he is going to stay engaged in making sure his community is taken care of. I know he will continue to care about Indiana and America and things going on around the world.

Perhaps we will have an opportunity, my friend, to partner together moving forward and do some good together and—as I think you put it, plainly but very directly—to leave this world a little better than you found it. Thank you for your service, JOE. Thank you to your family.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I wish to lend my voice and talk for a moment about a very special friend, Senator JOE DONNELLY.

One of the things we know about the Midwest and Great Lakes is that we do care about our neighbors. Someone with a really good snowblower might clean off his neighbor's driveway, too, since he was out there anyway. That reminds me of JOE DONNELLY.

We know that JOE is the senior Senator from Indiana. It is a wonderful neighboring State. We may compete now and again, but I have been so grateful to be Senator DONNELLY's neighbor and his friend.

Over the past 6 years, I have had the good fortune to partner with Senator DONNELLY on many issues that affect our States and the country.

We are both passionate about fighting for workers and stopping the exporting of American jobs. We want to export our products, not our jobs. JOE has been at the front of the line fighting for American workers.

Making things and growing things—that is what Michigan does, that is what Indiana does, that is what we are all about, and JOE has been at the front of the line to make sure that jobs are there making things and growing things.

We have had the opportunity to work together on the Senate Agriculture Committee, and in just a moment, we are going to hopefully be passing a 5-year farm bill. JOE has been an important voice in that. It is something that we relish because, as a committee, we work together on a bipartisan basis and get things done. Senator DONNELLY has been a very important part of that, including getting important wins for Indiana. It includes his legislation that targets the opioid crisis by expanding USDA rural development investments in community treatment facilities and telemedicine—no small thing.

That will save lives. It provides peace of mind for farmers to use crops and

participate in crop insurance. It creates a broadband grant program, which will connect underserved communities. As Senators from the Great Lakes States, we have fought together to protect our water—our most precious resource.

I will never forget the event Senator DONNELLY and I did to celebrate the Regional Conservation Partnership Program when we announced nearly \$14 million in public and private investment improving water quality and wildlife and fish habitat in the St. Joseph watershed—a watershed that we share. We held that at Pier 33 in St. Joseph, MI, just up the road from South Bend. If you have ever been to Pier 33, you have probably seen their showroom and the amazing collection of beautiful boats. In fact, I am not sure “boats” is the word for these amazing boats. I know Senator DONNELLY was impressed, as was I. After the press conference, I asked him how he thought it went, and he said it was good, but he was disappointed that he wasn't going to get to take home one of the boats. I shared that as well.

If you ask anyone in the Senate, they are likely to say the same thing: Senator JOE DONNELLY—JOE—is one of the nicest guys you will ever meet.

He is also very funny. Both of those qualities have made him a real joy to work with. I know I speak for everyone on both sides of the aisle; he will be missed.

Senator DONNELLY—JOE, thank you for your hard work, your leadership. Thank you for being a wonderful and great neighbor. Let me know the next time you are up North, and we will grab lunch and check out some of those boats.

Mr. DONNELLY. Good deal. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, very quickly, I want to add to the remarks of my distinguished ranking member, Senator STABENOW, on the sometimes powerful Senate Agriculture Committee, and I associate myself with her remarks.

In a moment or two, we are going to go to the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, for which he had positive contributions. We wouldn't have been able to pass a bill without bipartisan support, which he stressed in his last message to the Senate.

JOE, thank you for being a friend, and thank you for being a great colleague, and thank you for being such a great member of the farmers, ranchers, and growers in Indiana. You have done a good job. We will certainly miss you.

Mr. President, I think we have to ask unanimous consent to give an additional 10 minutes to the distinguished ranking member and me to make remarks prior to the vote on the farm bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Michigan.

H.R. 2

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I want to first thank our majority leader and the Democratic leader for their support in bringing this bill to the Senate floor for consideration. Thanks to all of our Agriculture Committee members, including the Presiding Officer and conferees on both sides of the aisle, for working to put this bipartisan farm bill together. Most importantly, I want to thank our distinguished chairman of the committee—my partner, my friend—for working so hard.

We have worked together from the very beginning. We promised each other we would deliver a strong, bipartisan farm bill. Despite many obstacles along the way, we kept that promise.

The final farm bill reflects a hard-fought bipartisan agreement on a 5-year bill to strengthen the diversity of American agriculture and the 16 million jobs it supports. We know something about that in Michigan, where agriculture and the food industry support one out of four jobs. That is a lot of jobs. We also grow a wider variety of crops than any other State but one—a small State called California.

Now more than ever, we need to be broadening the diversity of American agriculture, and that is exactly what the farm bill does. Our farm bill continues to support the wide variety of farms all across America—big farms, small farms, ranchers, urban, rural. We provide new permanent support to keep this progress going, which I think is really important.

We invest in the bright future of agriculture by helping new and beginning farmers, including young people and our returning veterans, who are playing a greater role in agriculture in Michigan, as well as across the country.

New investments in international trade promotion will help farmers sell their products abroad. This couldn't come at a more important time. Streamlined, permanent support for farmers markets, food hubs, and local food processing will help our farmers sell their products to their neighbors. We need to sell around the world, and we need to be able to sell in our own communities.

By protecting and expanding crop insurance and improving support for our dairy farmers—in fact, strengthening the support for our dairy farmers, who were hit so hard with price drops and other issues—we maintain a strong safety net for farmers. Importantly, we maintain a strong safety net for our families.

We said no to harmful changes that would take away food from families. Instead, we will increase program integrity and job training to be able to make sure that things are working as they should and that every dollar is used as it should be. Instead, we will connect participants with healthy food through strong investments in farmers markets and nutrition incentives.

This bill also continues the farm bill's legacy as one of the largest investments in our land and our water. It is so important to Michigan. By focusing on successful conservation partnerships, we will actually grow funding by leveraging nearly \$3 billion in new private investment over the next decade.

This bill also supports our small towns and rural communities, such as Clare, where I grew up. New investments in high-speed internet will support communities most in need. There are new opioid treatment resources to help those struggling with addiction.

The bill also helps ensure that small town water systems are providing clean and reliable tapwater. All of these things create opportunities for young people to stay in their homes and their hometowns and raise their families, which is what we want. That is what this bill is all about—growing opportunity.

I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this bill. I want to thank all of my incredibly talented staff for their hard work, as well as the chairman's staff. I know we will have another opportunity to speak more at length about the provisions of the 12 titles of the farm bill and be able to speak more about the hard work of our staff, but today we are ready for a vote, to be able to get this done so that we can send it to the House for their support, as well, and then on to the President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE).

The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for her remarks and associate myself with those remarks. I rise today as the Senate considers the conference report on an issue that is critically important to our Nation—the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, the farm bill.

The goal, the responsibility, the absolute requirement is to provide farmers, ranchers, growers, and everyone within America's agriculture and food value chain certainty and predictability during these very difficult times. This conference agreement includes policy improvements from both the House-passed bill and the Senate bill, which passed this body with a strong bipartisan vote of 86 to 11. We have worked to maintain as many priorities for as many Members as possible.

This farm bill meets the needs of producers across all regions and all crops. It ensures that our voluntary conservation programs are keeping farmland in operation while protecting our agriculture lands, our forests, and other natural resources.

The bill focuses on program integrity—program integrity, and common-sense investments to strengthen our nutrition programs to ensure the long-term success of those in need of assistance. With trade and market uncertainty, to say the least, it provides certainty for our trade promotion and research programs.

Feeding an increasing global population is not simply an agriculture challenge; it is a national security challenge. This means we need to grow more, raise more with fewer resources. That will take investments in research, new technology, lines of credit, and proper risk management. It takes the government providing tools and then getting out of the producer's way.

Organizations representing thousands of agriculture, food, nutrition, hunger, forestry, conservation, rural, business, faith-based, research, and academic interests have issued statements supporting this conference report. This is what happens when the Congress works in a bipartisan, bicameral fashion. This is a good bill. It is a good bill that accomplishes what we set out to do—again, to provide certainty and predictability for farmers, families, and rural communities.

We have made tough choices, being judicious with the scarce resources we have on behalf of the taxpayer. This may not be the best possible bill. We know that, but it is the best bill possible under these circumstances. Importantly, it provides our farmers, our ranchers, and other rural stakeholders much needed certainty and predictability.

I encourage my colleagues to support this conference report. Every farmer, every rancher, every grower, everyone within our Nation's food supply is watching to see if we cannot meet our obligations and pass this bill. Let us do that. Let us tell those farmers and ranchers, who are going through tough times, that they are going to be good for the next 5 years. Their lender is paying attention to this bill. Let us support this bill.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). The question occurs on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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. JOHNSON assumed the chair.)

The result was announced—yeas 87, nays 13, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 259 Leg.]

YEAS—87

Alexander	Cortez Masto	Hirono
Baldwin	Crapo	Hoeven
Bennet	Cruz	Hyde-Smith
Blumenthal	Daines	Inhofe
Blunt	Donnelly	Isakson
Booker	Duckworth	Jones
Boozman	Durbin	Kaine
Brown	Ernst	King
Burr	Feinstein	Klobuchar
Cantwell	Fischer	Lankford
Capito	Gardner	Leahy
Cardin	Gillibrand	Manchin
Carper	Graham	Markey
Casey	Harris	McCaskill
Cassidy	Hassan	McConnell
Collins	Hatch	Menendez
Coons	Heinrich	Merkley
Corker	Heitkamp	Moran
Cornyn	Heller	Murphy

Murray	Sasse	Thune
Nelson	Schatz	Tillis
Perdue	Schumer	Udall
Peters	Scott	Van Hollen
Portman	Shaheen	Warner
Reed	Shelby	Warren
Risch	Smith	Whitehouse
Roberts	Stabenow	Wicker
Rounds	Sullivan	Wyden
Sanders	Tester	Young

NAYS—13

Barrasso	Johnson	Paul
Cotton	Kennedy	Rubio
Enzi	Kyl	Toomey
Flake	Lee	
Grassley	Murkowski	

The conference report was agreed to.
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). The Senator from Montana.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY RELATING TO "RETURNS BY EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS AND RETURNS BY CERTAIN NONEXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS"—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 630, S.J. Res. 64.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the joint resolution.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 64) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of the Treasury relating to "Returns by Exempt Organizations and Returns by Certain NonExempt Organizations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the provisions of 5 USC 802, there are 10 hours of debate equally divided.

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I just want to make a very short statement and then flesh it out a little further tomorrow.

The resolution we are about to take up will help to protect our democracy, and it will hold special interests accountable. I do not believe we can continue to allow special interests to hide under the cover of darkness, as they have such great influence on our elections. The American people have spoken. I think they have made it clear that they are very tired of the dark money in our elections and that the decision by the administration to allow megadonors and special interests to further hide is not acceptable.

The vote is simple. The vote is for more transparency by these special interests. Quite frankly, it has major impacts on our elections. I just went through one, and I will talk a little more about it tomorrow.

The bottom line is that this resolution is one that, I believe, will add more transparency, will help our de-

mocracy, will help both Democrats and Republicans know who is trying to influence the elections, and will also allow us to determine whether foreign entities—which is, by the way, illegal—are trying to influence our elections.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

2008 HOUSING CRISIS

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, this is a special time of the year—Christmas. All of us are in a hurry to get home. Our children are waiting for us to get home. Our families can't wait to share the joy of the day. We want fun around the fire and the household. I would hate to be the grinch who stole Christmas in the Senate. I don't want to think that 10 years from now, if only I hadn't said this, this wouldn't have happened or, maybe, if I had seen it coming, I would have done something.

In 2008 and 2009, the Senator from Montana, Senator HOEVEN, and I, among others, went through the 2008–2009 housing crisis that ended up in mortgage-backed securities failures, in all of the trouble that happened on Wall Street—Dodd-Frank—and in the collapse of our economy. It was the worst collapse of our economy ever since 1927. We all remember what happened. We ended up getting the TARP. We ended up having crisis after crisis. Slowly but surely, we guaranteed enough stuff to get the market strong enough to begin to build back. Just now, it is back where it ought to be from the standpoint of values, which is a decade later.

Quite frankly, the housing market is not as strong. Its only strength is that there are not that many houses for sale. That is because people aren't putting them on the market. Builders can't build specs, and there is not near the credit that there should be. People who have resales are putting them off and fixing the houses up because they are staying longer. So they are selling them for more money.

On the Multiple Listing Service, in Atlanta, GA, when I left my company in 1998, there were 140,000 houses on the market in Atlanta in June of 1998. Now there are about 60,000. That is not because the market has failed. It is just that there is not that big a housing stock out there, and it is for all of the reasons I said. In terms of financing being readily available, it is readily available, and that is what I want to talk about.

I was thinking the other day. I heard an ad on the radio about no-doc loans, and I heard an ad about the VA's 100-percent loan—that we will approve what the banks will not—and stuff that I knew was patently wrong. So I turned to the business section, which I used to look at as a businessman every day but don't anymore because I don't have the decisions to make. I am glad that I did because it taught me a lesson, and I want to read you this from last Sunday's paper: How about a loan with no down payment, zero-down mortgages,

and jumbo loans? We will approve what the banks won't.

That is exactly the thing that took us down the wrong path in 2008 and 2009. Greed took over common sense. Then, common sense failed, and we did some bad things. All of the things in the mortgage-backed securities market took place all at once. What happened was, because money was chasing rates and rates were starting to rise—and now they are starting to rise; that is happening in our economy—the instruments that yielded higher rates than the going rate for regular credit started being created to be sold and packaged on Wall Street. You would make money on the sale of the security, but you would also fund the mortgage at a higher yield to you, the investor, which is just fine and dandy until the person at the lower end of the spectrum, who gets approved with a no-document, no-down payment loan, ends up qualifying for it, gets it, does not make a payment, and gets foreclosed on. All of a sudden, the credit is lost. The house is lost. The same thing that happened in 2008–2009 starts happening all over again.

I am not saying that we are on the verge of a collapse. What I am saying is that it is a carbon copy—I mean a carbon copy—of exactly what was happening in 2008 and 2009 when the markets collapsed. We can't afford another one. Banking is stronger today for a lot of reasons. It is mainly because there aren't nearly as many of them. There aren't nearly as many of them because a lot of them failed. In the South—in Atlanta, GA, my State—we lost more than almost anybody in the country, simply because the capacity was not there.

As I said about the housing market, the number of houses available in the marketplace is much lower than it was back in the 1990s and back in 2005, 2006, and 2007. It is down because there is not as much to put on the market. There is not enough credit to finance it and put it on the market and have spec loans. People are very tight with their money because a lot of them got burned in 2008 and 2009. They see their parents who lost their houses and their savings. They see values collapse. They couldn't get through their college by borrowing against their homes because their home equity loans died.

There are lots of folks out there who are trying to put together instruments and package them in an attractive way to sell them on the New York markets and through mortgage-backed securities and to attract low-credit borrowers or young borrowers who aren't totally prepared to borrow the way they should be. It is of higher risk for us. It is a high risk for our economy. The middlemen make a lot of money early, but on a 30-year mortgage, you don't want to just make your money early. You want to have somebody with skin in the game for all 30 years.

So I just want to say to all of my colleagues—and I am talking to myself as

much as I am talking to you; I am not talking at myself; I am talking with myself—that we have to be careful if we see things happening that happened in our recent past that we didn't learn from. If we let them happen again, they will be worse. Then you will just say: Well, I wish I had seen it coming.

It is coming. Read the paper with me. I am going to come to the floor a lot in the next few months just to kind of monitor it myself. I see the creep of easy credit, the creep of no documentation, the creep of no underwriting for the quality of the borrower, and the creep of greed coming into the marketplace. The greater it gets, the worse the economy is and the faster it goes bad, and we all go bad with it.

So I just came out to wish everybody a Merry Christmas. I don't want to be the grinch who stole Christmas, but it is happening, and it is being advertised in our newspapers. It is happening in our cities, and it is happening in our backyard. We need to make sure that we don't let it get away from us because, if we do, we will have only ourselves to blame.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks, the Senator from Iowa, Mr. GRASSLEY, be recognized.

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

DEFENSE BUDGET

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I don't know how, but a lot of people back home have gotten in their heads that defending America is a complicated issue and that it is the kind of issue they think is going to have to be decided in Washington by a lot of smart people and all that, but nothing could be further from the truth.

The reality is, defending America is just common sense. It is called priority—something we didn't have in the last administration. We all—every American citizen—need to be responsible for our own national security. I am going to be coming here each week to outline the common sense for our common defense—what we are working on here in Washington—for families back home.

Today I will talk about how we face the urgency in funding our national defense. It is very simple. Again, it is common sense. Without action to exempt the military from sequestration or to reach a budget agreement, once again, we will have to face the devastating cuts of the Budget Control Act in our military. We could handle it in other areas, and I am very supportive of it but not in the military at this particular time.

I will tell you why. We know what the result will be. We saw it during the Obama administration. Without sufficient, sustained, and predictable funding, we will squander the progress the military has made over the past 2 years, which is to improve readiness,

increase procurement for critical capabilities, and investment in future technologies. This is just in the past 2 years. We need to continue to make progress.

We also need to implement the national defense strategy. The Trump administration's national defense strategy correctly prioritized strategic competition—and that is with China and Russia—but the effective strategies are going to have to be matched with resources.

This chart is from the National Defense Strategy Commission. That is this document right here. This is put together by a number of very top people chosen by Democrats and Republicans. In fact, Senator JON KYL was a member of this Commission before he got to the Senate. He and I will be talking about this and complementing each on this tomorrow. This chart we are looking at right now gives you an idea of what is happening with some of the other countries. We have China, which is actually increasing—they are passing us in terms of their number of ships. This is true with everything else. It looks like they will pass us in about 2023.

In this country, we are kind of used to having the very best of everything. Ever since World War II, we thought that was our mission.

There is a quote out of this document we have right here that has been so brilliantly described by so many people. It says: "Put bluntly, the U.S. military could lose the next state-versus-state war it fights." These are the top military and nonmilitary people in our society who conducted this study. It has been heralded as the most accurate study by all parties having to do with our Nation's defense.

At a minimum, next year's defense budget should at least be \$733 billion. That is a floor, not a ceiling. I have to say, that represents a no-growth budget because, in fiscal year 2018, we went from \$700 billion. Then, in fiscal year 2019, we went to \$716 billion, and then this will actually be going up to \$733 billion. If that happens—do the math—that is an increase of 2.1 percent, which is not even a growth. It is a no-growth budget.

I have to say, General Dunford, Secretary Mattis, and the rest of them have called for fully implementing the national defense strategy, which would require between 3 to 5 percent of real growth.

On both sides of the aisle, we have had some individuals who are advocating for cutting defense spending because of the increased deficit. I am concerned about the increased deficit, but we also have to have this priority. We have to have America catch up. We are not used to having to catch up defensewise, but we are now.

Defense spending is not the primary reason for our increased debt. We could eliminate the entire Pentagon budget, and the deficit would actually grow. Here is why.

Over the past 10 years, our national debt has grown 86 percent. During the same time, mandatory spending has grown 41 percent. All that time, defense spending has been cut by 3 percent. It has been cut by 3 percent. Meanwhile, constant dollar defense spending dropped \$200 billion between the years 2010 and 2015. In 2010, the total budget was \$794 billion. In 2015, 5 years later, it dropped to \$586 billion. That is a drop of \$200 billion. In percentage terms, it is a 24-percent drop. This hasn't happened since the end of the Korean war.

We have to do something about the growing debt. The only way we can actually curtail it is to address the growth in mandatory spending. There are a lot of programs in mandatory spending that could be cut. Again, if you cut out the entire defense budget, it would not reduce or eliminate the debt.

As mandatory programs drive spending growth to new highs, debt held by the American people has correspondingly increased. If we don't do something about this, interest on the debt will surpass defense spending by fiscal year 2023.

As we see from this gray line here, this is the net increase in spending compared to the total spending of non-defense. It passes nondefense in 2023.

The Obama administration viewed the world as they wanted to see it, not as it was. The assumption that Russia was a strategic partner was and is fundamentally flawed and profoundly misguided. It has cost us dearly.

Today we are faced with the reality that those decisions not only weakened our national security by sacrificing our military advantages over Russia, but it will be costly to recoup the capabilities that President Obama had chosen to cut with his lack of priorities for the military. That is the reality.

I think this President has done a good job in outlining who our pure competitors are. We are talking about countries that have things better than we have. We are going to be talking about that in some detail tomorrow.

When the military is forced to reduce spending, it is going to have to take tradeoffs between lowering readiness, reducing force structure, and just not modernizing. In this case, we suffered through all three of those in the last administration.

In the meantime, our adversaries—Russia and China—have increased their own military spending and focused on force structure and modernization. The size of the Chinese Navy will soon pass the size of the U.S. Navy. There it is right here. It shows we are almost ready for those lines to cross in 2018. They will cross in 2022.

Over the 2000 and 2030 timeframe, the U.S. Navy is growing at an average rate of about one ship every 2 years, while the Chinese Navy is growing more than 20 times faster, at an average rate of about 10 ships annually. The quality and capability of those ships is increasing as well.

As chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I see no bigger imperative than this: to fully fund our defense and to fully implement the national defense strategy.

When I talk to people out in the real world—I am talking about going out to Oklahoma and talking to groups of people—and they find out it was true that ever since World War II, we have had the occasion of being No. 1 in all areas of our equipment, such as artillery and other things, they are shocked to find out that the Chinese and the Russians actually have equipment that is better than ours. We will be specifically talking about this tomorrow.

With that, I thank my friend from Iowa. By unanimous consent, I think he is the next speaker after my remarks.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Oklahoma.

H. R. 2

Mr. President, I want to thank Senate Agriculture Committee Chairman ROBERTS and Ranking Member STABENOW for their hard work in putting together the 2018 farm bill. It was a long and difficult process, and they negotiated in good faith.

I also want to thank my friend and colleague from Iowa, Senator JONI ERNST, for her dedication to reforming the Conservation Reform Program. In the Midwest, we refer to that as the CRP. The program's intent is to reduce land erosion, improve water quality, and help wildlife populations. Over the years, it has strayed from its intended focus.

Some landowners have been receiving more than \$300 per acre to enroll their entire farms in the CRP. That puts young and beginning farmers at a competitive disadvantage. In fact, even well-established farmers have had rented land taken away from them because it was enrolled in the CRP at lucrative rates paid by the government that the individual farmer could not compete with.

Farmers can't and shouldn't have to compete with the government, especially with the current debt our country has. Senator ERNST has been an advocate for these reforms, and these reforms have been accomplished as a result of her efforts.

Unfortunately, the 2018 farm bill did not include another critical reform that would help young and beginning farmers, that is my payment limitations amendment. This is a process I have been trying to get accomplished and have been unsuccessful through at least this farm bill and two previous farm bills.

Each time I have been successful in getting these reforms throughout the U.S. Senate—in the 2014 farm bill, I was able to get them through both the House and Senate in the same form—but do you know what? In the dark rooms of conference committee meet-

ings and phone calls, people who don't like to save the taxpayers money and who don't want to help young and beginning farmers and medium-sized and smaller farmers and who worry more about the wealthy farmers have been able to undercut the effort, even when a majority of both bodies has supported it.

I didn't give up as a result of the 2014 bill and the disappointment there. I got through the U.S. Senate those hard caps on what any one farmer can get and to make sure the people who benefited from it were, in fact, farmers, not nonfarmers who maybe had a distant relationship from some farming operation, maybe even being on Wall Street.

Once again, I was undercut in this effort to save the taxpayers money and to concentrate our farm bill on medium- and small-sized farmers who need the help, when things have happened naturally or politically or internationally that are beyond their control that drive down prices or acts of God such as a drought. It is the small- or medium-sized farmers who need the help from the government, not these big farmers and corporate farmers whom we are going to end up helping, the way this bill is written.

To say the least, I am disappointed that the bill makes more subsidies available to the wealthiest farmers and many nonfarmers. I would say that is a severe understatement. I am more than just a little disappointed, especially when the impact of large farmers being allowed to manipulate the system is that young and beginning farmers face even larger hurdles.

So far, the bill has not won much praise outside of the Washington lobby groups whose members will receive more taxpayer subsidies from a few select changes.

At its core, farm policy should be a limited safety net to help farmers weather the storm of natural disasters, unpredictable commodity markets, and other unforeseen challenges. This bill goes well beyond that limited safety net.

Today we have a farm bill that is intentionally written—I want to emphasize “intentionally written”—to help the largest farmers receive unlimited subsidies from the Federal Government. There is no other way to characterize what the conference committee has done in this area.

In the last farm bill, both bodies of Congress approved a commonsense amendment I offered that would have limited the abuses related to title I subsidies. This time the House would not even have that debate—no debate on my reforms. The Senate did, however, include it in their bill.

However, the 2014 conference committee put in a loophole that exempted family farms, which account for approximately 95 percent of farms, from the new rules. This bill makes their original loophole even larger. So as bad as the 2014 farm bill was, this new 5-

year farm bill widens that loophole almost beyond explaining.

The new farm bill will allow nieces and nephews to qualify as part of a family farm without any new requirements that they actually have to work. Despite what some of my colleagues may say, this is not about helping nieces and nephews get into farming. Why? Because every person who really farms already qualifies for title I payments by themselves without this new gimmick. So this new gimmick is just to award this big taxpayer money to people who aren't actually working the farm.

Allowing nieces and nephews to qualify as part of a large farm entity merely allows larger farmers to get more subsidies. They just need to hire the right lawyer to structure the farming operation in a certain way, and they can then receive unlimited taxpayer subsidies.

For years I have been using this figure about the top 10 percent of the farmers receiving more than 70 percent of the subsidies from the government. That is only one of the many reasons it is so hard for young and beginning farmers to get started.

I know it is hard to believe, but I have never heard a single young or beginning farmer tell me that the way to help the young and beginning farmer is to give more money out of the U.S. Treasury to the largest farmers.

Many farmers are hurting from the downturn in commodity prices. That has been a downturn over the last three or four years. Corn and soybeans have had significant price declines in those years. If only all crops were as lucky as cotton, with its high prices ensured by the Federal Government over the last year, then all people would be, what we say, “living in the clover.”

However, market corrections do not justify Congress expanding subsidy loopholes that only benefit the wealthy—especially at a time when our long-term fiscal situation is as bad as it has ever been.

The last time we passed a farm bill, our national debt was \$17 trillion. Today it stands at \$21.8 trillion, and we all know that it is growing. So whether it is talking about saving the taxpayers' money or whether it is talking about targeting the farm program to small and medium-sized farmers as opposed to the wealthy, or whether it is talking about getting young people into farming, Congress needs to get serious about spending.

This bill represents an open-ended spigot of taxpayer subsidies in the title I programs of the bill. Because of this, when we cast our vote about 1 hour ago, I voted against this farm bill, which, otherwise, is a pretty basic program. We could have done a lot more to save the taxpayers money, and we didn't.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about some very good

news. After months of bipartisan negotiations, the Senate has finally passed the new farm bill. This bill will probably not get as much attention as some other news going on right now in politics. That is too bad, because the farm bill is a significant piece of legislation that touches the lives of every person every day in Minnesota and throughout the country. This bill is crucial to our Nation's farmers, and our farmers are producing the food and the fuel that feed our Nation and the world.

It is also good news because Congress has come together to get this done. At a time when so many Americans are frustrated with divisive politics, it is worth pausing over the way Members of both parties have come together to produce such an important bill through hard work and compromise.

In the Senate, we came together with a wide range of priorities from every region of the country. Senators representing crops like cotton and peanuts worked together with Senators from States like mine, with soybeans and corn, to reach this final compromise. We were able to find agreement because of the leadership that was provided by Chairman ROBERTS and Ranking Member STABENOW on the Senate committee and Chairman CONAWAY and Ranking Member COLLIN PETERSON, from Minnesota, on the House committee.

When I became a Senator just under 1 year ago, I fought for a seat on the Agriculture Committee, and I immediately formed a farm bill working group in Minnesota so that I could hear from farmers and ranchers, foresters and researchers, rural community leaders and Tribes, as well as experts in nutrition, energy, and conservation, to make sure that Minnesota's priorities were included in this farm bill. From corn growers in Goodhue County in the southeastern part of Minnesota to sugar beet farmers in the northeastern part of the State, I heard the same message: We must pass a farm bill this year.

The farm bill is so vitally important to Minnesotans because agriculture is the foundation of Minnesota's economy. In Minnesota, agriculture generates \$121 billion in economic activity and supports 400,000 jobs. Minnesota is No. 1 in sugar beets, No. 2 in corn processing, and No. 3 in soybeans. We raise the second most hogs, and we raise the most turkeys.

So working on the farm bill, one of my first stops was with COLLIN PETERSON in Ada, MN, where we met with farmers and rural development leaders, and everyone in that community told me how the farm bill directly affects them. So I directed my staff to continue these listening sessions, and I am proud to say that we had almost 50 of them around the State. Meeting with the working group and touring farms and rural development projects around Minnesota have made the issues facing rural America and our farmers one of my top priorities here in the Senate.

Minnesotans have given me some great ideas about what to fight for here in Washington, DC.

I heard from young farmers in Minnesota—like organic farmer Matthew Fitzgerald of Hutchinson, and Eric Sannerud, a hops farmer in Foley—about the difficulty beginning farmers face in accessing USDA programs. So I pushed for the farm bill to include provisions to support our next generation of farmers with my friend and colleague Senator HEIDI HEITKAMP of North Dakota and Senator ANGUS KING of Maine.

After visiting the Good Acre in Falcon Heights and learning about local food systems, I joined a bipartisan effort to better connect farmers with their communities. So I am grateful for the leadership of Senator SHERROD BROWN from Ohio and Senator SUSAN COLLINS from Maine on this important issue.

In March, I visited the Haubenschild Dairy Farm in Princeton, MN. Three generations of the Haubenschild family run this dairy farm. As we toured their impressive operation, this family talked to me about how dairy farmers have been hit hard by low commodity prices. This was a message that was echoed by dairy farmers across the State, who have been a really important part of my farm bill working group.

So when I got back to Washington, I was determined to help fight for strong safety net programs that support dairy farmers, along with many of my Senate colleagues. A bipartisan coalition of Senators from dairy States worked to make sure that this farm bill builds on the improvements made to the dairy safety net in the March omnibus bill.

The final version of this bill does just that. This farm bill expands gains made in the dairy safety net, especially for small and medium-sized farms. There are still a lot of challenges ahead for dairy farmers, but hopefully these provisions will help Minnesota's farmers who are facing falling milk prices.

Many farmers told me they were worried about skyrocketing healthcare costs. So during a visit to Fergus Falls, MN, healthcare leaders from Douglas County Hospital and Lake Region Healthcare spoke to us about the unique health challenges facing rural communities. In Minnesota we are focused on finding innovative solutions to address rural health challenges. It is clear that Federal agencies need to do more to examine the barriers people face who are accessing care in rural communities.

That is why I helped to shepherd the bipartisan Rural Health Liaison Act through the Agriculture Committee, and I helped to introduce this bill with Senator DOUG JONES of Alabama and Senator MIKE ROUNDS of South Dakota. The Rural Health Liaison Act will create a new position in the Department of Agriculture to ensure that the USDA is working with other agencies

and departments, like Health and Human Services, to coordinate efforts. This is an important step toward improving rural health across America.

When I talked to Minnesotans from the Red River Valley, I heard about how important the sugar program is to maintain their competitiveness. I fought during the floor debates to sustain this program on behalf of sugar beet farmers in my State and across the upper Midwest.

I advocated to make sure that the farm bill funds a preparedness and response program to national animal disease outbreaks and a vaccine bank to prevent the spread of foot and mouth disease. This was a bipartisan effort, again, with my fellow Minnesota Senator, AMY KLOBUCHAR, and Senator JOHN CORNYN of Texas.

At the poultry testing lab in Willmar, MN, I heard about the need for vaccine banks and animal disease readiness. When Minnesota was hit hard by the avian flu outbreak that resulted in the death of nearly 9 million turkeys and chickens, we knew that this program was necessary.

Other Minnesota priorities came from conversations with folks across the State. This bill advances conservation programs so farmers have the opportunity to start conservation strategies and to keep them going long into the future to protect the environment and increase productivity. Minnesotans use these programs almost more than any other State.

Minnesotans know that the transition to clean energy presents a great economic opportunity for rural and farming communities. As the top Democrat on the Rural Development and Energy Subcommittee, I introduced legislation outlining a road map for a strong energy title in this farm bill, and a bipartisan coalition of Senators urged the committee to fund and strengthen these many successful energy programs at the USDA.

One example is the Rural Energy for America Program, which helps agriculture producers, local businesses, and rural communities to develop energy efficiency and renewable energy projects that create jobs, cut energy bills, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Rural communities will benefit greatly from the mandatory funding given to this program.

Another issue emphasized by rural development leaders across Minnesota is the need that people have for access to reliable and affordable internet service. Broadband access is critical to farmers using modern equipment and for rural families trying to access healthcare, education, and jobs.

This bill incorporates my Community Connect Grant Program Act to increase funding for this important effort to create better broadband access to unserved remote rural and Tribal communities. This provision is a step forward and one of the many things we need to do to connect Minnesota and people across the Nation with affordable, reliable internet service.

This farm bill also expands access to jobs and agriculture for returning servicemembers by encouraging the USDA to assist veterans in joining the agriculture workforce. I pushed for this provision, which will help veterans have the resources they need to take advantage of these opportunities.

Today, as our farmers face deep uncertainty regarding tariffs and the impacts they have, this bill includes bipartisan provisions to increase funding for USDA trade promotion activities, because we all know that international markets are essential to many farmers.

All farmers deserve these opportunities, and now there will be greater inclusion of Tribal products in Federal trade promotion efforts and activities to make sure that Native farmers aren't missing out on new international markets. I want to thank my colleagues, Senator JOHN HOEVEN of North Dakota and Senator STEVE DAINES of Montana, for working with me on this issue.

It is great that this farm bill includes these provisions, and I hope farmers will begin to feel some relief, but the core trade problem remains.

Don't get me wrong—I am committed to standing up to our trade partners and holding them accountable when they engage in unfair trade practices. But the chaotic approach we have seen to implementing these tariffs lacks a coherent message and a coherent strategy, and we need to solve this problem for the health of Minnesota and American farm country.

Farmers are on the frontlines of this trade war, and the cycle of retaliation has no end in sight. In this farm bill, we begin to increase access to international markets, but we still need a long-term plan to reopen and preserve the markets farmers rely on.

As I have already mentioned, the farm bill touches the lives of every American. The farm bill provides important stability and predictability to Minnesota farmers, ranchers, rural communities, and Indian Country, while also sustaining hundreds of thousands of Minnesota jobs.

It is important to remember that the farm bill reaches beyond rural development, commodity programs, and trade. The nutrition programs reauthorized by this farm bill are of vital importance, and the data backs this up. According to the Agriculture Department, in 2017, 15 million households with over 40 million people—including millions of children across the country—live in households that are food insecure, which is a fancy way of saying that many people have no clear idea of where all of their meals are going to come from in a certain week. We need to do better than this in America. That is why farmers and ranchers in my State tell me how important they think it is to support nutrition programs, and I am glad this is reflected in the final farm bill.

We have passed this bill in the Senate, and I hope the House will pass it in

the next few days. Then the President needs to sign it into law to give farmers and ranchers the certainty they deserve.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

FIRST STEP ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, this morning the majority leader announced that the Senate will soon take up a revised version of the FIRST STEP Act, which will provide a number of long-needed reforms to our criminal justice system.

I have long been a supporter of these reforms after I saw the positive impact in my home State of Texas back in 2007. Then, in response to a steadily growing prison population, Texas began enacting reforms to reduce recidivism through programs like job training and vocational education. This, of course, allows prisoners to spend their time in prison preparing themselves for life outside of prison. The results were pretty significant. We saw a reduction in both incarceration and crime rates by double digits at the same time. Let me say that again. We saw a reduction in both incarceration and crime rates by double digits at the same time. Not only does this lead to massive savings of taxpayer dollars, it is an investment in the men and women who are committed to turning their lives around.

What we like to say is that Texas has long been known for being tough on crime. But in 2007, we finally decided to be smart on crime, too, recognizing that people who went to prison almost entirely got out of prison at some point. The question is, How prepared were those who were willing to work to turn their lives around for life on the outside?

For years, I tried to bring this successful Texas model to Washington, DC, and now we have a piece of this legislation before us that will take these reforms nationwide. More than 75 percent of the bill we will be voting on is my prison reform legislation that I originally introduced with Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE of Rhode Island.

The great thing about the laboratories of democracy known as the States is that we can actually test some of our theories at the State level to see whether they work. In the case of prison reform, when they do work, we can then scale it up so it applies to the entire Nation.

Today, there are more than 180,000 inmates in the Federal criminal justice system. The Federal Bureau of Prison's budget has doubled to approximately \$7 billion over the last decade. We have an opportunity to save lives by reducing the crime rate for each of those prisoners who does not recidivate when they get out of prison and conserve tax dollars, as well as to create a criminal justice system that works for, not against, the American people.

Let me be clear. This is not about letting people out of prison who

shouldn't be let out of prison; this is about people who have served their time and are going to be leaving prison and making sure that they at least have available to them some of the tools they need in order to transform their own lives. I am not so naive as to think that every person will take advantage of that opportunity, but we know from experience at the State level that there is a significant percentage of offenders who will take advantage of the opportunity to turn their lives around. That is why I was proud to work with the White House and my colleagues here in Congress—especially, as I mentioned, Senator WHITEHOUSE and Congressman DOUG COLLINS in the House of Representatives—to advance these reforms.

Earlier this year, we passed the bill out of the House with strong bipartisan support, and I have worked with my colleagues here in the Senate as the bill has changed and developed—and, I believe, for the better. Unfortunately, some members of the law enforcement community have raised concerns about the bill. Out of my respect for our law enforcement organizations, I spoke with many of my Republican colleagues about the bill. Originally, they said they were unable to support it or were undecided because they wanted to make sure we were doing everything we could to address the concerns raised by law enforcement organizations. So we went to work trying to make improvements in the bill, which I believe we succeeded in doing.

I want to express my gratitude to Senator DURBIN, who is the principal Democratic sponsor, Senator LEE, Senator GRASSLEY, and others who worked on this and say how much I appreciate their willingness to try to get to yes and come up with something we can pass with strong bipartisan support.

I also wanted to make sure we talked to the stakeholders—the police officers who patrol the streets, the sheriffs who work in each of our States and counties—about their concerns. I believe we have worked hard and successfully to address many of them. I don't necessarily believe all of them will agree with every single piece in this bill, but I think, on the whole, it does balance the interests of our law enforcement personnel with the needs of our society to better prepare people so that when they come out of prison, they will not likely repeat their mistakes, in every case that is possible.

As I say, I think we made some big improvements. The revised legislation will keep dangerous and violent criminals who use guns to commit crimes from being released from prison early. They will not be eligible for any sort of earned time release. It will also limit the amount of time that offenders can spend on supervised release and ensure that the Bureau of Prisons will revoke pre-release custody for offenders who violate the terms of their supervision.

I appreciate all of the work of our colleagues in the Senate who chose to

roll up their sleeves and get to work rather than just complain about what was or was not in the bill. I am proud to announce that I will cosponsor this new and improved version of the bill, and I encourage all of my colleagues to review it and hopefully join me in supporting this legislation. I look forward to working with everybody in this body, as well as our colleagues in the House, to get this bill over the finish line.

I know, when we produce the bill in the House and the Senate, President Trump will sign it. He has encouraged the majority leader, Senator McCONNELL, to put this bill on the floor even in this short window of time we have during the lameduck session, and the majority leader has accommodated the President's request by saying that we will address this before we go home for Christmas.

FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. President, on another matter, the clock is ticking, of course, and we are quickly approaching the deadline to fund the Federal Government. My Republican colleagues and I stand ready to advance our remaining appropriations bills, but it really depends on what our Democratic colleagues decide to do.

Seventy-five percent of the government is already funded through bipartisan cooperation on the passage of appropriations bills, and that is something we haven't done for a long time. But there is still critical funding—particularly for the Department of Homeland Security, for the FBI, and for the Department of Justice—that needs to be taken care of before we break for the holidays.

Earlier today, we know that Democratic Leader Senator SCHUMER and Minority Leader PELOSI met with President Trump to figure out whether there is any room for agreement to resolve the dispute between them. The question is, really, What is the appropriate amount of money in this bill to fund border security? The President said he wants \$5 billion. Senator SCHUMER has said \$1.6 billion ought to be enough. Obviously, there is a gap between them.

Some people have said: Well, we ought to just shut down the government over this dispute. I don't see the wisdom in that because when you shut down the government because you are unable to resolve a dispute, when you reopen the government, usually what happens is that same problem is staring you in the face. What we need to do is to work together with the administration to come up with a solution rather than resort to tactics like a government shutdown with all the complications that involves. I don't think shutdowns play well for either Republicans or Democrats, for the White House or the Congress.

The problem, it seems to me, is that our Democratic friends are listening to some of the fringes of their own political party who are now telling them:

Don't do anything that President Trump wants. Anything President Trump wants, the answer is no.

Well, that is more about politics than it is about doing our job as legislators trying to solve problems.

It also appears that they seem to think that the continued status quo along our border is good enough, and they are more than willing to gamble with a partial government shutdown than work with the President to ensure that our border is secure.

Somewhere along the way, our friends across the aisle have forgotten that border security should be about protecting the American people from the drugs that come across the border—90-plus percent of the heroin consumed in the United States comes from Mexico—or the children and women who are trafficked for sex or the migrants who come from Central America, up through Mexico, and into the United States, and the cartels charging roughly \$8,000 a person. It is a huge moneymaking business, but the people who are getting rich are the transnational criminal organizations and drug cartels.

We have seen before what happens when the government shuts down. It affects millions of people across the country and often yields no different result. We have seen what happens when we fail to secure the border. That is why we need to finish our work funding the government and, by doing that, also recognize the importance of a secure border. This should not be about partisan politics or listening to your political base; this ought to be about doing our job. We had the midterm elections; now is the time to govern.

Just a few weeks ago, our friends across the aisle wanted to magnify the migrant crisis by focusing narrowly on the news coming out of Tijuana, Mexico, across the border from San Diego. Some talked about the crisis as if it were a one-off event, an isolated event.

They wanted us to look at this like we were looking through a soda straw and ignore all of the context and the consequences of failing to secure our border. They wanted to ignore how we find ourselves with this humanitarian crisis in the first place.

The caravans of men, women, and children who left their homes in Central America and made the long, dangerous journey to the United States are sadly symptoms of a far greater problem. Our border has been exploited for years, contributing to this crisis. That is why ensuring additional resources for border security is an essential piece of the puzzle.

My home State of Texas is on the frontline—1,200 miles of common border with Mexico. Texas is home to many vibrant border communities that greatly benefit from having some of the busiest land ports in the country, across which legitimate trade and commerce travels. As I said, we are also on the front row of the many challenges that come along with an unsecured border when it comes to public safety.

Yesterday I talked about some of those challenges: striking a balance between a secure border and a completely closed border. A secure border maintains the flow of legitimate goods and services while deterring cartels from shuttling illegal contraband across our borders. A closed border would cut off trade and commerce that is the lifeblood of our economy, which brings me to another challenge—something that I think in Washington there is simply not enough awareness of; that is, the cartels, gangs, and the transnational criminal organizations that get rich exploiting our porous borders.

Some like to think of these organizations as a “them, not us” problem because they have taken control over large parts of Central America and even Mexico, but the business of these groups does not stay there. What happens in Central America, what happens in Mexico does not stay in Central America and Mexico. It comes flooding across our borders.

These gangs and cartels are very shrewd and adapt to changing circumstances. They found, the more our borders and ports of entry are clogged with migrants and migrant families, the easier it is to traffic people, drugs, and contraband into the United States. That has a reciprocal effect, too, causing legitimate trade, travel, and commerce to slow significantly at our ports of entry.

It is not only exploitation of our border that poses a threat, it is the violence and the instability caused by the cartels and gangs. That makes it not just a border security issue but a national security issue as well.

My friend and fellow Texan, Representative HENRY CUELLAR—a true blue dog Democrat, as he says—has a great saying for how we should think about this. He likes to say that border security starts in Central America and ends at our border. I think that is exactly right. In other words, you don't mount a goal line defense at a football game. You actually start contesting the game farther down the field. In this case, the game needs to be contested in the places where these migrants and the drugs emanate, from where they start.

We are going to have to work more closely in partnership with Mexico and other Central American governments to address the violence these groups spread by restoring public trust in law enforcement and stabilizing the economy and these countries.

I spoke with my friend, the Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN. She represents a border State. She and I have partnered on a number of national security law enforcement matters. She said she was interested in working together in a bipartisan way to address the challenges presented by Central America and Mexico. I said: Absolutely. Sign me up.

Representing a border State, as you might suspect, I make it a point to talk to those who live and work in our

border communities. It is a unique part of the United States. I like to say, the concept that people in Washington, DC, have about the borders has been learned from movies and novels; it is not from talking to people or visiting with the communities along the border. That is not a criticism. That is just a fact of life.

When I hear from people like Manny Padilla, who is the Border Patrol's sector chief for the Rio Grande Valley, I can better understand how much is required to maintain situational awareness and operational control of the border, not to mention personal safety of the Border Patrol, who more and more are frequently assaulted with rocks and other makeshift weapons that endanger their safety and their lives.

For those who may not be at the border every day, it is hard to grasp the range of topography across the 1,200-mile border that Texas shares with Mexico. It can be hard to imagine how many resources are actually needed. In some places, there are high mountains and cliffs and others, there is thick brush. In the urban areas that surround our ports of entry, there is plenty of opportunity to race across the border and blend in, never to be heard from again.

There will be places where physical infrastructure will make the most sense. In some places, technology or personnel is more effective than a fence. The point is, the border security is complex. Better enforcement of our border will require a combination of infrastructure, technology, and personnel. That begins with ensuring we have the resources we need to implement a border enforcement strategy. That is what this issue is all about—the discussion Ms. PELOSI, Senator SCHUMER, and President Trump had today.

My question for our Democratic colleagues is, Why will you not help us secure the border? Are you satisfied with the status quo of drugs coming across the border through these transnational criminal organizations? Are you satisfied with the status quo of these caravans—thousands of migrants from Central America trying to storm our ports of entry and literally closing them down so legitimate trade and commerce cannot occur?

Securing our border and protecting our country should not be a partisan issue; it is something we ought to be able to work out and agree on. We know the challenges our friend Senator SCHUMER has—the Democratic leader on the other side. He has a cadre of people auditioning for the Presidential nomination in 2020, and they are trying to outdo each other in their impending runs for President. I think, in many ways, his hands are tied. Like every leader, he has to decide when to say yes and when to say no to the people in your conference.

Minority Leader PELOSI has a delicate task of trying to cajole her new and emboldened Members of the far-

left wing of her caucus. They are both trying to fend off outside groups that think that even talking to President Trump on this issue may mean it will be subject for the next attack or perhaps a primary campaign. I don't envy the spot they are in, but it is a game of political chicken, and they are playing it among themselves.

The reality is, President Trump is in the White House, and our Democratic colleagues need to work with him and us to try to move the country forward, to try solve these problems, as hard as they may be. The American people are the losers when their elected officials decide their political image and their political aspirations matter more than the people they represent in their respective States.

As I said, so far, the Congress has worked together in a bipartisan manner to pass roughly 75 percent of the government funding. We shouldn't let that bipartisan spirit fail us now. Finishing our work and securing our border shouldn't be an occasion to turn the end of the year into a political sideshow. I think the American people do not need any more sideshows and circuses in Washington, DC. They want results, and they want us to own up to our responsibility and do our duty.

Border security is an issue where we should be able to find common ground, and funding the government is, of course, one of our most basic responsibilities. The point should be made that we have already found common ground on many of these issues before. Several of our colleagues on the other side who are still serving in this Chamber, including Senator SCHUMER, supported passage of the Secure Fence Act in 2006. How that is different from what President Trump is requesting now is lost on me, when they agreed that 700 miles of border should be secured by a fence.

I should also note that the Secure Fence Act was also supported by then-Senators Obama, Biden, and Clinton. This should not be a partisan issue. I hope all of our colleagues will choose to get to work, roll up our sleeves, and do our duty. Not only do we have the chance to fund the government and keep the lights on but we also have a chance to put ourselves that much closer to a secure border and helping end the migrant crisis.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, while the distinguished senior Senator from Texas, deputy leader, is still on the floor, let me thank him for his kind remarks and express a word of appreciation for his patience through the long process of getting to a conclusion that we appear now to have finally reached on bringing criminal sentencing reform to a vote on the Senate floor.

This is at least the third Congress in which the Cornyn-Whitehouse bill to

improve the preparation of Federal prisoners for release, when they are going to be released, has been with us, and it has been a long process. I think the bill we are going to go to is, in majority, our original bill. For a long time, it has been the engine that I think all sides have seen as the means to solve the sentencing piece, which was much more difficult.

Over and over again, our efforts to move our bill have been held up in order to try to make a package, which is a pretty strong sign that our bill is a pretty good thing to get on board with. I want to thank Senator CORNYN for his patience through all of this.

Then I want to say a quick appreciation to Representative COLLINS and Representative JEFFRIES, whose bill on the House side was basically started like ours, and then they were able to negotiate what Senator CORNYN and I both agree were improvements—so that we adopted our bill to incorporate the improvements from the House side.

Other than that, we are about where we began with the sentencing improvements that have been added, and it has been a long trip, but I am indebted and appreciative of my colleague in all of this, Senator CORNYN, for having kept the faith through these many years and many Congresses in getting to this point.

Thank you, sir.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from New Jersey, Mr. MENENDEZ, be recognized at the conclusion of my remarks, if he is on the floor.

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, this week, Nations of the world are gathering in Katowice, Poland, to review—and we hope amplify—their commitments to reduce carbon emissions under the 2015 Paris Agreement and to discuss how they will report and verify reductions in carbon pollution.

The United States of America is technically present in Poland in the form of a small delegation, but American leadership in Poland is decidedly absent. Why? It is pretty simple. The Government of the United States of America has fallen under the political control of the industry most responsible for this mess.

American leadership was essential to forging the global consensus on carbon emissions in the original Paris Agreement. I know because I was there in Paris in 2015 as Secretary Kerry and the U.S. negotiating team worked to seal the landmark pact.

What a pathetic difference a few years make. In 2017, President Trump announced that the United States would become the only country in the world to turn its back on this global agreement. The United States abdicates its leadership, just as the scientific warnings of the dangers of climate change grow clearer and

grimmer. In October, came a new report from the world's scientists working through the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Just last month, our own Federal Government released its own sobering news about the worsening risks climate change poses to our Nation and our economy.

Our National Climate Assessment warned of hundreds of billions of dollars in losses we can anticipate due to climate change if we don't act to curtail carbon emissions. Trump responded first by describing his own—and I will quote him on this—“very high levels of intelligence.” Then he went on to simply deny all the science. He said: I don't see it.

Well, guess what. Pope Paul V didn't see it when Galileo demonstrated the Earth revolved around the Sun, but that didn't change the astrophysics.

The climate science—laid out in black and white by Trump's own government agencies—is that our planet is heating up due to our use of fossil fuels.

The science is even more incontrovertible than when Donald Trump said that climate science was incontrovertible back in 2009. Saying that he now doesn't see it is the very definition of climate denial.

So many people who are engaged in climate denial actually know better but, for a variety of motives, will not act, will not admit it. As to the President's not seeing it, “willful blindness” would be another term.

This takeover of our government by fossil fuel forces is having very real consequences in U.S. emissions numbers. After years of decline, U.S. carbon emissions rose in 2018, increasing by 2.5 percent.

This, of course, coincides with the Trump administration's efforts on behalf of its industry benefactors to delay, repeal, and weaken rules limiting carbon emissions from powerplants, from oil and gas wells, from industrial facilities, even from vehicles.

Of course all of these industries share a measure of the blame for not cleaning up their own mess on their own, and you can add to that their culpability for pushing the Trump administration to weaken the safety regulations that, in some cases, the industry had actually agreed to. The auto industry had actually agreed to the CAFE standards and then fought to undo them through its trade group so that they could keep their own hands clean.

Chinese carbon emissions increased in 2018, as did Indian emissions. Among major economies, only the European Union saw its emissions decline in 2018.

This is why international summits like Poland are so important. The world urgently needs to correct course, and we can best do so if countries together do their part to reduce emissions.

According to the IPCC, to avoid the most catastrophic effects of climate change, we need to cut carbon emissions to 50 percent below 2010 levels by

2030, which is just 11 years from now. We have to be 50 percent below our emissions in 2010, 11 years from now, in 2030, and we have to hit net zero emissions—carbon removed for all carbon added—by 2050. That is not that far away.

The IPCC report calls pricing carbon the central policy that will allow us to hold the global temperature increase to 1.5 degrees Celsius or less. This is not some fantasy of the environmental community. Some of the world's biggest investors—\$32 trillion worth of investment represented by these groups—stood up in Poland to say: We need to fix this problem or there will be economic catastrophe ahead. They also said that a price on carbon and an end to the subsidy that the fossil fuel industry enjoys and is at the heart of its political intervention, which has prevented us from taking on climate change, needs to go.

You have to add a price on carbon, and you have to get rid of the fossil fuel subsidies. That is their prescription for avoiding economic catastrophe.

Well, maybe they don't know what they are talking about, but \$32 trillion worth of money thinks that they know what they are talking about because they put their money in the hands of these people to make wise investments for the future. A lot of people have bet their savings and resources behind these groups that are now saying: No price on carbon, no end of the fossil fuel subsidies, watch out—watch out for catastrophe.

On an ideological level, if you are sincere about market capitalism, where the costs of a product need to be in the price of the product for the market to work, this is pretty obvious stuff. The only reason this gets difficult is if you are a fake free marketeer who is really fronting for the fossil fuel industry.

But if you are not a fake on market economics when it is the industry that funds your party involved, it is pretty straightforward stuff. It is basic economic market principles.

You put the public harm externalities of a product—those costs—into the price of the product for the market to work—econ 101.

It shows the priorities around here when market capitalism and the principles of free market economics are so readily thrown under the bus by our friends once they cross the interests of big, big donor industries.

The good news is that many governments—from cities, States, and provinces to countries and regions—are already pricing carbon. This chart shows all of the various governments that have set a price on carbon, either through emissions trading—those are the green ones—or through a carbon price, a carbon fee—the various purple ones—and some do both, which is where they are mixed.

The carbon fee involved will vary. Sweden, for example, charges almost

\$140 per ton of carbon emitted, covering nearly 50 percent of the Nation's emissions.

The Canadian Province of British Columbia enacted a carbon fee in 2008, which has risen over time to its current price of \$35 per ton. In the 4 years following the British Columbia carbon fee, fossil fuel use decreased by 17 percent in the Province, compared to increasing by 1 percent in the rest of Canada. So it works at decreasing emissions, and British Columbia's economy grew faster than that of any other Canadian province.

Why would it not? One hundred percent of the revenues raised from British Columbia's carbon fee are returned to taxpayers in the form of other tax cuts. And it is popular; 70 percent of British Columbians support the policy.

So what about the United States? Well, California has put a price on carbon via an emissions trading system, as have the nine Northeastern States, including Rhode Island, that are members of the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative. For the moment, the prices in California and the RGGI are still relatively low—around 5 bucks for us in Rhode Island for RGGI.

Senator SCHATZ and I have introduced our American Opportunity Carbon Fee Act again to assess a carbon fee starting at 50 bucks per metric ton of emissions in 2019. It is the midrange of the Office of Management and Budget's 2016 estimates of what they call the social cost of carbon. The social cost of carbon is the name for the long-term damage that is done by carbon pollution, which the fossil fuel industry is fighting so hard to be a public subsidy rather than to be put into the price of their product.

Our market-based proposal is an appeal to true conservative Republican colleagues. As one Republican former legislator said: It is not just an olive branch; it is an olive limb that we have offered. But the fossil fuel industry keeps a stranglehold on the Republican Party, preventing climate action—even climate action using market principles.

Axios just did this chart. I saw it today and had it reproduced for the floor. This is the number of times climate change was mentioned in Congress in press releases, floor statements, and online by Members of Congress. This is how often the Democrats have mentioned it from 2013 to 2018. I am afraid I am probably a measurable piece of those blue columns.

But if you look over here, this is how often Republicans have mentioned climate change. Their best year was 678 mentions. For all Republicans in Congress, in all of their press releases, floor statements, and online communications, the grand total is 678 mentions—I mean, seriously—and it has gone down as it has gotten worse because I think it is difficult to talk about if you are a Republican.

Everybody is looking around at the wildfires; everybody is looking around

at the sea level rise coming up; everybody is looking at the storms; everybody is looking around at the science now, not only warning of climate change but being able to connect specific weather events to climate change, most recently, the massive heat wave that wiped out so much of the Great Barrier Reef.

So here is how often Republicans talk about it, and here is how often Democrats do. We should probably do better. But, anyway, that is where we are.

If that doesn't show the effect of the industry squelching debate and driving Republicans into alignment with their industry welfare, then I don't know what that could express that much more clearly.

So I wanted to show that, and this is unlikely to change as long as millions of fossil fuel industry dollars slosh around Washington, protecting this corrupting industry from having to account, as economics would suggest, for the actual economic cost of its pollution.

America is called the indispensable Nation, and American leadership is indispensable if we are to achieve a global response to this global challenge. But American leadership is sorely lacking because the dark money and sleazy operatives of the fossil fuel industry today control the Trump administration and swaths of the Republican Party.

There used to be a guy in this body who said "Country First." We could use a little of that now in this tragic, climate-denying Trump sleaze-fest.

I yield the floor, and per the previous order I think Senator MENENDEZ is here, to be recognized momentarily. I saw him come to the floor a moment ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss—and I appreciate the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island and the work he has done on this critical question of climate change. I am pleased to join him today on the floor in pursuit of what he has been doing.

I rise today to discuss the negotiations taking place in Katowice, Poland, to finalize the rule book on implementing the Paris climate change agreement. There is an immediate urgency for global action to reduce greenhouse gas pollution as emissions continue to increase. The longer it takes for us to fully accept and acknowledge the problem, the more aggressive the world will have to be to avoid the worst effects of climate change from becoming a reality.

For decades, the science has yielded increasing causes for concern. Today, the connection between manmade greenhouse gas emissions—primarily fossil fuel combustion—and climate change is undeniable. Three major reports on the growing climate crisis have been published in the last 30 days

alone. That includes reports from the world's top climate scientists on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and the U.N. Environment Programme. That includes the National Climate Assessment, which was assembled by 13 Federal agencies and 300 government experts—our Federal agencies and our government experts.

What the scientists are telling us is that robust and immediate action is necessary to prevent catastrophic changes in the Earth's climate—changes that have already begun to affect every single American.

There is a tendency to dismiss scientific reports as abstract, as hard to understand. The President seems to simply not believe them. So let me speak plainly: The consequences of climate change are anything but abstract—regional food and water shortages, inundation of island nations and coastal communities that are home to billions of people around the world, mass migration, and refugee crises.

Our own National Climate Assessment makes clear that the United States—with all our wealth and good fortune—is far from immune from the effects of climate change. If we fail to confront this challenge, the United States will experience effects that will cost American lives and billions in losses to our national economy.

While we shouldn't point to any single event as evidence, the changes in trends depicting climate change's harsh reality are undeniable. It is a fact that the average global temperature on Earth has increased by about 0.8 degrees Celsius—1.4 degrees Fahrenheit—since 1880, and two-thirds of the warming has occurred since 1975. It is a fact that the frequency and intensity of extreme weather events in many regions of the United States are increasing, including conditions that heighten wildfire risks. It is a fact that sea level has been rising over the past century, and the rate has increased in recent decades. In 2017, global mean sea level was 3 inches above the 1993 average—the highest annual average in the satellite record. None of these facts are new. None of these facts are deniable. The science predicted these climate change effects 20, even 30 years ago.

To echo a common sentiment among climate change leaders on the urgency of the situation, "We are the first generations to experience the effects of climate change and the last that can act to prevent the worst."

This urgency is fueling the negotiations in Poland this week. Deliberations on the various elements of these rules began shortly after the Paris Agreement's entry into force in November 2016, and the agreement requires that the rules be completed this year, making the COP in Katowice the most consequential conference of parties since COP21 in Paris.

The Paris Agreement establishes firm, albeit nonbinding, global emissions reduction goals—reductions sufficient to prevent a 2 degrees Celsius in-

crease in global average temperatures. The Paris Agreement also clearly outlined robust and transparent reporting so that parties can hold each other accountable via diplomatic engagement as opposed to binding legal punishment.

Of course, success comes down to execution. That is what makes the development of the implementation rule book so consequential and President Trump's decision to abandon the Paris Agreement so antithetical to our own interests.

The current administration's wholesale rejection of meaningful engagement with the global community is disturbingly naive and is bound to result in repeating past mistakes with detrimental outcomes.

China is emboldened by President Trump's plan to abandon the Paris Agreement. China effectively slowed progress at COP23 and will continue its efforts. In the leadership vacuum that President Trump has created, China is stepping in to write the rules.

It is completely absurd to assume that the United States, by withdrawing from the Paris Agreement, is somehow immune to the global economic implications of climate change.

The President couched his decision to abdicate American leadership regarding the Paris Agreement as putting "America first" in a June 2017 announcement riddled with inaccurate characterizations of the Paris Agreement and alternative facts on climate change.

There is no truthful, factual, or reality-based argument to justify how allowing every country in the world except the United States to build the clean energy economy of the future and confront our most pressing global challenge puts America first.

Continued U.S. leadership and climate diplomacy can only yield economic benefits for U.S. workers. More than 900 U.S. businesses support keeping the United States in the Paris Agreement, including more than 20 Fortune 500 companies.

Acting to prevent the worst effects of climate change holds tremendous economic and job-growth opportunities for New Jersey and our Nation. I am proud to say that New Jersey is a national leader in deploying clean energy technologies, creating clean energy jobs, and planning and investing in climate change resilience.

New Jersey is home to 417 solar energy manufacturing and installation companies employing more than 7,000 workers.

New Jersey is also competing hard to become the first Mid-Atlantic State to produce offshore wind energy, supported by the recent enactment of legislation establishing a 3,500-megawatt production goal for offshore wind energy.

New Jersey has also recently increased its renewable energy standards to 50 percent by 2030 and set a new State carbon emissions reduction goal of 80 percent by 2050.

New Jersey's leadership among the States working to combat climate change is rooted in our vulnerability to the effects of climate change. The fact is, if we continue on our current emissions trajectory, the world could see global average temperature increase by 3 degrees Celsius. This would devastate New Jersey, risking \$800 billion in coastal property value, along with the health, security, and livelihood of millions of residents. The potential losses from sea level rise and increased intensity and frequency of extreme weather associated with climate change would cost my State's economy billions in economic losses.

Just yesterday, the *Star-Ledger*—a statewide paper—published a column by Robert Kopp, the director of the Rutgers Institute of Earth, Ocean, and Atmospheric Sciences, highlighting many of these consequences, as outlined by the recent National Climate Assessment.

Our winters have been warming faster than our summers. Pests like pine beetle and ash borer are no longer kept in check by winter freezes. Perhaps even more alarming, we have seen our crops begin to bud earlier and earlier, only to see them decimated by cold snaps later in the season. In the Garden State—famous for our tomatoes, cranberry bogs, blueberries, and other specialty crops—that is a big deal.

As temperatures rise, we also expect to see a surge in heat-related deaths and illnesses due to allergies and asthma, while disease-carrying bugs like mosquitos and ticks thrive in increased seasonal moisture.

Our fisheries—the life blood of so many of our coastal communities—have already begun to see how changing water temperatures are changing migrations, making it harder for us to manage historic fisheries and harder for our fishermen to earn a living.

Of course, perhaps the clearest threat to New Jersey from climate change comes in the form of coastal flooding from sea level rise and extreme weather events. We saw it with Superstorm Sandy, and we understand the devastating consequences it can have for our families, our communities, and our infrastructure.

There is no convincing me that ignoring climate change and walking away from the world's only mechanism for holding countries like India, China, and Russia accountable for their emissions puts New Jersey first.

The Trump administration's failure to recognize this potential and its refusal to recognize the growing market demand for clean energy is a stunning example of the transactional relationship this President has with the fossil fuel industry. He is putting wealthy, politically connected corporations ahead of the best interests of the American people. Proof of the administration's political favoritism for fossil fuels is exemplified by the only U.S. Government-sponsored event at COP24 in Poland, titled "The Future of Coal."

Never mind how insulting and tone-deaf it is to sponsor an event to promote dirty, coal-powered energy at a climate change conference while countries like the Marshall Islands, the Maldives, Mongolia, and Mozambique, which face existential crises from climate change, look on—even more than that, this public forum flaunts the administration's wholesale sellout to the industries the government is tasked with regulating. It also shows us this administration's contempt for the booming renewable energy sector in the United States, which, according to Trump's own Department of Energy, employs more Americans than the U.S. fossil fuel industries by a 5-to-1 reality. All told, nearly 1 million Americans work in the energy efficiency, solar, wind, and alternative vehicles sectors. That equals nearly five times the number of workers employed in the fossil fuel electric industry, which includes coal, gas, and oil workers.

As the ranking member on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I believe that climate diplomacy must be a priority for U.S. foreign policy. Climate change poses an imminent and long-term threat not just to U.S. national security but also to the long-term prosperity of this country and of our world. Addressing the crisis requires collective action and cooperation by local and national representatives, small and large businesses, and every one of us.

If the United States is to maintain our status as the world's superpower, it is in our best interest to lead the global cooperative effort to address the serious challenges posed by climate change and to promote stability and resilience by helping developing countries reduce their vulnerability to the effects of climate change. If we stand alone on the sidelines as these changes and international economics take shape, we will ultimately be the loser.

I urge my colleagues to join me in calling on the administration to advance continuing U.S. climate diplomacy and reconsider the decision to withdraw. It is essential to U.S. national security interests, as defined by our own Department of Defense, and growing U.S. economic opportunity.

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT

Mr. President, I want to take one moment to speak to a different topic, which is to support the Tester-Wyden Congressional Review Act.

This is an administration cloaked in secrecy and deception. It is an administration that doesn't want the American people to know what it is doing. So it is no surprise that in July, the Treasury Department issued their dark money rule. They don't want the American people to know that behind every bill, amendment, and Executive order is a big-money special interest. They want to make it easier for big corporations, billionaires, and even illegal foreign money to influence our elections. These special interests know that so long as the money keeps flow-

ing, there will be someone in Congress to do their bidding.

At a time when Americans want transparency from their government, this rule would allow special interests to hide their donors from the IRS.

It has been 8 years since the Supreme Court's Citizens United decision—a decision that gave corporations the right to spend unlimited, unchecked, and, more often than not, undisclosed money on our elections. For 8 long years, more and more money has flowed from corporate coffers into campaign ads and political expenditures, and Republicans have defended the dark money poisoning our politics every step of the way.

Let me demonstrate the sheer magnitude of the dark money that has been pumped into our recent elections. In 2016, outside groups spent more than \$1.4 billion, much of it funneled through trade associations and nonprofits. In 2018, outside groups spent more than \$1.3 billion.

These funds were not spent by the candidates' campaign committees but by groups that did not have to reveal their donors and disclose them to the public.

Spending by independent, outside groups reached an alltime high of \$49 million in this year's congressional elections in my home State of New Jersey. State and county parties spent about \$8.1 million. In other words, outside groups this year outspent formal parties by over 600 percent.

All of this secret cash and dark money undermines the ability of the American people to hold their government accountable. Yet, for the President and some of my Republican colleagues, that is not enough.

Ask yourself: Under these rules, what is to prevent anonymous foreign corporate donors that have unlimited amounts of cash to influence the American political system and help elect candidates who benefit them and then exert influence over those candidates once elected?

It is no wonder this administration would want to make it harder for the American people to know who is behind donations to tax-exempt organizations. It is the wrong direction and is a dangerous one.

As we now know, the President benefited from this dark money, particularly money that came from the NRA. What is baffling, however, is that the administration would make it easier for hidden money to flow through these organizations when we know that the Russian Government and its agents have used them as a conduit to try to influence our political system.

The recent indictment and guilty plea of Maria Butina shows this is not fantasy but reality. The Butina case came about because she was discovered to be an unregistered foreign agent. Yet she may just be the tip of the iceberg when it comes to Russians who are trying to pass money into our electoral system.

Under this administration's rule, uncovering those efforts will be made harder, not easier. That is why, tomorrow, I will be urging the FBI and the FEC to investigate whether other covert Russian sources may be behind political contributions the NRA made during the 2018 electoral cycle to any House or Senate candidate. We need to know who is contributing millions of dollars to influence the political system right now.

In our democracy, the size of your wallet should not determine the power of your voice. I urge my colleagues to listen to the American people, who have been loud and clear that they want disclosure, that they want to reduce special interest influence in our politics, and that they want this government to work for them.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

(The remarks of Ms. MURKOWSKI pertaining to the introduction of S. 3739 and S. 3740 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Ms. MURKOWSKI. With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I have the honor of representing Louisiana in the U.S. Senate, and it gives me no pleasure to say that in Louisiana we have a crime problem.

In Louisiana and, frankly, in other parts of America, I regret to say, criminals are turning neighborhoods into war zones and small towns into drug dens and, in the process, families are being destroyed.

Now, some people make a youthful mistake, and they could benefit from a second chance. I think most Americans agree with that, but other people never change. I don't know why it is. If I make it to Heaven, I am going to ask, but there are some people out there, they are not mixed up, they are not confused, they are not sick, it is not a question of whether their mama or daddy loved them enough—they are just bad. Unfortunately, they are just bad.

For that reason, I think we all recognize that prisons are a necessary fixture that make our communities safer.

As we prepare to hear a bill or bills on changes to sentences for Federal prisoners, I wanted to share with the Senate a cautionary tale from my home State of Louisiana.

People in my State are being killed, and people in my State are being hurt because of these so-called "criminal justice reforms"—I put that expression

in quotation—that were put in place by my Governor.

Louisiana, about 14 months ago, started letting prisoners out of our prisons. The overall goal of the Governor was to save money. So far, I think he has let out about 2,000 prisoners. Now, the inmates he let out were not vetted. They weren't vetted by the probation boards, they weren't vetted by the parole boards to see if they were a threat to public safety. These prisoners he let go weren't paired with programs to reduce recidivism. He just let them go. He did it under a statute he named and called the Justice Reinvestment Act. It certainly wasn't any reinvestment in justice for the victims.

His law is failing the law-abiding public in my State. So far, 22 percent of inmates have been rearrested. Now, that is over 14 months—a very short period of time. The Governor and his Department of Corrections said: Well, we are only going to release nonviolent criminals. Well, somebody forgot to tell the criminals they were non-violent.

In the 23rd Judicial District Court in Louisiana, which encompasses small towns and three parishes, one in three inmates that the Louisiana State government let go has been rearrested. That is higher than the 22 percent I just quoted. That is a recidivism rate of 33 percent in a little over a year.

I have talked to Louisiana's law enforcement officers and prosecutors. They don't support what the Edwards administration has done. Now, they are scared to say anything because the Governor controls a lot of their budgets and their money, but if you ask 9 out of 10 law enforcement officials in my State privately if they support it, they will tell you no, and the 10th is probably lying.

The head of the District Attorneys Association, in fact, has publicly said that Louisiana's streets are not safer because of this so-called criminal justice reform. He also noted that simply reducing prison population is not a measure of success. He is a wise man.

Louisiana State government now seems to care more about criminals than it cares about those criminals' victims. In fact, I have never heard my Governor talk about victims at all. It is always criminals.

I recently received a letter. We all get letters from constituents, but this one really—this one really shook me up. I received a letter from a constituent in South Louisiana about what this failed experiment of criminal release in Louisiana has cost his family. His words—this gentleman's words—have been weighing on my heart and on my mind since I read them, and I would like to read a bit from that letter now.

I am quoting: My name is Gary Prince, and my youngest son Jordan was killed by a drunk driver in May of 2015. He was only 18 years old, and he had just graduated high school 12 days

before this accident. The man that killed him was driving the wrong way on Highway 90 near New Iberia and crashed into my son head-on. His blood alcohol level was .16, which is twice the State's legal limit.

He was sent to jail with a sentence of 15 years, but this person that killed my son served only 18 months in jail.

Mr. Prince, the father, goes on: There is a State law which States that anyone convicted of a DUI with vehicular homicide, with a blood alcohol level of .15 or greater, has to serve a minimum of 5 years without the benefit of early release. This was not taken into account for this criminal. My son was a good kid. He had a bright future. He wanted to follow in my footsteps and become a machinist. I feel that my family deserves better than this. I want you to know that when I say my prayers at night, I pray for a better Louisiana.

Mr. Prince, I want you to know how sorry I am for you and your family's loss. While the State of Louisiana might consider this a nonviolent crime, your family paid a horrific price for this man's behavior. I can't imagine anything worse than a man or a woman having to bury his or her son, especially a teenager. For your son's killer to be out on the streets after 18 months is more than just salt in the wound. It is a miscarriage of justice, and it is precisely what happens when policies like criminal release programs are pursued without considering the victims or their families. It is not justice.

I believe in justice. I think most Americans do. What is justice? We talk about it a lot. I agree with what C.S. Lewis said: Justice is when someone gets what they deserve.

I am not saying that deterrence and rehabilitation are not important in a prison system. They are. They have nothing to do with justice. They have to do with the effectiveness of your prison system.

C.S. Lewis said: Justice is when people get what they deserve.

Justice is when the people of Tibet, for example, get to worship the Dalai Lama because they deserve religious freedom.

Justice is when a rapist is sent to prison and stays there for a time commensurate with his crime. That is justice. He is getting what he deserves.

C.S. Lewis didn't just say that. Immanuel Kant said that. He said our penal laws are a moral imperative. He didn't say rehabilitation is unimportant, because they are both important. They just have nothing to do with justice. Hegel said the same thing, and St. Augustine said the same thing—all of the great thinkers in history—that justice is when you get what you deserve.

It doesn't have anything to do with the cost of government. It doesn't have anything to do with deterrence. It

doesn't have anything to do with rehabilitation. Those are all important factors, but this has nothing to do with justice.

A criminal release program gone wrong has had other effects in Louisiana, too. It frees people like Tyrone "Smokey" White. Let me tell you about Mr. White. Our Governor let him go. He is a career criminal. He repaid the State promptly by robbing two roofers at gunpoint. Somebody forgot to tell Smokey that he was supposed to be nonviolent, too. Less than a week later, Mr. White was released under Louisiana's criminal release program, despite having more than 60 arrests on his record.

A criminal release program gone wrong looks like a convicted felon named Richard McLendon who, upon being granted early release, illegally gets himself a gun and uses it to fatally shoot another man in Bossier Parish. He then leaves his victim to die like roadkill on the side of the road with multiple gunshot wounds.

A criminal release program gone wrong in Louisiana, anyway, looks like a Dwayne Watkins. He is a pedophile. He had more than 21 arrests for child abuse and other assorted crimes on his record. He got to walk out of jail early—not just once but two times. Watkins earned 10 years for illegally possessing a gun as a felon, and he got out early, and he promptly sexually abused two young girls. He earned 3 more years in jail, and then, thanks to Louisiana State government and the Edwards administration, he got out early again. Give me a break.

In October, less than 2 months after his early release, he approached Kelly and Heather Jose at a shopping mall in Caddo Parish. When he asked to borrow their phone to call a cab, the couple offered him a ride. In Louisiana, we help each other. Well, Mr. Dwayne Watkins decided to repay their generosity by kidnapping them, shooting them, and burning them to death in their own car so badly that their bodies couldn't even be recognized. He is now awaiting trial for murder.

Kelly Jose, one of the victims, was an Air Force Reservist—God rest his soul—in Barksdale Air Force Base. He enlisted in the Air Force in 1998. Heather Jose, the other victim, was a small business owner. She loved working in the ministry of a church. They were good people. They were just trying to do a good deed. This was a senseless tragedy, and it did not have to happen.

Just this weekend, our sheriff from Caddo Parish rightly asked a question. He said: Why is Dwayne Watkins out of prison after violating his parole and sexually abusing two young girls? And many of us are asking that same question in Louisiana right now. But the answer is very simple—the Edwards administration's failed criminal release program.

I want to take a moment and consider what price we might be asking

the families back home to pay for these criminal release programs. In my State, innocent people are scared, and rightfully so, that they might become victims of violent crime. We are reneging on the justice we promised the victims like Mr. Prince, who lost a child. Do you want to put a price tag on justice? Have at it. I don't.

In Louisiana, we also failed the Joses' three children. They don't have parents anymore. Mr. Dwayne Watkins took care of that. He should have been in jail serving his time. That is justice.

Louisiana's failed experience has cost law-abiding folks dearly in every corner of my State.

I just want to implore my colleagues in the Senate to please think about more than just the criminals. Think about more than just the money. Think about the lives of the victims and their families, as well, because they are supposed to count too.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

H.R. 2

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, a few months ago, I had a chance to go up to the Colorado-Wyoming border to spend a night at the Ladder Ranch. It is a beautiful property—that is an understatement—situated in the Little Snake River Valley. If you were designing a postcard for the American West, you would struggle to do better than this place.

The ranch is owned by Pat and Sharon O'Toole. It has been in the family for six generations, dating all the way back to 1881. To give you some sense of how long that is, at the time, the State of Colorado was just 5 years old, and the Ottoman Empire was still around. Our world has been transformed since then, but the Ladder Ranch has endured through the Depression, the Dust Bowl, the two World Wars, and the transformation of our economy.

Of course, none of that happened just by chance. It happened because the family looked ahead and made hard choices to deliver that ranch from generation to generation. Pat and Sharon are continuing that legacy today, and they are joined on the ranch by their daughters, and their son, and a whole bunch of grandkids.

I am sharing the story of the Ladder Ranch because in many ways, it is the story of farmers and ranchers across my State and across the country—of people applying their ingenuity and common sense to hand more opportunity to the next generation.

One of the privileges of representing a State like Colorado is that I have had the opportunity to learn about places like the Ladder Ranch and the legacy of every one of our farms and ranches represent.

When I joined the Senate Ag Committee, the truth is that I had no idea how hard it can be for our farmers and ranchers. Like many people, I had very little appreciation of where our food comes from. If you are in agriculture, you can do everything right and still

fall behind because of forces beyond your control.

Today, farmers and ranchers in this country are facing tremendous uncertainty. They have persistent drought, which is growing worse due to climate change and threats of wildfire. They have low commodity prices and challenges with finding people who can work, because of our immigration debate here in Washington, and to find the seasonal labor they need. Dairies are struggling to hire the workers they need.

Now, on top of all of that, they have the confusion of the existing trade policies of the United States. Two weeks ago, the USDA announced that farm incomes are projected to drop 12 percent this year. When you add it all up—the uncertainty, the policy, the politics—farm income is going to be down 12 percent this year. All of this acts like a weight on our farmers and ranchers, making it even harder for them to pass on the legacy of their work to the next generation.

Earlier this year, our Agriculture Commissioner in Colorado, Don Brown, who is himself one of the most successful farmers in our State, said: "You're only 22 once." By that he meant that there is an entire generation out there deciding whether or not to pursue a career on the family farm or ranch, and they are looking at all of this uncertainty, and a lot of them are deciding that it is not worth it. That is why the average age of farmers is what it is in the United States.

We owe it to our farmers and ranchers to provide consistency where we can and to help to preserve the legacy of American agriculture for years to come.

By passing the 2018 farm bill, that is exactly what we have done. This bill means more certainty for America's producers in this volatile environment. This bill maintains crop insurance, and it makes risk management tools more effective. Most important to Colorado, this bill helps our farmers and ranchers to diversify their operations for the first time in 50 years.

This bill fully legalizes hemp. The majority leader was out here earlier. I want to congratulate him on his work to do that. In Colorado, our hemp growers have operated under a cloud of uncertainty for years. Our farmers worry about maintaining access to their water. They couldn't buy crop insurance or transport seeds. Some ran into redtape opening a bank account or even applying for Federal grants.

Despite these challenges, hemp cultivation in my State grew sixfold over the last 4 years. Again, it is interesting that the majority leader has wanted this, as well, because the climate in Kentucky and the climate in Colorado have almost nothing in common. But hemp grows in Kentucky, and it grows in Colorado.

We see hemp as an opportunity to diversify our farmers who manufacture high-margin products for the American

people. Now, Coloradans will be able to grow and manufacture hemp without a cloud of uncertainty hanging over them.

This bill also helps farmers and ranchers hand more opportunities to the next generation. It increases funding for conservation easements and makes it easier for people to secure them.

It invests in America's farm economy to drive innovation in agriculture and to keep up our competitiveness in the 21st century. It doubles funding to help communities in places like my State to deal with forest health, and it protects our watersheds better.

Working with the Presiding Officer, we increased funding for wildlife habitat and provided more opportunities for hunting and fishing on private lands.

We worked with Senator BOOZMAN of Arkansas to give rural communities new ways to improve housing and infrastructure.

The bill also provides new resources to help farmers and ranchers adapt to major challenges like climate change. For example, it creates tools for farmers and ranchers to sequester carbon, improve soil health, and become more resilient to drought.

We increased resources in this bill for renewable energy and energy efficiency for rural businesses.

All in all, this 2018 farm bill is an excellent piece of legislation, and a lot of credit lies in the approach we took on the Agriculture Committee. It should be like this for all of our committees. It is a committee on which we don't have partisan differences. If we have differences, we have regional differences, and we work them out. That is why that committee, which I am proud to serve on, is one of the only functioning committees in the Senate. We passed a 5-year farm bill the last time there was a farm bill, not a 6-month one, not a 6-day one, but a 5-year farm bill. This is another one because Republicans and Democrats both know we have to support our farmers and ranchers, not create even more uncertainty for them.

The other privilege of being on that committee is that I spend a lot of time in my State in counties where it is unlikely that I am ever going to win 10 or 20 percent of the vote, but I keep going back and back, not because I think I will win but because I think, as a country, we have to find a way to bring ourselves together and solve problems.

Our farmers and ranchers are a model for that. They are applying their ingenuity to things like climate and drought every single day. They don't have the luxury—and I would say we don't have the luxury—of pretending that politics is the only thing that matters. They are focused on delivering their farms or ranches to the next generations and handing more opportunity, not less, to them. That is all that matters, and that is the ethic we should be applying to our national politics.

BLUE WATER NAVY VIETNAM VETERANS ACT

Mr. President, I want to take a few minutes to call on the Senate to pass the Blue Water Navy Vietnam Veterans Act.

The bill extends critical VA benefits to veterans who were exposed to toxic chemicals while they served in the waters off Vietnam.

There is no reason the Senate shouldn't pass this. Our country already provides these benefits to veterans who served on land, and it is well past time we extended care to those who served at sea.

This bill is the result of a lot of good bipartisan work in the Senate, and the House has already passed it. To get this across the finish line, we should look to the example our veterans set for how to come together and fight until the job is done.

In Colorado, the United Veterans Committee has advocated strongly for this bill, and veterans from across our State have spoken out on behalf of their colleague veterans who deserve justice with the passage of this bill. Their example reminds us that there is no obstacle we cannot overcome to provide every veteran who has served in the United States of America with the greatest healthcare in the world as a reflection of their service. In this moment, we should rededicate ourselves to that goal by passing this significant bill.

Let me end by thanking Senator GILLIBRAND and the Presiding Officer for their leadership, along with Chairman ISAKSON and Ranking Member TESTER for getting it to this point.

We need to pass this bill in the Senate before we go home. It is the right thing to do.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

TRIBUTE TO JOE DONNELLY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to join my colleagues in thanking our friend, Senator JOE DONNELLY, for his service to his State and our Nation.

When he was about 30 years old, while he was practicing law in South Bend, JOE DONNELLY sought the Democratic nomination for attorney general in Indiana. Two years later, he ran for State senate. Both times, he lost.

Then he did something truly astonishing: He walked away from politics. For 10 years, he practiced law and ran a small stamp-and-ink business.

In 2003, local party officials asked him to run for Congress. They didn't expect him to win—just be a respectable sacrificial lamb.

He came closer to winning than anyone but he expected.

Two years later, he was elected, in a rematch, to the U.S. House.

As someone who also ran and lost three times before winning an election, I feel a natural camaraderie with my friend from Indiana.

I think I may also have some insight into why he was willing to try one more time.

You see, JOE DONNELLY grew up in New York. He moved to South Bend for college, and he is a Hoosier, through-and-through, but he is also a member of the great White Sox Nation.

In 2005, the Chicago White Sox won the World Series for the first time in 88 years—proof, some would say, that anything is possible if you persevere and work hard.

The next year, it was JOE DONNELLY's turn to score the upset victory by winning election to Congress from a red district in a deep-red State.

In his 6 years in the House, he voted to create the Affordable Care Act.

During the financial crisis of 2009, he voted for the American Recovery Act, to stop America's slide into a second great depression that could have brought down the entire global economy.

When free market hardliners said, "Save Wall Street but let the American auto industry die," Barack Obama said no—and so did JOE.

In November 2012, Hoosier voters sent JOE DONNELLY to the U.S. Senate, the first Democrat to hold his seat since 1977.

In a political era that often seems often to reward snark over substance, JOE DONNELLY is a soft-spoken throwback to an earlier era, when working across the aisle was viewed as a talent, not as treason.

JOE is decent, honest, and direct. You may disagree with him on an issue, but you will never doubt his motives.

His values are classic Hoosier: hard work, common sense, bipartisan compromise, and a disdain for grandstanding.

As a Senator, he has done what he believes is needed to level the playing field for "regular Joes," for farmers and factory workers and, as he says, "the people who go to work in the dark and come home in the dark."

I particularly want to thank him for his work to improve mental health care for military members and veterans. That work will save lives and families.

Like all nations, the White Sox Nation has some laws. One of my favorites is: "Respect the past . . . people that are shoeless . . . and anyone named Joe."

That last edict is a reference to one of the legends of White Sox history, Shoeless Joe Jackson, but it applies equally to our friend and colleague, Senator JOE DONNELLY, who has served his State and our Nation well and earned our great respect.

TRIBUTE TO HEIDI HEITKAMP

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in thanking Senator HEIDI HEITKAMP for her service to her State and our Nation.

I remember one of the first conversations Senator HEITKAMP and I had after she joined the Senate. I told her: "I would really like your support on a bill to help the kinds of mom-and-pop stores that are the heart of so many small towns in your state and mine."

I was about to give her my "elevator pitch" on the Marketplace Fairness Act. It wasn't necessary.

HEIDI said: "Uhm, DICK, you know the 1992 U.S. Supreme Court decision that makes the Marketplace Fairness Act necessary. I'm the petitioner in the case. 'Quill v. North Dakota?' That's me. I was the North Dakota tax commissioner who started that lawsuit."

As I was quick to learn, helping Main Street, mom-and-pop stores stay in business in the age of Amazon is just one of many causes that HEIDI HEITKAMP had been working on, tenaciously, for years before she was elected to this Senate.

HEIDI HEITKAMP came to Washington with a to-do list. She worked doggedly, with Democrats and Republicans, to whittle down that list.

It was clear from the day she arrived here that she meant to use her new position as a U.S. Senator to right as many old wrongs and fix as many intractable problems as she could.

She leaves knowing that she made a difference in the lives of countless people, in North Dakota and far beyond.

She has been a champion for Native Americans, whose voices are so rarely heard in the halls of power.

The first bill she sponsored in the Senate created a new and long overdue Commission on Native Children, to try to rectify the conditions that cause one-in-three Native American and Alaska Native children to live in poverty, with suicide rates 2.5 times the national average.

Like so much of her work here, that was a bipartisan effort. Her partner in that case was LISA MURKOWSKI.

When the Violence Against Women Act was reauthorized in 2013, it was HEIDI HEITKAMP who pushed successfully to close a loophole that allowed non-Indians who commit sexual assaults on Indian Reservations—very often—to go unpunished.

Her commitment to "make a better future" for Native children—and all children—is what motivated HEIDI to become my partner on a bill to increase and improve the treatment of childhood trauma, the root of so much suffering and violence.

We are proud that our trauma bill was included in the new law to combat the opioid epidemic. It will save lives.

HEIDI has said that her proudest achievement as a U.S. Senator was when she was able to help a Korean war veteran receive the Purple Heart and other medals.

The man, Corporal Andy Shaw, was a Native American elder who had served in World War II, was wounded in a gunfight in South Korea at the start of that conflict, and spent nearly the entire Korean war as a POW, but never received the thanks or medals he should have.

After 60 years, HEIDI HEITKAMP was able to right that wrong.

She and her staff tracked down the facts needed to document Corporal Shaw's heroism and sacrifice, and she travelled to the Spirit Lake Sioux Reservation in North Dakota to present Corporal Shaw's medals to him personally.

Andy Shaw has a little trouble standing now, but he stood proud and straight as his Senator presented his Purple Heart.

HEIDI cried because she knew how much he had sacrificed for that medal and what it meant to him.

That is who HEIDI HEITKAMP is: a woman who uses her power to help the underdog.

I wish she were not leaving so soon.

She has been a force for progress, a friend, and a leader for whom I have great respect.

I know that she has a lot of grit and determination still in her, and I look forward to seeing what her next chapter will bring.

H.R. 2

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, after months of hard fought and oftentimes contentious negotiations, the Senate passed the conference report on the 2018 farm bill, titled the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, by a vote of 87 to 13. This conference bill tracks closely with the bill passed by the Senate earlier this year and embraces the bipartisan tradition of the farm bill. This is well-balanced legislation that will provide much needed certainty to the country's struggling farmers; maintain food security for millions of American families; provide for cleaner waterways, better soils, protected open space, healthier forests, and the preservation of family farms; will make our drinking water safer; and will give rural America a much-needed economic boost.

I thank Chairman ROBERTS and Ranking Member STABENOW and all of their staff, as well as my own staff, who have worked day and night on this bipartisan effort. As I know from being chairman of the committee during the 1990 farm bill, it is no easy task to balance the needs of the various regions and commodities and the sometimes conflicting priorities among Senators when we are working within a fixed budget.

This farm bill makes continued improvements to the Margin Protection Program, MPP, after the enhancements to the program that I led in February of this year. The newly named Dairy Margin Coverage program brings the margin level up to \$9.50, lowers premium costs for a farm's first 5 million pounds of milk, and allows overlap of this program and other Department of Agriculture supported insurance programs. This bill will also help farmers initially blocked by USDA from enrolling in MPP due their participation in the Livestock Gross Margin Insurance for Dairy. They can now retroactively sign up for the improved margin protection program and access the critical benefits they missed out on this spring. A new program to incentivize milk donation is also included in this bill and will allow processors and producers to partner with charitable organizations to donate milk and reduce the waste of milk dumping.

As the father of the organic farm bill, I am pleased that the 2018 farm bill increases the funding for the Organic Agriculture Research and Extension Initiative and guarantees \$50 million a year in mandatory funding by fiscal year 2023. This will ensure baseline funding for future farm bill debates and further protect this critical investment in our local and organic food system. I must add though that I am concerned by one aspect of this bill that I felt was an unnecessary change to the Organic Foods Production Act. From the beginning of the farm bill process, it was clear that some agricultural groups and some Members of Congress did not fully comprehend the importance of the National Organic Standards Board, NOSB, and the role that it plays in maintaining the integrity of the organic seal. Since first authoring the Organic Foods Production Act, I have long argued that the statute was working well, and the many tweaks and adjustments Members sought could easily be addressed administratively.

As such, I was opposed to the statutory changes sought by the House and Senate bills and am disappointed that two of the NOSB provisions related to the redundant language on voting procedures and those dictating the composition of the board were included in the final farm bill.

While I view the NOSB provisions included in the final bill to be silent on the 2013 sunset policy change, I remain opposed its inclusion because I believe it only causes confusion in the organic market and unnecessarily muddies the waters on an already contentious issue within the organic community. With respect to the makeup of the board, the current statute already included a carefully crafted balance of perspectives and interests. I feel strongly that the voice of the independent organic farmer must remain a prominent part of the NOSB and should not be diluted or drowned out as larger organic companies seek a role on the board with their employees or representatives. I

feel very strongly that the two NOSB handler seats versus the farmer slots are a more appropriate avenue for such companies to be represented on the board. While I am disappointed that this House provision was included in the final farm bill conference agreement, I will continue to support the nomination of independent organic farmers to the NOSB farmer seats and the unique perspective they bring to the board.

Ranking Member STABENOW must be applauded for the newly combined Local Agriculture Market Program, LAMP, that also secures \$50 million by 2023 and will allow the work of local food programs to continue bringing fresh, local, and nutritious food to the tables of Vermonters and Americans everywhere. For Vermont farmers hoping to diversify and remain viable, this bill legalizes the growth and sale of hemp as an agricultural commodity and allows growers to be eligible for crop insurance. The compromise addresses concerns raised by criminal justice advocates regarding the hemp farming ban of individuals with drug-related felony convictions, and I am glad Vermonters will more fully be able to take advantage of this durable and profitable crop.

The conference agreement continues the proud tradition of providing nutritional assistance to our fellow Americans with the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, and wholeheartedly rejects the provisions included in the House bill that would have cut food access for millions of families. This bill continues our commitment to worldwide stability and productivity with programs like McGovern-Dole, Food for Peace, the Global Crop Diversity Trust, as well as valuable research to support farmers here at home and around the world. When people here and abroad do not have to wonder where their next meal may come from, children do better in school, workers are more productive, and our world is stronger.

Our Nation's conservation tradition is reinforced in this bill, with significant funding and necessary improvements to programs like the Agricultural Conservation Easement Program conserving family farms, the Environmental Quality Incentives Program fighting nitrogen and phosphorus runoff, and the Conservation Reserve Program in which I was able to include a fix allowing Vermonters to use the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program to further protect water quality where they were disqualified before. The worst of the House of Representative's forestry provisions were negotiated out of this bill to make sure we are protecting our forestland based on the best available science and expertise.

This bipartisan farm bill provides critical economic development support to address the unique challenges and needs faced by our rural communities. The Rural Economic Area Partnership,

REAP, Zone is renewed to continue developing our rural economy and the Northern Border Regional Commission, NBRC, is reauthorized and increased to \$33 million, with an additional \$5 million to build capacity in eligible counties. This bill also expands the eligible territory for NBRC investment to all fourteen counties in Vermont. The Commission will build upon the more than \$10.5 million in matching funds and \$18 million in total economic development and infrastructure projects invested in Vermont since 2010. The bill reauthorizes the good work of State Rural Development Councils through 2023 and reestablishes the position of Under Secretary for Rural Development that had been eliminated, in the 2017 USDA reorganization. I am pleased that I was able to reach a compromise for a 10-year reauthorization of the National Oilheat Research Alliance, NORA, a vital program that funds the development of improved and efficient oilheat technology to increase safety and reduce consumer costs.

I would be here all night if I were to talk about all of the wins for Vermont that were included in this farm bill, so I will close by saying that the 2018 farm bill should be viewed as a watershed moment in much needed bipartisanship and compromise. It will help millions of Americans, farmers, families, and children and will protect our natural resources, economic vitality, and public health. This is why we are here: to help people who need it, protect our national security, and ensure our planet is productive and clean for this generation and for generations to come. This bill must pass the House of Representatives and be signed by the President to deliver real help to real Americans everywhere.

JUVENILE JUSTICE REFORM ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have long supported juvenile justice programs, and I have long supported runaway and homeless youth programs. During the 20 years I served as the top Democrat on the Judiciary Committee and in my current role as the vice chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I have championed bipartisan reauthorizations and supported funding for these programs, overcoming the House of Representatives, which zeroes out juvenile justice programs in its appropriations bills year after year. These programs make a real and lasting difference in the lives of the children and teens they serve. The two programs are funded separately in separate appropriations subcommittees, and their reauthorizations have traditionally moved separately.

I am pleased the Senate today passed the long-debated Juvenile Justice Reform Act. This legislation makes needed, comprehensive, and long overdue updates to the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. It mandates research to study, identify, and address disproportionate minority contact in

the juvenile justice system and separates young offenders from adult jails and prisons. It also reauthorizes funding for key juvenile justice programs. Funding for these vital programs is key to preventing youth from coming in contact with the juvenile justice system and ensuring youth have the opportunity to get the help they need to avoid repeating the cycle. Reducing recidivism is not just the moral thing to do; it saves future State and Federal dollars.

The Grassley substitute amendment, which passed the Senate this evening, reauthorizes the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act at a lower level than I support, and a lower level than is supported by the providers and advocates in the field who know firsthand what the actual needs are to help these youths. It also fails to make important programmatic improvements that Senator COLLINS and I have been working on for years. These improvements include provisions to prevent and respond to human trafficking—to which runaway and homeless youth are particularly vulnerable—by requiring staff training to identify when a child entering their program has been a victim. Training program staff to identify young victims of trafficking helps ensure staff refers children and teenagers to appropriate services and takes steps to prevent their further traumatization. These young people have experienced major, unimaginable trauma, and we need to make sure they receive the right counseling and treatment to help them recover. Our reauthorization of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act also includes important non-discrimination language to ensure all youth who try to access programs can do so regardless of their faith, race, or sexual orientation. Unfortunately, these improvements will have to wait.

While we have much to celebrate with the passage of the Juvenile Justice Reform Act, I am disappointed that some Members on the other side of the aisle demanded the inclusion of an extension of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act and lowering its authorization without the improvements contained in my legislation with Senator COLLINS. The House passed and the Democratic hotline cleared H.R. 6964, a clean version of the juvenile justice Reform Act with no reference to the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act. Unfortunately, Senate Republicans on the Judiciary Committee refused to run the hotline on the Republican side. This in effect held hostage these important juvenile justice reforms to leverage authorization cuts to a completely unrelated program.

These two pieces of legislation have not moved in the same reauthorization bill in 30 years. They are funded through different appropriations bills, administered by difference departments, and their authorizations serve different purposes. Senator COLLINS and I have worked for years on a comprehensive bipartisan reauthorization

of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act and expressed our concern with including a lower reauthorization with no improvements as part of Juvenile Justice Reform. Unfortunately, members on the other side were willing to hold up passage of Juvenile Justice Reform for yet another Congress, over an unrelated program.

In the interest of ensuring programmatic improvements and reauthorization of juvenile justice programs, Senator COLLINS and I agreed to a 2-year reauthorization of Runaway and Homeless Youth programs at an 8-percent reduction from its last authorized levels. Although I am disappointed that Runaway and Homeless Youth programs are reauthorized even in the short term without needed programmatic improvements, I look forward to working with members of the House and Senate to pass a bipartisan, comprehensive Runaway and Homeless Youth reauthorization in the 116th Congress.

It is my understanding that the House Committee on Education and Workforce will prioritize a comprehensive reauthorization of Runaway and Homeless Youth next Congress, and I hope the Senate Judiciary Committee will do the same. If so, we have a chance to make a real difference in the lives of some of the most vulnerable children in our Nation. It is time we seize it.

RECIPROCAL ACCESS TO TIBET ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this evening the Senate unanimously passed the Reciprocal Access to Tibet Act of 2018. I was one of the earliest cosponsors of this bill, and I strongly support it. For far too long, the Chinese Government has tightly restricted access to Tibet, preventing U.S. diplomats and journalists from reporting on the systematic human rights abuses and destruction of Tibetan culture perpetrated by the Chinese Government and arbitrarily preventing Tibetan-Americans from visiting their families. Passing this legislation represents a strong, bipartisan step toward addressing that decades-long injustice. I would like to thank Senator RUBIO and Congressman MCGOVERN for their work on this legislation over several years.

The Chinese Government arbitrarily requires a special permit for a foreign diplomat, reporter, or tourist to visit Tibet, a requirement China does not impose for travel to any other provincial-level jurisdiction, even Xinjiang. The Chinese Government frequently denies requests for these permits to Tibet. Even when it does grant permits, it generally requires foreigners to be accompanied at all times by a government-designated guide. This arbitrary system not only makes it exceptionally difficult to report on the situation in Tibet, but it also gives the Chinese Government significant leverage, which it reportedly exploits in

various ways, over persons who hope to obtain a permit.

In a 2015 white paper, the Chinese Government claimed that, under Chinese rule, “Tibet has been transformed from a poor and backward society to one that is advanced in both economy and culture.” Setting aside that this statement would look perfectly at home among the discredited justifications for 19th century colonialism, if it were true, then one would expect China to welcome the world to witness its rule in Tibet; yet in 2016, the Washington Post reported that Tibet “is harder to visit as a journalist than North Korea.” International media cannot even enter Tibet except on infrequent, tightly controlled tours organized by the Chinese Government. The situation is much the same for U.S. diplomats.

It is not just journalists and officials whose freedom of movement is restricted. Tibetan-Americans attempting to visit their homeland report undergoing a discriminatory Chinese visa process, different from what is typically required for American citizens, and often find their requests arbitrarily denied. I have heard about this problem directly from my Tibetan-American constituents in Vermont. I have spoken about it with the leader of the Tibetan Government-in-exile.

This issue has even touched a Tibetan-American member of my staff, Nima Binara. His 89-year-old grandmother, Kaedungkhangsar Yangchen Dolkar, was a naturalized American citizen who hoped to see her homeland and her relatives one last time before she passed away, a visit the Chinese Government refused to grant. Denying a person’s right to visit their homeland is a petty display of authoritarian control and one that we should not tolerate in the 21st century.

I vividly remember visiting Tibet in 1988 and meeting its warmhearted people, appreciating its profound culture, and seeing its breathtaking landscape. With this legislation, we are now a step closer to the day when all American tourists, journalists, and diplomats can make such a trip without undue restrictions. This legislation will also make it more difficult for China to hide its atrocious human rights record in Tibet behind a cloak of isolation. It will make it easier for Tibetans inside Tibet to interact with the outside world and more likely for the world to realize that Tibetans are a distinct people who deserve their right to self-determination.

The House has already unanimously passed this bill. I urge the President to sign it into law without delay.

REMEMBERING BECKY WEICHHAND

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, during this season of Advent, millions of Americans join Christians around the world to celebrate the coming of Jesus Christ.

A central tenet of Christianity is born in the belief that Jesus is the Light of the World.

On December 25, we celebrate the light, the hope, and the joy our Lord and Savior brings into the world.

Today, I come to the floor of the U.S. Senate to pay tribute to a servant of Christ who dedicated her life to bring light, hope, and joy to children and families around the world.

Her name is Becky Weichhand.

Becky blazed a trail of hope and love to spread joy to children, especially those awaiting adoption.

To those who knew her best, Becky was an unconditional prayer warrior, who graciously shared love and loyalty to friends and strangers alike.

By all accounts, Becky shared uncommon devotion in her advocacy for children, especially those in our Nation’s foster care system.

Since 2014, Becky served as executive director of the Congressional Coalition on Adoption Institute.

Before that, she served as director of policy, where she shined light on the needs of children here in the United States and abroad, including the United Kingdom, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Cambodia, Vietnam, South Korea, and Haiti.

Since first joining the corps of dedicated professionals working to help the foster youth community, Becky had a plan.

She had a plan for kids who went to bed each night praying for a forever home.

She had a plan for young people who were growing up without a mom or dad.

She had a plan to connect as many kids as possible with a forever family.

Becky worked tirelessly to educate, organize and advocate here on Capitol Hill and at the grassroots.

She devoted her life and career to making dreams come true for adoptive parents and their children.

Among her priorities and achievements, I know that Becky was committed to growing the Foster Youth Internship Program that connects foster youth and congressional offices.

The program provides opportunities for foster youth to work on Capitol Hill.

Through this program, foster youth collaborate and bring real-life perspective to the policymaking tables.

I have been fortunate to have an intern through this program who worked with my staff to help develop Federal child welfare reforms.

They identified more effective ways to serve foster kids, including those who age out of the system.

Becky also worked to grow the Angels in Adoption Program.

It brings recognition to families who go above and beyond the call to action in their local communities to open their hearts and homes to children awaiting adoption.

Shining light on the good deeds and unmet needs of others was her way of bringing light to the world.

As a founder and cochair of the Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth, I would like to turn the spotlight on Becky's good works.

She was driven to find a forever family for every child. She was a problem solver brimming with energy. Her advocacy led to important reforms. She believed in miracles. She made every effort to work miracles for children and families.

Becky mentored foster youth and paved the way for kids to dream big. She gave them reason to hope that their dreams can come true.

I extend my condolences to Becky's family, friends, and loved ones.

At age 36, Becky lost a brave battle to cancer.

Her legacy will live on and bring joy to countless children and moms and dads where it matters the most: in a forever family united through the blessing of adoption.

On Saturday, December 15, a celebration of life will take place at the First Church of God in Becky's hometown of St. Joseph, MI.

On this day, her loved ones will celebrate the light, joy, and hope she brought to this world.

May the blessings of God's Heavenly embrace welcome Becky into her new forever home for life everlasting.

TRIBUTE TO CAROLYN E. BOLDEN

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, along with my colleague, the ranking member on the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee, Senator MURRAY, I wish to pay tribute to Carolyn Bolden, a nondesignated employee on the HELP Committee staff. Ms. Bolden is retiring at the end of this month after more than 23 years of distinguished service to the Congress, including more than 12 years serving on the HELP Committee.

Ms. Bolden has served on the HELP Committee as an assistant editor on detail from the Government Publishing Office since September 2006, providing support in all aspects of editing and printing the committee's many documents.

Ms. Bolden is well-regarded on both sides of the aisle, having proven her professionalism, courtesy, and substantial expertise across four chairs and both parties. Without the support of Ms. Bolden and the rest of the nondesignated staff, the committee could not accomplish the important work the American people expect us to get done on their behalf. I, along with the ranking member and the rest of the committee's members, want to recognize Ms. Bolden for that tremendous contribution to the Committee as she exits her time in the Senate.

I would like to yield now to my colleague, the ranking member, Senator MURRAY, for her remarks.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I thank Chairman ALEXANDER and join him in commending Ms. Bolden for her many years of dedicated and out-

standing service to the Government Publishing Office, the Congress, and the American people. I greatly appreciate the sacrifice that Ms. Bolden has made over the past 13 years in assisting the HELP Committee by applying her expertise in editing, printing, and memorializing our important work. We wish her and her family all the best in her well-deserved retirement.

We hope our colleagues will join us in thanking Ms. Bolden for her service.

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD B. PROVENCHER

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, along with my colleagues Senator MIKE CRAPO and Representative MIKE SIMPSON, today I recognize and congratulate Mr. Richard B. Provencher on his upcoming retirement after more than 32 years of distinguished Federal service consisting of Active-Duty military service, service with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, NRC, and more than 29 years of service with the U.S. Department of Energy, DOE.

Mr. Provencher began his Federal career in 1986 as a health physicist for the NRC Headquarters Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards. Rick transferred to NRC Region 1 in King of Prussia, PA, where he was a materials inspector. In 1990, he joined the DOE as a health physicist and began his Senior Executive Service career as deputy director at West Valley Demonstration Project in New York. In 1998, he served as the director of the Miamisburg Closure Project in Ohio.

In 2003, he transferred to the Idaho Operations Office in Idaho as the deputy manager for environmental management, where he had a profound impact on DOE's mission to address Idaho's environmental cleanup efforts. Mr. Provencher provided strong leadership to the Federal and contractor workforce, making Idaho's cleanup performance one of the most successful in the Nation.

Among his many accomplishments, Mr. Provencher was instrumental in negotiating and executing an agreement between the DOE and the State of Idaho to implement a cleanup plan for buried waste in the subsurface disposal area at the Idaho National Laboratory, INL, significantly reducing the scope of work from the original plan and saving taxpayers \$5 billion.

Most recently, Mr. Provencher served as the Office of Nuclear Energy Manager for Idaho Operations Office and Contractor Assurance, responsible for overseeing the INL—our Nation's flagship nuclear energy laboratory. This responsibility includes managing over 200 Federal technical personnel and oversight of over 6,000 contractor employees with an annual budget in excess of \$1 billion. Under his leadership, the INL completed major infrastructure improvements and significantly improved research and development capabilities with state-of-the-art equipment and facilities that will ensure a bright future for the laboratory.

Mr. Provencher's remarkable ability to foster collaboration has strengthened partnerships internal and external to DOE. He repeatedly demonstrated his ability to build coalitions through his interactions with the State of Idaho and other elected officials regarding the operation of the INL. With multiple Departmental organizations present on the site, as well as many strategic partners across the government, it is a testament to Rick's leadership that all the various business functions are seamlessly integrated to support the INL's missions.

Mr. Provencher's performance has improved public trust and confidence in the DOE's mission work. He has partnered with environmental cleanup and laboratory participants in carrying the message of cleanup success, laboratory growth, and contributions to the region which have improved public perception of the INL and overall DOE mission work.

Through his years of dedicated service, Mr. Provencher exemplifies the best qualities of Idaho. Senator CRAPO, Representative SIMPSON, and I thank Rick for his service and wish him well in all of his future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN OSCAR "JOHNNY" JONES

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, I am pleased to commend Mr. John Oscar "Johnny" Jones, who is retiring from U.S. Department of Agriculture Rural Development after 37 consecutive years of service to the Nation.

Raised in Coffeerville, MS, Johnny joined USDA in 1980 as a student trainee in the Coffeerville Farmers Home Administration Office. In pursuing a career with USDA, Johnny followed in the footsteps of his father, William Woodrow Jones, and brother, William Woodrow "Woody" Jones, Jr., who both made significant contributions to American agriculture and rural economies throughout Mississippi as lifelong USDA employees.

Following his graduation from Mississippi State University in 1982, Johnny was promoted to the position of assistant county supervisor, ACS, for Webster County in Eupora, MS, with responsibility for Webster and Choctaw Counties. In 1985, he was promoted to county supervisor for Attala County. In 1990, Johnny was selected to serve as a rural housing specialist in the State Farmers Home Administration Office in Jackson. Seven years later, Johnny became the State program director for Single Family Housing for Rural Development in Mississippi, a position he has ably held for 21 years.

Working his way up from the Farmers Home Administration Office in his hometown to the State office in Jackson, Johnny not only gained exceptional knowledge and expertise, but he also contributed unique perspective to his work. Johnny understood the needs

of rural Americans, as well as the challenges rural communities must overcome to gain accessibility to the quality of life standards afforded to urban America. Applying his knowledge, expertise, and competence, Johnny devoted himself to making a positive difference in the lives of Mississippians.

Johnny's contributions to the people of Mississippi have been notably remarkable. Throughout his tenure as program director of the Single Family Housing program in Mississippi, he assisted nearly 50,000 families in achieving the American dream of home ownership. Whether a family needed a home or an impoverished elder required emergency home repairs, Johnny effectively managed USDA home loan and repair programs to assure the well-being of people he served, and in the process, he helped them improve themselves and their families.

Johnny Jones made the mission of his profession to selflessly and honorably serve others. He has directly contributed to improving the quality of life of literally tens of thousands of Mississippians. Few individuals have the opportunity through their careers to hold such distinction. On the occasion of his retirement, it is an honor to recognize Johnny Jones for his dedicated service to his State and to the country.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING HIGH DESERT MILK

● Mr. RISC. Mr. President, agriculture has always been of outsized importance to my home State of Idaho. Dairy farming has always had a presence in the State and has grown considerably over the past several years, and agricultural co-ops play a vital role in making sure our State's agricultural products make it to market. As the chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, it is my distinct privilege to recognize High Desert Milk as the Small Business of the Month for December 2018. High Desert Milk is committed to building longlasting relationships and providing opportunities for dairy farmers across, southern Idaho.

Located on the banks of the Snake River in Burley, ID, High Desert Milk is a cooperative partnership, committed to serving its farmer-owners while also remaining flexible in a competitive market. Founded in 2001, High Desert sought to create a more efficient dairy market for local farmers. In 2008, High Desert opened a purpose-built milk dehydration plant which is capable of processing up to 2.2 million pounds of milk per day. In 2013, the company was able to expand its operations and began producing butter to meet increased demand in the United States. From an initial team of 30 employees, High Desert Milk has grown into a multimillion-dollar operation

with over 150 full-time employees. In 17 short years, High Desert Milk has become a fixture in the community by providing reliable milk pickup services and professional milk marketing.

Presently, High Desert Milk works with 23 family-owned dairies across 70,000 acres of southern Idaho farmland. The company's operations support more than 1,000 related dairy jobs in the area. Annually, the company produces almost 60 million pounds of powdered milk, more than 40 million pounds of butter, and 4 million pounds of buttermilk powder. High Desert Milk's products are shipped all across the country and all over the world. The company has a reputation for meeting and even exceeding U.S. Department of Agriculture and customer standards due to careful technician monitoring during processing. High Desert Milk has been named one of the top 100 dairy operations in the United States due to its cleanliness, high quality control standards, and good relationships with its members.

Despite its worldwide presence, High Desert Milk is still a local Idaho company with close ties to Burley and rural southern Idaho. High Desert Milk has a positive presence in the area and takes an active role in its community. The company hosts several annual charity fundraisers, including an annual fundraiser for the American Cancer Society. The company also supports local 4-H and Future Farmers of America clubs and even sponsors an annual high school-age rodeo. These community-building practices aim to encourage youth to take an interest in their local communities and to encourage them to seek careers in Idaho's vibrant agricultural industry. Each year, High Desert Milk presents talented local high school students with scholarships to continue their education. The generous scholarship program encourages students to excel in the fields of agribusiness and dairy science. Scholarships are also made available to High Desert employees who want to continue their studies.

High Desert Milk's tenacious commitment to its member-farmers and community is preparing the way for a new generation of Idaho dairy farmers and entrepreneurs. The company's commitment to quality and efficiency while building a positive relationship with their members and community is a perfect example of Idaho's entrepreneurial spirit. The company has become an economic anchor in southern Idaho, creating new market opportunities for local farmers and providing jobs for local community members.

I would like to extend my sincere congratulations to High Desert Milk and all its farmer-members for being named the Small Business of the Month for December 2018. I wish you all the best of luck, and I look forward to watching your continued growth and success.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a withdrawal which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:58 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 245. An act to amend the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self Determination Act of 2005, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3008. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the George W. Bush Childhood Home, located at 1412 West Ohio Avenue, Midland, Texas, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5513. An act to provide for an exchange of lands with San Bernardino County, California, to enhance management of lands within the San Bernardino National Forest, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6108. An act to provide for partnerships among State and local governments, regional entities, and the private sector to preserve, conserve, and enhance the visitor experience at nationally significant battlefields of the American Revolution, War of 1812, and Civil War, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6118. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to annually designate at least one city in the United States as an "American World War II Heritage City", and for other purposes.

H.R. 6665. An act to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to apply to territories of the United States, to establish offshore wind lease sale requirements, to provide dedicated funding for coral reef conservation, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6893. An act to amend the Overtime Pay for Protective Services Act of 2016 to extend the Secret Service overtime pay exception through 2020, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7213. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction Office, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bill, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 2248. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide certain burial benefits for spouses and children of veterans who are buried in tribal cemeteries, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bill, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 2511. An act to require the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere to carry out a program on coordinating the assessment and acquisition by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration of unmanned maritime systems, to make available to the public data collected by the Administration using such systems, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill (H.R. 3946) to name the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic in Statesboro, Georgia, the "Ray Hendrix Veterans Clinic", and that the House has agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the aforementioned bill.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 12:26 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 315. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to distribute maternity care health professionals to health professional shortage areas identified as in need of maternity care health services.

H.R. 3946. An act to name the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic in Statesboro, Georgia, the Ray Hendrix Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 3008. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the George W. Bush Childhood Home, located at 1412 West Ohio Avenue, Midland, Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 5513. An act to provide for an exchange of lands with San Bernardino County, California, to enhance management of lands within the San Bernardino National Forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 6108. An act to provide for partnerships among State and local governments, regional entities, and the private sector to preserve, conserve, and enhance the visitor experience at nationally significant battlefields of the American Revolution, War of 1812, and Civil War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 6118. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to annually designate at least one city in the United States as an "American World War II Heritage City", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-7393. A communication from the Regulations Team Lead, Rural Utilities Service,

Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Buy American Requirement" (RIN0572-AC42) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 5, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-7394. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances; Withdrawal" (FRL No. 9986-43) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 7, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-7395. A communication from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Margin and Capital Requirements for Covered Swap Entities" (RIN3052-AD28) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 6, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-7396. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pears Grown in Oregon and Washington; Increased Assessment Rate for Fresh Pears" (AMS-SC-18-0048) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 5, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-7397. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Reynold N. Hoover, United States Army National Guard, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-7398. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Registration of Privately Owned Motor Vehicles" (RIN0790-AK15) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 5, 2018; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-7399. A communication from the Acting Director, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "2017 Fair Lending Report of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7400. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel for Operations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary, Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 5, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7401. A communication from the Acting Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Truth in Lending (Regulation Z)" (RIN3170-AA90) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 6, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7402. A communication from the Acting Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Consumer Leasing (Regulation M)" (RIN3170-AA89) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 6, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7403. A communication from the Acting Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Pro-

tection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Appraisals for Higher-Priced Mortgage Loans Exemption Threshold" (RIN3170-AA91) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 6, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7404. A communication from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Covered Investment Fund Research Reports" (RIN3235-AM24) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 5, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7405. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Indiana; Cross-State Air Pollution Rule" (FRL No. 9987-75-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 7, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7406. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Relief from the Once-In-Always-In Condition for Excluding Part-time Employees from Making Elective Deferrals under Section 403(b) Plan" (Notice 2018-95) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 7, 2018; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-7407. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2018-0203 - 2018-0206); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-7408. A communication from the Executive Secretary, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to vacancies in the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 10, 2018; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-7409. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Listing of Drug Products That Have Been Withdrawn or Removed From the Market for Reasons of Safety or Effectiveness" ((RIN0910-AH35) (Docket No. FDA-2016-N-2462)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 10, 2018; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-7410. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Labor's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2018 through September 30, 2018; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7411. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2018 through September 30, 2018 and the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7412. A communication from the Chief Financial Officer and Associate Administrator for Performance Management, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's fiscal

year 2018 Agency Financial Report and the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7413. A communication from the Chief Operating Officer, Millennium Challenge Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the Office of Inspector General's Semiannual Report for the period of April 1, 2018 through September 30, 2018; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7414. A communication from the Acting Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2018 through September 30, 2018; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-312. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Alaska urging the United States Congress to reauthorize the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 29

Whereas, in 1908, the United States Congress enacted 16 U.S.C. 500 (National Forest Receipts Program), which required 25 percent of annual income earned from activities on national forest land to be shared with states for distribution to cities and boroughs in which the land is located for the benefit of education and roads; and

Whereas, in 1986, changes in the approach to managing our national forests seriously curtailed the ability of forest communities to harvest forest products and resulted in steep declines in forest revenue paid to affected communities; and

Whereas, in the early 1990s, the United States Congress recognized that the decision to secure and retain land in federal ownership would deprive the communities in which the land is located of revenue otherwise received if the land were in private ownership; and

Whereas the enactment of P.L. 106-393, 16 U.S.C. 500 note (Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000), temporarily stabilized national forest revenue payments to forest communities and replaced much needed financial support for education and roads; and

Whereas the National Forest Service controls approximately 22,000,000 acres of land in the state; and

Whereas many of the state's rural communities are nestled in the Tongass National Forest and the Chugach National Forest; and

Whereas there continues to be little privately owned land in those forest communities on which to pursue economic development activities, and the communities therefore remain largely dependent on revenue generated from national forests; and

Whereas the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 expired on September 3, 2015, and has not been permanently reauthorized; and

Whereas the United States Congress temporarily extended the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 for federal fiscal years 2017 and 2018; and

Whereas education is one of the critical services supported by the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000; and

Whereas failure to permanently reauthorize the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 will have a devastating effect on many forest communities across America, especially communities in this state, and will severely affect the public education of students living in those forest communities; be it

Resolved, That the Alaska State Legislature respectfully requests that the United States Congress pass and the President sign into law a long-term reauthorization of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000; and be it further

Resolved, That the Alaska State Legislature encourages the United States Congress to pass H.R. 2340 or S. 1027 to extend, or legislation to permanently reauthorize, the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000.

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Donald J. Trump, President of the United States; the Honorable Sonny Perdue, United States Secretary of Agriculture; the Honorable Betsy DeVos, United States Secretary of Education; the Honorable Lisa Murkowski, Chair of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable Dan Sullivan, U.S. Senator, and the Honorable Don Young, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress; and all other members of the 115th United States Congress.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THUNE, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

S. 2369. A bill to authorize aboriginal subsistence whaling pursuant to the regulations of the International Whaling Commission, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-425).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

Report to accompany S. 90, A bill to survey the gradient boundary along the Red River in the States of Oklahoma and Texas, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-426).

Report to accompany S. 441, A bill to designate the Organ Mountains and other public land as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-427).

Report to accompany S. 569, A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the Land and Water Conservation Fund to maximize the effectiveness of the Fund for future generations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-428).

Report to accompany S. 2160, A bill to establish a pilot program under which the Chief of the Forest Service may use alternative dispute resolution in lieu of judicial review of certain projects (Rept. No. 115-429).

By Mr. THUNE, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2773. A bill to improve the management of driftnet fishing (Rept. No. 115-430).

By Mr. RISCH, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship:

Report to accompany S. 3562, A bill to amend the Small Business Act to modify the method for prescribing size standards for business concerns (Rept. No. 115-431).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first

and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. 3737. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out the Medical Surgical Prime Vendor program using multiple prime vendors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 3738. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to prevent the inter partes review process for challenging patents from diminishing competition in the pharmaceutical industry and with respect to drug innovation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 3739. A bill to amend the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1984 to modify the membership of the Arctic Research Commission, to establish an Arctic Executive Steering Committee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 3740. A bill to establish a congressionally chartered seaway development corporation in the Arctic, consistent with customary international law, with the intention of uniting Arctic nations in a cooperative Arctic shipping union, where voluntary collective maritime shipping fees will help fund the infrastructural and environmental demands of safe and reliable shipping in the region; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. KING):

S. Res. 719. A resolution designating December 15, 2018, as "Wreaths Across America Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. Res. 720. A resolution expressing the condolences of the Senate and honoring the memory of the victims of the shooting at Mercy Hospital and Medical Center in Chicago, Illinois, on November 19, 2018; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. Res. 721. A resolution designating the week beginning on October 21, 2018, as "National Chemistry Week"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. PETERS):

S. Res. 722. A resolution designating October 26, 2018, as "Day of the Deployed"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. Res. 723. A resolution congratulating the American College of Emergency Physicians on its 50th anniversary; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 352

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr.

SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 352, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Master Sergeant Rodrick "Roddie" Edmonds in recognition of his heroic actions during World War II.

S. 568

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 568, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 693

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 693, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the number of permanent faculty in palliative care at accredited allopathic and osteopathic medical schools, nursing schools, social work schools, and other programs, including physician assistant education programs, to promote education and research in palliative care and hospice, and to support the development of faculty careers in academic palliative medicine.

S. 1503

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1503, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of the 60th anniversary of the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame.

S. 1906

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1906, a bill to posthumously award the Congressional Gold Medal to each of Glen Doherty, Tyrone Woods, J. Christopher Stevens, and Sean Smith in recognition of their contributions to the Nation.

S. 3215

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3215, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the development of a bus operations safety risk reduction program, and for other purposes.

S. 3332

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3332, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the inclusion of certain fringe benefit expenses for which a deduction is disallowed in unrelated business taxable income.

S. 3611

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3611, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Higher Education Act of 1965 to facilitate the disclosure of tax return information to carry out the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S. 3622

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3622, a bill to condemn gross human rights violations of ethnic Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang, and calling for an end to arbitrary detention, torture, and harassment of these communities inside and outside China.

S.J. RES. 64

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 64, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of the Treasury relating to "Returns by Exempt Organizations and Returns by Certain Non-Exempt Organizations".

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 3739. A bill to amend the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1984 to modify the membership of the Arctic Research Commission, to establish an Arctic Executive Steering Committee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, there has been a lot of discussion this evening by my colleague from New Jersey and by my colleague from Rhode Island about the issue of climate

change and its impact. I come from a part of the country where climate change is there; it is with us; it is real. It is something that we look to as Alaskans with a reality of this world view.

I spend a lot of my time here in the Senate focused on not only the U.S. Arctic but the Arctic as a whole, the eight Arctic nations that we intersect with. So I would like to take a few minutes this evening to speak about the happenings in the Arctic—our new reality—as we are seeing greater opportunities but also greater challenges in an area that I find to be an extraordinary place on our globe.

It was maybe a little more than 150 years ago when Massachusetts Senator and the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at the time, Charles Sumner, argued the geostrategic importance of Alaska to our young Nation at the time. Senator Sumner spoke about how the Aleutians represented this gateway to Asia. This was a maritime route to the west coast that was roughly 1,000 miles shorter than the southern route through the Sandwich Isles, which was popular at the time.

It was about 70 years later that Gen. Billy Mitchell, who was the father of the Air Force, testified before Congress and said that he believed that in the future, whoever controls Alaska controls the world. He thought it was the most strategic place in the world.

Then we had World War II, the Japanese, who also recognized the strategic importance of the Aleutians, and they briefly seized and occupied the islands of Attu and Kiska.

While the war in the Aleutians may be forgotten by many here at home, the world continues to remember the strategic significance of the North.

Although General Mitchell saw the strategic geographic location of Alaska, he could not have imagined the environmental changes that would make sea routes accessible to commerce year-round, nor could he have imagined the rich mineral wealth beneath the Arctic. He might have been able to have imagined that Russia would take a major interest in the Arctic. Given its proximity from the Bering Strait region of Alaska, one can indeed see Russia from one's window. There are not too many people on Little Diomedede, but I have been there. Big Diomedede sits just about 2½ miles across the water, but I doubt that General Mitchell would ever have been able to have imagined that nations like China or India would have taken an interest in the very remote and often forbidding North, less that they would be fielding icebreakers in 2019 and 2020, as China and India are. He might also wonder why Singapore would take such an interest to justify observer status on the Arctic Council.

While places like Singapore seek observer status, the United States has passed the chairmanship of the Arctic Council and, with it, most of our diplomatic efforts towards the Arctic. The

Arctic Executive Steering Committee and other institutions within the executive branch that are focused on the Arctic have, in my view, just kind of wasted away just when the rest of the world has redoubled its focus on the Arctic.

The Department of Defense clearly gets it. It is starting to recognize what General Mitchell did back in 1935. Before the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee back in May 2016, I asked Secretary Carter whether we were doing what we needed to do from a defense standpoint to address changes in the Arctic. His response was pretty frank and, I think, very revealing. He told me that the Arctic is going to be a major area of importance to the United States strategically and economically in the future.

I think it is fair to say that we are late to the recognition of that, but I think we have the recognition. Now you are asking what comes in behind that recognition. I think a plan that is more than aspirational is needed, and I would be happy to work with you toward that end.

At that time, Secretary Carter's candor was refreshing, if not long overdue, but I have to tell you that we are still waiting for a plan that is more aspirational in the Arctic—not just a plan but a plan that is fully resourced. As an appropriator, I know full well how difficult that is to achieve.

Sometimes around here, like a tree that falls in the forest when there is nobody there to listen, it seems like official Washington doesn't recognize that something new and very real is occurring until it reads about it in the *New York Times* or perhaps in the *Washington Post*. Well, on Thanksgiving Day of this year, the *Washington Post* really laid it out. It had a special section—some 16 pages—which is entitled "The New Arctic Frontier." I would like to quote from the cover of this special section.

It reads:

As the Arctic slowly thaws, the United States, Canada, Russia, China and other interested nations are reconsidering how they strategically approach the region. Corporations have launched new missions to search for oil. Commercial fishing continues to evolve. Shipping and luxury cruise lines alike are planning to send more vessels north. Coastal erosion has prompted questions about how some Alaskan villages will survive and how the U.S. government should react. Against this backdrop, militaries are increasingly preparing for potential conflict in the Arctic. The United States is shifting forces to the north, planning to build a new class of icebreaker ships and cultivating stronger relationships with Nordic militaries. Russia, meanwhile, is investing in ice-capable vessels and infrastructure improvements, and China has declared itself a "near Arctic state."

This really sums up where we are today.

Truth be told, General Mitchell has been proven to be correct in ways that he probably could not have imagined when he said Alaska was the most strategic place in the world. For example,

right now, here today, Anchorage has the fifth busiest cargo airport in the world—not in the country but in the world. So we are sitting here in Anchorage, AK. We are less than 9½ hours from 90 percent of the industrialized world. So whether you are going to Singapore, London, Mexico City, we are less than 9½ hours from 90 percent of the industrialized world. So many carriers, such as FedEx, UPS, Alaska Airlines, Atlas Air, and others, are already using Anchorage as a cargo hub because of this very, very central location and these very real opportunities for commerce. We are also looking to regain the Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport position as a hub for international passenger travel.

Now we are getting ready for the holiday season, for Christmas. I think Santa had this figured out a long time ago. He knew that the shortest way to get around the globe, whether you were going to Fiji or to London or to Los Angeles or to Seoul, was over the Pole. Even Santa understood the geostrategic position of the Arctic. But it is Alaska. It really is Alaska, sitting right up there, which is the gateway to America's Arctic, that is at the center of all of this. That is not just bragging, not just my being parochial about it as Alaska's Senator. It is real, it is compelling, and it is demanding of attention and action. I know it is not easy.

The *Washington Post's* editors observed that the Arctic portends great opportunities and great challenges, so let's get to work on this. That is my central message today. It is time that we get to work and move ahead with a plan that fits the challenge that the Arctic represents for America. We talk a lot about aspiration. The time for aspiration is over—it is time for action. That starts by fully funding the first of the Coast Guard's Polar Security Cutters, whose purpose is to provide assured, year-round access to our polar regions. These are platforms that can project sea power anywhere, at any time, and are fully interoperable with interagency and international stakeholders to carry out national defense operations. These cutters will include sufficient space, weight, and power to conduct multimission activities that support our Nation's current and future needs in the Arctic.

The Polar Security Cutter will allow us to continue to engage with our fellow Arctic nations and our allies and our strategic competitors.

I share with you a picture of our existing Polar icebreaker, but when you look around the world at the various flags, here we are sitting in the United States—one of eight Arctic nations—and we have two icebreakers. I say two—maybe that is all we need. One of them is currently in dry dock in the Seattle-Tacoma area. She is never going to see activity again. The other one, *Polar Star*, is on her second life. She is working hard, but she is down in Antarctica, and she will be in Antarctica until she, too, is retired. Then

where does that leave us? Where does that put us?

We have a medium-strength vessel, the *Healy*. She does great work, but that is what the United States has.

Canada has nine government-owned, either operating or under construction. China has four—China, which has just determined they should be a "Near-Arctic State." Russia has 34, and when you count those that are nongovernment-owned, it is well over 40.

Here we are, the United States of America, an Arctic nation, and we are down to about one icebreaker. We have some work to do here.

Over the past several years, funds have been secured through the Navy to get started on building a new Polar Security Cutter. This year, the administration wisely decided—and I thank them for working with us—that it is time to lock in the project by budgeting the remaining funds necessary to complete the project. It is about \$750 million. That is a lot of money. That is a lot of money, but I would submit that this investment in the Polar Security Cutter is a small price to pay for the ability to project U.S. sea power in the Arctic.

The question of whether we follow through on this very important step is going to be determined this week, or perhaps next week, as we complete the fiscal year 2019 appropriations project. I would dare to suggest that our competitors in the Arctic are watching very, very closely whether we have the resolve to follow through on the first of these Polar Security Cutters.

Bringing the Polar Security Cutter online will give us capacity—we appreciate that—but the next and perhaps even more difficult challenge is to build the infrastructure to support the next phase of U.S. sea power in the Arctic. Most critical for that is the development of a deepwater port in the Bering Sea.

Our reality right now is that the Alaska deepwater port nearest to the Arctic is located in the Bering Sea. Dutch Harbor is almost 1,000 miles away from the Arctic. I am looking at my imaginary Alaska map here, but when you are down in the Aleutians—that is the nearest deepwater port—it is 1,000 miles to get to Point Hope, to Barrow, and that area.

A port is a critical piece of infrastructure that is needed, and it will serve many, many uses. It can support the Navy, the Coast Guard, and NOAA's research missions. It will support search and rescue activities that may be necessitated by increasing commercial vessel traffic in the Arctic, and it will provide a platform for the United States to harvest some of the economic upside of the vessel transits. RADM Jon White, U.S. Navy, retired, is President and CEO of the Consortium for Ocean Leadership. At a recent event, which was sponsored by the Wilson Center, he characterized the requirement for a deepwater port in the Arctic as a "no-brainer." He went on to

say: “Unfortunately, it’s not a no-coster.”

Last summer, Navy Secretary Spencer looked at various sites, potential sites for a deepwater port. He is very engaged in seeing how we can work together to bring the funding partners to make this happen. We look forward to working with him toward this endeavor. His engagement is so greatly—greatly—appreciated. He clearly understands the potential here.

All of these developments are very, positive, far more positive than we have seen in recent years. I am grateful for that. They are building blocks.

The race to protect America’s strategic interest in the Arctic demands attention on more than just defense; it will take coordination. That is why I am going to introduce today two pieces of legislation that are designed to reinvigorate America’s national and commercial strategic efforts.

For well over a decade now, you have heard me talk about how the diminishing Arctic sea ice presents both opportunities and concerns. If you look at this map here, you are looking at planet Earth from the perspective that most of us in Alaska view, which is from the top on down. You have the U.S. Arctic here with Alaska. You have the Canadian Arctic here. Here is Russia coming all the way around to Iceland, and Greenland is down in this area.

As I mentioned at the beginning of my comments, we recognize the impact that climate change is having on the Arctic—rapid impacts, clearly—more so than in any other part of the United States.

The latest report from the U.S. Global Change Research Program underscored this fact. Since the early eighties, the annual Arctic sea ice extent has gone down by about 4 percent per decade. The decrease for September sea ice extent—this is the time of year where we have had the least amount of ice. This time period has been even more pronounced at somewhere between 10.7 and 15.9 percent per decade in terms of the decrease in the sea ice.

What does all of this mean? According to that report, it means we are likely to experience a sea ice-free Arctic summer before this century is out.

Again, when you are looking at the top of the globe, looking at the Arctic here, all of the area in the light blue—you can’t see the red around it—was all of the extent of the September sea ice back in 1979. In 2015—3 years ago—the extent of that September ice is here in the pink. As you can appreciate, as you are losing this throughout more parts of the year, it does point to a reality that we are likely to see in the not too terribly distant future—a sea ice-free Arctic summer.

Loss of sea ice in the Arctic, of course, goes hand in hand with overall temperature warming. Over the last several years, it has been somewhat common to refer to the Arctic and include the fact that it is warming at

twice the rate of the rest of the country. This latest climate report shows us that this is not exactly right.

In fact, the North Slope of Alaska—this corner right there—is warming at 2.6 times the rate of the continental United States. Much of the rest of Alaska is warming at more than twice the continental U.S. rate as well. So it is not just twice as fast; it is more than twice as fast. Again, we are paying attention.

I face this reality. I hear about this reality every time I step off an airplane in a rural community. I listen to the people there, particularly the elders, as they share their knowledge. Record low extent of Arctic sea ice threatens many of our indigenous communities because of threats of coastal erosion. With less ice, waves build up, beat against the shore, and erode it. It is more than just coastal erosion; it is the impact on their traditional ways of life—food security issues, hunting, access to resources to basically exist.

We are very in tune. It is not just through the eyes of the people who are living there; this is abundantly clear in both the scientific data that is collected by our State and our Federal Agencies, as well as the experience of rural Alaska Natives.

According to this most recent report, the cost of infrastructure damaged from a warming climate in Alaska alone—we had our own chapter in the report—could range from \$110 to \$270 million per year. So changes to our air, our water, our soil, our food security, our disease ecology directly and directly resulting from our warming climate are going to impact the lives and the health of every Alaskan.

On the one hand, the future in the Arctic looks increasingly challenging for our rural communities. Then, on the other hand, the future also represents a new frontier. There are opportunities out there, whether they are in construction, in tourism, in energy, in minerals, in shipping, or in community development. You have challenges, and you have opportunities.

For some time now, my team and I have been working on two pieces of Arctic legislation to support responsible investment and development in the U.S. Arctic. It hasn’t been easy to meet the expectations and the needs of rural and indigenous communities that are most impacted by climate change in the U.S. Arctic, while, at the same time, focusing on economic development, environmental stewardship, human security, but we have really been trying to mesh these all together. I believe these two bills that I am introducing, along with Senator SULLIVAN—the Arctic Policy Act of 2018 and the Shipping and Environmental Arctic Leadership Act of 2018; that is, the SEAL Act—I think are steps in the right direction, helping us move closer to meeting these objectives.

The first bill, the Arctic Policy Act of 2018, will statutorily establish the Arctic Executive Steering Committee

under the Department of Homeland Security and provide the coordination necessary to advance a truly integrated plan for the Arctic.

By reinvigorating the central coordinating body for Arctic issues, the legislation will provide a venue to deliver the type of plan America needs and, more importantly, a place to work that plan into action across Agencies.

As it stands now, everybody has a little bit of a piece of something when it comes to the Arctic, but it doesn’t really seem as though there is any coordinating entity. When you don’t have anybody who ultimately has that responsibility, oftentimes, it is hard to see the progress.

We know Federal policy does not exist in a vacuum, so in addition to establishing the Arctic Executive Steering Committee, the legislation would also establish an Arctic Advisory Committee to ensure that residents of the Arctic and Alaska Native people have a seat at the table for the development of policy. They don’t want to be sitting back and being told what is happening; they want a seat at the table. As the indigenous peoples of the region, they fully have that right.

Further, the legislation calls for the establishment of regional Tribal advisory groups, starting with the Bering Sea Regional Tribal Advisory Group to advise the Federal Government as it shapes national priorities within the region. These Tribal advisory groups will be empowered to provide advice on specific challenges or regionally important issues.

I would like to say that if you go to rural Alaska, if you go to a small village, you are not going to find a lot of Ph.D.s out there, but what they do have is a Ph.D. in Arctic living. They know what is going on. Their very lives and survival depend on understanding and appreciating the world around them.

In the Arctic, we have an opportunity to show the world how to integrate indigenous knowledge and voices into policy and science. That is why the legislation will also update the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1984. This was legislation my father introduced when he was here in the Senate. We will update this to include more Native voices at the Arctic Research Commission and thereby push to include traditional knowledge and community coordination in our Nation’s scientific efforts in the Arctic, especially our efforts to study and understand climate change.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 3740. A bill to establish a congressionally chartered seaway development corporation in the Arctic, consistent with customary international law, with the intention of uniting Arctic nations in a cooperative Arctic shipping union, where voluntary collective maritime shipping fees will help fund the infrastructural and environmental

demands of safe and reliable shipping in the region; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, the second piece of legislation I am introducing is the Shipping and Environmental Arctic Leadership Act of 2018—the SEAL Act—which establishes a congressionally chartered seaway development corporation in the Arctic.

So this Arctic Corporation will work with representatives from NOAA, from the State Department, from the Coast Guard, and from DOT, as well as representatives from the State of Alaska, the Alaska business community, Alaska coastal and subsistence communities, and the Alaskan Maritime Labor Organization to help to develop an Arctic shipping union whose leadership will advocate for safe, secure, and reliable Arctic seaway development and further ensure that the Arctic becomes a place of international cooperation rather than competition or conflict.

The capacity to get maritime and shipping services funded by means of international cooperation is not a new concept. We have seen it done, and it exists with the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation in the United States. This is one example where countries that share a large maritime border—the United States and Canada—are able to develop a seaway system—one that is safe, secure, and reliable for its users.

I have people stop me and say: Well, this is so many years off from when we are going to see levels of commercial activity in the Arctic. There is no real need to move on this, is there?

Well, again, I will just remind you of some of the charts we have seen. The multiyear ice that once made the Arctic impassable and shielded our northernmost border year-round is diminishing, again, due to climate change. Because of this, shipping in and around the Arctic traffic will increase. So when you appreciate where we are with the Northwest Passage here, the Northwest Passage, by 2025, is intermittently open, but the for pathway, if you are going from the Bering Strait, right off of Alaska here and through Rotterdam, you are going to have an opportunity to basically be cutting through there.

For the northern sea route, following through Russia, by 2025, they anticipate that this sea lane will be open for a full 6 weeks.

The transpolar route, going more directly over the pole, by 2025 will have 2 weeks of open shipping.

So, yes, shipping is going to increase. When you can figure out a quicker way to get from Asia to Europe, when you can shave off days, when you can use less fuel, you are saving money. So this is, from a trade perspective, hugely significant.

But this looming increase in commercial vessel traffic also translates to greater demand for services and processes necessary to ensure that Arctic

shipping can be reliable and safe for shippers that need to transport goods from one place to another on a timetable.

This last chart that I am going to share is just a reminder of not today's reality, but this is the number of vessels that were tracked between year 2014 and 2015. So this is the Aleutians right down here. This is where the Great Circle route ships come through. It is so black here that you can't even tell that these are lines, but this demonstrates the level of existing traffic that we have here. Even 3 years ago, the number of vessels that transited up to the Arctic, whether it was to go over into the Beaufort or the Chukchi in the Arctic Ocean or to go through the northern sea route in that direction—this is here, and this is now. This is what is happening in the Arctic.

So what we are seeking to do with this SEAL legislation is to help to fund a system of Arctic ports—not just one port but a system of Arctic ports—ports of refuge for ships in trouble and ports to send, receive, and transship goods and people, private aids to navigation, all-weather tugs that can help ships that may have lost power or steerage, and to provide a commercial architecture to support the private sector investments in and use of icebreakers that can help ships that may be boxed in because of the ice. That happens.

So as we talk about this proposal that we are laying down in this legislation, I have likened it to Uber for icebreakers. It helps people kind of understand what it is that we are looking at here.

Port infrastructure will also benefit rural Arctic communities and bring down costs for delivering fuel, groceries, and other necessities which, in my State at this time, are just extraordinarily high. I think this legislation can help the United States to organize and attract investment opportunities for ports and icebreakers, for our own safety and for that of commercial vessels that are venturing into the Arctic, as well as, again, for those who live there.

So these two bills, building on the strategic efforts of the Department of Defense and the strides that have been made in the NDAA, can provide the legislative direction needed to help to develop that aspirational plan that Secretary Carter recognized that we need.

While I will be introducing these now, I am also going to be reintroducing them in the next Congress, and I certainly look forward to working with any and all of my colleagues and interested parties, as well as the executive branch, to refine them in the hopes that we can truly reclaim America's leadership role in the Arctic in this next Congress.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 719—DESIGNATING DECEMBER 15, 2018, AS “WREATHS ACROSS AMERICA DAY”

Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. KING) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 719

Whereas, in 1992, the Wreaths Across America project began an annual tradition of donating and transporting Maine balsam fir veterans' wreaths to Arlington National Cemetery each December and placing those wreaths on the graves of the fallen heroes buried at Arlington National Cemetery;

Whereas 5,000 donated veterans' wreaths were transported from Maine to Arlington National Cemetery during the first year of the Wreaths Across America project and placed on the graves of the fallen heroes buried at Arlington National Cemetery;

Whereas, during the 27 years preceding the date of adoption of this resolution, more than 6,082,300 wreaths have been sent to locations, including national cemeteries and veterans memorials, in every State and overseas;

Whereas the mission of the Wreaths Across America project, to “Remember, Honor, Teach”, is carried out in part by coordinating wreath-laying ceremonies in all 50 States and overseas, including at—

- (1) Arlington National Cemetery;
- (2) veterans cemeteries; and
- (3) other memorial locations;

Whereas the Wreaths Across America project carries out a week-long veterans parade between the State of Maine and the Commonwealth of Virginia, stopping along the way to spread a message about the importance of—

- (1) remembering the fallen heroes of the United States;
- (2) honoring those who serve; and
- (3) teaching the next generation of children about—

(A) the service of veterans; and

(B) the sacrifices made by veterans and the families of veterans to preserve the freedoms enjoyed by the people of the United States;

Whereas, in 2017, approximately 1,565,300 veterans' wreaths were delivered to more than 1,422 locations across the United States and overseas, an increase of more than 200 locations compared to the previous year;

Whereas, in December 2018, the tradition of escorting tractor-trailers filled with donated wreaths from Maine to Arlington National Cemetery will be continued by—

- (1) the Patriot Guard Riders; and
- (2) other patriotic escort units, including—
 - (A) motorcycle units;
 - (B) law enforcement units; and
 - (C) first responder units;

Whereas hundreds of thousands of individuals volunteer each December to help lay veterans' wreaths;

Whereas, in 2018, the trucking industry in the United States will continue to support the Wreaths Across America project by providing drivers, equipment, and related services to assist in the transportation of wreaths across the United States to more than 1,500 locations;

Whereas the Senate designated December 16, 2017, as “Wreaths Across America Day”; and

Whereas, on December 15, 2018, the Wreaths Across America project will continue the proud legacy of bringing veterans' wreaths to Arlington National Cemetery: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates December 15, 2018, as “Wreaths Across America Day”;

(2) honors—

(A) the Wreaths Across America project;

(B) patriotic escort units, including—

(i) motorcycle units;

(ii) law enforcement units; and

(iii) first responder units;

(C) the trucking industry in the United States; and

(D) the volunteers and donors involved in this worthy tradition; and

(3) recognizes—

(A) the service of veterans and members of the Armed Forces; and

(B) the sacrifices that veterans, members of the Armed Forces, and the families of veterans and members of the Armed Forces have made, and continue to make, for the United States, a great nation.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined by my colleague Senator ANGUS KING in sponsoring this resolution to designate December 15, 2018, as Wreaths Across America Day. Throughout human history, the evergreen wreath has been offered as a tribute to heroes. On December 15, we gather to offer this enduring symbol of valor and sacrifice to America’s heroes. In this season of giving, we pay tribute to those who have given us the most precious gift of all, our freedom.

Some who secured that gift did not return home. Some did return but have since passed on. Some remain missing but will never be forgotten. Many still live in honor among us.

We here at home must always respect their service. Often, we do this on those special days we set aside each year—Memorial Day, the Fourth of July, and Veterans Day. Sometimes, we do this spontaneously because our hearts, rather than our calendars, tell us to. That is the origin of Wreaths Across America.

Twenty-six Christmases ago, Morrill and Karen Worcester took time during their busiest season to donate and deliver 5,000 wreaths from their company in Harrington, Maine, to Arlington National Cemetery to mark the graves of fallen heroes. The people of Maine are proud that this heartfelt expression of America’s gratitude began in our State, and I congratulate Karen and Morrill for being awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor Society’s Patriot Award this April, the highest award the Society can bestow to civilians.

In the years since, that heartfelt gesture became a national phenomenon and an American tradition. More than six million wreaths have been laid by tens of thousands of volunteers at more than 600 cemeteries, here and abroad, and even on ships at sea. This remarkable effort is made possible by trucking companies across the Nation who donate their services and by the generosity of thousands of volunteers and supporters. With the Patriot Guard escort, the convoy from Maine to Washington is greeted at every stop along the way by grateful citizens of all ages. On December 15—after months of hard work, careful planning, and generous

donations—wreaths will be laid where American heroes lie at rest.

This year, for the first time, more than 9,300 Maine-made balsam wreaths will mark the headstones of all American service members laid to rest at the Normandy American Cemetery in France. It has been nearly 75 years since our brave troops stormed those beaches to liberate Europe but they will never be forgotten.

Wreaths Across America honors our departed heroes, but it does even more. It tells our veterans that we honor their service. It tells our men and women in uniform today that we are grateful for their courage and devotion to duty. It tells the families of those serving our country that they are in our thoughts and prayers. And it tells the families of the fallen that we share their grief.

The mission of Wreaths Across America is: Remember, Honor, Teach. Thanks to the spirit of this Maine-made tradition, we remember and honor America’s veterans, while also teaching the generations to come of the sacrifices that have been made to secure a future of peace and liberty. May God bless these heroes, and may God bless America.

SENATE RESOLUTION 720—EX-PRESSING THE CONDOLENCES OF THE SENATE AND HONORING THE MEMORY OF THE VICTIMS OF THE SHOOTING AT MERCY HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL CENTER IN CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, ON NOVEMBER 19, 2018

Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 720

Whereas on November 19, 2018, a gunman opened fire in the parking lot and lobby of Mercy Hospital and Medical Center in Chicago, Illinois;

Whereas the gunman took the lives of 3 individuals who had dedicated themselves to serving others as members of the law enforcement and medical communities;

Whereas Chicago Police Officer Samuel Jimenez, age 28, of the Second Police District, responded to the emergency call with bravery and made the ultimate sacrifice in an effort to protect the lives of others;

Whereas Chicago Police Superintendent Eddie Johnson said that—

(1) Officer Jimenez and the other officers who responded to the shooting “did what heroic officers always do—they ran toward the gunfire”; and

(2) the actions of Officer Jimenez and the other officers who responded to the shooting “saved a lot of lives”;

Whereas Officer Jimenez was—

(1) a dedicated law enforcement officer;

(2) a loving husband; and

(3) a loving father of 3 young children;

Whereas Officer Jimenez was the second police officer of the Chicago Police Department to be fatally shot in the line of duty in 2018, after Commander Paul R. Bauer, the commander of the 18th Police District, was fatally shot while attempting to apprehend an armed suspect on February 13;

Whereas Dr. Tamara O’Neal, age 38, a physician at Mercy Hospital and Medical Center,

was fatally shot by the gunman in the hospital parking lot;

Whereas Dr. O’Neal, a graduate of the University of Illinois College of Medicine, had worked in the emergency department at Mercy Hospital and Medical Center treating others and was devoted to her church and to charitable causes;

Whereas Dr. O’Neal was described by the director of the emergency department at Mercy Hospital and Medical Center as a “wonderful individual” who was “dedicated to caring for her community”;

Whereas Dayna Less, age 24, a pharmacist at Mercy Hospital and Medical Center, was fatally shot by the gunman;

Whereas Ms. Less, a graduate of Purdue University, had overcome health challenges as a youth and had decided to become a pharmacist to help serve the health needs of others;

Whereas Ms. Less, who was engaged to be married to her childhood sweetheart, was described by her father as “the strongest person I know”;

Whereas the city of Chicago suffers from our nation’s epidemic of gun violence, with nearly 2,700 people killed or injured by gunfire in Chicago in 2018;

Whereas the medical community in the United States works tirelessly every day to provide professional and dedicated care to individuals affected by gun violence across the nation;

Whereas the law enforcement community in the United States works tirelessly every day to respond to incidents of gun violence and protect others from harm at the risk of their own safety; and

Whereas the nation owes a debt of gratitude to members of the law enforcement and medical communities in Chicago and across the United States for the service they provide in helping others, including in the response to the shooting at Mercy Hospital and Medical Center on November 19, 2018: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses sincere condolences to the families, friends, and loved ones of Officer Samuel Jimenez, Dr. Tamara O’Neal, and Dayna Less, the victims of the tragic shooting on November 19, 2018, at Mercy Hospital and Medical Center in Chicago, Illinois;

(2) honors the lives and memory of the victims, with gratitude for the service the victims provided as members of the law enforcement and medical communities;

(3) extends support to the individuals subjected to the trauma of the shooting;

(4) thanks the law enforcement officers, medical personnel, emergency responders, and Mercy Hospital and Medical Center workers who responded to the shooting with professionalism, dedication, and bravery; and

(5) stands in solidarity with the victims of senseless gun violence in Chicago and in communities across the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 721—DESIGNATING THE WEEK BEGINNING ON OCTOBER 21, 2018, AS “NATIONAL CHEMISTRY WEEK”

Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 721

Whereas chemistry is the science of basic units of matter and, consequently, plays a role in every aspect of human life;

Whereas chemistry has broad applications, including food science, soil science, water quality, energy, sustainability, medicine, and electronics;

Whereas the science of chemistry is vital to improving the quality of human life and plays an important role in addressing critical global challenges;

Whereas innovations in chemistry continue to spur economic growth and job creation and have applications for a wide range of industries;

Whereas National Chemistry Week is part of a broader vision to improve human life through chemistry and to advance the chemistry enterprise and the practitioners of that enterprise for the benefit of communities and the environment;

Whereas the purpose of National Chemistry Week is to reach the public with educational messages about chemistry in order to foster greater understanding of and appreciation for the applications and benefits of chemistry;

Whereas National Chemistry Week strives to stimulate the interest of young people, including women and underrepresented groups, in enthusiastically studying science, technology, engineering, and mathematics and in pursuing science-related careers that lead to innovations and major scientific breakthroughs;

Whereas National Chemistry Week highlights many of the everyday uses of chemistry, including in food, dyes and pigments, plastics, soaps and detergents, health products, and energy technologies;

Whereas the theme of the 31st annual National Chemistry Week is “Chemistry is out of this world!”, which highlights the role of chemistry in the study of the chemical compositions of and processes relating to stars, planets, comets, and interstellar media; and

Whereas students who participate in National Chemistry Week deserve recognition and support for their efforts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week beginning on October 21, 2018, as “National Chemistry Week”;

(2) supports the goals of and welcomes the participants in the 31st annual National Chemistry Week;

(3) recognizes the need to promote the fields of science, including chemistry, technology, engineering, and mathematics, and to encourage youth to pursue careers in these fields; and

(4) commends the American Chemical Society and the partners of that society for organizing and convening events and activities surrounding National Chemistry Week each year.

SENATE RESOLUTION 722—DESIGNATING OCTOBER 26, 2018, AS “DAY OF THE DEPLOYED”

Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. PETERS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 722

Whereas more than 2,100,000 individuals serve as members of the Armed Forces of the United States;

Whereas several hundred thousand members of the Armed Forces rotate each year through deployments to more than 150 countries in every region of the world;

Whereas several million members of the Armed Forces have deployed to the area of operations of the United States Central Command since the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks;

Whereas the United States is kept strong and free by the loyal military personnel from the total force (the regular components, the National Guard, and the Reserves), who pro-

tect the precious heritage of the United States through their declarations and actions;

Whereas members of the Armed Forces serving at home and abroad have courageously answered the call to duty to defend the ideals of the United States and to preserve peace and freedom around the world;

Whereas the United States remains committed to easing the transition from deployment abroad to service at home for members of the Armed Forces and the families of the members;

Whereas members of the Armed Forces personify the virtues of patriotism, service, duty, courage, and sacrifice;

Whereas the families of members of the Armed Forces make important and significant sacrifices for the United States; and

Whereas the Senate designated October 26 as “Day of the Deployed” in 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, and 2017: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates October 26, 2018, as “Day of the Deployed”;

(2) honors the deployed members of the Armed Forces of the United States and the families of the members;

(3) calls on the people of the United States to reflect on the service of those members of the Armed Forces, wherever the members serve, past, present, and future; and

(4) encourages the people of the United States to observe the Day of the Deployed with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 723—CONGRATULATING THE AMERICAN COLLEGE OF EMERGENCY PHYSICIANS ON ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. CASIDY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 723

Whereas the American College of Emergency Physicians is the oldest and largest national medical specialty organization representing physicians who practice emergency medicine;

Whereas the American College of Emergency Physicians was founded in 1968 in Lansing, Michigan by 8 physicians and has grown to represent more than 37,000 members belonging to 53 chapters, including 1 chapter in each State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia and the Government Services Chapter that represents emergency physicians employed by branches of the military and other Government agencies;

Whereas emergency physicians treat more than 141,000,000 patients each year;

Whereas “Anyone, Anything, Anytime” is the approach of emergency physicians who provide diagnosis and treatment services in the health care system 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year;

Whereas emergency physicians are critical to the ability of the United States to respond to disasters and mass casualty events;

Whereas quick thinking and smart decisions by emergency physicians can save many lives every year;

Whereas emergency physicians are leaders in defining, evaluating, and improving quality emergency care, focusing on individual patients while advocating for the wellness of society as a whole;

Whereas emergency medicine was recognized in 1979 by the American Board of Medical Specialties as the 23rd medical specialty in the United States;

Whereas the American College of Emergency Physicians is a leading continuing education source for emergency physicians and a primary information resource on developments in the specialty of emergency medicine; and

Whereas the development of physicians specializing in emergency care has contributed greatly to the health and well-being of all the people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the American College of Emergency Physicians on its 50th anniversary;

(2) recognizes the accomplishments and contributions emergency physicians have made to advance the health care system in the United States; and

(3) reaffirms the value of emergency medicine and the vital role that emergency physicians serve in ensuring the health and well-being of their patients.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 4073. Mr. PERDUE (for Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. NELSON)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1092, to protect the right of law-abiding citizens to transport knives interstate, notwithstanding a patchwork of local and State prohibitions.

SA 4074. Mr. PERDUE (for Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. COONS)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2961, to reauthorize subtitle A of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990.

SA 4075. Mr. PERDUE (for Mr. GRASSLEY) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 6964, to reauthorize and improve the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, and for other purposes.

SA 4076. Mr. PERDUE proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 565, honoring the 40th anniversary of Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay in Kings Bay, Georgia.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 4073. Mr. PERDUE (for Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. NELSON)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1092, to protect the right of law-abiding citizens to transport knives interstate, notwithstanding a patchwork of local and State prohibitions; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Interstate Transport Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF KNIVES.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this Act, the term “transport”—

(1) includes staying in temporary lodging overnight, common carrier misrouting or delays, stops for food, fuel, vehicle maintenance, emergencies, or medical treatment, and any other activity related to the journey of a person; and

(2) does not include transport of a knife with the intent to commit an offense punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year involving the use or threatened use of force against another person, or with knowledge, or reasonable cause to believe, that such an offense is to be committed in the course of, or arising from, the journey.

(b) TRANSPORT OF KNIVES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of any law or any rule or regulation of a State or any political subdivision thereof, a person who is not otherwise

prohibited by any Federal law from possessing, transporting, shipping, or receiving a knife shall be entitled to transport a knife for any lawful purpose from any place where the person may lawfully possess, carry, or transport the knife to any other place where the person may lawfully possess, carry, or transport the knife if—

(A) in the case of transport by motor vehicle, the knife—

(i) is not directly accessible from the passenger compartment of the motor vehicle; or

(ii) in the case of a motor vehicle without a compartment separate from the passenger compartment, is contained in a locked container other than the glove compartment or console; and

(B) in the case of transport by means other than a motor vehicle, including any transport over land or on or through water, the knife is contained in a locked container.

(2) LIMITATION.—This subsection shall not apply to the transport of a knife or tool in the cabin of a passenger aircraft subject to the rules and regulations of the Transportation Security Administration.

(c) EMERGENCY KNIVES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A person—

(A) may carry in the passenger compartment of a mode of transportation a knife or tool—

(i) the blades of which consist only of a blunt tipped safety blade, a guarded blade, or both; and

(ii) that is specifically designed for enabling escape in an emergency by cutting safety belts; and

(B) shall not be required to secure a knife or tool described in subparagraph (A) in a locked container.

(2) LIMITATION.—This subsection shall not apply to the transport of a knife or tool in the cabin of a passenger aircraft subject to the rules and regulations of the Transportation Security Administration.

(d) NO ARREST.—A person who is transporting a knife in compliance with this section may not be arrested for violation of any law, rule, or regulation of a State or political subdivision of a State related to the possession, transport, or carrying of a knife, unless there is probable cause to believe that the person is not in compliance with subsection (b).

(e) COSTS.—If a person who asserts this section as a claim or defense in a civil or criminal action or proceeding is a prevailing party on the claim or defense, the court shall award costs and reasonable attorney's fees incurred by the person.

(f) EXPUNGEMENT.—If a person who asserts this section as a claim or defense in a criminal proceeding is a prevailing party on the claim or defense, the court shall enter an order that directs that there be expunged from all official records all references to—

(1) the arrest of the person for the offense as to which the claim or defense was asserted;

(2) the institution of any criminal proceedings against the person relating to such offense; and

(3) the results of the proceedings, if any.

(g) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit any right to possess, carry, or transport a knife under applicable State law.

SA 4074. Mr. PERDUE (for Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. COONS)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2961, to reauthorize subtitle A of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990; as follows:

On page 28, line 3, strike "\$19,000,000" and insert "\$16,000,000".

On page 28, line 7, strike "\$6,000,000" and insert "\$5,000,000".

SA 4075. Mr. PERDUE (for Mr. GRASSLEY) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 6964, to reauthorize and improve the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2018".

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Table of contents.

Sec. 3. Application of amendments.

TITLE I—DECLARATION OF PURPOSE AND DEFINITIONS

Sec. 101. Purposes.

Sec. 102. Definitions.

TITLE II—CHARLES GRASSLEY JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION PROGRAM

Sec. 201. Concentration of Federal efforts.

Sec. 202. Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Sec. 203. Annual report.

Sec. 204. Allocation of funds.

Sec. 205. State plans.

Sec. 206. Repeal of juvenile delinquency prevention block grant program.

Sec. 207. Research and evaluation; statistical analyses; information dissemination.

Sec. 208. Training and technical assistance.

Sec. 209. Administrative authority.

TITLE III—INCENTIVE GRANTS FOR PRISON REDUCTION THROUGH OPPORTUNITIES, MENTORING, INTERVENTION, SUPPORT, AND EDUCATION

Sec. 301. Short Title.

Sec. 302. Definitions.

Sec. 303. Duties and functions of the administrator.

Sec. 304. Grants for delinquency prevention programs.

Sec. 305. Grants for tribal delinquency prevention and response programs.

Sec. 306. Evaluation by Government Accountability Office.

Sec. 307. Technical amendment.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 401. Evaluation by Government Accountability Office.

Sec. 402. Authorization of appropriations; accountability and oversight.

SEC. 3. APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.

The amendments made by this Act shall not apply with respect to funds appropriated for any fiscal year that begins before the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE I—DECLARATION OF PURPOSE AND DEFINITIONS

SEC. 101. PURPOSES.

Section 102 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (34 U.S.C. 11102) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting ", tribal," after "State";

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting ", tribal," after "State"; and

(B) by striking "and" at the end;

(3) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

"(3) to assist State, tribal, and local governments in addressing juvenile crime through the provision of technical assistance, research, training, evaluation, and the dissemination of current and relevant information on effective and evidence-based pro-

grams and practices for combating juvenile delinquency; and"; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

"(4) to support a continuum of evidence-based or promising programs (including delinquency prevention, intervention, mental health, behavioral health and substance abuse treatment, family services, and services for children exposed to violence) that are trauma informed, reflect the science of adolescent development, and are designed to meet the needs of at-risk youth and youth who come into contact with the justice system.".

SEC. 102. DEFINITIONS.

Section 103 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (34 U.S.C. 11103) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8)—

(A) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by adding "or" at the end;

(B) by striking subparagraph (C); and

(C) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (C);

(2) in paragraph (18)—

(A) by inserting "for purposes of title II," before "the term"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"that has a law enforcement function, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior in consultation with the Attorney General;";

(3) by amending paragraph (22) to read as follows:

"(22) the term 'jail or lockup for adults' means a secure facility that is used by a State, unit of local government, or law enforcement authority to detain or confine adult inmates;";

(4) by amending paragraph (25) to read as follows:

"(25) the term 'sight or sound contact' means any physical, clear visual, or verbal contact that is not brief and inadvertent;";

(5) by amending paragraph (26) to read as follows:

"(26) the term 'adult inmate'—

"(A) means an individual who—

"(i) has reached the age of full criminal responsibility under applicable State law; and

"(ii) has been arrested and is in custody for or awaiting trial on a criminal charge, or is convicted of a criminal offense; and

"(B) does not include an individual who—

"(i) at the time of the offense, was younger than the maximum age at which a youth can be held in a juvenile facility under applicable State law; and

"(ii) was committed to the care and custody or supervision, including post-placement or parole supervision, of a juvenile correctional agency by a court of competent jurisdiction or by operation of applicable State law;";

(6) in paragraph (28), by striking "and" at the end;

(7) in paragraph (29), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(8) by adding at the end the following:

"(30) the term 'core requirements'—

"(A) means the requirements described in paragraphs (11), (12), (13), and (15) of section 223(a); and

"(B) does not include the data collection requirements described in subparagraphs (A) through (K) of section 207(1);

"(31) the term 'chemical agent' means a spray or injection used to temporarily incapacitate a person, including oleoresin capsicum spray, tear gas, and 2-chlorobenzalmalononitrile gas;

"(32) the term 'isolation'—

"(A) means any instance in which a youth is confined alone for more than 15 minutes in a room or cell; and

"(B) does not include—

"(i) confinement during regularly scheduled sleeping hours;

“(ii) separation based on a treatment program approved by a licensed medical or mental health professional;

“(iii) confinement or separation that is requested by the youth; or

“(iv) the separation of the youth from a group in a nonlocked setting for the limited purpose of calming;

“(33) the term ‘restraints’ has the meaning given that term in section 591 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 2901i);

“(34) the term ‘evidence-based’ means a program or practice that—

“(A) is demonstrated to be effective when implemented with fidelity;

“(B) is based on a clearly articulated and empirically supported theory;

“(C) has measurable outcomes relevant to juvenile justice, including a detailed description of the outcomes produced in a particular population, whether urban or rural; and

“(D) has been scientifically tested and proven effective through randomized control studies or comparison group studies and with the ability to replicate and scale;

“(35) the term ‘promising’ means a program or practice that—

“(A) is demonstrated to be effective based on positive outcomes relevant to juvenile justice from one or more objective, independent, and scientifically valid evaluations, as documented in writing to the Administrator; and

“(B) will be evaluated through a well-designed and rigorous study, as described in paragraph (34)(D);

“(36) the term ‘dangerous practice’ means an act, procedure, or program that creates an unreasonable risk of physical injury, pain, or psychological harm to a juvenile subjected to the act, procedure, or program;

“(37) the term ‘screening’ means a brief process—

“(A) designed to identify youth who may have mental health, behavioral health, substance abuse, or other needs requiring immediate attention, intervention, and further evaluation; and

“(B) the purpose of which is to quickly identify a youth with possible mental health, behavioral health, substance abuse, or other needs in need of further assessment;

“(38) the term ‘assessment’ includes, at a minimum, an interview and review of available records and other pertinent information—

“(A) by an appropriately trained professional who is licensed or certified by the applicable State in the mental health, behavioral health, or substance abuse fields; and

“(B) which is designed to identify significant mental health, behavioral health, or substance abuse treatment needs to be addressed during a youth’s confinement;

“(39) for purposes of section 223(a)(15), the term ‘contact’ means the points at which a youth and the juvenile justice system or criminal justice system officially intersect, including interactions with a juvenile justice, juvenile court, or law enforcement official;

“(40) the term ‘trauma-informed’ means—

“(A) understanding the impact that exposure to violence and trauma have on a youth’s physical, psychological, and psychosocial development;

“(B) recognizing when a youth has been exposed to violence and trauma and is in need of help to recover from the adverse impacts of trauma; and

“(C) responding in ways that resist re-traumatization;

“(41) the term ‘racial and ethnic disparity’ means minority youth populations are involved at a decision point in the juvenile justice system at disproportionately higher

rates than non-minority youth at that decision point;

“(42) the term ‘status offender’ means a juvenile who is charged with or who has committed an offense that would not be criminal if committed by an adult;

“(43) the term ‘rural’ means an area that is not located in a metropolitan statistical area, as defined by the Office of Management and Budget;

“(44) the term ‘internal controls’ means a process implemented to provide reasonable assurance regarding the achievement of objectives in—

“(A) effectiveness and efficiency of operations, such as grant management practices;

“(B) reliability of reporting for internal and external use; and

“(C) compliance with applicable laws and regulations, as well as recommendations of the Office of Inspector General and the Government Accountability Office; and

“(45) the term ‘tribal government’ means the governing body of an Indian Tribe.”

TITLE II—CHARLES GRASSLEY JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION PROGRAM

SEC. 201. CONCENTRATION OF FEDERAL EFFORTS.

Section 204 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (34 U.S.C. 11114) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), in the first sentence—

(i) by striking “a long-term plan, and implement” and inserting the following: “a long-term plan to improve the juvenile justice system in the United States, taking into account scientific knowledge regarding adolescent development and behavior and regarding the effects of delinquency prevention programs and juvenile justice interventions on adolescents, and shall implement”; and

(ii) by striking “research, and improvement of the juvenile justice system in the United States” and inserting “and research”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “Federal Register” and all that follows and inserting “Federal Register during the 30-day period ending on October 1 of each year.”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking paragraph (7);

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (5) and (6) as paragraphs (6) and (7), respectively;

(C) by inserting after paragraph (4), the following:

“(5) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2018, in consultation with Indian Tribes, develop a policy for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention to collaborate with representatives of Indian Tribes with a criminal justice function on the implementation of the provisions of this Act relating to Indian Tribes.”;

(D) in paragraph (6), as so redesignated, by adding “and” at the end; and

(E) in paragraph (7), as so redesignated—

(i) by striking “monitoring”;

(ii) by striking “section 223(a)(15)” and inserting “section 223(a)(14)”;

(iii) by striking “to review the adequacy of such systems; and” and inserting “for monitoring compliance.”

SEC. 202. COORDINATING COUNCIL ON JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION.

Section 206 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (34 U.S.C. 11116) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting “the Assistant Secretary for Mental Health and Substance Use, the Secretary of the Interior,” after “the Secretary of Health and Human Services.”; and

(ii) by striking “Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization” and inserting “Assistant Secretary for Immigration and Customs Enforcement”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “United States” and inserting “Federal Government”; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “paragraphs (12)(A), (13), and (14) of section 223(a) of this title” and inserting “the core requirements”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “, on an annual basis” after “collectively”; and

(ii) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) not later than 120 days after the completion of the last meeting of the Council during any fiscal year, submit to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a report that—

“(i) contains the recommendations described in subparagraph (A);

“(ii) includes a detailed account of the activities conducted by the Council during the fiscal year, including a complete detailed accounting of expenses incurred by the Council to conduct operations in accordance with this section;

“(iii) is published on the websites of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the Council, and the Department of Justice; and

“(iv) is in addition to the annual report required under section 207.”

SEC. 203. ANNUAL REPORT.

Section 207 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (34 U.S.C. 11117) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “a fiscal year” and inserting “each fiscal year”;

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and gender” and inserting “, gender, and ethnicity, as such term is defined by the Bureau of the Census.”;

(B) in subparagraph (E), by striking “and” at the end;

(C) in subparagraph (F)—

(i) by inserting “and other” before “disabilities.”; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) a summary of data from 1 month of the applicable fiscal year of the use of restraints and isolation upon juveniles held in the custody of secure detention and correctional facilities operated by a State or unit of local government;

“(H) the number of status offense cases petitioned to court, number of status offenders held in secure detention, the findings used to justify the use of secure detention, and the average period of time a status offender was held in secure detention;

“(I) the number of juveniles released from custody and the type of living arrangement to which they are released;

“(J) the number of juveniles whose offense originated on school grounds, during school-sponsored off-campus activities, or due to a referral by a school official, as collected and reported by the Department of Education or similar State educational agency; and

“(K) the number of juveniles in the custody of secure detention and correctional facilities operated by a State or unit of local or tribal government who report being pregnant.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) A description of the criteria used to determine what programs qualify as evidence-based and promising programs under this title and title V and a comprehensive list of those programs the Administrator has determined meet such criteria in both rural and urban areas.

“(6) A description of funding provided to Indian Tribes under this Act or for a juvenile delinquency or prevention program under the Tribal Law and Order Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–211; 124 Stat. 2261), including direct Federal grants and funding provided to Indian Tribes through a State or unit of local government.

“(7) An analysis and evaluation of the internal controls at the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention to determine if grantees are following the requirements of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention grant programs and what remedial action the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention has taken to recover any grant funds that are expended in violation of the grant programs, including instances—

“(A) in which supporting documentation was not provided for cost reports;

“(B) where unauthorized expenditures occurred; or

“(C) where subrecipients of grant funds were not compliant with program requirements.

“(8) An analysis and evaluation of the total amount of payments made to grantees that the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention recouped from grantees that were found to be in violation of policies and procedures of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention grant programs, including—

“(A) the full name and location of the grantee;

“(B) the violation of the program found;

“(C) the amount of funds sought to be recouped by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention; and

“(D) the actual amount recouped by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.”

SEC. 204. ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.

(a) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 221(b)(1) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (34 U.S.C. 11131(b)(1)) is amended by striking “2 percent” and inserting “5 percent”.

(b) OTHER ALLOCATIONS.—Section 222 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (34 U.S.C. 11132) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “age eighteen” and inserting “18 years of age, based on the most recent data available from the Bureau of the Census”; and

(B) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3) and inserting the following:

“(2)(A) If the aggregate amount appropriated for a fiscal year to carry out this title is less than \$75,000,000, then—

“(i) the amount allocated to each State other than a State described in clause (ii) for that fiscal year shall be not less than \$400,000; and

“(ii) the amount allocated to the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands for that fiscal year shall be not less than \$75,000.

“(B) If the aggregate amount appropriated for a fiscal year to carry out this title is not less than \$75,000,000, then—

“(i) the amount allocated to each State other than a State described in clause (ii) for that fiscal year shall be not less than \$600,000; and

“(ii) the amount allocated to the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American

Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands for that fiscal year shall be not less than \$100,000.”;

(2) in subsection (c), by striking “efficient administration, including monitoring, evaluation, and one full-time staff position” and inserting “effective and efficient administration of funds, including the designation of not less than one individual who shall coordinate efforts to achieve and sustain compliance with the core requirements and certify whether the State is in compliance with such requirements”; and

(3) in subsection (d), by striking “5 percent of the minimum” and inserting “not more than 5 percent of the”.

(c) CHARLES GRASSLEY JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION PROGRAM.—Part B of title II of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (34 U.S.C. 11131 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in the part heading, by striking “FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS” and inserting “CHARLES GRASSLEY JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION PROGRAM”; and

(2) by inserting before section 221 the following:

“SHORT TITLE

“SEC. 220. This part may be cited as the ‘Charles Grassley Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Program’.”

SEC. 205. STATE PLANS.

Section 223 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (34 U.S.C. 11133) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “and shall describe the status of compliance with State plan requirements.” and inserting “and shall describe how the State plan is supported by or takes account of scientific knowledge regarding adolescent development and behavior and regarding the effects of delinquency prevention programs and juvenile justice interventions on adolescents. Not later than 60 days after the date on which a plan or amended plan submitted under this subsection is finalized, a State shall make the plan or amended plan publicly available by posting the plan or amended plan on the State’s publicly available website.”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking “described in section 299(c)(1)” and inserting “as designated by the chief executive officer of the State”;

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in clause (i), by inserting “adolescent development,” after “concerning”;

(II) in clause (ii)—

(aa) in subclause (III), by striking “mental health, education, special education” and inserting “child and adolescent mental health, education, child and adolescent substance abuse, special education, services for youth with disabilities”;

(bb) in subclause (V), by striking “delinquents or potential delinquents” and inserting “delinquent youth or youth at risk of delinquency”;

(cc) in subclause (VI), by striking “youth workers involved with” and inserting “representatives of”;

(dd) in subclause (VII), by striking “and” at the end;

(ee) by striking subclause (VIII) and inserting the following:

“(VIII) persons, licensed or certified by the applicable State, with expertise and competence in preventing and addressing mental health and substance abuse needs in delinquent youth and youth at risk of delinquency;

“(IX) representatives of victim or witness advocacy groups, including at least one indi-

vidual with expertise in addressing the challenges of sexual abuse and exploitation and trauma, particularly the needs of youth who experience disproportionate levels of sexual abuse, exploitation, and trauma before entering the juvenile justice system; and

“(X) for a State in which one or more Indian Tribes are located, an Indian tribal representative (if such representative is available) or other individual with significant expertise in tribal law enforcement and juvenile justice in Indian tribal communities”;

(III) in clause (iv), by striking “24 at the time of appointment” and inserting “28 at the time of initial appointment”; and

(IV) in clause (v) by inserting “or, if not feasible and in appropriate circumstances, who is the parent or guardian of someone who has been or is currently under the jurisdiction of the juvenile justice system” after “juvenile justice system”;

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “30 days” and inserting “45 days”;

(iii) in subparagraph (D)—

(I) in clause (i), by striking “and” at the end; and

(II) in clause (ii), by striking “at least annually recommendations regarding State compliance with the requirements of paragraphs (11), (12), and (13)” and inserting “at least every 2 years a report and necessary recommendations regarding State compliance with the core requirements”; and

(iv) in subparagraph (E)—

(I) in clause (i), by adding “and” at the end; and

(II) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(D) in paragraph (5)(C), by striking “Indian tribes” and all that follows through “applicable to the detention and confinement of juveniles” and inserting “Indian Tribes that agree to attempt to comply with the core requirements applicable to the detention and confinement of juveniles”;

(E) in paragraph (7)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “performing law enforcement functions” and inserting “has jurisdiction”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in clause (iii), by striking “and” at the end; and

(II) by striking clause (iv) and inserting the following:

“(iv) a plan to provide alternatives to detention for status offenders, survivors of commercial sexual exploitation, and others, where appropriate, such as specialized or problem-solving courts or diversion to home-based or community-based services or treatment for those youth in need of mental health, substance abuse, or co-occurring disorder services at the time such juveniles first come into contact with the juvenile justice system;

“(v) a plan to reduce the number of children housed in secure detention and corrections facilities who are awaiting placement in residential treatment programs;

“(vi) a plan to engage family members, where appropriate, in the design and delivery of juvenile delinquency prevention and treatment services, particularly post-placement;

“(vii) a plan to use community-based services to respond to the needs of at-risk youth or youth who have come into contact with the juvenile justice system;

“(viii) a plan to promote evidence-based and trauma-informed programs and practices; and

“(ix) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2018, a plan which shall be implemented not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2018, to—

“(I) eliminate the use of restraints of known pregnant juveniles housed in secure

juvenile detention and correction facilities, during labor, delivery, and post-partum recovery, unless credible, reasonable grounds exist to believe the detainee presents an immediate and serious threat of hurting herself, staff, or others; and

“(II) eliminate the use of abdominal restraints, leg and ankle restraints, wrist restraints behind the back, and four-point restraints on known pregnant juveniles, unless—

“(aa) credible, reasonable grounds exist to believe the detainee presents an immediate and serious threat of hurting herself, staff, or others; or

“(bb) reasonable grounds exist to believe the detainee presents an immediate and credible risk of escape that cannot be reasonably minimized through any other method;”;

(F) in paragraph (8), by striking “existing” and inserting “evidence-based and promising”;

(G) in paragraph (9)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “, with priority in funding given to entities meeting the criteria for evidence-based or promising programs” after “used for”;

(ii) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in clause (i)—

(aa) by inserting “status offenders and other” before “youth who need”; and

(bb) by striking “and” at the end;

(II) in clause (ii) by adding “and” at the end; and

(III) by inserting after clause (ii) the following:

“(iii) for youth who need specialized intensive and comprehensive services that address the unique issues encountered by youth when they become involved with gangs;”;

(iii) in subparagraph (B)(i)—

(I) by striking “parents and other family members” and inserting “status offenders, other youth, and the parents and other family members of such offenders and youth”; and

(II) by striking “be retained” and inserting “remain”;

(iv) in subparagraph (E)—

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “delinquent” and inserting “at-risk or delinquent youth”; and

(II) in clause (i), by inserting “, including for truancy prevention and reduction” before the semicolon;

(v) in subparagraph (F), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “expanding” and inserting “programs to expand”;

(vi) by redesignating subparagraphs (G) through (S) as subparagraphs (H) through (T), respectively;

(vii) by inserting after subparagraph (F), the following:

“(G) programs—

“(i) to ensure youth have access to appropriate legal representation; and

“(ii) to expand access to publicly supported, court-appointed legal counsel who are trained to represent juveniles in adjudication proceedings,

except that the State may not use more than 2 percent of the funds received under section 222 for these purposes;”;

(viii) in subparagraph (H), as so redesignated, by striking “State,” each place the term appears and inserting “State, tribal.”;

(ix) in subparagraph (M), as so redesignated—

(I) in clause (i)—

(aa) by inserting “pre-adjudication and” before “post-adjudication”;

(bb) by striking “restraints” and inserting “alternatives”; and

(cc) by inserting “specialized or problem-solving courts,” after “(including); and

(II) in clause (ii)—

(aa) by striking “by the provision by the Administrator”; and

(bb) by striking “to States”;

(x) in subparagraph (N), as so redesignated—

(I) by inserting “and reduce the risk of recidivism” after “families”; and

(II) by striking “so that such juveniles may be retained in their homes”;

(xi) in subparagraph (S), as so redesignated, by striking “and” at the end;

(xii) in subparagraph (T), as so redesignated—

(I) by inserting “or co-occurring disorder” after “mental health”;

(II) by inserting “court-involved or” before “incarcerated”;

(III) by striking “suspected to be”;

(IV) by striking “and discharge plans” and inserting “provision of treatment, and development of discharge plans”; and

(V) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(xiii) by inserting after subparagraph (T) the following:

“(U) programs and projects designed—

“(i) to inform juveniles of the opportunity and process for sealing and expunging juvenile records; and

“(ii) to assist juveniles in pursuing juvenile record sealing and expungements for both adjudications and arrests not followed by adjudications;

except that the State may not use more than 22 percent of the funds received under section 222 for these purposes;

“(V) programs that address the needs of girls in or at risk of entering the juvenile justice system, including pregnant girls, young mothers, survivors of commercial sexual exploitation or domestic child sex trafficking, girls with disabilities, and girls of color, including girls who are members of an Indian Tribe; and

“(W) monitoring for compliance with the core requirements and providing training and technical assistance on the core requirements to secure facilities;”;

(H) by striking paragraph (11) and inserting the following:

“(11)(A) in accordance with rules issued by the Administrator, provide that a juvenile shall not be placed in a secure detention facility or a secure correctional facility, if—

“(i) the juvenile is charged with or has committed an offense that would not be criminal if committed by an adult, excluding—

“(I) a juvenile who is charged with or has committed a violation of section 922(x)(2) of title 18, United States Code, or of a similar State law;

“(II) a juvenile who is charged with or has committed a violation of a valid court order issued and reviewed in accordance with paragraph (23); and

“(III) a juvenile who is held in accordance with the Interstate Compact on Juveniles as enacted by the State; or

“(ii) the juvenile—

“(I) is not charged with any offense; and

“(II)(aa) is an alien; or

“(bb) is alleged to be dependent, neglected, or abused; and

“(B) require that—

“(i) not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2018, unless a court finds, after a hearing and in writing, that it is in the interest of justice, juveniles awaiting trial or other legal process who are treated as adults for purposes of prosecution in criminal court and housed in a secure facility—

“(I) shall not have sight or sound contact with adult inmates; and

“(II) except as provided in paragraph (13), may not be held in any jail or lockup for adults;

“(ii) in determining under clause (i) whether it is in the interest of justice to permit a juvenile to be held in any jail or lockup for adults, or have sight or sound contact with adult inmates, a court shall consider—

“(I) the age of the juvenile;

“(II) the physical and mental maturity of the juvenile;

“(III) the present mental state of the juvenile, including whether the juvenile presents an imminent risk of harm to the juvenile;

“(IV) the nature and circumstances of the alleged offense;

“(V) the juvenile’s history of prior delinquent acts;

“(VI) the relative ability of the available adult and juvenile detention facilities to not only meet the specific needs of the juvenile but also to protect the safety of the public as well as other detained youth; and

“(VII) any other relevant factor; and

“(iii) if a court determines under clause (i) that it is in the interest of justice to permit a juvenile to be held in any jail or lockup for adults—

“(I) the court shall hold a hearing not less frequently than once every 30 days, or in the case of a rural jurisdiction, not less frequently than once every 45 days, to review whether it is still in the interest of justice to permit the juvenile to be so held or have such sight or sound contact; and

“(II) the juvenile shall not be held in any jail or lockup for adults, or permitted to have sight or sound contact with adult inmates, for more than 180 days, unless the court, in writing, determines there is good cause for an extension or the juvenile expressly waives this limitation;”;

(I) in paragraph (12)(A), by striking “contact” and inserting “sight or sound contact”;

(J) in paragraph (13), by striking “contact” each place it appears and inserting “sight or sound contact”;

(K) in paragraph (14)—

(i) by striking “adequate system” and inserting “effective system”;

(ii) by inserting “lock-ups,” after “monitoring jails.”;

(iii) by inserting “and” after “detention facilities.”;

(iv) by striking “, and non-secure facilities”;

(v) by striking “insure” and inserting “ensure”;

(vi) by striking “requirements of paragraphs (11), (12), and (13)” and inserting “core requirements”; and

(vii) by striking “, in the opinion of the Administrator;”;

(L) by striking paragraphs (22) and (27);

(M) by redesignating paragraph (28) as paragraph (27);

(N) by redesignating paragraphs (15) through (21) as paragraphs (16) through (22), respectively;

(O) by inserting after paragraph (14) the following:

“(15) implement policy, practice, and system improvement strategies at the State, territorial, local, and tribal levels, as applicable, to identify and reduce racial and ethnic disparities among youth who come into contact with the juvenile justice system, without establishing or requiring numerical standards or quotas, by—

“(A) establishing or designating existing coordinating bodies, composed of juvenile justice stakeholders, (including representatives of the educational system) at the State, local, or tribal levels, to advise efforts by States, units of local government, and Indian Tribes to reduce racial and ethnic disparities;

“(B) identifying and analyzing data on race and ethnicity at decision points in State, local, or tribal juvenile justice systems to

determine which such points create racial and ethnic disparities among youth who come into contact with the juvenile justice system; and

“(C) developing and implementing a work plan that includes measurable objectives for policy, practice, or other system changes, based on the needs identified in the data collection and analysis under subparagraph (B);”;

(P) in paragraph (16), as so redesignated, by inserting “ethnicity,” after “race.”;

(Q) in paragraph (21), as so redesignated, by striking “local,” each place the term appears and inserting “local, tribal.”;

(R) in paragraph (23)—

(i) in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), by striking “juvenile” each place it appears and inserting “status offender”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(iii) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) in clause (i), by striking “and” at the end;

(II) in clause (ii), by adding “and” at the end; and

(III) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) if such court determines the status offender should be placed in a secure detention facility or correctional facility for violating such order—

“(I) the court shall issue a written order that—

“(aa) identifies the valid court order that has been violated;

“(bb) specifies the factual basis for determining that there is reasonable cause to believe that the status offender has violated such order;

“(cc) includes findings of fact to support a determination that there is no appropriate less restrictive alternative available to placing the status offender in such a facility, with due consideration to the best interest of the juvenile;

“(dd) specifies the length of time, not to exceed 7 days, that the status offender may remain in a secure detention facility or correctional facility, and includes a plan for the status offender’s release from such facility; and

“(ee) may not be renewed or extended; and

“(II) the court may not issue a second or subsequent order described in subclause (I) relating to a status offender unless the status offender violates a valid court order after the date on which the court issues an order described in subclause (I); and”;

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) there are procedures in place to ensure that any status offender held in a secure detention facility or correctional facility pursuant to a court order described in this paragraph does not remain in custody longer than 7 days or the length of time authorized by the court, whichever is shorter;”;

(S) in paragraph (26)—

(i) by inserting “and in accordance with confidentiality concerns,” after “maximum extent practicable.”; and

(ii) by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting the following: “, so as to provide for—

“(A) data in child abuse or neglect reports relating to juveniles entering the juvenile justice system with a prior reported history of arrest, court intake, probation and parole, juvenile detention, and corrections; and

“(B) a plan to use the data described in subparagraph (A) to provide necessary services for the treatment of such victims of child abuse or neglect;”;

(T) in paragraph (27), as so redesignated, by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(U) by adding at the end the following:

“(28) provide for the coordinated use of funds provided under this title with other

Federal and State funds directed at juvenile delinquency prevention and intervention programs;

“(29) describe the policies, procedures, and training in effect for the staff of juvenile State correctional facilities to eliminate the use of dangerous practices, unreasonable restraints, and unreasonable isolation, including by developing effective behavior management techniques;

“(30) describe—

“(A) the evidence-based methods that will be used to conduct mental health and substance abuse screening, assessment, referral, and treatment for juveniles who—

“(i) request a screening;

“(ii) show signs of needing a screening; or

“(iii) are held for a period of more than 24 hours in a secure facility that provides for an initial screening; and

“(B) how the State will seek, to the extent practicable, to provide or arrange for mental health and substance abuse disorder treatment for juveniles determined to be in need of such treatment;

“(31) describe how reentry planning by the State for juveniles will include—

“(A) a written case plan based on an assessment of needs that includes—

“(i) the pre-release and post-release plans for the juveniles;

“(ii) the living arrangement to which the juveniles are to be discharged; and

“(iii) any other plans developed for the juveniles based on an individualized assessment; and

“(B) review processes;

“(32) provide an assurance that the agency of the State receiving funds under this title collaborates with the State educational agency receiving assistance under part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311 et seq.) to develop and implement a plan to ensure that, in order to support educational progress—

“(A) the student records of adjudicated juveniles, including electronic records if available, are transferred in a timely manner from the educational program in the juvenile detention or secure treatment facility to the educational or training program into which the juveniles will enroll;

“(B) the credits of adjudicated juveniles are transferred; and

“(C) adjudicated juveniles receive full or partial credit toward high school graduation for secondary school coursework satisfactorily completed before and during the period of time during which the juveniles are held in custody, regardless of the local educational agency or entity from which the credits were earned; and

“(33) describe policies and procedures to—

“(A) screen for, identify, and document in records of the State the identification of victims of domestic human trafficking, or those at risk of such trafficking, upon intake; and

“(B) divert youth described in subparagraph (A) to appropriate programs or services, to the extent practicable.”;

(2) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

“(c)(1) If a State fails to comply with any of the core requirements in any fiscal year, then—

“(A) subject to subparagraph (B), the amount allocated to such State under section 222 for the subsequent fiscal year shall be reduced by not less than 20 percent for each core requirement with respect to which the failure occurs; and

“(B) the State shall be ineligible to receive any allocation under such section for such fiscal year unless—

“(i) the State agrees to expend 50 percent of the amount allocated to the State for such fiscal year to achieve compliance with any

such core requirement with respect to which the State is in noncompliance; or

“(ii) the Administrator determines that the State—

“(I) has achieved substantial compliance with such applicable requirements with respect to which the State was not in compliance; and

“(II) has made, through appropriate executive or legislative action, an unequivocal commitment to achieving full compliance with such applicable requirements within a reasonable time.

“(2) Of the total amount of funds not allocated for a fiscal year under paragraph (1)—

“(A) 50 percent of the unallocated funds shall be reallocated under section 222 to States that have not failed to comply with the core requirements; and

“(B) 50 percent of the unallocated funds shall be used by the Administrator to provide additional training and technical assistance to States for the purpose of promoting compliance with the core requirements.”;

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking “described in paragraphs (11), (12), (13), and (22) of subsection (a)” and inserting “described in the core requirements”; and

(B) by striking “the requirements under paragraphs (11), (12), (13), and (22) of subsection (a)” and inserting “the core requirements”;

(4) in subsection (f)(2)—

(A) by striking subparagraph (A); and

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) through (E) as subparagraphs (A) through (D), respectively; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(g) COMPLIANCE DETERMINATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For each fiscal year, the Administrator shall make a determination regarding whether each State receiving a grant under this title is in compliance or out of compliance with respect to each of the core requirements.

“(2) REPORTING.—The Administrator shall—

“(A) issue an annual public report—

“(i) describing any determination described in paragraph (1) made during the previous year, including a summary of the information on which the determination is based and the actions to be taken by the Administrator (including a description of any reduction imposed under subsection (c)); and

“(ii) for any such determination that a State is out of compliance with any of the core requirements, describing the basis for the determination; and

“(B) make the report described in subparagraph (A) available on a publicly available website.

“(3) DETERMINATIONS REQUIRED.—The Administrator may not—

“(A) determine that a State is ‘not out of compliance’, or issue any other determination not described in paragraph (1), with respect to any core requirement; or

“(B) otherwise fail to make the compliance determinations required under paragraph (1).”.

SEC. 206. REPEAL OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM.

Part C of title II of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (34 U.S.C. 11141 et seq.) is repealed.

SEC. 207. RESEARCH AND EVALUATION; STATISTICAL ANALYSES; INFORMATION DISSEMINATION.

Section 251 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (34 U.S.C. 11161) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “may” and inserting “shall”;

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking “plan and identify” and inserting “annually publish a plan to identify”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking clause (iii) and inserting the following:

“(iii) successful efforts to prevent status offenders and first-time minor offenders from subsequent involvement with the juvenile justice and criminal justice systems;”;

(II) by striking clause (vii) and inserting the following:

“(vii) the prevalence and duration of behavioral health needs (including mental health, substance abuse, and co-occurring disorders) among juveniles pre-placement and post-placement in the juvenile justice system, including an examination of the effects of secure detention in a correctional facility;”;

(III) by redesignating clauses (ix), (x), and (xi) as clauses (xvi), (xvii), and (xviii), respectively; and

(IV) by inserting after clause (viii) the following:

“(ix) training efforts and reforms that have produced reductions in or elimination of the use of dangerous practices;

“(x) methods to improve the recruitment, selection, training, and retention of professional personnel who are focused on the prevention, identification, and treatment of delinquency;

“(xi) methods to improve the identification and response to victims of domestic child sex trafficking within the juvenile justice system;

“(xii) identifying positive outcome measures, such as attainment of employment and educational degrees, that States and units of local government should use to evaluate the success of programs aimed at reducing recidivism of youth who have come in contact with the juvenile justice system or criminal justice system;

“(xiii) evaluating the impact and outcomes of the prosecution and sentencing of juveniles as adults;

“(xiv) successful and cost-effective efforts by States and units of local government to reduce recidivism through policies that provide for consideration of appropriate alternative sanctions to incarceration of youth facing nonviolent charges, while ensuring that public safety is preserved;”;

(B) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “date of enactment of this paragraph, the” and inserting “date of enactment of the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2018, the”; and

(II) by inserting “in accordance with applicable confidentiality requirements” after “wards of the State”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by inserting “and Indian Tribes” after “State”;

(iii) in subparagraph (F), by striking “and” at the end;

(iv) in subparagraph (G), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(v) by adding at the end the following:

“(H) a description of the best practices in discharge planning; and

“(I) an assessment of living arrangements for juveniles who, upon release from confinement in a State correctional facility, cannot return to the residence they occupied prior to such confinement.”;

(2) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “may” and inserting “shall”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(f) NATIONAL RECIDIVISM MEASURE.—The Administrator, in accordance with applicable confidentiality requirements and in consultation with experts in the field of juvenile justice research, recidivism, and data collection, shall—

“(1) establish a uniform method of data collection and technology that States may use to evaluate data on juvenile recidivism on an annual basis;

“(2) establish a common national juvenile recidivism measurement system; and

“(3) make cumulative juvenile recidivism data that is collected from States available to the public.”.

SEC. 208. TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

Section 252 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (34 U.S.C. 11162) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “may”;

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting “shall” before “develop and carry out projects”; and

(ii) by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting “may” before “make grants to and contracts with”; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) shall provide periodic training for States regarding implementation of the core requirements, current protocols and best practices for achieving and monitoring compliance, and information sharing regarding relevant Office resources on evidence-based and promising programs or practices that promote the purposes of this Act.”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “may”;

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting “shall” before “develop and implement projects”; and

(ii) by inserting “, including compliance with the core requirements” after “this title”; and

(iii) by striking “and” at the end;

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting “may” before “make grants to and contracts with”; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) shall provide technical assistance to States and units of local government on achieving compliance with the amendments to the core requirements and State Plans made by the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2018, including training and technical assistance and, when appropriate, pilot or demonstration projects intended to develop and replicate best practices for achieving sight and sound separation in facilities or portions of facilities that are open and available to the general public and that may or may not contain a jail or a lock-up; and

“(4) shall provide technical assistance to States in support of efforts to establish partnerships between a State and a university, institution of higher education, or research center designed to improve the recruitment, selection, training, and retention of professional personnel in the fields of medicine, law enforcement, the judiciary, juvenile justice, social work and child protection, education, and other relevant fields who are engaged in, or intend to work in, the field of prevention, identification, and treatment of delinquency.”;

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by inserting “prosecutors,” after “public defenders;”;

(B) by inserting “status offenders and” after “needs of”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(d) BEST PRACTICES REGARDING LEGAL REPRESENTATION OF CHILDREN.—In consultation with experts in the field of juvenile defense, the Administrator shall—

“(1) share best practices that may include sharing standards of practice developed by recognized entities in the profession, for attorneys representing children; and

“(2) provide a State, if it so requests, technical assistance to implement any of the best practices shared under paragraph (1).

“(e) BEST PRACTICES FOR STATUS OFFENDERS.—Based on the available research and State practices, the Administrator shall—

“(1) disseminate best practices for the treatment of status offenders with a focus on reduced recidivism, improved long-term outcomes, and limited usage of valid court orders to place status offenders in secure detention; and

“(2) provide a State, on request, technical assistance to implement any of the best practices shared under paragraph (1).

“(f) TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR LOCAL AND STATE JUVENILE DETENTION AND CORRECTIONS PERSONNEL.—The Administrator shall coordinate training and technical assistance programs with juvenile detention and corrections personnel of States and units of local government—

“(1) to promote methods for improving conditions of juvenile confinement, including methods that are designed to minimize the use of dangerous practices, unreasonable restraints, and isolation and methods responsive to cultural differences; and

“(2) to encourage alternative behavior management techniques based on positive youth development approaches that may include methods responsive to cultural differences.

“(g) TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO SUPPORT MENTAL HEALTH OR SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT INCLUDING HOME-BASED OR COMMUNITY-BASED CARE.—The Administrator shall provide training and technical assistance, in conjunction with the appropriate public agencies, to individuals involved in making decisions regarding the disposition and management of cases for youth who enter the juvenile justice system about the appropriate services and placement for youth with mental health or substance abuse needs, including—

“(1) juvenile justice intake personnel;

“(2) probation officers;

“(3) juvenile court judges and court services personnel;

“(4) prosecutors and court-appointed counsel; and

“(5) family members of juveniles and family advocates.

“(h) TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO SUPPORT JUVENILE COURT JUDGES AND PERSONNEL.—The Attorney General, acting through the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and the Office of Justice Programs in consultation with entities in the profession, shall provide directly, or through grants or contracts, training and technical assistance to enhance the capacity of State and local courts, judges, and related judicial personnel to—

“(1) improve the lives of children currently involved in or at risk of being involved in the juvenile court system; and

“(2) carry out the requirements of this Act.

“(i) FREE AND REDUCED PRICE SCHOOL LUNCHESES FOR INCARCERATED JUVENILES.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall provide guidance to States relating to existing options for school food authorities in the States to apply for reimbursement for free or reduced price lunches under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) for juveniles who are incarcerated and

would, if not incarcerated, be eligible for free or reduced price lunches under that Act.”.

SEC. 209. ADMINISTRATIVE AUTHORITY.

Section 299A of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (34 U.S.C. 11182) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) by inserting “(1)” before “The Administrator”;

(B) by striking “, after appropriate consultation with representatives of States and units of local government,”;

(C) by inserting “guidance,” after “regulations,”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following: “In developing guidance and procedures, the Administrator shall consult with representatives of States and units of local government, including those individuals responsible for administration of this Act and compliance with the core requirements.

“(2) The Administrator shall ensure that—

“(A) reporting, compliance reporting, State plan requirements, and other similar documentation as may be required from States is requested in a manner that respects confidentiality, encourages efficiency and reduces the duplication of reporting efforts; and

“(B) States meeting all the core requirements are encouraged to experiment with offering innovative, data-driven programs designed to further improve the juvenile justice system.”; and

(2) in subsection (e), by striking “requirements described in paragraphs (1), (12), and (13) of section 223(a)” and inserting “core requirements”.

TITLE III—INCENTIVE GRANTS FOR PRISON REDUCTION THROUGH OPPORTUNITIES, MENTORING, INTERVENTION, SUPPORT, AND EDUCATION

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

Section 501 of the Incentive Grants for Local Delinquency Prevention Programs Act of 2002 (34 U.S.C. 11101 note) is amended—

(1) by inserting “Youth Promise” before “Grants”; and

(2) by striking “2002” and inserting “2018”.

SEC. 302. DEFINITIONS.

Section 502 of the Incentive Grants for Local Delinquency Prevention Programs Act of 2002 (34 U.S.C. 11281) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 502. DEFINITIONS.

“In this title—

“(1) the term ‘at-risk’ has the meaning given that term in section 1432 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6472);

“(2) the term ‘eligible entity’ means—

“(A) a unit of local government that is in compliance with the requirements of part B of title II; or

“(B) a nonprofit organization in partnership with a unit of local government described in subparagraph (A);

“(3) the term ‘delinquency prevention program’ means a delinquency prevention program that is evidence-based or promising and that may include—

“(A) alcohol and substance abuse prevention or treatment services;

“(B) tutoring and remedial education, especially in reading and mathematics;

“(C) child and adolescent health and mental health services;

“(D) recreation services;

“(E) leadership and youth development activities;

“(F) the teaching that individuals are and should be held accountable for their actions;

“(G) assistance in the development of job training skills;

“(H) youth mentoring programs;

“(I) after-school programs;

“(J) coordination of a continuum of services that may include—

“(i) early childhood development services;

“(ii) voluntary home visiting programs;

“(iii) nurse-family partnership programs;

“(iv) parenting skills training;

“(v) child abuse prevention programs;

“(vi) family stabilization programs;

“(vii) child welfare services;

“(viii) family violence intervention programs;

“(ix) adoption assistance programs;

“(x) emergency, transitional and permanent housing assistance;

“(xi) job placement and retention training;

“(xii) summer jobs programs;

“(xiii) alternative school resources for youth who have dropped out of school or demonstrate chronic truancy;

“(xiv) conflict resolution skill training;

“(xv) restorative justice programs;

“(xvi) mentoring programs;

“(xvii) targeted gang prevention, intervention and exit services;

“(xviii) training and education programs for pregnant teens and teen parents; and

“(xix) pre-release, post-release, and re-entry services to assist detained and incarcerated youth with transitioning back into and reentering the community; and

“(K) other data-driven evidence-based or promising prevention programs;

“(4) the term ‘local policy board’, when used with respect to an eligible entity, means a policy board that the eligible entity will engage in the development of the eligible entity’s plan described in section 504(e)(5), and that includes—

“(A) not fewer than 15 and not more than 21 members; and

“(B) a balanced representation of—

“(i) public agencies and private nonprofit organizations serving juveniles and their families; and

“(ii) business and industry;

“(C) at least one representative of the faith community, one adjudicated youth, and one parent of an adjudicated youth; and

“(D) in the case of an eligible entity described in paragraph (1)(B), a representative of the nonprofit organization of the eligible entity;

“(5) the term ‘mentoring’ means matching 1 adult with 1 or more youths for the purpose of providing guidance, support, and encouragement through regularly scheduled meetings for not less than 9 months;

“(6) the term ‘State advisory group’ means the advisory group appointed by the chief executive officer of a State under a plan described in section 223(a); and

“(7) the term ‘State entity’ means the State agency designated under section 223(a)(1) or the entity receiving funds under section 223(d).”.

SEC. 303. DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS OF THE ADMINISTRATOR.

Section 503 of the Incentive Grants for Local Delinquency Prevention Programs Act of 2002 (34 U.S.C. 11282) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1); and

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (4) as paragraphs (1) through (3), respectively.

SEC. 304. GRANTS FOR DELINQUENCY PREVENTION PROGRAMS.

Section 504 of the Incentive Grants for Local Delinquency Prevention Programs Act of 2002 (34 U.S.C. 11281 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 504. GRANTS FOR LOCAL DELINQUENCY PREVENTION PROGRAMS.

“(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to enable local communities to address the unmet needs of at-risk or delinquent youth, including through a continuum of delinquency prevention programs for juveniles

who have had contact with the juvenile justice system or who are likely to have contact with the juvenile justice system.

“(b) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—The Administrator shall—

“(1) for each fiscal year for which less than \$25,000,000 is appropriated under section 506, award grants to not fewer than 3 State entities, but not more than 5 State entities, that apply under subsection (c) and meet the requirements of subsection (d); or

“(2) for each fiscal year for which \$25,000,000 or more is appropriated under section 506, award grants to not fewer than 5 State entities that apply under subsection (c) and meet the requirements of subsection (d).

“(c) STATE APPLICATION.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, a State entity shall submit an application to the Administrator that includes the following:

“(1) An assurance the State entity will use—

“(A) not more than 10 percent of such grant, in the aggregate—

“(i) for the costs incurred by the State entity to carry out this section, except that not more than 3 percent of such grant may be used for such costs; and

“(ii) to provide technical assistance to eligible entities receiving a subgrant under subsection (e) in carrying out delinquency prevention programs under the subgrant; and

“(B) the remainder of such grant to award subgrants to eligible entities under subsection (e).

“(2) An assurance that such grant will supplement, and not supplant, State and local efforts to prevent juvenile delinquency.

“(3) An assurance the State entity will evaluate the capacity of eligible entities receiving a subgrant under subsection (e) to fulfill the requirements under such subsection.

“(4) An assurance that such application was prepared after consultation with, and participation by, the State advisory group, units of local government, community-based organizations, and organizations that carry out programs, projects, or activities to prevent juvenile delinquency in the local juvenile justice system served by the State entity.

“(d) APPROVAL OF STATE APPLICATIONS.—In awarding grants under this section for a fiscal year, the Administrator may not award a grant to a State entity for a fiscal year unless—

“(1)(A) the State that will be served by the State entity submitted a plan under section 223 for such fiscal year; and

“(B) such plan is approved by the Administrator for such fiscal year; or

“(2) after finding good cause for a waiver, the Administrator waives the plan required under subparagraph (A) for such State for such fiscal year.

“(e) SUBGRANT PROGRAM.—

“(1) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each State entity receiving a grant under this section shall award subgrants to eligible entities in accordance with this subsection.

“(B) PRIORITY.—In awarding subgrants under this subsection, the State shall give priority to eligible entities that demonstrate ability in—

“(i) plans for service and agency coordination and collaboration including the collocation of services;

“(ii) innovative ways to involve the private nonprofit and business sector in delinquency prevention activities;

“(iii) developing data-driven prevention plans, employing evidence-based prevention strategies, and conducting program evaluations to determine impact and effectiveness;

“(iv) identifying under the plan submitted under paragraph (5) potential savings and efficiencies associated with successful implementation of such plan; and

“(v) describing how such savings and efficiencies may be used to carry out delinquency prevention programs and be reinvested in the continuing implementation of such programs after the end of the subgrant period.

“(C) SUBGRANT PROGRAM PERIOD AND DIVERSITY OF PROJECTS.—

“(i) PROGRAM PERIOD.—A subgrant awarded to an eligible entity by a State entity under this section shall be for a period of not more than 5 years, of which the eligible entity—

“(I) may use not more than 18 months for completing the plan submitted by the eligible entity under paragraph (5); and

“(II) shall use the remainder of the subgrant period, after planning period described in subclause (I), for the implementation of such plan.

“(ii) DIVERSITY OF PROJECTS.—In awarding subgrants under this subsection, a State entity shall ensure, to the extent practicable and applicable, that such subgrants are distributed throughout different areas, including urban, suburban, and rural areas.

“(2) LOCAL APPLICATION.—An eligible entity that desires a subgrant under this subsection shall submit an application to the State entity in the State of the eligible entity, at such time and in such manner as determined by the State entity, and that includes—

“(A) a description of—

“(i) the local policy board and local partners the eligible entity will engage in the development of the plan described in paragraph (5);

“(ii) the unmet needs of at-risk or delinquent youth in the community;

“(iii) available resources in the community to meet the unmet needs identified in the needs assessment described in paragraph (5)(A);

“(iv) potential costs to the community if the unmet needs are not addressed;

“(B) a specific time period for the planning and subsequent implementation of its continuum of local delinquency prevention programs;

“(C) the steps the eligible entity will take to implement the plan under subparagraph (A); and

“(D) a plan to continue the grant activity with non-Federal funds, if proven successful according to the performance evaluation process under paragraph (5)(D), after the grant period.

“(3) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—An eligible entity desiring a subgrant under this subsection shall agree to provide a 50 percent match of the amount of the subgrant that may include the value of in-kind contributions.

“(4) SUBGRANT REVIEW.—

“(A) REVIEW.—Not later than the end of the second year of a subgrant period for a subgrant awarded to an eligible entity under this subsection and before awarding the remaining amount of the subgrant to the eligible entity, the State entity shall—

“(i) ensure that the eligible entity has completed the plan submitted under paragraph (2) and that the plan meets the requirements of such paragraph; and

“(ii) verify that the eligible entity will begin the implementation of its plan upon receiving the next installment of its subgrant award.

“(B) TERMINATION.—If the State entity finds through the review conducted under subparagraph (A) that the eligible entity has not met the requirements of clause (i) of such subparagraph, the State entity shall reallocate the amount remaining on the

subgrant of the eligible entity to other eligible entities receiving a subgrant under this subsection or award the amount to an eligible entity during the next subgrant competition under this subsection.

“(5) LOCAL USES OF FUNDS.—An eligible entity that receives a subgrant under this subsection shall use the funds to implement a plan to carry out delinquency prevention programs in the community served by the eligible entity in a coordinated manner with other delinquency prevention programs or entities serving such community, which includes—

“(A) an analysis of the unmet needs of at-risk or delinquent youth in the community—

“(i) which shall include—

“(I) the available resources in the community to meet the unmet needs; and

“(II) factors present in the community that may contribute to delinquency, such as homelessness, food insecurity, teen pregnancy, youth unemployment, family instability, lack of educational opportunity; and

“(ii) may include an estimate—

“(I) for the most recent year for which reliable data is available, the amount expended by the community and other entities for delinquency adjudication for juveniles and the incarceration of adult offenders for offenses committed in such community; and

“(II) of potential savings and efficiencies that may be achieved through the implementation of the plan;

“(B) a minimum 3-year comprehensive strategy to address the unmet needs and an estimate of the amount or percentage of non-Federal funds that are available to carry out the strategy;

“(C) a description of how delinquency prevention programs under the plan will be coordinated;

“(D) a description of the performance evaluation process of the delinquency prevention programs to be implemented under the plan, which shall include performance measures to assess efforts to address the unmet needs of youth in the community analyzed under subparagraph (A);

“(E) the evidence or promising evaluation on which such delinquency prevention programs are based; and

“(F) if such delinquency prevention programs are proven successful according to the performance evaluation process under subparagraph (D), a strategy to continue such programs after the subgrant period with non-Federal funds, including a description of how any estimated savings or efficiencies created by the implementation of the plan may be used to continue such programs.”.

SEC. 305. GRANTS FOR TRIBAL DELINQUENCY PREVENTION AND RESPONSE PROGRAMS.

The Incentive Grants for Local Delinquency Prevention Programs Act of 2002 (34 U.S.C. 11281 et seq.) is amended by redesignating section 505 as section 506, and by inserting after section 504 the following:

“SEC. 505. GRANTS FOR TRIBAL DELINQUENCY PREVENTION AND RESPONSE PROGRAMS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall make grants under this section, on a competitive basis, to eligible Indian Tribes (or consortia of Indian Tribes) as described in subsection (b)—

“(1) to support and enhance—

“(A) tribal juvenile delinquency prevention services; and

“(B) the ability of Indian Tribes to respond to, and care for, at-risk or delinquent youth upon release; and

“(2) to encourage accountability of Indian tribal governments with respect to preventing juvenile delinquency, and responding to, and caring for, juvenile offenders.

“(b) ELIGIBLE INDIAN TRIBES.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an Indian Tribe or consortium of Indian Tribes shall submit to the Administrator an application in such form as the Administrator may require.

“(c) CONSIDERATIONS.—In providing grants under this section, the Administrator shall take into consideration, with respect to the Indian Tribe to be served, the—

“(1) juvenile delinquency rates;

“(2) school dropout rates; and

“(3) number of youth at risk of delinquency.

“(d) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Of the amount available for a fiscal year to carry out this title, 11 percent shall be available to carry out this section.”.

SEC. 306. EVALUATION BY GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE.

(a) EVALUATION.—Not later than 2 years after the end of the 5th fiscal year for which funds are appropriated to carry out the Incentive Grants for Local Delinquency Prevention Programs Act of 2002, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an evaluation of a sample of subgrantees selected by the Comptroller General in accordance with subsection (b) that received funds under section 504(e) of such Act and shall submit a report of such evaluation to the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the United States House of Representatives.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS FOR EVALUATION.—For purposes of subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall—

(1) ensure that the sample to be evaluated is made up of subgrantees in States that are diverse geographically and economically; and

(2) include in such sample subgrantees that proposed different delinquency prevention programs.

(c) RECOMMENDATIONS AND FINDINGS.—In conducting the evaluation required by subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall take into consideration whether—

(1) the delinquency prevention programs for which subgrantees received funds under section 504(e) of Incentive Grants for Local Delinquency Prevention Programs Act of 2002 achieved the outcomes and results anticipated by the particular State involved;

(2) in the case of outcomes and results of delinquency prevention programs defined by the State or a local entity, unanticipated improved outcomes or results for juveniles occurred;

(3) the number of subgrantees that continue after the expenditure of such funds to provide such delinquency prevention programs;

(4) such delinquency prevention programs replaced existing or planned programs or activities in the State; and

(5) the evidence-base information used to justify such delinquency prevention programs was used with fidelity by local entities in accordance with the approach used to find the evidence;

SEC. 307. TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.

Title V of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 as enacted by Public Law 93-415 (88 Stat. 1133) (relating to miscellaneous and conforming amendments) is repealed.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. EVALUATION BY GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE.

(a) EVALUATION.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) conduct a comprehensive analysis and evaluation regarding the performance of the

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (referred to in this section as “the agency”), its functions, its programs, and its grants;

(2) conduct a comprehensive audit and evaluation of a selected, sample of grantees (as determined by the Comptroller General) that receive Federal funds under grant programs administered by the agency including a review of internal controls (as defined in section 103 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (34 U.S.C. 11103), as amended by this Act) to prevent fraud, waste, and abuse of funds by grantees; and

(3) submit a report in accordance with subsection (d).

(b) CONSIDERATIONS FOR EVALUATION.—In conducting the analysis and evaluation under subsection (a)(1), and in order to document the efficiency and public benefit of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (34 U.S.C. 11101 et seq.), the Comptroller General shall take into consideration—

(1) the outcome and results of the programs carried out by the agency and those programs administered through grants by the agency;

(2) the extent to which the agency has complied with the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-62; 107 Stat. 285);

(3) the extent to which the jurisdiction of, and the programs administered by, the agency duplicate or conflict with the jurisdiction and programs of other agencies;

(4) the potential benefits of consolidating programs administered by the agency with similar or duplicative programs of other agencies, and the potential for consolidating those programs;

(5) whether less restrictive or alternative methods exist to carry out the functions of the agency and whether current functions or operations are impeded or enhanced by existing statutes, rules, and procedures;

(6) the number and types of beneficiaries or persons served by programs carried out by the agency;

(7) the manner with which the agency seeks public input and input from State and local governments on the performance of the functions of the agency;

(8) the extent to which the agency complies with section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Freedom of Information Act);

(9) whether greater oversight is needed of programs developed with grants made by the agency; and

(10) the extent to which changes are necessary in the authorizing statutes of the agency in order for the functions of the agency to be performed in a more efficient and effective manner.

(c) CONSIDERATIONS FOR AUDITS.—In conducting the audit and evaluation under subsection (a)(2), and in order to document the efficiency and public benefit of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (34 U.S.C. 11101 et seq.), the Comptroller General shall take into consideration—

(1) whether grantees timely file Financial Status Reports;

(2) whether grantees have sufficient internal controls to ensure adequate oversight of grant fund received;

(3) whether disbursements were accompanied with adequate supporting documentation (including invoices and receipts);

(4) whether expenditures were authorized;

(5) whether subrecipients of grant funds were complying with program requirements;

(6) whether salaries and fringe benefits of personnel were adequately supported by documentation;

(7) whether contracts were bid in accordance with program guidelines; and

(8) whether grant funds were spent in accordance with program goals and guidelines.

(d) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(A) submit a report regarding the evaluation conducted under subsection (a) and audit under subsection (b), to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate; and

(B) make the report described in subparagraph (A) available to the public.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report submitted in accordance with paragraph (1) shall include all audit findings determined by the selected, statistically significant sample of grantees as required by subsection (a)(2) and shall include the name and location of any selected grantee as well as any findings required by subsection (a)(2).

SEC. 402. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; ACCOUNTABILITY AND OVERSIGHT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (34 U.S.C. 11101 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“TITLE VI—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; ACCOUNTABILITY AND OVERSIGHT

“SEC. 601. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act, except for titles III and IV, \$176,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023, of which not more than \$96,053,401 shall be used to carry out title V for each such fiscal year.

“SEC. 602. ACCOUNTABILITY AND OVERSIGHT.

“(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that, in order to ensure that at-risk youth, and youth who come into contact with the juvenile justice system or the criminal justice system, are treated fairly and that the outcome of that contact is beneficial to the Nation—

“(1) the Department of Justice, through its Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, must restore meaningful enforcement of the core requirements in title II; and

“(2) States, which are entrusted with a fiscal stewardship role if they accept funds under title II must exercise vigilant oversight to ensure full compliance with the core requirements for juveniles provided for in title II.

“(b) ACCOUNTABILITY.—

“(1) AGENCY PROGRAM REVIEW.—

“(A) PROGRAMMATIC AND FINANCIAL ASSESSMENT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2018, the Director of the Office of Audit, Assessment, and Management of the Office of Justice Programs at the Department of Justice (referred to in this section as the ‘Director’) shall—

“(I) conduct a comprehensive analysis and evaluation of the internal controls of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (referred to in this section as the ‘agency’) to determine if States and Indian Tribes receiving grants are following the requirements of the agency grant programs and what remedial action the agency has taken to recover any grant funds that are expended in violation of grant programs, including instances where—

“(aa) supporting documentation was not provided for cost reports;

“(bb) unauthorized expenditures occurred; and

“(cc) subrecipients of grant funds were not in compliance with program requirements;

“(II) conduct a comprehensive audit and evaluation of a selected statistically signifi-

cant sample of States and Indian Tribes (as determined by the Director) that have received Federal funds under title II, including a review of internal controls to prevent fraud, waste, and abuse of funds by grantees; and

“(III) submit a report in accordance with clause (iv).

“(ii) CONSIDERATIONS FOR EVALUATIONS.—In conducting the analysis and evaluation under clause (i)(I), and in order to document the efficiency and public benefit of titles II and V, the Director shall take into consideration the extent to which—

“(I) greater oversight is needed of programs developed with grants made by the agency;

“(II) changes are necessary in the authorizing statutes of the agency in order that the functions of the agency can be performed in a more efficient and effective manner; and

“(III) the agency has implemented recommendations issued by the Comptroller General or Office of Inspector General relating to the grant making and grant monitoring responsibilities of the agency.

“(iii) CONSIDERATIONS FOR AUDITS.—In conducting the audit and evaluation under clause (i)(II), and in order to document the efficiency and public benefit of titles II and V, the Director shall take into consideration—

“(I) whether grantees timely file Financial Status Reports;

“(II) whether grantees have sufficient internal controls to ensure adequate oversight of grant funds received;

“(III) whether grantees’ assertions of compliance with the core requirements were accompanied with adequate supporting documentation;

“(IV) whether expenditures were authorized;

“(V) whether subrecipients of grant funds were complying with program requirements; and

“(VI) whether grant funds were spent in accordance with the program goals and guidelines.

“(iv) REPORT.—The Director shall—

“(I) submit to the Congress a report outlining the results of the analysis, evaluation, and audit conducted under clause (i), including supporting materials, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate; and

“(II) shall make such report available to the public online, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section.

“(B) ANALYSIS OF INTERNAL CONTROLS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2018, the Administrator shall initiate a comprehensive analysis and evaluation of the internal controls of the agency to determine whether, and to what extent, States and Indian Tribes that receive grants under titles II and V are following the requirements of the grant programs authorized under titles II and V.

“(ii) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2018, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a report containing—

“(I) the findings of the analysis and evaluation conducted under clause (i);

“(II) a description of remedial actions, if any, that will be taken by the Administrator to enhance the internal controls of the agency and recoup funds that may have been expended in violation of law, regulations, or program requirements issued under titles II and V; and

“(III) a description of—

“(aa) the analysis conducted under clause (i);

“(bb) whether the funds awarded under titles II and V have been used in accordance with law, regulations, program guidance, and applicable plans; and

“(cc) the extent to which funds awarded to States and Indian Tribes under titles II and V enhanced the ability of grantees to fulfill the core requirements.

“(C) REPORT BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2018, the Attorney General shall submit to the appropriate committees of the Congress a report on the estimated amount of formula grant funds disbursed by the agency since fiscal year 2010 that did not meet the requirements for awards of formula grants to States under title II.

“(2) OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL PERFORMANCE AUDITS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In order to ensure the effective and appropriate use of grants administered under this Act (excluding title IV) and to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall annually conduct audits of grantees that receive funds under this Act.

“(B) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2018 and annually thereafter, the Inspector General shall conduct a risk assessment to determine the appropriate number of grantees to be audited under subparagraph (A) in the year involved.

“(C) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY ON WEBSITE.—The Attorney General shall make the summary of each review conducted under this section available on the website of the Department of Justice, subject to redaction as the Attorney General determines necessary to protect classified and other sensitive information.

“(D) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—A recipient of grant funds under this Act (excluding title IV) that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive grant funds under this Act (excluding title IV) during the first 2 fiscal years beginning after the 12-month period beginning on the date on which the audit report is issued.

“(E) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this Act (excluding title IV), the Administrator shall give priority to a State or Indian Tribe that did not have an unresolved audit finding during the 3 fiscal years prior to the date on which the State or Indian Tribe submits an application for a grant under this Act.

“(F) REIMBURSEMENT.—If a State or an Indian Tribe is awarded a grant under this Act (excluding title IV) during the 2-fiscal-year period in which the recipient is barred from receiving grants under subparagraph (D), the Attorney General shall—

“(i) deposit an amount equal to the amount of the grant funds that were improperly awarded to the grantee into the general fund of the Treasury; and

“(ii) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment to the general fund under clause (i) from the grantee that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

“(G) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term ‘unresolved audit finding’ means a finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General—

“(i) that the audited State or Indian Tribe has used grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost; and

“(ii) that is not closed or resolved during the 12-month period beginning on the date on which the final audit report is issued.

“(3) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this paragraph and the grant programs described in this Act (excluding title IV), the term ‘nonprofit organization’ means an organiza-

tion that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

“(B) PROHIBITION.—The Administrator may not award a grant under any grant program described in this Act (excluding title IV) to a nonprofit organization that holds money in offshore accounts for the purpose of avoiding paying the tax described in section 511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

“(C) DISCLOSURE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Each nonprofit organization that is awarded a grant under a grant program described in this Act (excluding title IV) and uses the procedures prescribed in regulations to create a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness for the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees, and key employees, shall disclose to the Administrator, in the application for the grant, the process for determining such compensation, including—

“(I) the independent persons involved in reviewing and approving such compensation;

“(II) the comparability data used; and

“(III) contemporaneous substantiation of the deliberation and decision.

“(ii) PUBLIC INSPECTION UPON REQUEST.—Upon request, the Administrator shall make the information disclosed under clause (i) available for public inspection.

“(4) CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.—

“(A) LIMITATION.—No amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice under this Act may be used by the Attorney General, or by any individual or organization awarded discretionary funds through a cooperative agreement under this Act, to host or support any expenditure for conferences that uses more than \$20,000 in funds made available to the Department of Justice, unless the Deputy Attorney General or such Assistant Attorney Generals, Directors, or principal deputies as the Deputy Attorney General may designate, provides prior written authorization that the funds may be expended to host a conference.

“(B) WRITTEN APPROVAL.—Written approval under subparagraph (A) shall include a written estimate of all costs associated with the conference, including the cost of all food and beverages, audiovisual equipment, honoraria for speakers, and entertainment.

“(C) REPORT.—The Deputy Attorney General shall submit an annual report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives on all conference expenditures approved under this paragraph.

“(5) PROHIBITION ON LOBBYING ACTIVITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated under this Act may not be utilized by any recipient of a grant made using such amounts—

“(i) to lobby any representative of the Department of Justice regarding the award of grant funding; or

“(ii) to lobby any representative of a Federal, State, local, or tribal government regarding the award of grant funding.

“(B) PENALTY.—If the Attorney General determines that any recipient of a grant made using amounts authorized to be appropriated under this Act has violated subparagraph (A), the Attorney General shall—

“(i) require the recipient to repay the grant in full; and

“(ii) prohibit the recipient to receive another grant under this Act for not less than 5 years.

“(C) CLARIFICATION.—For purposes of this paragraph, submitting an application for a grant under this Act shall not be considered lobbying activity in violation of subparagraph (A).

“(6) ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.—Beginning in the 1st fiscal year that begins after the effective date of this section, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, an annual certification that—

“(A) all audits issued by the Inspector General of the Department of Justice under paragraph (2) have been completed and reviewed by the appropriate Assistant Attorney General or Director;

“(B) all mandatory exclusions required under paragraph (2)(D) have been issued;

“(C) all reimbursements required under paragraph (2)(F)(i) have been made; and

“(D) includes a list of any grant recipients excluded under paragraph (2) during the then preceding fiscal year.

“(c) PREVENTING DUPLICATIVE GRANTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Before the Attorney General awards a grant to an applicant under this Act, the Attorney General shall compare potential grant awards with other grants awarded under this Act to determine if duplicate grant awards are awarded for the same purpose.

“(2) REPORT.—If the Attorney General awards duplicate grants to the same applicant for the same purpose the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives a report that includes—

“(A) a list of all duplicate grants awarded, including the total dollar amount of any duplicate grants awarded; and

“(B) the reason the Attorney General awarded the duplicative grant.

“(d) COMPLIANCE WITH AUDITING STANDARDS.—The Administrator shall comply with the Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards, published by the General Accountability Office (commonly known as the ‘Yellow Book’), in the conduct of fiscal, compliance, and programmatic audits of States.”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 388(a) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (34 U.S.C. 11280(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “section 345 and”; and

(B) by striking “\$140,000,000 for fiscal year 2009, and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013” and inserting “\$127,421,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2020”;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) PERIODIC ESTIMATE.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraph (1), such sums as may be necessary shall be made available to carry out section 345 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2020.”; and

(3) in paragraph (4), by striking “fiscal year 2009 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2019 through 2020”.

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (34 U.S.C. 11101 et seq.) is amended by striking—

(1) section 299 (34 U.S.C. 11171); and

(2) section 505.

SA 4076. Mr. PERDUE proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 565, honoring the 40th anniversary of Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay in Kings Bay, Georgia; as follows:

In the 19th whereas clause of the preamble, strike “, which” and all that follows through “United States”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I have 5 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, December 11, 2018, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing on Chinese and Russian naval activities.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, December 11, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Oversight of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission.”

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, December 11, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Oversight of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission.”

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, December 11, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the nomination of Courtney Dunbar Jones, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, December 11, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Oversight of the U.S. Customs and Border Protection.”

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Jon Cheatwood and Allison Tinsey, both fellows in my office, and Dean Williams, detailee on my Homeland Subcommittee, be granted floor privileges for the duration of today's session of the Senate.

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

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Riya Mehta, a fellow, and Lindsay White, a detailee, on the minority staff on the Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee be granted floor privileges for the duration of the Congress.

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

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privileges of the floor be granted to my military fellow, Juan Ramirez, for the remainder of his fellowship, through June of 2019.

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

INTERSTATE TRANSPORT ACT OF 2017

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 560, S. 1092.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1092) to protect the right of law-abiding citizens to transport knives interstate, notwithstanding a patchwork of local and State prohibitions.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Interstate Transport Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF KNIVES.

(a) *DEFINITION.—In this Act, the term “transport”—*

(1) *includes staying in temporary lodging overnight, common carrier misrouting or delays, stops for food, fuel, vehicle maintenance, emergencies, medical treatment, and any other activity related to the journey of a person; and*

(2) *does not include transport of a knife with the intent to commit an offense punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year involving the use or threatened use of force against another person, or with knowledge, or reasonable cause to believe, that such an offense is to be committed in the course of, or arising from, the journey.*

(b) *TRANSPORT OF KNIVES.—*

(1) *IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of any law or any rule or regulation of a State or any political subdivision thereof, a person who is not otherwise prohibited by any Federal law from possessing, transporting, shipping, or receiving a knife shall be entitled to transport a knife for any lawful purpose from any place where the person may lawfully possess, carry, or transport the knife to any other place where the person may lawfully possess, carry, or transport the knife if—*

(A) *in the case of transport by motor vehicle—*

(i) *the knife is not directly accessible from the passenger compartment of the motor vehicle; or*

(ii) *in the case of a motor vehicle without a compartment separate from the passenger compartment, is contained in a locked container other than the glove compartment or console; and*

(B) *in the case of transport by means other than a motor vehicle, including any transport over land or on or through water, the knife is contained in a locked container.*

(2) *LIMITATION.—This subsection shall not apply to the transport of a knife or tool in the cabin of a passenger aircraft subject to the rules and regulations of the Transportation Security Administration.*

(c) *EMERGENCY KNIVES.—*

(1) *IN GENERAL.—A person—*

(A) *may carry in the passenger compartment of a mode of transportation a knife or tool—*

(i) *the blades of which consist only of a blunt tipped safety blade, a guarded blade, or both; and*

(ii) *that is specifically designed for enabling escape in an emergency by cutting safety belts; and*

(B) *shall not be required to secure a knife or tool described in subparagraph (A) in a locked container.*

(2) *LIMITATION.—This subsection shall not apply to the transport of a knife or tool in the cabin of a passenger aircraft subject to the rules and regulations of the Transportation Security Administration.*

(d) *NO ARREST OR DETENTION.—A person who is transporting a knife in compliance with this section may not be arrested or otherwise detained for violation of any law, rule, or regulation of a State or political subdivision of a State related to the possession, transport, or carrying of a knife, unless there is probable cause to believe that the person is not in compliance with subsection (b).*

(e) *CLAIM OR DEFENSE.—A person may assert this section as a claim or defense in a civil or criminal action or proceeding. When a person asserts this section as a claim or defense in a criminal proceeding, the State or political subdivision shall have the burden of proving, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the person was not in compliance with subsection (b).*

(f) *RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit any right to possess, carry, or transport a knife under applicable State law.*

Mr. PERDUE. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be withdrawn and that the Thune substitute amendment at the desk 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.

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

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

The amendment (No. 4073) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Interstate Transport Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF KNIVES.

(a) *DEFINITION.—In this Act, the term “transport”—*

(1) *includes staying in temporary lodging overnight, common carrier misrouting or delays, stops for food, fuel, vehicle maintenance, emergencies, or medical treatment, and any other activity related to the journey of a person; and*

(2) *does not include transport of a knife with the intent to commit an offense punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year involving the use or threatened use of force against another person, or with knowledge, or reasonable cause to believe, that such an offense is to be committed in the course of, or arising from, the journey.*

(b) *TRANSPORT OF KNIVES.—*

(1) *IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of any law or any rule or regulation of a State or any political subdivision thereof, a person who is not otherwise prohibited by any Federal law from possessing, transporting, shipping, or receiving*

a knife shall be entitled to transport a knife for any lawful purpose from any place where the person may lawfully possess, carry, or transport the knife to any other place where the person may lawfully possess, carry, or transport the knife if—

(A) in the case of transport by motor vehicle, the knife—

(i) is not directly accessible from the passenger compartment of the motor vehicle; or

(ii) in the case of a motor vehicle without a compartment separate from the passenger compartment, is contained in a locked container other than the glove compartment or console; and

(B) in the case of transport by means other than a motor vehicle, including any transport over land or on or through water, the knife is contained in a locked container.

(2) LIMITATION.—This subsection shall not apply to the transport of a knife or tool in the cabin of a passenger aircraft subject to the rules and regulations of the Transportation Security Administration.

(c) EMERGENCY KNIVES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A person—

(A) may carry in the passenger compartment of a mode of transportation a knife or tool—

(i) the blades of which consist only of a blunt tipped safety blade, a guarded blade, or both; and

(ii) that is specifically designed for enabling safety escape in an emergency by cutting safety belts; and

(B) shall not be required to secure a knife or tool described in subparagraph (A) in a locked container.

(2) LIMITATION.—This subsection shall not apply to the transport of a knife or tool in the cabin of a passenger aircraft subject to the rules and regulations of the Transportation Security Administration.

(d) NO ARREST.—A person who is transporting a knife in compliance with this section may not be arrested for violation of any law, rule, or regulation of a State or political subdivision of a State related to the possession, transport, or carrying of a knife, unless there is probable cause to believe that the person is not in compliance with subsection (b).

(e) COSTS.—If a person who asserts this section as a claim or defense in a civil or criminal action or proceeding is a prevailing party on the claim or defense, the court shall award costs and reasonable attorney's fees incurred by the person.

(f) EXPUNGEMENT.—If a person who asserts this section as a claim or defense in a criminal proceeding is a prevailing party on the claim or defense, the court shall enter an order that directs that there be expunged from all official records all references to—

(1) the arrest of the person for the offense as to which the claim or defense was asserted;

(2) the institution of any criminal proceedings against the person relating to such offense; and

(3) the results of the proceedings, if any.

(g) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit any right to possess, carry, or transport a knife under applicable State law.

The bill (S. 1092), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

VICTIMS OF CHILD ABUSE ACT REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2018

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 581, S. 2961.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2961) to reauthorize subtitle A of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Victims of Child Abuse Act Reauthorization Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Section 211 of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (34 U.S.C. 20301) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “2,000,000” and inserting “3,300,000”;

(2) in paragraph (6)—

(A) by inserting “improve positive outcomes for the child,” before “and increase”; and

(B) by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(3) in paragraph (7), by striking “could be duplicated in many jurisdictions throughout the country.” and inserting “have expanded dramatically throughout the United States; and”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) State chapters of children’s advocacy center networks are needed to—

“(A) assist local communities in coordinating their multidisciplinary child abuse investigation, prosecution, and intervention services; and

“(B) provide oversight of, and training and technical assistance in, the effective delivery of evidence-informed programming.”.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 212 of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (34 U.S.C. 20302) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (3) and (6);

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), (7), (8), and (9) as paragraphs (3), (4), (5), (6), and (7), respectively;

(3) in paragraph (6), as so redesignated, by striking “and” at the end;

(4) in paragraph (7), as so redesignated, by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) the term ‘State chapter’ means a membership organization that provides technical assistance, training, coordination, grant administration, oversight, and support to local children’s advocacy centers, multidisciplinary teams, and communities working to implement a multidisciplinary response to child abuse in the provision of evidence-informed initiatives, including mental health counseling, forensic interviewing, multidisciplinary team coordination, and victim advocacy.”.

(c) REGIONAL CHILDREN’S ADVOCACY CENTERS.—Section 213 of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (34 U.S.C. 20303) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “with the Director and”

(B) by striking paragraph (2);

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively;

(D) in paragraph (2), as so redesignated, by striking “and” at the end;

(E) in paragraph (3), as so redesignated—

(i) by inserting after “mental health care professionals” the following: “, law enforcement officers, child protective service workers, forensic interviewers, prosecutors, and victim advocates.”;

(ii) by striking “medical” each place that term appears; and

(iii) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(F) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) collaborate with State chapters to provide training, technical assistance, coordination, and oversight to—

“(A) local children’s advocacy centers; and
“(B) communities that want to develop local children’s advocacy centers.”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “, in coordination with the Director.”;

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “and” at the end;

(iii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “the prevention, judicial handling, and treatment of child abuse and neglect; and” and inserting “multidisciplinary team investigation, trauma-informed interventions, and evidence-informed treatment.”; and

(iv) by striking subparagraph (C); and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “communities” and inserting “communities, local children’s advocacy centers, multidisciplinary teams, and State chapters”;

(II) in clause (i), by inserting “and expanding” after “developing”;

(III) by redesignating clauses (ii) through (x) as clauses (iii) through (xi), respectively;

(IV) by inserting after clause (i) the following:

“(ii) in promoting the effective delivery of the evidence-informed Children’s Advocacy Model and the multidisciplinary response to child abuse, including best practices in—

“(I) organizational support and development;

“(II) programmatic evaluation; and

“(III) financial oversight of Federal funding.”;

(V) in clause (iii), as so redesignated, by striking “a freestanding facility where interviews of and services for abused children can be provided” and inserting “child-friendly facilities for the investigation of, assessment of, and intervention in abuse”; and

(VI) in clause (iv), as so redesignated, by striking “multiple” and inserting “duplicative”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “and interested communities” after “advocacy centers”;

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(C), by striking “remedial counseling to” and inserting “evidence-informed services for”;

(B) in paragraph (3)(A)(ii), by striking “multidisciplinary child abuse program” and inserting “children’s advocacy center”; and

(C) in paragraph (4)(B)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “, in coordination with the Director.”;

(ii) by striking clause (iii); and

(iii) by redesignating clauses (iv) and (v) as clauses (iii) and (iv), respectively;

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “, in coordination with the Director.”;

(B) in paragraph (2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “and the Director.”; and

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking “DISCONTINUATION OF FUNDING.—” and all that follows through “Upon discontinuation” and inserting the following: “DISCONTINUATION OF FUNDING.—Upon discontinuation”;

(5) by striking subsections (e) and (f).

(d) LOCAL CHILDREN’S ADVOCACY CENTERS.—Section 214 of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (34 U.S.C. 20304) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator, in coordination with the Director of the Office of Victims of Crime, shall make grants to—

“(1) develop and enhance multidisciplinary child abuse investigations, intervention, and prosecution; and

“(2) promote the effective delivery of the evidence-informed Children’s Advocacy Model and the multidisciplinary response to child abuse, including best practices in programmatic evaluation and financial oversight of Federal funding.”;

(2) in subsection (b)—
 (A) in the subsection heading, by inserting “HUMAN TRAFFICKING AND” before “CHILD PORNOGRAPHY”;

(B) by striking “with the Director and”; and
 (C) by inserting “human trafficking and” before “child pornography”;

(3) in subsection (c)—
 (A) in paragraph (1)—
 (i) by striking “Director” and inserting “Administrator”; and
 (ii) by striking “this section” and inserting “subsections (a) and (b)”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—
 (i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “social service” and inserting “child protective service”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “the counseling center” and inserting “a children’s advocacy center”;

(iii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “sexual and serious physical abuse and neglect cases to the counseling center” and inserting “child abuse cases that meet designated referral criteria to the children’s advocacy center”;

(iv) in subparagraph (D)—
 (I) by striking “investigative” and inserting “forensic”; and
 (II) by striking “social service” and inserting “child protective service”;

(v) by striking subparagraph (E);
 (vi) by redesignating subparagraphs (F) through (J) as subparagraphs (E) through (I), respectively;

(vii) in subparagraph (E), as so redesignated, by striking “counseling center” and inserting “children’s advocacy center or an agency with which there is a linkage agreement regarding the delivery of multidisciplinary child abuse investigation, prosecution, and intervention services”;

(viii) in subparagraph (F), as so redesignated, by striking “minimize the number of interviews that a child victim must attend” and inserting “eliminate duplicative forensic interviews with a child victim”;

(ix) in subparagraph (G), as so redesignated, by striking “multidisciplinary program” and inserting “children’s advocacy center”;

(x) in subparagraph (H), as so redesignated, by inserting “intervention and” before “judicial proceedings”; and
 (xi) in subparagraph (I), as so redesignated, by striking “Director” and inserting “Administrator”;

(4) in subsection (d)—
 (A) by striking “the Director” and inserting “the Administrator”; and
 (B) by striking “both large and small States” and inserting “all States that are eligible for such grants, including large and small States,”; and
 (5) by adding at the end the following:
 “(f) GRANTS TO STATE CHAPTERS FOR ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL CHILDREN’S ADVOCACY CENTERS.—In awarding grants under this section, the Administrator shall ensure that a portion of the grants is distributed to State chapters to enable State chapters to provide technical assistance, training, coordination, and oversight to other recipients of grants under this section in providing evidence-informed initiatives, including mental health counseling, forensic interviewing, multidisciplinary team coordination, and victim advocacy.”

(e) GRANTS FOR SPECIALIZED TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING PROGRAMS.—Section 214A of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (34 U.S.C. 20305) is amended—
 (1) in subsection (a), by striking “to attorneys” and all that follows and inserting the following: “to—
 “(1) attorneys and other allied professionals instrumental to the criminal prosecution of child abuse cases in State or Federal courts, for the purpose of improving the quality of criminal prosecution of such cases; and
 “(2) child abuse professionals instrumental to the protection of children, intervention in child

abuse cases, and treatment of victims of child abuse, for the purpose of—

“(A) improving the quality of such protection, intervention, and treatment; and
 “(B) promoting the effective delivery of the evidence-informed Children’s Advocacy Model and the multidisciplinary response to child abuse, including best practices in programmatic evaluation and financial oversight of Federal funding.”;

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) GRANTEE ORGANIZATIONS.—

“(1) PROSECUTORS.—An organization to which a grant is made for specific training and technical assistance for prosecutors under subsection (a)(1) shall be one that has—

“(A) a broad representation of attorneys who prosecute criminal cases in State courts; and

“(B) demonstrated experience in providing training and technical assistance for prosecutors.”

“(2) CHILD ABUSE PROFESSIONALS.—An organization to which a grant is made for specific training and technical assistance for child abuse professionals under subsection (a)(2) shall be one that has—

“(A) a diverse portfolio of training and technical resources for the diverse professionals responding to child abuse, including a digital library to promote evidence-informed practice; and
 “(B) demonstrated experience in providing training and technical assistance for child abuse professionals, especially law enforcement officers, child protective service workers, prosecutors, forensic interviewers, medical professionals, victim advocates, and mental health professionals.”; and

(3) in subsection (c)(2), by inserting after “shall require” the following: “, in the case of a grant made under subsection (a)(1),”.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 214B of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (34 U.S.C. 20306) is amended—
 (1) in subsection (a), by striking “sections 213 and 214” and all that follows and inserting the following: “sections 213 and 214, \$19,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.”; and
 (2) in subsection (b), by striking “section 214A” and all that follows and inserting the following: “section 214A, \$6,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.”.

(g) ACCOUNTABILITY.—Section 214C of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (34 U.S.C. 20307) is amended—

(1) by striking “All grants awarded” and inserting the following:
 “(a) IN GENERAL.—All grants awarded”; and
 (2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) REPORTING.—Not later than March 1 of each year, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that—

“(1) summarizes the efforts of the Administrator to monitor and evaluate the regional children’s advocacy program activities under section 213(d);

“(2) describes—

“(A) the method by which amounts are allocated to grantees and subgrantees under this subtitle, including to local children’s advocacy centers, State chapters, and regional children’s advocacy program centers; and

“(B) steps the Attorney General has taken to minimize duplication and overlap in the awarding of amounts under this subtitle; and
 “(3) analyzes the extent to which both rural and urban populations are served under the regional children’s advocacy program.”.

(h) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO TITLE 34, UNITED STATES CODE.—The Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (34 U.S.C. 20301 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 212(1) (34 U.S.C. 20302), by striking “(42 U.S.C. 5611(b))” and inserting “(34 U.S.C. 11111(b))”;

(2) in section 214(c)(1) (34 U.S.C. 20304(c)(1)), by striking “(42 U.S.C. 5665 et seq.)” and inserting “(34 U.S.C. 11183, 11186)”;

(3) in section 214A(c)(1) (34 U.S.C. 20305(c)(1)), by striking “(42 U.S.C. 5665 et seq.)” and inserting “(34 U.S.C. 11183, 11186)”;

(4) in section 217(c)(1) (34 U.S.C. 20323(c)(1)), by striking “(42 U.S.C. 5665 et seq.)” and inserting “(34 U.S.C. 11183, 11186)”;

(5) in section 223(c) (34 U.S.C. 20333(c)), by striking “(42 U.S.C. 5665 et seq.)” and inserting “(34 U.S.C. 11183, 11186)”.

SEC. 3. IMMUNITY PROTECTIONS FOR REPORTERS OF CHILD ABUSE.

(a) STATE PLANS.—Section 106(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106a(b)(2)(B)(vii)) is amended to read as follows:

“(vii) provisions for immunity from civil or criminal liability under State and local laws and regulations for individuals making good faith reports of suspected or known instances of child abuse or neglect, or who otherwise provide information or assistance, including medical evaluations or consultations, in connection with a report, investigation, or legal intervention pursuant to a good faith report of child abuse or neglect.”;

(b) FEDERAL IMMUNITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any individual making a good faith report to appropriate authorities of a suspected or known instance of child abuse or neglect, or who otherwise, in good faith, provides information or assistance, including medical evaluations or consultations, in connection with a report, investigation, or legal intervention pursuant to a good faith report of child abuse or neglect shall not be subject to civil liability or criminal prosecution, under any Federal law, rising from making such report or providing such information or assistance.

(2) PRESUMPTION OF GOOD FAITH.—In a Federal civil action or criminal prosecution brought against a person based on the person’s reporting a suspected or known instance of child abuse or neglect, or providing information or assistance with respect to such a report, as described in paragraph (1), there shall be a presumption that the person acted in good faith.

(3) COSTS.—If the defendant prevails in a Federal civil action described in paragraph (2), the court may award costs and reasonable attorney’s fees incurred by the defendant.

Mr. PERDUE. I ask unanimous consent that the Blunt amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to; that the committee-reported substitute amendment, as amended, be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered and made and laid upon the table.

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

The amendment (No. 4074) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To adjust the authorization of appropriations)

On page 28, line 3, strike “\$19,000,000” and insert “\$16,000,000”.

On page 28, line 7, strike “\$6,000,000” and insert “\$5,000,000”.

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

The bill (S. 2961), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2961

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Victims of Child Abuse Act Reauthorization Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Section 211 of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (34 U.S.C. 20301) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “2,000,000” and inserting “3,300,000”;

(2) in paragraph (6)—

(A) by inserting “improve positive outcomes for the child,” before “and increase”; and

(B) by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(3) in paragraph (7), by striking “could be duplicated in many jurisdictions throughout the country.” and inserting “have expanded dramatically throughout the United States; and”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) State chapters of children’s advocacy center networks are needed to—

“(A) assist local communities in coordinating their multidisciplinary child abuse investigation, prosecution, and intervention services; and

“(B) provide oversight of, and training and technical assistance in, the effective delivery of evidence-informed programming.”.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 212 of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (34 U.S.C. 20302) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (3) and (6);

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), (7), (8), and (9) as paragraphs (3), (4), (5), (6), and (7), respectively;

(3) in paragraph (6), as so redesignated, by striking “and” at the end;

(4) in paragraph (7), as so redesignated, by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) the term ‘State chapter’ means a membership organization that provides technical assistance, training, coordination, grant administration, oversight, and support to local children’s advocacy centers, multidisciplinary teams, and communities working to implement a multidisciplinary response to child abuse in the provision of evidence-informed initiatives, including mental health counseling, forensic interviewing, multidisciplinary team coordination, and victim advocacy.”.

(c) REGIONAL CHILDREN’S ADVOCACY CENTERS.—Section 213 of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (34 U.S.C. 20303) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “with the Director and”

(B) by striking paragraph (2);

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively;

(D) in paragraph (2), as so redesignated, by striking “and” at the end;

(E) in paragraph (3), as so redesignated—

(i) by inserting after “mental health care professionals” the following: “, law enforcement officers, child protective service workers, forensic interviewers, prosecutors, and victim advocates.”;

(ii) by striking “medical” each place that term appears; and

(iii) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(F) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) collaborate with State chapters to provide training, technical assistance, coordination, and oversight to—

“(A) local children’s advocacy centers; and

“(B) communities that want to develop local children’s advocacy centers.”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “, in coordination with the Director.”;

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “and” at the end;

(iii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “the prevention, judicial handling, and treatment of child abuse and neglect; and” and inserting “multidisciplinary team investigation, trauma-informed interventions, and evidence-informed treatment.”; and

(iv) by striking subparagraph (C); and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “communities” and inserting “communities, local children’s advocacy centers, multidisciplinary teams, and State chapters.”;

(II) in clause (i), by inserting “and expanding” after “developing”;

(III) by redesignating clauses (ii) through (x) as clauses (iii) through (xi), respectively;

(IV) by inserting after clause (i) the following:

“(ii) in promoting the effective delivery of the evidence-informed Children’s Advocacy Model and the multidisciplinary response to child abuse, including best practices in—

“(I) organizational support and development;

“(II) programmatic evaluation; and

“(III) financial oversight of Federal funding.”;

(V) in clause (iii), as so redesignated, by striking “a freestanding facility where interviews of and services for abused children can be provided” and inserting “child-friendly facilities for the investigation of, assessment of, and intervention in abuse”; and

(VI) in clause (iv), as so redesignated, by striking “multiple” and inserting “duplicative”; and

(i) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “and interested communities” after “advocacy centers.”;

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(C), by striking “remedial counseling to” and inserting “evidence-informed services for”;

(B) in paragraph (3)(A)(ii), by striking “multidisciplinary child abuse program” and inserting “children’s advocacy center”; and

(C) in paragraph (4)(B)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “, in coordination with the Director.”;

(ii) by striking clause (iii); and

(iii) by redesignating clauses (iv) and (v) as clauses (iii) and (iv), respectively;

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “, in coordination with the Director.”;

(B) in paragraph (2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “and the Director”; and

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking “DISCONTINUATION OF FUNDING.—” and all that follows through “Upon discontinuation” and inserting the following: “DISCONTINUATION OF FUNDING.—Upon discontinuation”; and

(5) by striking subsections (e) and (f).

(d) LOCAL CHILDREN’S ADVOCACY CENTERS.—Section 214 of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (34 U.S.C. 20304) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator, in coordination with the Director of the Office of Victims of Crime, shall make grants to—

“(1) develop and enhance multidisciplinary child abuse investigations, intervention, and prosecution; and

“(2) promote the effective delivery of the evidence-informed Children’s Advocacy Model and the multidisciplinary response to child abuse, including best practices in pro-

grammatic evaluation and financial oversight of Federal funding.”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by inserting “HUMAN TRAFFICKING AND” before “CHILD PORNOGRAPHY”;

(B) by striking “with the Director and”; and

(C) by inserting “human trafficking and” before “child pornography”;

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “Director” and inserting “Administrator”; and

(ii) by striking “this section” and inserting “subsections (a) and (b)”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “social service” and inserting “child protective service”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “the ‘counseling center’” and inserting “a ‘children’s advocacy center’”;

(iii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “sexual and serious physical abuse and neglect cases to the counseling center” and inserting “child abuse cases that meet designated referral criteria to the children’s advocacy center”;

(iv) in subparagraph (D)—

(I) by striking “investigative” and inserting “forensic”; and

(II) by striking “social service” and inserting “child protective service”;

(v) by striking subparagraph (E);

(vi) by redesignating subparagraphs (F) through (J) as subparagraphs (E) through (I), respectively;

(vii) in subparagraph (E), as so redesignated, by striking “counseling center” and inserting “children’s advocacy center or an agency with which there is a linkage agreement regarding the delivery of multidisciplinary child abuse investigation, prosecution, and intervention services”;

(viii) in subparagraph (F), as so redesignated, by striking “minimize the number of interviews that a child victim must attend” and inserting “eliminate duplicative forensic interviews with a child victim”;

(ix) in subparagraph (G), as so redesignated, by striking “multidisciplinary program” and inserting “children’s advocacy center”;

(x) in subparagraph (H), as so redesignated, by inserting “intervention and” before “judicial proceedings”; and

(xi) in subparagraph (I), as so redesignated, by striking “Director” and inserting “Administrator”;

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking “the Director” and inserting “the Administrator”; and

(B) by striking “both large and small States” and inserting “all States that are eligible for such grants, including large and small States.”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(f) GRANTS TO STATE CHAPTERS FOR ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL CHILDREN’S ADVOCACY CENTERS.—In awarding grants under this section, the Administrator shall ensure that a portion of the grants is distributed to State chapters to enable State chapters to provide technical assistance, training, coordination, and oversight to other recipients of grants under this section in providing evidence-informed initiatives, including mental health counseling, forensic interviewing, multidisciplinary team coordination, and victim advocacy.”.

(e) GRANTS FOR SPECIALIZED TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING PROGRAMS.—Section 214A of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (34 U.S.C. 20305) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “to attorneys” and all that follows and inserting the following: “to—

“(1) attorneys and other allied professionals instrumental to the criminal prosecution of child abuse cases in State or Federal courts, for the purpose of improving the quality of criminal prosecution of such cases; and

“(2) child abuse professionals instrumental to the protection of children, intervention in child abuse cases, and treatment of victims of child abuse, for the purpose of—

“(A) improving the quality of such protection, intervention, and treatment; and

“(B) promoting the effective delivery of the evidence-informed Children’s Advocacy Model and the multidisciplinary response to child abuse, including best practices in programmatic evaluation and financial oversight of Federal funding.”;

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) GRANTEE ORGANIZATIONS.—

“(1) PROSECUTORS.—An organization to which a grant is made for specific training and technical assistance for prosecutors under subsection (a)(1) shall be one that has—

“(A) a broad representation of attorneys who prosecute criminal cases in State courts; and

“(B) demonstrated experience in providing training and technical assistance for prosecutors.

“(2) CHILD ABUSE PROFESSIONALS.—An organization to which a grant is made for specific training and technical assistance for child abuse professionals under subsection (a)(2) shall be one that has—

“(A) a diverse portfolio of training and technical resources for the diverse professionals responding to child abuse, including a digital library to promote evidence-informed practice; and

“(B) demonstrated experience in providing training and technical assistance for child abuse professionals, especially law enforcement officers, child protective service workers, prosecutors, forensic interviewers, medical professionals, victim advocates, and mental health professionals.”; and

(3) in subsection (c)(2), by inserting after “shall require” the following: “, in the case of a grant made under subsection (a)(1),”.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 214B of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (34 U.S.C. 20306) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “sections 213 and 214” and all that follows and inserting the following: “sections 213 and 214, \$16,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.”; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “section 214A” and all that follows and inserting the following: “section 214A, \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.”.

(g) ACCOUNTABILITY.—Section 214C of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (34 U.S.C. 20307) is amended—

(1) by striking “All grants awarded” and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—All grants awarded”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) REPORTING.—Not later than March 1 of each year, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that—

“(1) summarizes the efforts of the Administrator to monitor and evaluate the regional children’s advocacy program activities under section 213(d);

“(2) describes—

“(A) the method by which amounts are allocated to grantees and subgrantees under this subtitle, including to local children’s advocacy centers, State chapters, and re-

gional children’s advocacy program centers; and

“(B) steps the Attorney General has taken to minimize duplication and overlap in the awarding of amounts under this subtitle; and

“(3) analyzes the extent to which both rural and urban populations are served under the regional children’s advocacy program.”.

(h) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO TITLE 34, UNITED STATES CODE.—The Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (34 U.S.C. 20301 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 212(1) (34 U.S.C. 20302), by striking “(42 U.S.C. 5611(b))” and inserting “(34 U.S.C. 11111(b))”;

(2) in section 214(c)(1) (34 U.S.C. 20304(c)(1)), by striking “(42 U.S.C. 5665 et seq.)” and inserting “(34 U.S.C. 11183, 11186)”;

(3) in section 214A(c)(1) (34 U.S.C. 20305(c)(1)), by striking “(42 U.S.C. 5665 et seq.)” and inserting “(34 U.S.C. 11183, 11186)”;

(4) in section 217(c)(1) (34 U.S.C. 20323(c)(1)), by striking “(42 U.S.C. 5665 et seq.)” and inserting “(34 U.S.C. 11183, 11186)”;

(5) in section 223(c) (34 U.S.C. 20333(c)), by striking “(42 U.S.C. 5665 et seq.)” and inserting “(34 U.S.C. 11183, 11186)”.

SEC. 3. IMMUNITY PROTECTIONS FOR REPORTERS OF CHILD ABUSE.

(a) STATE PLANS.—Section 106(b)(2)(B)(vii) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106a(b)(2)(B)(vii)) is amended to read as follows:

“(vii) provisions for immunity from civil or criminal liability under State and local laws and regulations for individuals making good faith reports of suspected or known instances of child abuse or neglect, or who otherwise provide information or assistance, including medical evaluations or consultations, in connection with a report, investigation, or legal intervention pursuant to a good faith report of child abuse or neglect.”.

(b) FEDERAL IMMUNITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any individual making a good faith report to appropriate authorities of a suspected or known instance of child abuse or neglect, or who otherwise, in good faith, provides information or assistance, including medical evaluations or consultations, in connection with a report, investigation, or legal intervention pursuant to a good faith report of child abuse or neglect shall not be subject to civil liability or criminal prosecution, under any Federal law, rising from making such report or providing such information or assistance.

(2) PRESUMPTION OF GOOD FAITH.—In a Federal civil action or criminal prosecution brought against a person based on the person’s reporting a suspected or known instance of child abuse or neglect, or providing information or assistance with respect to such a report, as described in paragraph (1), there shall be a presumption that the person acted in good faith.

(3) COSTS.—If the defendant prevails in a Federal civil action described in paragraph (2), the court may award costs and reasonable attorney’s fees incurred by the defendant.

JUVENILE JUSTICE REFORM ACT OF 2018

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 612, H.R. 6964.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 6964) to reauthorize and improve the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency

Prevention Act of 1974, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measure?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. PERDUE. I ask unanimous consent that the Grassley amendment at the desk be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

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

The amendment (No. 4075) was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute.)

(The amendment is printed in today’s RECORD under “Text of Amendments.”)

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. PERDUE. I know of no further debate on the bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 6964), as amended, was passed.

Mr. PERDUE. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table.

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

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES FOR CHILDREN PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2018

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 695, S. 3482.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3482) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measure?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. PERDUE. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 3482) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3482

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Emergency Medical Services for Children Program Reauthorization Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF THE EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES FOR CHILDREN PROGRAM.

Section 1910(d) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300w-9(d)) is amended by inserting before the period the following: “, and \$22,334,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024”.

RECIPROCAL ACCESS TO TIBET ACT OF 2018

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 701, H.R. 1872.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1872) to promote access for United States diplomats and other officials, journalists, and other citizens to Tibetan areas of the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measure?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PERDUE. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

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

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. PERDUE. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 1872) was passed.

Mr. PERDUE. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

21ST CENTURY INTEGRATED DIGITAL EXPERIENCE ACT

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 5759 which was received from the House.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill, (H.R. 5759) to improve executive agency digital services, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. PERDUE. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (H.R. 5759) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

PROTECTING ACCESS TO THE COURTS FOR TAXPAYERS ACT

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3996 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title. The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3996) to amend title 28, United States Code, to permit other courts to transfer certain cases to United States Tax Court.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. PERDUE. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (H.R. 3996) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

PROMOTING AWARENESS OF MOTORCYCLE PROFILING AND ENCOURAGING COLLABORATION AND COMMUNICATION WITH THE MOTORCYCLE COMMUNITY AND LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS TO PREVENT INSTANCES OF PROFILING

Mr. PERDUE. I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 154.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 154) promoting awareness of motorcycle profiling and encouraging collaboration and communication with the motorcycle community and law enforcement officials to prevent instances of profiling.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. PERDUE. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 154) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of May 4, 2017, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

NATIONAL RUNAWAY PREVENTION MONTH

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 711 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 711) designating November 2018 as “National Runaway Prevention Month.”

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. PERDUE. I further ask that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 711) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of November 29, 2018, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 719, S. Res. 720, S. Res. 721, S. Res. 722, and S. Res. 723.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

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

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

HONORING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF NAVAL SUBMARINE BASE KINGS BAY IN KINGS BAY, GEORGIA

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Armed Services Committee be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 565.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 565) honoring the 40th anniversary of Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay in Kings Bay, Georgia.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to; that the Perdue amendment to the preamble be considered and agreed to; that the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; and that the

motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 565) was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 4076) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the preamble) In the 19th whereas clause of the preamble, strike “, which” and all that follows through “United States”.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

S. RES. 565

Whereas, in 1954, the Department of the Army began to acquire land at Kings Bay, Georgia, to build a military ocean terminal to ship ammunition in case of a national emergency;

Whereas the facility at Kings Bay, Georgia, was completed in 1958, but since there was no immediate operational need for the installation, the base was placed in an inactive ready status;

Whereas, in 1975, during treaty negotiations between the United States and Spain, the countries agreed to move Submarine Squadron 16, the fleet ballistic missile submarine squadron, from its operational base at Rota, Spain;

Whereas after evaluating more than 60 sites along the Atlantic and Gulf Coasts, the Department of the Navy selected Kings Bay, Georgia, as the new home of Submarine Squadron 16;

Whereas, from January to July 1978, the first group of sailors arrived at Kings Bay, Georgia, to transfer the base from the Department of the Army to the Department of the Navy;

Whereas the Naval Submarine Support Base Kings Bay was established in a developmental status on July 1, 1978;

Whereas construction of Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay was the largest peacetime construction program ever undertaken by the Department of the Navy;

Whereas, in May 1979, the Department of the Navy selected Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay as the preferred East Coast site for Ohio-class submarines;

Whereas, on October 23, 1980, the Secretary of the Navy announced Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay as the future home of the new Ohio-class submarine;

Whereas, on January 15, 1989, the first Trident ballistic missile submarine, the USS Tennessee (SSBN 734), arrived at Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay;

Whereas the Coast Guard commissioned the successful Maritime Force Protection Unit, the first of its kind, on July 24, 2007, at Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay to provide enhanced security for the SSBN fleet of the United States within the homeport transit area;

Whereas Camden County, Georgia, is home to 1 of 6 Coast Guard Atlantic Area Maritime Safety and Security Teams that conduct missions including counter-drug and migrant interdiction boardings and escorts for high-capacity passenger vessels;

Whereas Marine Corps Security Force Battalion Kings Bay secures strategic assets within the Strategic Weapons Facility Atlantic area of responsibility in order to prevent unauthorized access or loss of control;

Whereas Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay was named the top military installation in the Department of Defense for 2007, receiving the Commander-in-Chief's Installation Excellence Award for its ability to sustain its

mission, increase productivity, and enhance quality of life;

Whereas Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay is the state-of-the-art home to the Trident II Submarines of the Atlantic Fleet in St. Marys, Georgia;

Whereas Submarine Group 10 exercises operational and administrative control of Ohio-class ballistic missile submarines and guided missile submarines stationed at Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay;

Whereas 6 ballistic missile submarines make up Submarine Squadron 20 and are currently assigned to Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay: USS Maryland (SSBN 738), USS Rhode Island (SSBN 740), USS Tennessee (SSBN 734), USS West Virginia (SSBN 736), USS Wyoming (SSBN 742), and USS Alaska (SSBN 732);

Whereas 2 guided missile submarines make up Submarine Squadron 16 and are currently assigned to Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay: USS Florida (SSGN 728) and USS Georgia (SSGN 729);

Whereas the Department of the Navy stores the strategic assets of the United States at the Strategic Weapons Facilities at Kings Bay, Georgia;

Whereas the Strategic Weapons Facility Atlantic is responsible for assembling the D-5 missile and processing missile guidance and launcher subsystem components for the ballistic missile submarine fleet;

Whereas the Naval Submarine Support Center provides critical support services to the submarines and staffs of Submarine Squadron 16, Submarine Squadron 20, and all visiting and other assigned units, which allows the team at Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay to work efficiently and effectively;

Whereas the D-5 ballistic missile is the heart of the Trident weapons system of the United States;

Whereas the D-5 Life Extension Program of the Department of the Navy will extend the life of the D-5 missiles until 2040;

Whereas the Trident Refit Facility provides timely and top-quality industrial and logistics support to Trident ballistic missile submarines of the United States;

Whereas the Trident Training Facility trains sailors in the skills necessary to operate and maintain Trident submarines and systems;

Whereas one of the largest covered dry docks of the Northern Hemisphere is located at Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay;

Whereas construction of not less than 12 Columbia-class submarines is scheduled to begin in 2021, with the first submarine slated to be fully operable by 2031;

Whereas Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay is responsible for \$1,142,000,000 in total economic output to the Camden County area; and

Whereas The Camden Partnership has supported Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay since its inception, and continues to promote the ability of the base to conduct current and future missions, and the ability of the community to provide a highly qualified workforce: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay on its 40th anniversary;

(2) commends the thousands of men and women who have worked and trained at Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay;

(3) honors the people of Camden County and the Georgia coastal communities for their continued support of Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay; and

(4) looks forward to Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay continuing its instrumental role in the strategic deterrence and national defense of the United States.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY,
DECEMBER 12, 2018

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, December 12; further, that following the prayer and the pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S.J. Res. 64 and that the Senate vote on adoption of the resolution at 12:15 p.m.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

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

Thereupon, the Senate, at 8:02 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, December 12, 2018, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

ROBERT A. MANDELL, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2022, VICE BRENT FRANKLIN NELSEN, TERM EXPIRED.

DON MUNCE, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2024, VICE LORETTA CHERYL SUTLIFF, TERM EXPIRED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. ARNOLD W. BUNCH, JR.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 11, 2018:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

JUSTIN GEORGE MUZINICH, OF NEW YORK, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

THE JUDICIARY

JONATHAN A. KOBES, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive Message transmitted by the President to the Senate on December 11, 2018 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF COL. CLIFFORD N. JAMES, TO BE BRIGADIER GENERAL, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON MAY 7, 2018.