



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 31, 2019

No. 20

## Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

### PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Lord of the harvest, we continue to seek You, for we desire to do Your will. You are the strength of our lives.

As our lawmakers strive to walk uprightly, provide them with the harvest of truth, justice, and righteousness. May they cultivate such ethical congruence that their rhetoric will be undergirded by right actions.

Lord, keep them aware of Your continuous presence as they find in You fullness of joy. Show them the path to life as Your truth brings them to a safe harbor.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore 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.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). The majority leader is recognized.

S. 1

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, earlier this week, Senate Democrats stopped filibustering the important legislation before us. They finally joined Republicans and voted to advance these measures to renew our commitment to Israel, deepen our cooperation with Jordan, and deliver justice

for the victims of Assad's brutality in Syria.

But it appears some of my Democratic colleagues are not finished with their obstruction just yet.

On Tuesday, I offered a straightforward amendment to allow for a straightforward debate about the Senate's continued commitment to ongoing missions in Syria and Afghanistan. It is not a partisan amendment. It is not complicated. There is no poison pill—just an opportunity for Senators to go on the record about what our country should be doing in Syria and Afghanistan.

I have been clear about my own views on these subjects. I believe the threats remain. ISIS and al-Qaida have yet to be defeated, and American national security interests require continued commitment to our missions there.

But I guess some Senate Democrats don't want to vote on these important subjects. Perhaps it could have put some of my colleagues with aims beyond the Senate at odds with parts of the far left. Whatever the reason, our colleagues tried to avoid taking a position and tried to block my amendment from getting a vote.

Make no mistake. Today, the Senate will vote on this amendment. Members will go on the record for our allies and our partners in the Middle East.

When Senator RUBIO introduced S. 1, which is just a collection of bipartisan bills, I hoped for an open amendment process so that the Senate could debate important matters of national security. I am disappointed that our friends on the other side of the aisle have chosen to make that impossible.

Another issue I had hoped we could address is America's ironclad commitment to the transatlantic alliance. NATO has a proud history of delivering greater security to America and our allies and greater peace to the world. We stood shoulder to shoulder with our NATO allies throughout the Cold War; they stood with us following 9/11.

NATO's mission in Afghanistan today is an essential element of bringing peace and stability to that troubled country.

NATO will continue to be critical to transatlantic security, but it must adapt to new challenges. The United States has made significant new investments in our security posture in Europe, most notably through troop deployments all along the eastern flank and through the European Deterrence Initiative, which has bipartisan support here in Congress.

Former Secretary Mattis was also instrumental in pushing NATO to reform, especially in the areas of capabilities modernization, readiness, and military mobility. These reforms are essential to ensuring NATO readiness.

President Trump has also reaffirmed our Nation's commitment to NATO. As recently as just a few days ago, he said the United States will "be with NATO 100 percent."

The President is right to call upon our allies to contribute their fair share toward our collective defense. As NATO's Secretary General recently explained, President Trump has "clearly stated that NATO allies need to invest more. . . . we agreed to do more . . . and now we see the results. . . . by the end of next year, NATO allies will add . . . 100 billion extra U.S. dollars [for] defense."

Here is how the Secretary General summed it up: "So we see some real money, and some real results, and we see that the clear message from President Trump is having an impact."

We need to build on this momentum and continue strengthening NATO, dispelling all doubt—all doubt—about America's commitment to this alliance, which has reshaped history for the better.

NATO deserves the Senate's support. I believe it has the Senate's support, and at some point I hope this institution is able to debate that matter.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S775

H.R. 1

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, on a totally different matter, earlier this week I began discussing H.R. 1. This is the House Democrats' marquee bill for the new Congress.

I have stated this week that it really adds up to one big expensive partisan power grab, an effort to centralize more control over America's speech and America's voting here in Washington—the "Democratic Politician Protection Act." I am pleased that people are beginning to pay attention to this monstrosity—a monstrosity.

Today I want to focus on how the power grab would affect our elections because when Washington politicians suddenly decide their top priority is grabbing unprecedented control over how they get elected and sent to Washington in the first place, alarm bells should start ringing all over this place.

After all, article I, section IV of the Constitution clearly gives—clearly gives—State legislatures primary responsibility for "the Times, Places, and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives."

There are times in American history when it has come to that. There have been times when our Nation has needed the Federal Government to get involved to expand and protect the franchise or to respond to a national emergency, for examples, bills like the Voting Rights Act, which secured the franchise for African Americans, or the Help America Vote Act, which provided guideposts—guideposts—to prevent a crisis like the Bush v. Gore recount from occurring a second time.

So what is the alleged crisis now? What is the alleged crisis now, in 2019, that has House Democrats calling for an unprecedented Federal takeover of elections across our country? Why is this Democratic bill—which would create more Federal Government mandates over the minutia of the election process than has ever been done in the past—necessary now?

The year 2016 saw the most ballots ever cast in a Presidential election in American history. Now, with population growth, that isn't entirely surprising, but the turnout rate was the third highest since 1968. So people are voting in great numbers.

Let's look at the 2018 midterms—the highest midterm turnout in 50 years. People voted in the midterms.

Listen to what Americans themselves had to say about their experience. After the election, 92 percent—92 percent—of surveyed voters told the Pew Research Center their voting experience was "very easy" or "somewhat easy"—92 percent—very easy or somewhat easy to vote. Regardless of when they voted and how they voted, huge majorities communicated that they had no real trouble—no real trouble—casting their ballots. No trouble.

My Democratic friends seem to be implying there is a supposed crisis here that conveniently is not rooted in the facts or in the opinions of American voters.

There is no objective basis for the sweeping Federal takeover of elections that House Democrats have dreamed up. There is no emergency. It is just a Washington power grab for its very own sake.

Decision after decision that our Constitution properly leaves to the States just melts away in this proposal. Practically every variable of any consequence to American elections gets a top-down mandate written by whom? Why, the Democrats, of course.

Could States require a signature to vote under the Democrats' bill? Only if they accept a computerized mark, making that signature requirement about as serious as clicking one checkbox on a website.

What if States and localities want to make sure that ineligible voters under the age of 18 don't end up on the voter rolls or decide whether or how convicted felons have their voting rights restored? Well, under the "Democratic Politician Protection Act," States have no choice in the matter.

How many early days of voting should there be? Do polls need to be open on Sundays? What is the best way to make absentee ballots available? When can early voting take place, and how long and where should the polling places be located?

Different States and communities have come to different legitimate judgments on all of these questions. It is a core part of our constitutional system, and the decentralization of our election process leads to a more democratic system with more direct impact on the elections of those decision makers.

The United States of America has never been about centralizing all power in Washington, and Washington should not get to micromanage the processes that determine who comes to Washington.

But, alas, House Democrats don't seem to care if their partisan power grab upsets this constitutional balance. These Representatives even—get this—want the Federal Government to dictate to States how their very own congressional districts will be drawn. They want the Federal Government to tell the States how to draw their congressional districts.

Right now, there is a competition of ideas among the States about the best way to handle this. Different places arrive at different answers.

Naturally, House Democrats have a different idea. They want to force every State to use a commission that is designed by them—by Washington Democrats. Every State will have to use a commission designed by Washington Democrats whose structure and procedures are prescribed, of course, by Washington Democrats. If a State doesn't know how to bow to their will, then the DC Federal court will make the decisions that have been reserved for the State legislatures going back to our Nation's founding.

I know it is not fashionable on the far left to praise the wisdom of our

constitutional structure. It seems to be out of fashion. I am sure that in some corners I will be derided for referencing the Constitution at all. They will say: How could it still be relevant after all these years?

Of course, this thinking shows exactly why our founding principles are so important.

Our Constitution is there to protect our liberties and protect our form of government from the whim of whoever happens to be currently in power. These guardrails exist to stop things like a narrow partisan majority in the House of Representatives grabbing control of election laws just to benefit themselves politically. We need to stand with Alexander Hamilton and our Constitution, not with the House Democrats' partisan power grab.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### STRENGTHENING AMERICA'S SECURITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST ACT OF 2019—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1) to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McConnell amendment No. 65, to express the sense of the Senate that the United States faces continuing threats from terrorist groups operating in Syria and Afghanistan and that the precipitous withdrawal of United States forces from either country could put at risk hard-won gains and United States national security.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for S. 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Calendar No. 1, S. 1, a bill to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United

States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Pat Roberts, Shelley Moore Capito, Mitt Romney, Richard Burr, John Cornyn, Rick Scott, Mike Crapo, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Michael B. Enzi, Kevin Cramer, Mike Braun, John Boozman, Steve Daines, James M. Inhofe, Thom Tillis, Joni Ernst.

#### NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to proceed to Calendar No. 7, S. 47.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion to proceed.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 7, S. 47, a bill to provide for the management of the natural resources of the United States, and for other purposes.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk on the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 7, S. 47, a bill to provide for the management of the natural resources of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Pat Roberts, Shelley Moore Capito, Mitt Romney, Richard Burr, John Cornyn, Rick Scott, Mike Crapo, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Michael B. Enzi, Kevin Cramer, Mike Braun, John Boozman, Steve Daines, James M. Inhofe, Thom Tillis, Joni Ernst.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls be waived.

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

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

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

S. 1

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I am pleased the Senate is finally debating S. 1 after three inexplicable Democratic attempts to filibuster the bill. This package of Middle East policy bills, all of which have bipartisan support, addresses a number of key issues.

For starters, this legislation will further strengthen our relationship with our closest ally in the Middle East, Israel. It authorizes 10 years of mili-

tary support funding to Israel. It reaffirms the U.S. commitment to ensuring that Israel has better weapons and equipment than its enemies. It will also foster increased technical cooperation between Israel and the United States to support the security of both of our countries.

The legislation also strengthens our relationship with another close ally of ours in the Middle East, the Kingdom of Jordan. The Senate Intelligence Committee hearing on Tuesday was a timely reminder of the importance of investing in our alliances. Senior intelligence officials testified that China and Russia are becoming increasingly aggressive in seeking to increase their influence, not just in their own regions but in other parts of the world. Russia's support in the Syrian regime is a prime example.

Now, more than ever, it is vital that we maintain close relationships with our allies. The legislation before us also contains the Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act. This legislation will help hold accountable individuals who have supported the atrocities of the Assad regime. It directs the Treasury Department to investigate whether the Central Bank of Syria launders money for the Syrian Government.

The conflict in Syria has claimed hundreds of thousands of lives and driven literally millions of Syrians from their country. While the United States cannot solve every conflict around the world, it is vital that we make it very clear the United States will not tolerate those who have contributed to the brutality of Bashar al-Assad's government.

Finally, the legislation we are considering today will protect the right of State and local governments to decline to do business with entities that have chosen to boycott Israel. As I said, all of the bills in the legislation before us today have bipartisan support, and I hope the Senate will pass this legislation with a strong bipartisan majority.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 65

Madam President, I also would like to take a few moments to talk about an amendment the leader has proposed. As I noted, this week, our intelligence community leaders gave a frank assessment of the threats we face to our national security and to our interests, from ISIS and al-Qaida to the danger posed by a growing alignment between Russia and China, to Iran's destabilizing activities in the Middle East. As intelligence officials made clear, the U.S. faces numerous persistent threats, and we should be wary of letting our guard down or becoming complacent about our strength. For that reason, I would like to state my support for Leader MCCONNELL's amendment to express the sense of the Senate that we should be cautious about any premature withdrawal of our troops from Syria and Afghanistan.

We don't have to look back very far for a reminder that prematurely withdrawing our troops can create a power

vacuum that terrorists and others will step in to fill. Our too-hasty withdrawal from Iraq, on a timeline we announced to our enemies, created the circumstances that allowed for the rise of ISIS. We need to be wary about allowing something like that to happen again.

Terrorist groups are not the only entities we have to worry about. Adversaries like Russia and Iran are already trying to flex their power in the Middle East and would be more than happy to take advantage of an early U.S. withdrawal to strengthen their foothold in the region.

While I understand and respect President Trump's desire to bring our troops home and to end these protracted wars, we must do so in a way that ensures enduring stability and protects our interests and those of our allies. The leader's amendment is an important reminder of the need for caution and reflection as we consider troop withdrawals and would reassure our allies that the United States does not intend to abruptly leave them in the midst of the battle.

I hope all my colleagues will support the leader's amendment when we vote on it later this afternoon.

#### USS "SOUTH DAKOTA"

Madam President, before I close, I would like to mention the commission of the Navy's newest Virginia-class attack submarine, the USS *South Dakota*, which will occur this Saturday, February 2, 2019, in Groton, CT. Designated SSN 790, the USS *South Dakota* will be the 17th submarine of her class, pushing the envelope of U.S. maritime technology and undersea dominance.

We are proud the State of South Dakota will once again be represented in the fleet by this engineering marvel, which will project America's strength and protect our national interests throughout the maritime domain and beyond.

In March 2012, I led the South Dakota delegation, which then included Senator Tim Johnson and Congresswoman Kristi Noem, in writing Secretary of the Navy Mabus to request that the Navy name its next attack submarine the USS *South Dakota*. I join them and all South Dakotans in saying we are excited to see this honor come to fruition.

The *South Dakota* will build off the legacy of her forebears, a Pennsylvania-class armored cruiser that served as a troop escort in World War I and a battleship that was one of the most decorated battleships in World War II. The battleship *South Dakota* was a proud representative of the 68,000 South Dakotans who answered their country's call to serving the war, earning 13 battle stars in the Pacific theater.

The *South Dakota* led with her nine 16-inch guns in the battles of the Santa Cruz Islands and Guadalcanal, which earned her a reputation as a fighting machine by defending U.S. aircraft carriers and disabling the enemy's.

In her second Pacific tour, the *South Dakota* supported marine landings on the Marshall Islands with shore bombardments before joining the Battle of the Philippine Sea and fighting through a bomb hit in order to defend our fast carriers. As information on U.S. military action was limited at the time, she was often referred to as “Battleship X” and “Old Nameless.”

The submarine *South Dakota* will continue this distinguished tradition of service, and as is the nature of the submarine force, the accomplishments of this new boat and her crew may be even more secretive than those of her battleship predecessor's. In fact, it could be decades until we fully appreciate all the *South Dakota* might do in her 30-plus-year service life. We may very well read about her exploits in a sequel to “Blind Man’s Bluff”—the daring account of early U.S. submarine espionage and power projection.

Because of the nature of their work, the so-called Silent Service is often an undersung hero of the U.S. military's. I have certainly never seen a submarine at an airshow or coming down Main Street in a parade. The nature of the sub force's mission is as secretive as it is high stakes, but at any given moment, the U.S. submarine force is patrolling the depths of the ocean and is monitoring littoral waters for threats against our Nation and our allies.

The *South Dakota* will project power at sea and ashore with her payload of torpedoes and Tomahawk cruise missiles, which can be delivered without warning. Undetected, she will carry out the seven core competencies of the submarine force—anti-submarine warfare, anti-surface warfare, the delivery of special operations forces, strike warfare, irregular warfare, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance, and mine warfare—all while keeping adversaries on their toes.

While Saturday will be a time for our Navy and the country to celebrate this milestone, the *South Dakota* won't just be talked about here at home; around the world, our adversaries are taking note as this submarine will further strengthen our global presence and ability to protect the interests of the U.S. and our allies. Our adversaries are already undertaking significant efforts to challenge U.S. military capabilities and international order.

While they can try to copy our designs, mimic our operational concepts, or even try to replicate the way we train, one thing they will never be able to do is to imitate our people. The commissioning crew has proven its aptitude and professionalism in the months leading up to this point. The men and women of our submarine force, like those who serve in the ranks across the Department of Defense, are the root of America's military strength.

As Americans, we are grateful for all who have answered the call to serve and the families who support them, especially those who endure spending

months apart during long deployments. The lives of submariners are not easy, and they are not easy for their loved ones. We thank them for their sacrifice.

The *South Dakota's* complement of 135 talented officers and sailors will put its population in line with those of South Dakota towns like Isabel, Pierpont, and Java. Like South Dakota's rural towns, the USS *South Dakota* will be a tight-knit community of its own, albeit one that is uniquely confined to a submersed vessel just over a football field long and with a nuclear reactor.

The indigenous inhabitants and early pioneer settlers of the State of South Dakota instilled a resourceful and resilient ethic in the culture of our State that continues to this day. This was driven by the remote, austere, and often unforgiving conditions on the Great Plains. I am confident that such hardiness will be replicated in all officers and crew members of the *South Dakota* as they live up to the boat's motto, which means “Under the sea, we rule.”

As boat sponsor Deanie Dempsey brings the boat to life on Saturday, we thank the officers and crew of the *South Dakota* for their dedicated service to our country.

May God bless the USS *South Dakota* and keep watch over her as she patrols the seas.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 1

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I want to continue talking about a subject that I talked about yesterday, and that is our situation in the Middle East—specifically, but not exclusively, with respect to Syria.

To focus my thoughts, I want to begin talking about S. 1, which we are considering and will be considering shortly. We have been considering the procedural matters.

S. 1 is the Strengthening America's Security in the Middle East Act. Its sponsor is the senior Senator from the Presiding Officer's State, Senator RUBIO. He has done an extraordinary job with this bill. We both know Senator RUBIO. He is whip-smart, as I said yesterday. Speaking for me, he has forgotten more foreign policy than I will ever know.

This is a good bill. I will just mention a couple of things. Senator RISCH has worked very hard on it as well. He is, of course, the chairman of our Foreign Relations Committee.

There is a lot to like in S. 1. I just made a list walking over here. No. 1, S. 1 is going to reaffirm our commitment

to protecting Israel. Israel is easily our most important ally in the Middle East and is easily our most important friend in the Middle East. On some days, I think they are easily our only friend in the world, and we should support our friends. Let me say that again. We have to support our friends, and Israel is a friend. This bill will support Israel, and I like that. So I am going to vote for the bill.

No. 2, Senator RUBIO's bill strengthens our bond with Jordan, another key ally. Jordan is a key ally in fighting terrorism and the humanitarian catastrophe caused by Assad's butchering of his own people in Syria, along with the help of Vladimir Putin in Russia.

No. 3, Senator RUBIO's bill will combat a radical economic warfare campaign against Israel. That is very important. You either support Israel or you don't. It is time for everybody to stand up and be counted. I do.

Finally, Senator RUBIO's bill creates new sanctions on the Government of Syria. I am not sure they are going to be enough, but it is a start. It targets those who have been laundering money to help the Assad regime.

I support all of these things. I support S. 1, sponsored by Senator RUBIO. I thank him, Senator RISCH, and everybody who has worked so hard on S. 1.

There is a way to make S. 1 better, and I have an amendment pending that will do that. I have heard some of my colleagues correctly say that S. 1 is about standing with our allies, and that is important. Certainly, America's foreign policy is centered, in part, around interests but not exclusively around interests. Values are important too. If you have a foreign policy just based on your nation's interests, all you do is go from deal to deal to deal, and everything becomes expendable, depending on what day it is.

America's foreign policy has never been based exclusively on interests. I am not saying interests aren't involved, but it has been based on values. One of our values in America is that we stand with our allies. That is what S. 1 does. It stands with our friend Israel. It stands against our enemy Assad. It stands with Jordan.

I will tell you who it doesn't stand with—the Syrian Kurds. The Kurdish people are one of the largest—if not the largest—minorities in the world that is stateless. There are Kurds in Iraq, Iran, Turkey, and Syria. They don't have a caliphate. They don't have a country. They are occupying northeast Syria right now, and I believe they want peace. I believe—some of my colleagues disagree with me—that they believe in democracy, and that they, in large part, embrace Western values.

I understand that is debatable, but I will tell you one thing that is not debatable. We would not have defeated ISIS without the help of the Syrian Kurds. That is just an actual fact. You can write that one down and take it home to Mama.

Before somebody starts saying, well, we haven't defeated ISIS, I say: You

never defeat the terrorist group. They will just change their names. Has every jihadist in the world been eliminated in the Middle East? No. Duh. We will never eliminate all of them, but that doesn't mean the President was wrong to say a couple of years ago, when he became President: I don't know how many jihadists are calling themselves members of ISIS.

There were 100,000. There sure aren't 100,000 today. I know they had a capital in Raqqa. I know they had a caliphate in the Middle East. I know there were at least 100,000 of them, but there aren't 100,000 of them now.

We wouldn't have beaten back ISIS without the help of the Syrian Kurds.

The President has announced that he is going to pull American troops out of Syria, and he is talking about pulling American troops out of Afghanistan. I know there is a lot of debate about that. To be truthful, I don't know who is right and who is wrong.

Senator MCCONNELL has a vote on his amendment to S. 1 today. I am not sure I am going to vote for it. It is not because I think he is wrong, but it is because I am not sure he is right. I am not sure who is right. The President says one thing, his intelligence community says another, and Members of the Senate say a multitude of things, as we always do.

We have to get this one right. There is a lot of talk, not by Senators, but I have seen the opinions in the press. They say that this is all just a bunch of cynical politics, that the whole purpose of S. 1—and I don't believe it, but I have heard people say it, and I guess I can see their point—is about making somebody take a tough vote; that is all it is about.

Well, I don't care about tough votes or easy votes or the politics of this. I think what the American people are looking at is that we have been in Syria, and we have been in Afghanistan and Iraq, and we have spent trillions of dollars. Why are we there? Have we accomplished why we are there? And if not, when are we going to accomplish it? And, by the way, how much more will it cost?

I think the President makes a very valid point about nation-building and about mission creep. I have listened to this debate, and I honestly don't know, and I don't think the American people know. I know the intelligence community may be split, but we in the Senate, all of us—I have met every Member of the Senate—all have brains above a single cell organism. We can have experts come over here and brief us and tell us the pros and the cons. We haven't done that, and that really bothers me.

I am not here to criticize Turkey or President Erdogan. I am not saying I agree with everything President Erdogan does or everything Turkey does, but Turkey is a NATO ally, and that means a lot to us. Turkey is supposed to be a friend. I wish we could have better relationships with Turkey.

I would like to have a trade deal with Turkey, but I also want to protect our friends the Syrian Kurds.

It is no secret and it is no understatement to say that President Erdogan, his administration, and Turkey have had some pretty harsh things to say about the Syrian Kurds and about some of the things that Turkey might do if we pull out and the Syrian Kurds are left exposed. I know that puts us in a very difficult situation. It puts the Senate in a very difficult situation. It puts the President in a very difficult situation. Well, that is why we are here.

The purpose of this amendment, which I hope the Senate will support—I hope I will be allowed to bring it up—is not to make anybody take a tough vote or an easy vote. It is not about the 2020 elections. It is not about trying to get back at the House. It is about trying to allow us to focus and, hopefully, resolve a problem coming down the pike, like thunder on a summer night, that we are going to have to face: What are we going to do if we pull out or minimize our presence in Syria, and our friends the Turks attack our friends the Syrian Kurds? What are we going to do?

I don't want to see us wait until that happens and have us all running around like a bunch of sprayed roaches trying to figure it out. We need to deal with it now. We don't need to deal with it on the politics, and we don't need to deal with it in terms of who we are trying to make take a tough vote.

I would like to see the Senate have a briefing. I would like to bring experts over to talk to us—those who believe we ought to remain in Syria, those who believe we ought to leave. While we are at it, let's do the same thing about Afghanistan.

Then let's talk to the American people straight up: Here is what we have decided, and here is why. Here is the game plan. Here is when it is going to be completed, and here is what it is going to cost.

I am going to go back to where I started. I am not naive, nor is the Presiding Officer. A country's foreign policy always has involved with it interests—your own interests—but it is not interests alone. There has to be a moral component to a nation's foreign policy, and our moral principle is that we stand by our friends.

I am glad we are standing by Israel. I am going to vote for the bill. I am not sure I am going to vote for the amendment this afternoon, but I am going to vote for the bill. I just wish we would stand by our friends the Syrian Kurds.

Thank you.

I yield to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I recognize the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Thank you, Mr. President.

First, let me thank Senator KENNEDY. I think he has articulated a number of things that are important to us,

and it is important that we do debate these things. When the Founding Fathers put the Constitution together, they were very clear on article I rights, legislative rights, and some on the executive branch rights. On foreign policy, I think that was a work still in progress with them, and they left it with both branches to have a role in both crafting the foreign policy of this country and also in execution of the foreign policy of this country. In essence, that is what we are doing with S. 1.

S. 1 is a work that has been going on for a considerable period of time, and it addresses the relationships we have with a number of our friends in the Middle East. I think I heard the Senator say he did agree with S. 1 and the things that are in there, trying to help our friends the Israelis, trying to help our friends the Jordanians, and also trying to help what friends we have in Syria to help them shed the yoke of Bashar al-Assad, which is the Caesar bill, which is included in this. This is a conglomeration of about four different bills. It is bipartisan, not something that is common around here these days, but it is bipartisan in almost all respects, and it does do a lot of the things we want it to do. So I appreciate hearing his support for S. 1. I want to talk for just a minute about a couple of issues he raised.

No. 1, talking about the debate that has been going on within the executive branch on certain issues. This is the way it is supposed to work. Most of the time, this is done in the Intelligence Committee and in the Foreign Relations Committee in closed hearings. Occasionally, it bubbles over, as it has recently, where there were some statements made by the intelligence community that the President didn't necessarily subscribe to, but the intelligence community was doing its job.

There are 17 committed intelligence Agencies of the United States. Every day, they gather a massive amount of information which they try to boil down and understand where we are headed. Their job is to gather that and to submit it to policymakers—this body, to the Foreign Relations Committee, to the Intelligence Committee, this entire body, and, most importantly, to the President of the United States and all policymakers throughout government. They do that, and they do a good job doing it. Not everyone agrees.

The intelligence communities—I think I can say without breaching confidences—from time to time have a different level of confidence as to a conclusion they reach regarding a certain situation. Sometimes we debate these things publicly. The vast majority of times, we don't. As policymakers, we do have to make decisions.

The President of the United States has recently talked about the military activities we are doing both in Syria and in Afghanistan, and it has properly spawned a debate as to what we are

doing there, as the Senator suggested, what we have accomplished there, and what our continuing work there should be. I think that is a work in progress today.

I think everyone agrees that no matter what, the nation-building we did after World War II in Germany and Japan and after the Korean war in South Korea was incredibly successful. We spent a lot of money there, we imported American values there, and we did a great job. Over the last few decades, we have tried to use the same model in the Middle East, and it has been very unsuccessful. Before you can be successful, people have to want what you are giving them. That has not been unanimously accepted in the Middle East, and I think the President is right that we need to examine the nation-building and, for that matter, standing up our fighting forces that again have not been particularly competent in the Middle East.

In any event, it is a good debate to have. We are in the middle of that debate right now. I think everyone agrees that, no matter what, we have to maintain a sufficient military presence in the Middle East in various places. I think the military people are better making that decision than we are, but we have to have a military presence in certain places so that when we get a threat to America, we can respond, and we will respond. I don't think there is anything the President has said that backs us away from our commitment to respond, when necessary, to threats to the United States by terrorists. We are going to continue to respond. I think he has rightly identified that we should reexamine our nation-building efforts and expenditures in some areas, and I think he is right there.

I want to touch on, for just a minute, what the Senator said about the situation between the Turks and the Kurds, and then yield to my friend from Texas. You are absolutely right. The Kurds have been a great friend of ours for a long time. They have stood by our side. They have helped us in Syria and in other places when we have been fighting over the recent decades in the Middle East. They are good people. I met with them yesterday, and as I always do, I thanked them for their commitment to us and the sacrifices they have made. I realize they are there in their homeland and protecting their homeland. They have been magnificent fighters, and they are great people to have alongside us.

Some elements of the Kurdish people have had issues with Turkey. Turkey has been a long ally of the United States. We have a significant military presence there and a significant base there. This has been going on for a long time. They are a member of NATO. They are an official NATO ally of ours, which gives us certain responsibilities and gives them certain responsibilities.

The fact that the Kurds and the Turks are having issues with each other should very much concern us. No

matter what happens, as the Senator mentioned, we have American values, and both the Turks and the Kurds have to understand that they need to respect human rights, they need to respect the rule of law, and we have to stand by and watch that this occurs. There have been conversations going on—I don't think it is a secret to anyone—about how this is going to play out and what role the United States plays in this regard, but it is a difficult situation, as the Senator referred to.

At this time, I am going to oppose the amendment the Senator has proposed. I do so reluctantly because I think he is trying to speak to the fact that we need to stand by our friends, and we do need to stand by our friends. Our relationship with the Turks, I don't think it is a secret to anyone that it has hit a rough patch, but simply because we are in a rough patch doesn't mean we throw the baby out with the bathwater.

We are going to have to continue to keep our commitments. We are going to have to, as the Senator suggested, see that we stand by our friends. It is going to be difficult. It is difficult in the situation we are in, but we can do this, we are committed to do this, and we are going to continue to work at it. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

#### PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICING

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, on Tuesday of this week, the Senate Finance Committee had a very important hearing on the skyrocketing costs of prescription drugs, something the Presiding Officer knows a lot about.

In 2017, a study found that more than half of Americans regularly take some form of prescription medication. Modern medicine has made living with chronic health conditions that would have once been debilitating or fatal—like diabetes, high blood pressure, or asthma—modern medicine has made living with those conditions manageable. That is a blessing for which we are all grateful.

I know, at the same time, many of my constituents and many Americans struggle to buy prescription drugs to treat common health problems, not because they aren't widely available but because they simply are unaffordable. For many higher cost, brand-named drugs, generic alternatives are available at a lower price. For example, I happened to take a drug called Lipitor, which previously was covered by a patent. As a result of that patent, the cost of the drug was higher because the producer of the drug had a monopoly. We grant that monopoly for a period of time—I believe it is 12 years—in order for them to recoup their research and investment dollars. Unfortunately, many of these efforts to come up with lifesaving drugs are unsuccessful. So in order to encourage innovation and lifesaving discoveries, we have to find a way to allow drug companies to recover their sunk costs and make a profit.

Generic drugs have really been a lifesaver for many people. That same Lipitor that I take now is off of patent and is available for a few dollars for a 30-day supply. That is just one example. One study found that 93 percent of generic prescriptions are filled at \$20 or less, with the average cost being just more than a little over \$6, but for many drugs, there are no low-cost alternatives, and people are increasingly struggling to cover the rising costs of their medication.

One witness from Indiana, Kathy Sego, I think, speaks for a lot of parents who have children suffering from diabetes needing insulin, and I think her story was emblematic of that problem across the country.

In her case, she is a wife, a mother of two, and a choir teacher. Her son Hunter is one of the more than 30 million Americans who suffer from diabetes, and he relies on insulin to manage his blood sugar.

Kathy told us that when her son Hunter started college, he started to go to the pharmacy to pick up his insulin prescription himself. That is when he discovered that it cost \$1,700 a month, even with health insurance. The copay—the part they were responsible for and had been paying for Hunter, unbeknownst to him—is \$1,700 a month. Kathy assured him that, unfortunately, that cost was correct; \$1,700 only covers a 1-month supply.

Over the next few weeks, their family began to notice a change in their son Hunter. He was losing weight, falling behind in school, and was depressed—a far cry from what she said was his normally positive and energetic self. Unbeknownst to his parents, Hunter had only purchased one vial of insulin when he needed four, and he began rationing his supply of the drug. To try to counterbalance that, he began skipping meals—which is dangerous for a diabetic to do, let alone an incredibly active college football player like him. Fortunately, in time, his family realized what had happened, and they intervened, avoiding what could have been fatal consequences, but her family still battles with the expense of this insulin.

Kathy says she worries about what happens when Hunter graduates from college, noting that his life choices are contingent upon his ability to pay for the medicine he needs to keep him alive. She wondered at our hearing: Can he afford an apartment, utility bills, and repay his student loans? Hunter, she said, needs insulin to live, but should that need for insulin keep him from living?

About 1.5 million Americans have type 1 diabetes like Hunter, where their body produces no insulin to deal with the blood sugar, but as I mentioned earlier, 30 million Americans, according to the Centers for Disease Control, have diabetes, and about 3 million of those 30 million are in my State of Texas. Three million Texans have diabetes for which insulin is a required treatment.



While we know it is common to see higher drug prices for new drugs that have recently completed the costly research-and-development phase, that is not the case for insulin, which has been around for nearly a century and is a type of biologic drug which is generally more expensive to produce.

I hope Kathy and Hunter's story—which could be told millions of times by other families across the country—impels us to investigate the causes for these unreasonable costs for some of these prescription drugs. I hope we find a solution—and I am confident we will if we try hard enough—that will allow families like Kathy's to live without the burden of wondering how to pay for their healthcare costs, particularly when it comes to prescription drugs.

At Tuesday's hearing, I also questioned our witnesses about a phenomenon known as rebates and the way pharmacy benefit managers deal with pharmaceutical companies.

I noted that, ordinarily, it was a crime to kick back money to a provider. For some reason that nobody could justify, there was an exclusion for these rebates by pharmacy benefit managers to pharmaceutical companies.

In the case of prescription drug pricing, rebates and discounts provided by manufacturers could mean the difference between a drug being covered by your insurance plan or not, and, certainly, whatever the net price is after the rebate is not transparent to anybody, much less to the consumer, or returned directly to the consumer. Not only does this drive up the list price and out-of-pocket cost of lifesaving drugs, but it makes it impossible for Congress or anybody to determine where each dollar goes.

I find this lack of transparency alarming. It shouldn't take an advanced degree to figure out where your money is going when you buy prescription drugs or how to shop for the most effective drug at the right price. When it comes to prescription drugs, we need to promote transparency first and foremost, and we need to streamline and eliminate regulations and laws that allow the middlemen to unnecessarily drive up prices. We know we have the opportunity to do that in the coming months.

We shouldn't require people suffering from chronic diseases to subsidize the healthcare costs of healthy people. There is something strangely wrong about this picture. I am glad we had the opportunity to listen to witnesses on this topic, and I thank them for taking the time to share their insights.

I look forward to continuing to work with all of our colleagues on the Finance Committee and generally to identify ways to make prescription drugs more affordable and accessible to the American people.

As the Presiding Officer knows, given his background in healthcare, I am confident he can be an important part of that solution, as well.

#### TRIBUTE TO SUSAN PAMERLEAU

Mr. President, switching gears just a bit, I want to share a quick good-news story of two outstanding Texans who blazed the trail for women in public service.

While I was in San Antonio, my hometown, a couple of weeks ago, I had the chance to congratulate our new U.S. marshal for the Western District of Texas, Susan Pamerleau. Over the years, she has held many impressive titles—general in the Air Force and sheriff—and now she is a U.S. Marshal. In addition to each of those, I have always been proud to know her under a different title—as a friend.

At Susan's ceremonial swearing-in, Chief Judge Orlando Garcia opened by noting the historical significance of her being the first female marshal ever in the Western District of Texas, which was established in 1857.

Susan's long and impressive career began at Lackland Air Force Base in Texas, where my dad happened to have been stationed at one time, where she received her commission through officer training school. Over the course of her 32-year career in the Air Force, she rose through the ranks and retired, ultimately, as an Air Force major general in the year 2000.

When she returned to Texas, Susan joined USAA as a vice president and later became senior vice president. It wasn't until 10 years later that her career in law enforcement began when she was elected sheriff of Bexar County, TX, which is the 11th largest sheriff's office in the Nation.

Susan was the first woman to hold that role as well, but she said:

It was not about being the first woman. It was really about redefining the role of what the Bexar County sheriff does.

Over the years, I have had the opportunity to work with her on a number of issues impacting my constituents and our constituents, including mental health and law enforcement reforms. I think she has made an enormous contribution to both of those areas.

Needless to say, I was thrilled when the President nominated Susan to be the new U.S. marshal for the Western District of Texas and when she was confirmed last fall. Her integrity, leadership, and management skills are critical to the Western District of Texas, which comprises 68 counties and more than 6 million people.

I wish, once again, to congratulate my dear friend Susan Pamerleau on becoming the U.S. marshal, and I look forward to continuing to work with her as we serve together the people of Texas.

#### REMEMBERING MARY LOU ROBINSON

Mr. President, finally, when you talk about women opening doors in Texas, you can't leave out Mary Lou Robinson, who sadly passed away last weekend at the age of 92.

Her long and distinguished legal career began at the University of Texas School of Law, where she met her husband, A.J. After law school, they re-

turned to Amarillo, TX, where they opened up the firm appropriately named Robinson & Robinson.

In 1955, she left the private practice of law when Potter County commissioners appointed her judge of the Potter County Court at Law, making her the first in a series of firsts for this remarkable woman.

Judge Robinson found her passion, and she was hooked. In the coming decades, she became an advocate for women's rights, and she helped to promote the passage of the Texas Equal Rights Amendment, a constitutional amendment voted on by the people in 1972.

Over the course of her remarkable 63-year judicial career, Judge Robinson served as the 108th District Court judge, followed by associate and then chief justice of the 7th Court of Appeals, located in Amarillo.

In 1979, she was appointed by President Jimmy Carter to be a judge of the U.S. District Court for Northern District of Texas, where she served for nearly 40 years.

Her career is impressive, not only for its length but for its quality. One attorney practicing before Judge Robinson noted: "Lawyers may disagree on a lot of things, but almost all agree that she treats everyone equally and fairly." That is high praise for a district judge.

Judge Robinson will be remembered as an inspiring and devoted judge, an early advocate for women's rights, and a beloved member of her community.

Last summer, Senator CRUZ and I introduced a bill to rename the Federal building and courthouse in Amarillo the J. Marvin Jones Federal Building and the Mary Lou Robinson United States Courthouse.

This lasting testament to her judicial career will live on for generations, and I am proud that Senator CRUZ and I were able to cement this legacy for this legal pioneer.

While our family sends our prayers to the family of Mary Lou Robinson, we can all be proud of her distinguished career of service, not only to her beloved community in Amarillo but to the State of Texas and to the Nation as a whole.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I recognize the Senator from North Carolina.

#### COMBUSTIBLE CIGARETTES

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I was not next in the queue. Senator GARDNER was, but since I don't see him, I am going to jump in, in great Senate fashion.

I rise today to educate my colleagues and the American people on actions that are currently being taken by the Food and Drug Administration. It deals with one specific thing that is familiar to all of us: combustible cigarettes. It revolves around a decision the FDA has just announced earlier this year: their plan to ban menthol combustible products. Their rationale for doing this is that menthol is the doorway for youth usage of tobacco products.

Let me start and end at the same point. I am going to start with this chart. This chart displays, from 2011 to 2017, the CDC's annual study of youth usage of tobacco products. Specifically, this one addresses the use of menthol cigarettes, where we have seen a reduction of 5.8 percent to 2.5 percent.

Somehow, as this chart displays, we have had a significant reduction in the use of menthol products for youth in this country. With this trend line, we are now making the case, as the Federal Government, that we have to ban this product because it is what is fueling an increase in youth usage.

Over the same period, youth usage of combustible cigarettes has dropped by 12.5 percent. By any standard we would look at, we would say that we have an education program in America that is actually having the right impact here. Between what we educate, parental guidance, and school pressures, the usage of our youth is going down.

This would be something that typically we would praise, but, no, an administration that came in primarily saying that we are here to reduce the regulation of the Federal Government, has picked one area that not only is it not reducing, but it is disregarding the trends that we see, and it is coming out with new regulations that, at the end of the day, are going to impact adults for whom we haven't either provided the tools to stop using combustible cigarettes or who have made a conscious choice that they want to use a legal product they know up front is harmful to their health.

To successfully talk about this, I have to hit rewind and go back 10 years, because it was 10 years ago, in 2009, that the Congress of the United States took up the Tobacco Control Act. I will say that it was a controversial debate. I spent hours on this floor.

Here are some of the points I made in 2009—that H.R. 1256, which was the Tobacco Control Act, did not provide a pathway to market for new tobacco products. New tobacco products were products that technologically we could create that provided a level of satisfaction for its users but didn't have the harmful effects of the combustion of tobacco. Innovative products—we see them in the market place today. They are there not because of the guidance of the Food and Drug Administration, with over 10 years of total control over the tobacco industry. They are there because the marketplace demanded it. Consumers said: Give me a tool to switch. We have gone from gum to patches, to now electronic cigarettes.

It was believed, at the time, that because we centralized tobacco regulation within an Agency that understands how to use scientific information to make decisions, they would look at trend lines like this and would make decisions that were consistent with it—that as technology became more available, we could determine how to put a heart valve in with it being less invasive through the use of

technology. Over 10 years, we haven't figured out how to write a foundational rule to tell companies how they need to apply to get an e-cigarette approved.

When we went into this 10 years ago, HHS claimed that the Department would need \$100 million to establish an Agency solely focused on tobacco products. We did them one better. We imposed user fees on the tobacco industry. For every piece of tobacco product that is sold, they paid to the FDA a user fee on that product. It is that user fee that has funded the FDA effort.

In 2019, the FDA received \$712 million in user fees from the industry. Let me put that in perspective. Everybody who buys a tobacco product is paying a higher price today so that this money can go to the FDA so the FDA, hopefully, will create a foundational pathway that will allow them to approve and receive applications for reduced-harm products.

It is very consistent with this trend line of money we pumped into education to reduce youth usage and to encourage adults to switch, but until it is illegal in the United States, adults ought to have the freedom to choose the products they want.

Unfortunately, 10 years later, we are in no better position than we were 10 years ago, where the choices are combustible products or products that have yet to even have an established pathway by the FDA.

Those who are venturing out today offering e-cigarettes and alternatives are doing it with the understanding that tomorrow the FDA could walk in and say: We are going to pull this product off the marketplace because it hasn't been approved. Yet the FDA has never created the pathway and shown an individual or a company the application process to get a product like this approved.

Ten years ago, before TCA was signed into law, there were 14 Agencies that regulated tobacco in the United States. It was the Treasury Department, the Transportation Department, Commerce, Justice, the Executive Office of the President, HHS, Education, Labor, and the General Services Administration. It is now consolidated into one. You would think that we would do a much better job of doing it.

I am going to share with you the conclusion, and I will come back to this a couple of times.

There is an age restriction on the purchase of tobacco today. It is 18. We can have a debate as to whether it should be 21. We can have a debate about moving the age.

But when an agency that has the sole control of tobacco cannot enforce the age requirement for it to be purchased, you have to ask yourself, by taking away options that adults have, does that in any way, shape, or form affect youth usage when the youth are illegally accessing the product today?

You see, back when 14 agencies controlled it—and being a former Governor, the Presiding Officer may re-

member some of this—States actually enforced because the Federal mandate was to enforce the age requirements. They do it on alcohol today, and in some places, they do it on tobacco. But when we centralized all of the authority at the FDA, the FDA apparently gave up on the age requirement, and they only focused on things like this, where they can manipulate through government regulation, through onerous actions on the consumers, what they want to accomplish, which I would suggest to my colleagues and to the American people is not driven by facts or science; it is driven by politics. It is driven by those who want to see this product eliminated.

I will say what I said 10 years ago: I am ready for the debate. Let's bring it to the floor, and we can talk about it and debate it.

This is eerily similar to Canada a few years ago when they banned menthol products. How did they follow that up? This year, they legalized cannabis. Maybe that is the route we are on. We can have that debate at any point, but right now, that is illegal in the United States, and we put up with it with States that have legalized it. I am not sure it is a good move for adults, and I am not sure it is a good move for our youth. It certainly has the same combustible concerns we have with tobacco products. But there is a difference between the two—this is legal. We have agreed that if you are over 18, you can choose to use it—with an extensive educational campaign to tell everybody why it is harmful to their health.

Also 10 years ago, I offered an amendment to create a department within HHS known as the Tobacco Harm Reduction Center, requiring public ranking of tobacco products according to their risk. That amendment would have allowed for the development of new products to encourage individuals to give up traditional tobacco products and turn to less harmful products.

I remember the debate well. My colleagues who were opposed to me in the debate said: If we centralize this at FDA, the natural reaction will be that they will migrate to not only the application being understood as to how to process it, but they will be inclined to approve those products quickly because of the alternative that we know today.

Here we are 10 years later, and we have no transitional, foundational pathway for a manufacturer to know how to apply to the FDA or what standards they have to meet. It is almost as if we are going to make it up as we go along. Therefore, these products are on the marketplace, but there is no application process at the FDA. They are susceptible to millions of dollars of investment being yanked tomorrow because somebody wakes up and says: My gosh. Youth have started using e-cigarettes. The Presiding Officer knows there is an 18-year-old age requirement on e-cigarettes as well. Is the answer to that to remove all of



that product for every American because we can't figure out a way to enforce an age limitation? I would suggest to my colleagues, if that is where we are headed, we are going to eliminate some products that will cause chaos in this country.

I suggest that this will not cause chaos, but this will be the wrong signal to send to adults who prefer to use this product, and we do it under the false pretense that we are doing this because of America's youth. America's youth are doing the right thing. They are reducing their usage of combustible products. They are not enticed by things like menthol. Yet they are the ones whom we are using to be the fig leaf of all this new government regulation that the Food and Drug Administration is proposing to do.

Within the office of tobacco control, there are 778 employees. There are close to 1,000 employees in the center for drug review. Put that in perspective—all the drugs that are out there, all the applications they are going through. We have almost as many people in the tobacco control agency as we do in drug review.

Well, the one thing I can assure you about drug review is that they actually do process applications. It is long. It is laborious. We would like to speed that up. Under the latest PDUFA reauthorization, the user fee for drugs, there is a 304-day average to process an application. Well, the review of a modified risk—if you change the risk of a combustible, if you have decided as a manufacturer that you are going to change the paper on the cigarette because there is technology that assures you that paper is not going to burn and somebody is not going to fall asleep and burn down a house—when they change that, that has to go through a modification review at the FDA. How long does a modification review currently take? It takes 360 days—56 days longer than that of a new drug application actually working its way through the Food and Drug Administration. They can't claim there are not enough people. There are ample people, and the FDA has hired 267 employees in tobacco control since 2017. The numbers may actually be identical now.

As I said earlier, in 2019 the FDA will receive \$712 million in user fees from the industry. Of the \$582 million in user fees collected by the FDA in 2018, which we have just completed, \$205 million originated from the sale of combustible menthol cigarettes. So this one proposal is going to reduce by one-third the amount of money that the regulatory agency has.

I might share with the Presiding Officer—because I think he would find this of great interest, having left the State of Florida as Governor—that there is a tax revenue piece tied to this. A ban on the sale of menthol cigarettes will generate a significant revenue loss for State, Federal, and local governments. Last year, menthol sales brought in \$4.1 billion in Federal excise tax, it

brought in \$9.1 billion in State and local excise tax, and it brought in \$1.8 billion in State and local sales tax. That is a total of \$15.2 billion. Two-thirds of it is—State and local governments will lose over \$10 billion in revenue from this one decision, the elimination of a choice for adults—all under the belief and sales pitch to the American people that this is going to stop youth usage of tobacco. Bull. We are not going to stop youth usage until we enforce the age limit, whether it is 18, 20, 21, wherever we set it. We eliminated enforcement of the age when 10 years ago we consolidated all of this into one entity at the Food and Drug Administration.

So my suggestion to my colleagues is we have gotten no benefit out of this. If anything, we have lost because we don't enforce age. We have gotten no new innovative products. We are not even on the horizon looking at a proposed pathway. There is not a pathway. I question whether there is even one perceived, even though we have 1,000 people working at CTP—soon to be cut by one-third by their own proposal that is going to eliminate user fees based upon the loss of sales of menthol products.

So I say to my colleagues, it is extremely important that you understand that when Commissioner Gottlieb announced his reform initiative for the regulation of tobacco on July 28, 2017—and I recognize the fact that we move from administration to administration, we move from Commissioner to Commissioner, and most come in and say: The last guy did it all wrong; I am going to do it differently. I hold him to his word on July 28 when he said that. He said in that announcement: The goals of the new approach will include the development of foundational regulations to provide the rules of the road for the review of tobacco product applications and a path to market for less harmful products as part of the solution to end the cycle of disease and death.

Let me repeat what I said earlier. The FDA has yet to issue a single foundational rule as called for in July of 2017. The proposed version of one SE rule is currently under review at the OMB.

If you are now the single agency in charge of the regulation of tobacco and you are looking at how to reduce the harm of the product, wouldn't your focus first be on how you approve technological products that meet the threshold of reduced risk? If you saw an increase in youth usage, would you not look at a period of time, like 7 years, and ask yourself, is this an anomaly?

We will have a report next month from CDC of their annual tobacco survey. There must be something alarming in it relative to youth usage of e-cigarettes alone, and I don't dispute what they found. If, in fact, we find that menthol took a spike up and they say 11 percent of our youth are using

it, I will question the science of their survey, with the trend that has consistently built over the last 7 years.

But I would also make this point: If there is an age limitation on e-cigarettes, just as there is on combustibles, are we not smart to first go in and find an enforcement mechanism for age if, in fact, our concern is that our youth are using the product?

In essence, what they have done with the menthol rule is they suggested: We don't want to enforce the age thing. That is hard. What is easy for us to do is to do something that is political. It doesn't change much, but we can go out and say "Look at what we did. We eliminated access to this product."

The majority of the people who use this product are adults. The tax revenues at the State, local, and Federal levels are huge.

As a matter of fact, one of the settlements that were made prior to the Tobacco Control Act was the Master Settlement Agreement. That was before the Presiding Office was Governor and before some in this room might have been born. It was in 1998, and it was a significant change for an industry. They agreed not only to defray Medicaid costs at the State level; they agreed to an annual payment. That annual payment was more than \$200 billion in manufacturer funds to defray the cost of healthcare to States through Medicaid resulting from the use of tobacco products and to develop cessation programs to get Americans to quit smoking.

Let me suggest to you that it is not the industry that is fighting this; it is the industry that is fueling this. They are funding it. They are the ones funding the CTP. They are the ones funding the education programs. They are actually the ones that are supplementing Medicaid funding in States.

Well, let me say to Commissioner Gottlieb and to those bright folks over at CTP: When you do this, you are eliminating a portion of that \$200 billion that is calculated based upon the sale of products in the marketplace, and you are reducing the shared cost of Medicaid. For many States that have diverted that money to other things, you are reducing economic development. I think one State was building sidewalks with tobacco money in one large city.

I could be critical of how they have done it and what they have used it for, but I do know this: I went far enough in math to know that if you reduce the amount of sales and if the payment is figured based on sales, then you reduce the take States and cities are going to get from taxes or from the settlement.

So I say to my colleagues, concentrate on this number—2.5 percent was the last number the CDC came out and said that of our youth, this is the percentage that use menthol products.

We should not quit until that number is zero. If you want to make that number zero for youth under 18 today for all tobacco products, I have the answer: enforce the law. Hold retailers

accountable. Do the same raids on tobacco that you do with alcohol. We probably will never get to zero, but we might do better than 2.5 percent of menthol or 8.5 percent of overall tobacco usage.

I want to summarize because I know there are other colleagues who wish to speak. I assure my colleagues, and I assure Commissioner Gottlieb and all the individuals who work at the CTP at the Food and Drug Administration, I am going to be down here every week. These speeches are going to get longer and longer and they will get more and more detailed because I want my colleagues who aren't here to understand the debate we went through, the decisions we made, and the assumptions that were made for consolidating these Agencies into one Agency versus multiple Agencies, and what they said would happen. I can give my own report card, and I am giving it to you. They have done zero. All of these matters about reduced-harm products that the FDA was going to set up, transitional, foundational rules don't exist.

It is 10 years later. It is 2 years after the current Commissioner got in and said: We are going to do this.

Well, I am still waiting. Rather than produce things which adults can take advantage of—tools to get off of combustible cigarettes—what is the action all of a sudden they take? To everybody's amazement, they said: We are going to ban menthol from the marketplace.

I mentioned Canada earlier. They banned menthol and, 3 years later, they approved cannabis as a legal product. I am not accusing the administration of having that pathway, though it does raise suspicion because it is not the administration of reduced regulation and onerous government when you see what the FDA is proposing to a legal consumer product, but I will state that the Commissioner announced not long ago that they were beginning to review products that were derived from cannabis, oils, and other things that they thought they could safely approve for use in the United States.

Well, Mr. Commissioner, you are only fueling my fears that you are following the roadmap Canada followed; that this is all a bait-and-switch situation. Not only is it not valid to suggest we are doing this because of our youth, you are doing it to prove that the Food and Drug Administration can overreach and not be slapped and that somewhere down the road you may come to the same conclusion Canada did; rather than enforce cannabis and illegal drugs, let's just approve them. Let's make them legal. Boy, that is a sad day. It is shocking to me as one who has been engaged in this debate for now 25 years.

We are extremely worried about the combustible impact of cigarettes—and we should be—but States don't have any concerns about the combustible nature of cannabis. There are no filters on it. There are no regulations on the

paper that is used, even though it is legal in some States. As a matter of fact, we have less research on cannabis in this country than any legal product that exists, including band-aids.

There is more research and development and approval that goes into band-aids than goes into cannabis in the States where it is legal for either recreational or medical use.

So I would state to Commissioner Gottlieb, in the insane world you have created, if you are going to head down this road, No. 1, expect Congress to weigh in but, No. 2, understand that if you begin to loosen up the legal use of cannabis, then we are going to hold you to the same standards you display for everyone else, everything that you hold a drug manufacturer to, that you hold a drug device manufacturer to, and, quite honestly, that you hold the tobacco industry to. Don't think you are going to slide this by and there are not going to be regulations or that we are going to adopt the Canada model or we are going to continue letting States do what they are doing.

If you are worried about somebody burning a product and inhaling it into their lungs, there better be as much concern about that as it relates to marijuana use. Why is there no effort—given that this is legal from a recreational and medical standpoint—from the FDA to study this and put the science out?

It only suggests to me that science is not important. Yet this is the institution that is the gold standard for the use of science. There is a scientific reason for why it takes 304 days to get a new drug approved. There is no scientific reason that it takes 360 days to approve as acceptable changing the paper on a combustible cigarette.

I am not creating this pathway, the FDA did. It started with the U.S. Congress providing this much authority to one Agency, an Agency they believed could do everything. Because they are not funded by the U.S. Congress for this piece—they are funded by the industry—do you know what? They think Congress has no say in it.

Do you know who funds 75 percent of new drug applications that are filed, reviewed, and approved? The drug industry. Seventy-three percent of applications they review and approve for the medical device industry are funded by the medical device industry.

With regard to generic drugs, which we all want more of because they drive down the cost of drugs in America, all of a sudden the FDA has a backlog that is years-long for approving generic applications. They said, if only we had a user fee agreement for generic drugs, and that user fee agreement is over 60 percent of the cost of approving a generic drug. What has happened? The backlog is every bit as big today as it was when the user fee was created. So if my colleagues wonder why I am standing in the way of a user fee agreement for over-the-counter drugs, it is because I figured this out.

They get funded by the industry. Their actual work goes down. The American people pay the tab for the user fees that are sent to the FDA, while the price of drugs, devices, cigarettes, and over-the-counter drugs goes up. When Congress stands up and says explain this, they look at us—and we control 25 percent of their budget for any given center—and they say: We are going to go talk to the people who pay 75 percent of our budget, not to you.

The last thing I will share is that 25 years ago it wasn't like this. Twenty-five years ago, we appropriated everybody's budget in the administration. One hundred percent of the money for the FDA was appropriated by Congress. When I, as a Member of the U.S. Senate, picked up the phone and called the FDA, they didn't want to answer my question over the phone. They wanted to come to my office that day and answer it. They wanted to actually solve the problem.

I just went through a period of time where I gave FDA 2 weeks to respond to letters and, in some cases, it took a month to get a response.

They don't think we play a role in this. Yet we set legislation priorities for the country. I would suggest to my colleagues that this is an isolated example, that is true, but it is an example of a much bigger problem within the Food and Drug Administration and this Commissioner; that Congress is insignificant to them; that you can be called up to provide oversight in front of a committee, and you can say whatever because we have no clarity and no transparency inside the system. So they can tell me the review time has gone down 47 days since last year. I don't know whether it is accurate. I can only tell you this. I don't see it in the numbers of third parties that do reviews. I see actions such as this with no science to substantiate it, and I have to question the science they use across the landscape of products they review.

The Food and Drug Administration regulates 25 cents of every dollar of the U.S. economy. This ought to be something that not just my colleagues but the American people should be concerned with.

If you believe my argument is half accurate and this is ill-advised, for God's sake, pick up the phone and call the White House switchboard and tell the President, who came in to reduce regulation, that there is an Agency that is not listening.

Not only is there an Agency that is not listening, the President has a Commissioner that went on Twitter, and there was a tweet that said the President's numbers are going down, and the Commissioner "liked" the tweet. Maybe I will say that a few more times so the President will see it or hear it, but maybe somebody is listening who will tell him.

I am not interested in a single individual's political goal. This has to be an individual political goal because

there is no science to substantiate what they are doing, and the losers are the localities and States in taxes and States in settlement payments but, more importantly, adults who choose this product because it is legal.

Now the FDA says, with the strike of a pen: We can eliminate it. It is no longer a choice you have.

That is not the America I signed up for, but I did sign up to come here and fight for things I thought weren't in the best long-term interests of the country. This is at the top of my list right now. You will hear me often.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator from Iowa.

(The remarks of Ms. ERNST pertaining to the introduction of S. 285 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Ms. ERNST. I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. SANDERS pertaining to the introduction of S. 309 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

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

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

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture vote on the McConnell amendment occur at 3 p.m. today, and the filing deadline for second-degree amendments apply as if the vote occurred at the originally scheduled time of 3:30 p.m.

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

Mr. THUNE. 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.

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

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

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS pertaining to the introduction of S. 296 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Ms. COLLINS. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

#### TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise to discuss challenges that influence nearly every component of our day-to-day lives and the opportunity to address these challenges in the 116th Congress.

No matter who you are, where you live, or your level of income, every one of us is affected by our Nation's transportation system. I believe, as most Nebraskans do, that a core responsibility of the Federal Government is to provide sufficient and sustainable transportation and infrastructure to all of our citizens. Our transportation system is critical to our national security, to our economy, and to our public safety. Here in the Senate, I have worked hard to remove the unnecessary obstacles to the safe and efficient flow of goods and people throughout our country and around the world, and I plan to continue that work as we begin this Congress.

This is a priority that is of particular importance to my State of Nebraska. Agriculture is the economic engine of our State's economy. According to the U.S. Trade Representative's office, Nebraska is the fifth largest agricultural exporting State. To continue moving our products from the heartland to the coasts and beyond, we need an efficient, an effective, and a safe transportation system. Few understand this better than Nebraskans. We rely on the connection of our roads and highways, railroads, ports, and ocean carriers to bring goods and services to the world market. We use trucks to haul livestock across the country. Our railroads and waterways move vast quantities of grain across the prairie and to the coasts, and our ports and ocean vessels move these commodities around the world.

For Nebraska to continue benefiting from domestic and international trade, it is vital that we build and maintain our infrastructure, reduce unnecessary regulatory burdens, and promote safety across the surface transportation network. We must also recognize that connections across all of these modes—truck, rail, waterway, ocean, and air—must function smoothly for the system to work.

In the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee, I am proud to, once again, chair the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine Infrastructure, Safety and Security, which oversees the important surface transportation issues. This will be my fifth year as chairman, and I am looking forward to continuing the effective accomplishments that my colleagues and I have made.

Specifically, in 2015, we worked across party lines to pass the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act, more commonly known as the FAST Act. This was the first long-term highway bill that had been passed by Con-

gress in over a decade, and it included several positive reforms to our surface transportation system. It recognized the importance of freight movement as part of the broader infrastructure debate by including a new freight formula program and a freight specific grant program. It gave key State and local officials the flexibility they needed to develop strategic investments in their communities.

Together, we have improved the flow of commercial traffic and increased the safety of America's roads, but there is still much work to be done. With the 116th Congress underway, we have much to do on transportation policy.

Of note is the quickly approaching expiration of the FAST Act reauthorization in September of 2020. The transportation and safety subcommittee, which oversees the Department of Transportation and a number of modal administrations, will be hard at work on our part of that FAST Act reauthorization. Administrations under the jurisdiction of the subcommittee include the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, the Federal Railroad Administration, and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Each of these modal administrations will be closely examined by the subcommittee.

We will be holding hearings on Federal trucking policy and will be providing oversight for the FMCSA. The trucking industry is critical to our economy because it moves the most freight by volume and value across this country. As such, we will be examining a number of trucking issues, including hours of service requirements, the Compliance, Safety, Accountability Program, and the very wide scope of trucking regulations. Moving forward, we will work together to find safe, practical solutions to these issues.

Additionally, we must carefully consider policies to support our port facilities and the connections they make between truck and rail networks to ocean shipping. It may sound funny to my colleagues that a Senator from a triple landlocked State like Nebraska is advocating the support of our ports and ocean shipping industry. Yet, as I noted earlier, Nebraska is the fifth largest agriculture exporting State in the Nation, and whether it is beef or grain or equipment, we depend on our ports to ensure our quality products reach around the world.

There are currently a wide variety of issues facing this key portion of our transportation system. Ocean carriers are using even bigger vessels, which has greatly increased the amount of freight moving through the ports and is affecting the connections to other transportation modes.

Port operations are becoming increasingly complex, and stakeholders are examining ways to support freight movement by better utilizing data, such as GE Portal at the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach.

Ports are taking advantage of new types of infrastructure, like inland

ports, while also addressing new challenges such as a shortage of chassis to move the containers.

State and local governments, industry, labor, and the Commissioners at the Federal Maritime Commission are reviewing these and other important issues to the maritime commerce system. We need to hear from all of these stakeholders to better understand these challenges and these opportunities before us.

Additionally, last year, the Federal Railroad Administration oversaw one of the biggest changes to our railroad network in recent history—the implementation of positive train control, or PTC.

There are 41 railroads that are required by Congress to install and to use PTC on their systems. I was glad to see the statement from the FRA that all 41 railroads met the deadline to submit documentation that they are either utilizing PTC or that they have completed the requirements to receive an extension, as required by the Positive Train Control Enforcement and Implementation Act of 2015. This, however, was the first of two major deadlines for PTC implementation.

Railroads that receive an extension must complete their PTC systems no later than December 31, 2020. Congress must continue its oversight of PTC implementation, especially as railroads work to achieve that interoperability across the network.

The Transportation and Safety Subcommittee will be looking at PTC but also at regulations and railroad investments more broadly, both at the Federal Railroad Administration and at the Surface Transportation Board.

Late in the 115th Congress, the Senate confirmed Patrick Fuchs and Martin Oberman to be members of the STB, and I look forward to working with the Board and its new members on rail commerce issues.

The Transportation and Safety Subcommittee will also examine pipeline safety issues as we prepare for a reauthorization of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration. For families, consumers, workers, and businesses, the safety and security of our pipeline network must remain a top priority. America's pipelines move vital energy to homes and businesses in Nebraska and throughout our Nation. Congress must continue its robust oversight of our pipeline network.

In 2016, we worked in a bipartisan manner to pass a bill I introduced—what ultimately became known as the PIPES Act—to reauthorize PHMSA through fiscal year 2019.

The Transportation and Safety Subcommittee will be working to reauthorize PHMSA with an eye toward improving the efficiency and the effectiveness of the Agency's pipeline oversight. We will continue ensuring the Agency has what it needs to complete its pending rulemakings.

As Congress begins its work on these surface transportation issues, I look

forward to working with the administration on policies that cut redtape and improve the movement of people and freight across our system.

During the last Congress, I was very pleased to twice host Transportation Secretary Elaine Chao to Nebraska, and I look forward to continuing to work with the Secretary and the Modal Administrators. I also look forward to working with Senator DUCKWORTH, the new ranking member of the Transportation and Safety Subcommittee, and with all of my colleagues on the subcommittee so we can find bipartisan solutions for our surface transportation system.

We have a very unique opportunity to work together to improve the daily lives of all Americans. This is so much more than just drawing a few lines on the map. It means making decisions that will help parents get their children to school using safe and reliable roads. It means ensuring our commercial truckdrivers, railroads, ports, ocean carriers, and all those in between can ship products made in Nebraska to the rest of the country and all over the world. It means connecting American communities.

During my chairmanship, I will encourage strategic, targeted, and long-term investments that improve safety and more efficiently facilitate commerce. By working together, we can deliver solutions that will allow American families, communities, and businesses to thrive for generations to come.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

AMENDMENT NO. 65

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I come to speak about the pending amendment we are going to vote on in about 25 minutes. It is an amendment that says it is a mistake to proceed with the withdrawal from Syria in the pace and scale that is currently proposed or that the White House has announced they are going to undertake.

What I will say here today is what I said about it initially; that is, that I think it is a bad idea. I said it then, and I said it to the President in a subsequent meeting, and I think it is important to restate it here as we begin to vote, since I believe this issue is going to be covered in the press more as a political issue than as a foreign policy one.

It is unfortunate that a lot of these issues are wrapped up as political decisions. These are not votes on political decisions. These are votes on the conduct of American foreign policy, which oftentimes have no partisan lines but rather are ideological, in some cases, or just simply a different way to view an issue.

I share the White House's and the President's desire that as quickly as possible—the key words being “as possible”—we end conflicts abroad. It is in the best interest of our Nation, our

families, and the families of the service men and women who are stationed abroad and involved in conflict zones that this be the case. The problem is, if you do so in the wrong way, you end up dramatically increasing the likelihood of a future conflict that will involve even bigger wars, with an even higher investment of lives and resources to win.

Our foreign policy in the Middle East today—particularly in this region we are talking about with Syria and Iraq—is focused on two primary objectives, as clearly stated by the policymakers. The first is the regional threat of Iran, its growing influence and its spreading reach, and the other is counterterrorism. These are the two linchpins of why we are there in the first place.

The Iran threat is self-explanatory. They pose a threat to our allies in the region, particularly Israel but ultimately to the United States. The terror threat is one that reminds us how quickly we as a nation have a tendency to forget things.

Now, no one has forgotten September 11, 2001, but what we sometimes fail to remember is what made it possible in the first place. What made September 11, 2001, possible in the first place was that a terrorist organization—al-Qaida—led by Osama bin Laden, had established within Afghanistan a safe haven. Al-Qaida was not the Government of Afghanistan—that was the Taliban—but the Taliban allowed them to have a safe haven in Afghanistan, and from that safe haven, they were able to plot terrorist attacks against America and ultimately strike us here in the homeland. It was possible because they had a place that allowed them to do this.

It is, in fact, the key to any terrorist organization that would like to conduct external attacks and that would like to attack America. They have to have a place to operate from, and it cannot be a place where they are being followed, where they are being attacked, and where they are being wiped out by Americans or coalition forces. It has to be a safe haven.

My No. 1 concern about this decision that has been made is that it could lead to the reestablishment of safe havens inside of Syria from which ISIS and al-Qaida could reconstitute themselves, conduct external plotting, and ultimately attack the United States.

We already face this risk. In Northwest Syria today, there is very little sustained pressure on ISIS elements. In Idlib, there is virtually no pressure on al-Qaida. Now, imagine with even less coalition pressure being put upon them, how capable they can become and how quickly they can establish a place from which they can plot against us.

To understand why ISIS needs to plot against us and conduct spectacular attacks against Europe and the United States—this is a group that needs to prove it is still alive, and it is still strong. If they can't prove it, they

can't recruit people, and they can't raise money.

They are also in competition with other terrorist groups. In fact, ISIS is a spinoff of al-Qaida. These groups actually compete with one another for members and for resources. Both of them have a vested interest in attacking us abroad, not just in fulfillment of some ideological aims but as a means of survival because if these groups are able to conduct or inspire these kinds of attacks, it gives them credibility, they attract members and fighters, and it allows them to raise money for more attacks.

Some people will tell you: Well, let the others who are in the region take care of them—Turkey or Iran or the regime or the Russians. The problem is, none of these groups have shown any interest in fighting ISIS, not even a limited interest.

The Turks are largely interested in a buffer zone in the northern part of Syria—a buffer zone which the Kurds do not dominate because of their own internal politics. I am not claiming the Turks are fans of ISIS. I am saying ISIS is not their No. 1 priority.

Their No. 1 priority is defeating Kurdish forces and gaining control of a buffer zone in the northern part of Syria. That is what they are going to prioritize above anything and everywhere else. They are not a reliable partner, nor do they have the capability to be a reliable partner in sustaining pressure on ISIS.

Interestingly enough, if you look at what Turkey will need—even if they wanted to be a sustained partner against ISIS—it is logistical support from the United States of America. In essence, they can't even do what they are promising to do unless we are there with them to do it, but they don't want us to be there. That tells you they really just want us to leave so they can create this zone in the northern part of Syria.

The regime only cares about ISIS if they are in population areas or if ISIS is threatening critical infrastructure. If ISIS is taking hold of an oil facility somewhere, they will care. If ISIS is in the middle of a big city, they will care. All of these other vast spaces, they don't have the resources, and frankly they don't care, as long as they don't pose a threat to the regime, they don't pose a threat to population centers they want to control, and they don't pose a threat to critical infrastructure like oil. If they are not there, they are not going to spend their limited resources.

All things being equal, they probably want to defeat them, but they don't have the wherewithal to sustain pressure on them. They have limited resources, and they are going to invest those resources in controlling population centers and in controlling critical infrastructure.

So here is the answer: If the United States and the anti-ISIS coalition are not in Syria and operating until ISIS is

completely wiped out, there will be no sustained pressure on ISIS or on al-Qaida, and they will both grow back stronger, and they will have the capability to plot against the homeland and American interests around the world. That is something we cannot allow to happen. We cannot have that happen.

Some may say: Well, we can target them. We just don't have to have 1,500 or 1,800 special operators on the ground. We don't need to do that. We can do it through the air and so forth. ISIS is becoming an insurgency. An insurgency is much different than a group with a flag that controls buildings and territory. You can find those people, and you can strike them. An insurgency is people who blend into the population.

By day, they are a baker or an accountant or a merchant, but in the evenings and at night, they are an ISIS fighter planting bombs and killing people. Insurgencies are very difficult to fight and almost impossible, if not impossible, to fight with simply airpower, which is why the situation in Syria has been so positive. Two thousand American servicemen and special operators, alongside thousands of Syrian Democratic Forces and Kurds—who are primarily doing the ground fighting with our logistical support and air support—have eroded ISIS's control of territory in the country, but they have not eliminated it, and there is enough of it left that it could reconstitute itself. In fact, it is in the process of doing so already. They are clearly capable of killing American servicemen, as they did a few days ago, and since that time, there have been a series of other IED attacks inside of Syria, some of which could have killed Americans.

This is a group who has openly talked about their desire to possess chemical weapons, which they could use at any moment, potentially, against Syrian Democratic Forces and Kurds in that area—and, by the way, putting directly in danger our remaining service men and women alongside them. This remains a dangerous group capable of conducting attacks not just in Syria but potentially—especially if they have a safe haven abroad—here in the United States.

That is not to even mention a group who doesn't get talked about enough anymore—al-Qaida. Al-Qaida still exists, and there is a part of Syria in which they are completely uncontested. No one is going after them. They completely dominate the area, and they do whatever they want from there. And I promise you they are not there starting a car wash; they are there working to expand their brand and reach, to resurrect the al-Qaida brand around the world. What is the fastest way to do that? By conducting an attack against the United States and our interests. We should be worried about that alone.

The first reason why I am against this policy and why I support this amendment is that this policy directly

undermines one of the two pillars of our strategy and our policy in this region, and that is counterterrorism. The second is the spread of Iranian influence. Let there be no doubt that this withdrawal as currently structured is a win—perceptually at a minimum but I believe in reality—for Iran.

Let's begin in Southern Syria, the areas that border Israel and Jordan. Our withdrawal means Iran and their pro-Iranian forces that include Hezbollah militias will now have even more operating space from which to target Israel and will now be able to set up a more reliable ground route by which they can send weaponry into Lebanon to support Hezbollah so that one day they can attack Israel from the air with rockets, precision-guided munitions, and the like.

We see it already, for example, in Natanz, where the United States still maintains a presence very near a huge refugee camp. We can already see the pro-Iran, pro-regime forces beginning to encroach closer and closer upon the American position, to the point where we may have to leave simply because we no longer have a defensive posture we can sustain. But what the withdrawal has done is it has allowed Iran and the pro-regime forces to go to our allies, to go to the groups on the ground whom we have been working with to fight ISIS and say to them "The Americans are unreliable. The Americans are leaving. You might as well partner up with us now. We are the only ones who can protect you" or "You can lay down your weapons and just go back to your families because Americans are leaving." I fear it is working. I fear that they may dictate the pace of our withdrawal, because that announcement alone has undermined our credibility in the eyes of the partners we have worked with in Southern Syria.

What I just outlined is also true in the north, where the Kurds are facing the risk of military attack from the Turks, and they are saying: America is leaving, and the only people left whom we can partner up with to protect us are Iran and the regime and/or the Russians.

In fact, we have left them no choice but to join up with Iran and the Russians and pro-regime forces because if the choice is between annihilation by a Turkish military attack and joining up with a regime to stop a Turkish intrusion, they are joining up with a regime in Iran, further increasing Iran's power in this country.

It is not just contained within Syria; this announcement has actually accelerated the process of putting pressure on us to also get out of Iraq. All of the pro-Iran political parties inside the Iraqi Parliament are pushing very hard, very aggressively to pass a law that kicks America out of Iraq, and they are moving quickly on this. We see their tentacles in Afghanistan, where they are beginning to create internal political pressure through their

parliamentary body to force America to pick a date: Tell us when you are leaving, a date certain.

People may say: What is wrong with this? Get out of Syria. Get out of Iraq. Get out of Afghanistan. Why are we fighting other people's wars?

We are not. These are not other people's wars; these are ours. These people who are going to operate in these safe havens and Iran—we are their target. They want to strike at us. And if we are not in Afghanistan and we are not in Iraq and we are not in Syria, then from where exactly are we going to conduct operations against terrorism? From where exactly are we going to be postured to defend ourselves if Iran decides to strike our other military facilities in the region? The answer is, we won't have anyplace to do that from. We won't. Not to mention what it says to the region.

Understand this: The Iranians and our enemies in the region have been telling everyone for a long time—and the Russians echo this—"The Americans are unreliable. They always abandon their friends. You can't count on them" or "America is a declining power." That is the other argument they use openly: "America is a great power in decline, and every year that goes by, you will see that they can't back up their words, and that is why you can't count on them. America is weakened." I don't believe that is true. In fact, we know that is not true. But halfway around the world, they do, and when we take actions that prove it, it makes it true in the minds of a lot of people and a lot of countries, and it actually is dangerous because it could invite someone to take a reckless and irresponsible action on the basis of miscalculation. Someone may actually believe "America is now weak; let's attack them," and then we will be in a war.

The best way to prevent a war is to make sure those who want to fight you know they have no chance of winning. If you give them any belief that they have a chance to win because you have withdrawn and, as a result, reinforced the narrative being used against you, I believe you will have increased the chance of war.

This is being used against us right now. Iran is openly parroting this. They are holding this up as an example of an Iranian win. They are saying: This proves our strategy has been working. The Americans are leaving Syria. They are going to have to leave Iraq. They are going to leave Afghanistan with their tail between their legs. We are winning, and they are losing.

It reinforces a narrative, by the way, that is also used against us by the Chinese and other parts of the world.

This is a very dangerous situation. That is why this is a bad idea. This is about a lot more than just pulling out and not wasting any more money in these other places. There is no one in the world who wishes that more than I do. I wish the money, I wish the lives,

I wish all of this investment had not had to be spent. I openly wonder, how much more could we be doing if we didn't have this threat? But here is the problem: Whether or not we want it to exist, the Iranian threat and the threat of terrorism exist.

We cannot deal with the world the way we want it to be; we have to deal with the world the way it is. We didn't create the terror threat, but it is there. We can ignore ISIS, we can ignore al-Qaida, and we can ignore Iran, but they will not ignore us. We can decide not to go after them, but they will come after us.

I think it is a grave mistake because if we allow al-Qaida or ISIS or both to have a resurgence, they will attack the United States of America, they will attack our allies and our interests around the world, and they will try and they will plot to attack us here at home. The Iranian influence operation and their growth and influence in Iraq and Syria and now in Lebanon and increasingly in Yemen—and God forbid, in the future, in Bahrain—pose an existential threat to all of our allies in this region—none more so than the State of Israel. That is why I support this amendment. That is why I hope all of my colleagues will support this amendment.

It is important that the legislative branch and the Senate, which has a constitutional role to play in the setting of American foreign policy—they come to us to confirm people, and they come to us to fund these things—that we play our rightful role in the setting of American foreign policy. It is important that the Senate be on the right side of this issue so that we can hope to influence future actions and policies before they are taken and we can help change them once they have been taken in places headed in the wrong direction.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the McConnell amendment expresses the sense of the Senate regarding the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Syria and Afghanistan, an action I have long supported. Many Senators, including several of the cosponsors of the amendment, have supported the exact opposite position and would prefer to send more U.S. troops to both countries.

I believe that our military and diplomatic presence in Syria and Afghanistan should be determined by strategy and not by Presidential whims. I believe that our strategy should be developed with the thoughtful input of experts, both in executive agencies and in Congress. I believe that strategy should be consulted and coordinated with allies and partners and that it should be debated thoroughly in Congress. I believe that our commitments should not be open-ended and should have realistic and achievable goals that bring them to completion.

As the new Congress convened, amidst a government shutdown, the majority leader sought to bring S. 1,

this so-called Middle East security bill, to the floor. Now, he has brought a hastily drafted amendment to the table, one that on its face seems to rebuke the President's impulsive announcement earlier this month that he was precipitously withdrawing troops from Syria. Congress should debate this issue. I support bringing our troops home from Syria and Afghanistan, and the manner and pace in which that occurs should be the subject of a full debate here in the Senate. We should have a debate about the scope of authorities under current authorizations for the use of military force, AUMFs, and whether new AUMFs are warranted. This amendment may be designed to put Members on the record opposing the President's announcement, but in Congress, we should have more meaningful debates that influence policy and practice rather than fuel headlines.

I hope the majority leader will soon schedule that debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote scheduled for 3 p.m. occur now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Senate amendment No. 65 to Calendar No. 1, S. 1, a bill to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, John Thune, Thom Tillis, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Roy Blunt, Josh Hawley, Rick Scott, Deb Fischer, David Perdue, Mike Rounds, John Barrasso, Johnny Isakson, Cory Gardner, Dan Sullivan, Steve Daines, Todd Young.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 65, offered by the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. McCONNELL, to S. 1, a bill to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.



The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea," the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) would have voted "yea," and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) would have voted "yea."

Mr. SCHUMER. I announce that the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRAUN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 68, nays 23, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 13 Leg.]

#### YEAS—68

Barrasso	Feinstein	Reed
Bennet	Fischer	Risch
Blackburn	Gardner	Roberts
Blumenthal	Graham	Romney
Boozman	Grassley	Rosen
Braun	Hassan	Rounds
Burr	Hawley	Rubio
Cantwell	Hoeven	Sasse
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Carper	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Casey	Johnson	Shaheen
Cassidy	Jones	Shelby
Collins	Kaine	Sinema
Coons	King	Stabenow
Cornyn	Lankford	Tester
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Thune
Cotton	McConnell	Tillis
Cramer	McSally	Toomey
Crapo	Menendez	Warner
Daines	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Murray	Wicker
Enzi	Peters	Young
Ernst	Portman	

#### NAYS—23

Baldwin	Kennedy	Schatz
Booker	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Smith
Cruz	Lee	Udall
Gillibrand	Markey	Van Hollen
Harris	Merkley	Warren
Heinrich	Murphy	Wyden
Hirono	Sanders	

#### NOT VOTING—9

Alexander	Durbin	Paul
Blunt	Isakson	Perdue
Brown	Moran	Sullivan

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRAUN). On this vote, the yeas are 68, the nays are 23.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1) to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 96 TO AMENDMENT NO. 65

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I call up Menendez amendment No. 96.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] proposes an amendment numbered 96 to amendment No. 65.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To clarify that the amendment shall not be construed as a declaration of war or an authorization of the use of military force)

At the end of the amendment, add the following:

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as a declaration of war or an authorization of the use of military force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. I would like to ask Senator MENENDEZ, is it your understanding that your amendment does not affect any existing legal authorities governing the use of military force?

Mr. MENENDEZ. Yes, that is my understanding. My amendment should not be construed to affect in any way any existing authorities governing the use of military force. It only clarifies that the McConnell amendment is not an authorization for the use of military force or a declaration of war.

Mr. RISCH. I thank Senator MENENDEZ. Based on our understanding of your amendment, I will be supporting it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, the Senate just invoked cloture on the majority leader's amendment, and I now rise to urge support for my second-degree amendment, the one where the colloquy included in the RECORD between the chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and me leads to the conclusion of his support. I believe the amendment will also have the support of the majority leader and the rest of the body. The inclusion of my amendment will be essential for my vote in support in terms of moving forward.

As I have stated over the past month, I continue to be seriously concerned that precipitously withdrawing U.S. troops from Syria and Afghanistan will deeply harm American interests and security. With that in mind, I am generally supportive of Senator MCCONNELL's amendment to S. 1, which echoes what I have been saying for much of the past 2 years, calling on the administration to develop a real strategy for securing our interests in the Middle East, including combating terrorist groups and effectively confronting Iranian and Russian aggression, and calling on the administration

to more effectively engage with the legislative branch.

I share in the belief that the way in which the President announced his Syria withdrawal—with no plan, without consultation with Congress or our allies or consideration of the implication for our partners—is not in our interest. American troops on the ground are on the frontline, fighting for our interests and also providing leverage to achieve diplomatic success.

At the same time, it is imperative that this body, which has the responsibility to authorize the use of military force, emphasize that such force alone will not protect our interests; that military force alone cannot defeat ISIS, al-Qaida, or other nonstate actors; and that military force alone will not provide enduring, sustainable peace and security against our adversaries.

More importantly, when we do send our sons and daughters into combat, we should do so only after careful consideration and consultation and with clear objectives and strategy—a strategy that requires investments into diplomatic efforts in coordination with our allies and partners.

I want to make it crystal clear that the McConnell amendment cautioning against a precipitous withdrawal of U.S. troops in no way constitutes Senate support for their permanent presence for an undefined mission. As a legal matter, my amendment makes clear one critical point: Nothing in the McConnell amendment can be construed as an authorization for the use of military force. Authorizing military force is simply not part of the debate on either the McConnell amendment or S. 1.

At the end of the day, I would like to see all of our troops back home and off the battlefield. I believe we must continue to have comprehensive strategies to achieve that outcome.

So, in conclusion, I believe the majority leader's amendment sends an important message to the President—that while he is the Commander in Chief, the legislative branch will continue to exercise the due diligence and oversight of his actions regarding our security and interests abroad. It also sends a message that the United States will not abandon our allies and our partners.

I particularly worry about the Kurds in this regard, who have been some of the most significant fighters on the ground in Syria and who are also in pursuit of our interests there. We cannot send a global message that once we have finished using you for our purposes, we will leave you to die on the battlefield. That sends a message across the globe: Don't fight, and don't join the United States because when it finishes with you, it will leave you to die on the battlefield.

I want to make it clear to the American people, however, that we are not in the business of authorizing open-ended conflicts or of keeping our troops on the battlefield forever. Our safety

and security depend on holistic, comprehensive strategies, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ensure that we are effectively using our powers to make sure the President is effectively using his.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE'S  
HEARING ON WORLDWIDE THREATS

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I rise to discuss for a few moments reflections upon the hearing we had this week in the Intelligence Committee on worldwide threats. This is an annual hearing and is in public, at least the first part. Then there is a closed session afterward with the heads of our intelligence Agencies—the CIA, the FBI, the NSA, the Defense Intelligence Agency, and, of course, with the Director of National Intelligence.

This is an important hearing because it basically outlines to the American people the threats we face and the seriousness of those threats. It is an opportunity for those of us on the committee and for Members of the Senate in general to understand the nature of the threats, what the intelligence is, and what the information is that we have to help us make good policy decisions.

Good intelligence is crucial to making good decisions. We live in an incredibly complex world, and my work on the Intelligence and Armed Services Committees over the past 6 years has educated me as to just how complex and difficult a lot of these issues are. I remember a long discussion about the Middle East at one of the Intelligence Committee meetings, and one of the members on the committee said that this is a really hard, complicated subject. The witness that day, who was from the CIA, said: "Welcome to the Middle East."

These are very difficult issues, but in order to make rational, thoughtful, important, and very results-oriented decisions based upon the information from these hearings, we have to know the facts. We have to understand what the implications are and what the likely results are but also, more fundamentally, just what is going on, on the ground. Whether you look back 50 years, 100 years, or 150 years, often our worst foreign policy misadventures have been based on one of two things—either bad intelligence or intelligence that was somehow skewed in order to meet the desires of the policymakers. If we don't have good intelligence, we can't make good decisions.

A lot of attention has been paid to the people who were testifying at that hearing—as I mentioned, the heads of the FBI and the CIA and the Directors of National Intelligence, Defense Intelligence, and the National Security Agency. Yet those individuals were speaking on behalf of thousands of other people who are scattered around the world, who often risk their lives to gain the information they were sharing

with us that day. It was not Dan Coats' opinion or Gina Haspel's opinion or Paul Nakasone's opinion. They were distilling and presenting to us the intelligence and the information that had been developed by their good people over the course of the past month, week, years to inform us and to inform the President of the best information available so we can make the best decisions.

After the hearing, what disturbed me was the reaction of the President of the United States. Instead of absorbing and listening to this information, he dismissed it. He not only dismissed the information, but he dismissed the messengers and said they had to go back to school or that they were being naive. Now, I don't want to be heard as having said that the intelligence community always gets it right. I know, in my having sat through hearings on Afghanistan and Syria and on many of the other difficult subjects we face, that there are mistakes made and that Dan Coats does not have a direct line to the Almighty in terms of the facts. They are not always right. Yet, if one is going to dismiss their findings, it should be based upon some additional set of facts or information from some source.

There were two things that bothered me about the President's reaction. One was he essentially dismissed the facts in a whole series of cases—of Iran and ISIS. Those were two we talked about. With regard to North Korea and Russia, basically, he said: I don't believe any of it. The problem with that is, it undermines the confidence you have in the decision-making authority at the highest level if facts don't matter. The information that is supplied is not by Dan Coats, not by Gina Haspel, not by Paul Nakasone but is the view—the distilled wisdom—of the thousands of people whose job it is, whose profession it is, to ferret out the truth.

At the beginning of the hearing, Dan Coats gave the best synopsis I have ever heard of the mission of the intelligence Agencies, of the mission of our intelligence community. It was very simple—to seek the truth and to speak the truth. That is exactly what they did at that hearing. They sought the truth through the auspices of these very professional, very thorough Agencies that are scattered throughout the world. Then they spoke the truth by telling us what they learned.

The second problem I have with the President's reaction is a little more subtle, and this goes to the heart of the relationship between the intelligence community and policymakers. The subtle message that was being sent was: Don't tell the boss things he doesn't want to hear. Don't give it to us unvarnished. Style the information; sly the information; amend the information in order to meet what is perceived to be what the boss wants to hear. Whether the boss is this President, a past President, or a future President, that is disastrous. The intelligence community

has to deal in facts and information, not policy, but if the message is sent down through the ranks of "don't give me an assessment that disagrees with where I started," that will start to happen.

Indeed, it is human nature. All of us want to be in the good graces of the boss. All of us want to give our superiors information they want to get. I was in law school over 50 years ago and had a friend who had been a captain in Vietnam. He told the story of being on the ground in Vietnam. There was a skirmish in which a half a dozen Viet Cong were killed. He filed his report. His report went to the division. At that point, half a dozen became 15. It went to headquarters where 15 became 50. It then went to Washington where 50 became 150. That is because Washington wanted to see higher counts. That was the perception that corrupted the process, not because people were being corrupt in the sense of being evil or of wanting to do wrong but because they were doing what is human nature, which is "I want to please the person above me in the chain of command."

If the President of the United States is not so subtly telling the intelligence community what he wants to hear, that will inevitably affect the quality of the product he receives, which, indeed, will also inevitably affect the quality of decisions he makes.

Again, I am not saying the intelligence community is always right. I certainly believe the President or any other policymaker, including Members of Congress who receive this information, need to review it critically—ask questions, probe and prod—and try to be sure the information is correct, but to dismiss it out of hand in a tweet, it seems to me, is dangerous. It is dangerous because it undermines the Executive's authority to make good decisions based upon the facts, and it is dangerous because it has the potential for skewing the information itself in the future. Either one of those things is a danger to national security.

If the President has facts that are different than those that are presented by the intelligence community, he should at least present them and say: This isn't consistent with what I learned at "such and such" a conference or what I am hearing from the State Department or from what I am hearing from Homeland Security. Yet to simply say they are naive, that they don't know what they are doing, and they should go back to school denigrates the work of thousands of loyal, patriotic Americans who are doing their level best to produce information upon which good decisions can be made.

I stand today not to say the intelligence community always gets it right but to say the intelligence community should at least get an honest hearing and that the information they present is important to this country. It is important to the President, and it is important to the Congress. The day we

start encouraging them to skew the information is the day the national security of this country is at risk.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 65

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to express my opposition to the amendment before the Senate right now with respect to the disposition of American forces in Syria.

First, for my colleagues, let me stipulate that President Trump's Syria policy has been an absolute mess. It has been a train wreck. It has been a dumpster fire on a daily basis. That is something Republicans and Democrats can agree on, and I assume that is the reason we are having this debate right now.

There is bipartisan consternation over a policy in Syria that seems to change daily. It often changes based upon who the last person was to walk into the Oval Office or catch the President's ear.

The current policy seems to be that the President is intent on pulling out the 2,000 or so troops that are there at the request of the leader of Turkey. He would love to see the United States pull out so that he could move his troops in and overrun the Kurdish forces, which have been our partners for several years in trying to root out ISIS and extremist groups from Syria.

Let me also stipulate that I was one who did not support sending American troops into Syria in the first place. I have never believed that there is a military solution, led by the United States, to the host of problems that ravage that country. But once you have made that commitment, if you are going to undo it, you have to do it in some orderly fashion. To simply decide on a moment's notice, without any discussion with our allies or partners, that we are moving troops out is the wrong way to undo a commitment that I would argue was wrong in the first place.

You have to have a plan in place for the security of those you are leaving behind—both the Kurdish forces that you have pushed to bring the fight to ISIS, as well as all of the civilians who could be caught in the crossfire between an advancing Turkish force and a defensively oriented Kurdish force.

This is not why I am on the floor today—to try to, once again, rehash all of the ways that Trump's policy in Syria has gone wrong. I want to talk about why this amendment is not the right way for us to proceed as a means of correcting Trump's backward policies and how it could, frankly, get us

more deeply mired into a series of conflicts in the Middle East, which are not supported—nor will they be supported—by the American people.

First, we should be debating an authorization of military force for American forces in Syria, not an amendment that restricts an illegal use of military force.

The President does not have congressional authorization to use U.S. troops to fight ISIS in Syria or anywhere else. He claims he does because he has taken the 2001 AUMF and suggested that because some elements of al-Qaida eventually became elements of ISIS, that authorization continues. There is no one who voted then for that authorization some 17 years ago who thought that it would now be used as a means to fight a very different terrorist organization.

We should be having a debate about renewing America's authorization of military force so that it is updated for the enemies we are actually fighting, instead of conceding that the President has what is now, potentially, unlimited ability to fight anyone, anywhere around the world, who has any kind of affiliation to a terrorist group named 17 years ago. We are not doing that. Instead, through this amendment, in some way, shape, or form, we are ratifying the President's extra-constitutional use of military force overseas, green-lighting the continued end-around on congressional authorization that this President and many other Presidents would like to continue.

Let me also concede that this perversion of the 2001 AUMF was not invented by President Trump. It was invented by President Obama. I opposed it then, as I oppose it now.

Second, the language of this bill suggests that our mission inside Syria is not just to fight ISIS. The language of this bill suggests that our troops are in Syria to fight Iran as well. Over and over again, this amendment is peppered with references to the rationale for our existence in Syria being not just to fight ISIS but also to counter Iranian influence.

In fact, the amendment lists a series of conditions that we believe need to be filled before troops are to be withdrawn. Among those conditions is a strategy to “stop Iran from dominating the region.” That is an interesting debate for us to have: What should be the role of the United States to stop Iran from dominating the region?

I agree with my Republican colleagues that it is not in the security interests of the United States, nor our allies, for Iran to continue to gain a bigger foothold in the region, but there is absolutely no congressional authorization for U.S. forces to be in Syria to counter Iran or to fight Iran or to try to be a bulwark against Iranian aggression. No matter what kind of hoops you jump through to try to contort the 2001 AUMF to counter ISIS, you cannot get it to cover Iran.

This resolution—I don't know that it suggests, but it essentially admits—it

asserts—that our troops are inside Syria today not just to fight ISIS but to stop Iran from gaining a bigger foothold there and, in fact, makes a condition of our troops' withdrawal be a strategy to continue to press back against the Iranians. There is no AUMF for that.

Let me tell you my real worry. Putting a bipartisan stamp of approval today on an amendment that suggests our troops are inside Syria, in part, to counter Iran will ultimately empower those in the administration who are rooting for actual war with Iran. If Democrats and Republicans say here, today, that our mission inside Syria is ultimately to fight Iran, then doesn't that potentially put some imprimatur of congressional support for a bigger conflagration with Iran that some in the administration may be trying to achieve?

Third, this amendment leaves the impression that there is an American-led military solution to all of the vexing problems inside Syria. There is none. There is none. If we really want to have a debate about the future of American policy in Syria, then we need to come to the conclusion that, ultimately, if we want to be a real player in the long-term disposition of Syria for the betterment of the Syrian people, then American diplomats, American refugee programs, and American economic development aid are going to be much more dispositive than 2,000 American troops.

Let me give you an example. In Northern Syria, where the Kurds exist and where American troops are for the time being, we have a problem. As I outlined before, the problem is a relatively simple one. We have pushed the Kurds to become more and more influential in the military and governance matters of that region. That was important for us because the Kurds were the most likely fighting force to be able to oust ISIS, but we knew ahead of time that this was going to create a problem with the Kurds, who see the YPG—the Kurdish military—as a terrorist group. We don't agree with them, but we knew ahead of time that the Kurds would not stand for the long-term empowerment of the YPG in those portions of Syria.

We have now reached the point at which the rubber hits the road—at which Erdogan has said: We are not going to stand for that. We are going to bring our troops in, creating a potential flashpoint there.

There is a solution here, and Erdogan outlined it in an op-ed he wrote for a major American newspaper. He said: Well, listen, we understand the Kurds are going to have to be influential, but it has to be Kurds we support, not Kurds we believe to be affiliated with terrorist groups. That is a really tricky needle to thread, and I am not sure that it ever can be threaded. But the way you do that is, frankly, not with tanks or with American marines but with diplomats and with experienced

foreign policy hands—people who know how to work out a complicated political arrangement in which the Kurds continue to be able to run that region but the Turks decide to hold back and not press forward militarily. That is a diplomatic and political quandary that cannot be solved by the American military.

This amendment seems to suggest that we can solve all of our problems—or many of our problems—if we just keep 2,000 troops there.

Fourth, the back end of this amendment lays out a series of criteria that have to be fulfilled before the troops can be removed. I mentioned one of them—that there has to be a strategy to combat Iranian influence. The final of these criteria is that ISIS has to have been substantially defeated in the region and a certification has to be made to that effect.

Well, let me ask my colleagues this—it is a legitimate question, not a rhetorical one. I don't know the answer, and maybe someone can provide it to me. When was the last time this Congress tied the Executive hands in that way? When was the last time this Congress actually laid out the conditions by which the Executive cannot withdraw troops from a region? That seems to be a very curious exercise of our foreign policy oversight responsibility.

I am someone who has suggested for a long time that we have largely abdicated that responsibility. I would love for us to be debating foreign policy and exercising our oversight more often, but the idea that we would, as a legislative body, tell the President that he cannot withdraw troops from a place unless x, y, and z criteria are met seems to be dangerous and restrictive because there are all sorts of conditions that you can imagine that aren't listed in this amendment by which a President may feel it is in our best interest to bring troops home.

The Constitution doesn't vest in this Congress the power to undeclare war. It vests in us the power to declare war. To me, I worry that by restricting the aperture by which the President can make an argument to bring troops home, we ultimately will end up having them be in harm's way for longer than is necessary.

Maybe this isn't unprecedented. Maybe there are other times where we have done this, but it does seem to be fairly unprecedented for the legislature to tie the Executive's hands and tell him or her that he has to keep troops in a place for a certain period of time.

I wanted to come down to the floor and express my reservations about this amendment. Again, I wish we were having a debate on an AUMF. I wish this weren't the way in which we were exercising our constitutional prerogative on foreign policy. I am deeply worried—deeply worried—about language in this amendment that empowers those in the administration who are jonesing for a fight with Iran. I do not believe that however capable and brave

our troops are in Syria, they ultimately are the answer. If we want to have a debate on Syria policy, let's talk about all the other ways that we need to engage in Syria in order to bring stability to that place. I do worry about how we tie this President's hands or any President's hands when they want to bring our troops home and get them out of harm's way.

Trump has completely botched policy in Syria, but that shouldn't go—even Trump's most ferocious opponents—from endorsing endless wars. That shouldn't require Democrats to be against everything that he is for. He is pulling our troops out in a way that I oppose, but I worry about the long-term implications of this Congress asking for a fight in Syria that is unauthorized and then tying the President's hands when it comes to getting troops out of harm's way in places in far-off lands.

I oppose the amendment and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

LILLY LEDBETTER AND PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I rise to talk about the issues of fairness, of equality, and of basic dignity.

In the greatest Nation on Earth and the leader of the free world, women are paid 80 cents for every dollar paid to men—80 cents for every dollar. That disparity is starker yet for women of color. Black women are paid 61 cents on the dollar. Latina women are paid just 53 cents on the dollar. Alabama, my home State, has the fourth biggest gender wage gap of any State in the country. That is just inexcusable.

Those cents add up to real money, about \$10,000 on average for every woman working a full-time year-round job. That is a total of about \$900 million lost each year for American women—every single year, a total of \$900 million. That is real money, and that is increasing.

This gap persists regardless of education status and across different jobs, opportunities, and industries. It persists despite laudable efforts here in Congress over the past 50 years to start chipping away at this problem.

Most importantly, these lost wages impact women's ability to pay their rent or mortgages, to save for their children's college tuition, or to pay off existing debt. Think about this. This disparity can have lifelong consequences for the quality of life of women and their families.

Fortunately, there are steps we can take that have already had tremendous support.

I want to bring this home a little bit because we were looking at some statistics recently. If you factor in the fact that women are making so much less—a total of \$900 million; think about this—this is not just a matter of discrimination. It is a matter of economics. According to a 2015 Center for American Progress report, 42 percent of

mothers were the sole or primary breadwinners for their families in 2015, bringing in at least—at least—half of their family's incomes. Black and Latina mothers are more likely to be the breadwinners than White mothers. In fact, 70.7 percent of Black mothers and 40.5 percent of Latina mothers were the primary or sole breadwinners in 2015, compared with 37.4 percent of White mothers.

Not all of those women are going to be the subject of pay discrimination. We know that. But the fact is that there is likely to be a huge percentage. If there is \$900 million, that is a pretty big percentage. By equalizing the pay for men and women—equal pay for equal work, which we all talk about but which in theory and in practice just doesn't happen—we can raise the standard of living for families across this country, and we can raise the standard of living for families in a State like Alabama, where it is desperately needed.

These disparities, as I said, can have lifelong consequences for the quality of life of women and their families. Fortunately, there are steps that have already been taken.

Just yesterday, I was proud to join my colleague Senator MURRAY and a host of others—in fact, I think it is almost all Democrats in the Senate, all Democrats in the House, and one Republican in the House—to reintroduce the Paycheck Fairness Act, a modest, commonsense solution to the problem of pay inequity which persists despite the existence of Federal and State equal pay laws.

Introduction of the Paycheck Fairness Act also just so happened to fall on the day after the 10th anniversary of the signing of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act. The group who introduced this bill yesterday was joined here in Washington by Ms. Ledbetter herself.

Lilly Ledbetter, from Alabama, is a great friend of mine and a native Alabamian. She was born in Jacksonville, AL, about an hour and a half hour from where I grew up, just outside of Birmingham, in Fairfield. She married her husband Charles after graduating from high school, and they had two children, Vicky and Phillip.

After almost 20 years working at the Goodyear Tire and Rubber plant in Gadsden, AL, just as she was nearing retirement, Ms. Ledbetter learned she was making thousands of dollars a year less than the men in her same position. She decided to take some action. She sued to try to get her backpay and to try to end that discrimination. The case went all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Unfortunately, the Court found that her claims were time-barred because she hadn't filed a lawsuit 180 days from the day of her first paycheck, 20 years earlier, even though she was totally unaware of the discrimination that existed for that 20-year period.

Because of her fight—which, again, she took all the way to the Supreme

Court of the United States—Congress ultimately passed in 2009 the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, which restarts the 180-day clock every time a discriminatory paycheck is issued.

Now, for the 12th time, Congress has introduced the Paycheck Fairness Act, which ensures robust protection against sex-based pay discrimination. This vital legislation has been introduced in every single congressional session since 1997. It is absolutely inexcusable that versions of this very commonsense bill have had to be introduced 12 times and that it has yet to become law.

The Paycheck Fairness Act would require employers to prove that disparities in pay are job-related and necessary and not based on sex. It would make it illegal to retaliate against workers for discussing their wages.

It doesn't require employers to make wages public, unlike all of us who work for the government. It doesn't require that. It doesn't make them public, but it does make it illegal to retaliate against workers who simply discuss how much money they are making.

It would amend the Equal Pay Act of 1963 so that wronged workers can participate in class-action lawsuits challenging systemic—systemic—pay discrimination. It would also prohibit employers from relying on salary history in determining future pay so that pay discrimination doesn't follow women from job to job. Finally, this legislation would help businesses to facilitate equal pay practices.

Earlier this month, a historic number of women were sworn in to the 116th Congress—a historic number. Women are increasingly the primary breadwinner or the cobreadwinner in their families. Statistics are showing that every year those numbers increase. They cannot afford to get shortchanged.

The Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009 was an essential step forward in the fight for equal pay. I am proud, as we commemorate the 10th anniversary of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, to once again be a cosponsor of the Paycheck Fairness Act, which will continue the fight started by my friend Ms. Ledbetter more than 20 years ago and provide employees and employers—employees and employers—with new tools to battle pay gaps and pay discrimination.

Yesterday, Ms. Ledbetter came by to visit the office, as she always does. She comes by to see me. We were talking about this. My wife Louise was there, and we were having a discussion about how she was doing and how the bill 10 years ago affected her and so many others, and she made a really interesting statement.

She said: You know, I really don't want to be here, Senator.

Actually, she called me Doug. That is what she does, and she should.

She said: I don't want to be here. I shouldn't have to be here. I shouldn't have to come up to the Congress of the

United States every year simply to advocate for equal pay for women who are doing the same job as the men. I would prefer to be home, back in Alabama, playing with the family and the grandkids. I don't need to be here.

It really struck me: Why are we doing this every year? What could be the possible reason?

Then, this morning, I was doing a media call with some folks back in Alabama, and I was asked about this. There was a recent editorial in one of our media and in our newspapers. As is it always with all of the comments online, which these days I just refuse to read because they get so crazy, there were so many that talked about the fact that this is just fake news—that women really aren't treated differently and that their pay is not below. I couldn't believe it. Every statistic shows that.

My response to that is, also, this: If that is the case, then no one should be afraid of this bill. If every business is treating their women employees as fair as their men, they shouldn't worry about this. They should encourage it, because we know there will be some out there that are not doing it.

So if this is fake news, all the better. Let's pass this bill. Let's make sure we have in law the opportunity for women to get those equal wages.

I have a daughter who is getting into the workforce after getting a Ph.D. She deserves the same pay as the Ph.D.s with similar experience wherever she ends up in colleges or universities.

I have two granddaughters, Ever and Ollie, whom I want to grow up in a world where they don't have to worry about this, where they don't have to come to Congress in 30 years or 40 years—just like Ms. Lily Ledbetter has to do each year—to advocate for women and their rights, to make sure their families are taken care of in the same manner as their male counterparts' families.

It is the least we can do for the women in our country who work so hard, who represent the backbone of the American way with their families, who raise their children, who work hard and do all of those things we need to be proud of. It is the least we can do to simply say: The Congress of the United States acknowledges you, we appreciate you, and we want to make sure you are treated fairly.

I would urge all of my colleagues—particularly my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—to get behind this legislation, and let's get this passed this year so that we don't have to worry about it again.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

S. 130

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, this place fancies itself the world's greatest deliberative body, but we would be deceiving ourselves if we ignored the biggest debate that has been happening in America over the last 36 hours.

A publicly elected official—Governor of one of the 50 States—has been defending a practice that is morally repugnant. The Governor of Virginia has been defending a practice that is repugnant to civilized people across the entire world.

Here is just one of the ugly nuggets from Ralph Northam, the Governor of Virginia: "If the mother is in labor . . . the infant would be delivered, the infant would be kept comfortable, the infant would be resuscitated (if that's what the mother and the family desired) and then a discussion would ensue between the physician and the mother."

Let's be very clear about what we are talking about. We are talking about fourth-trimester abortion or what anyone in the normal world calls infanticide. That is what we are talking about, and the Governor of Virginia has been defending this all day yesterday and again today, going out and trying to equivocate and qualify and then double down and again say he wants to defend this practice, which is infanticide.

Let's be clear about what we are talking about. We are talking about killing a baby who has been born. We are not talking some euphemism. We are not talking about a clump of cells. We are talking about a little baby girl who has been born and is on a table in a hospital or a medical facility, and then a decision or a debate would be had about whether you could kill that little baby. We are talking about the most vulnerable among us, and we have a public official in America out there again and again defending this practice. This is infanticide that we are talking about.

This should be so far beyond any political consideration. We are talking about a little baby—a baby with dignity, an image bearer. We are talking about a tiny life that has done nothing wrong to warrant being left to die cold and alone on a table.

Everyone in the Senate ought to be able to say unequivocally that killing that little baby is wrong. This doesn't take any political courage, and if you can't say that, if there is a Member in this body who can't say that, there may be lots of work you can do in the world, but you shouldn't be here. You should get the heck out of any calling in public life where you pretend to care about the most vulnerable among us. There should be no politics here that are right versus left or Republican versus Democrat. This is the most basic thing you could be talking about. We are talking about a little baby born alive, and we have a public official in America defending the idea: Well, you could have a debate about killing her.

That is why today I am starting a dual-track legislative process to make sure this body has a clear-eyed look at the issue before us, has a clear-eyed look at this atrocity, and to make sure the 320 million men and women who are actually our bosses—to be sure

they have a clear-eyed look at what we stand for. Do we stand with those little, vulnerable babies in desperate need of care and comfort and support, medical treatment, food, or do we stand with the comments of the Governor of Virginia over the last 2 days?

Tonight, I am beginning what is known as the rule XIV process. That is an expedited procedure for floor consideration of my legislation, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

In addition, I want to announce that on Monday night, I am going to be sure that every Senator has the opportunity to come to the floor and say whom we stand for and what we stand against. So I want to announce that in addition to the rule XIV process that I am going to initiate in a moment, I also want Senators to be aware that on Monday evening, I am going to be asking unanimous consent for Senators to come to the floor and pass the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act legislation. I am going to ask all 100 Senators to come to the floor and be against infanticide. This shouldn't be complicated.

#### MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 311

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 311) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion.

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, I now ask for a second reading and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

Mr. SASSE. Thank you. I look forward to the debate in this body on Monday evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. 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.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

#### VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today I made the decision to return to Illinois

because of the challenges faced by the region's residents due to the extreme cold. As a result, I was necessarily absent from this afternoon's cloture vote on McConnell amendment No. 65 to the Strengthening America's Security in the Middle East Act of 2019 S. 1.

On vote No. 13, had I been present, I would have voted nay on the motion to invoke cloture.●

#### HONORING PRIVATE FIRST CLASS FLOYD K. LINDSTROM

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the bravery and service of PFC Floyd K. Lindstrom, a Colorado Springs World War II veteran who has earned our Nation's highest military decoration, the Medal of Honor. I also want to recognize the significance of February 3, 2019, which marks the 75th anniversary of his death. He was killed in action at the battle of Anzio.

It is my pleasure to commend the efforts of the VA Eastern Colorado Health Care System and Colorado's veterans community, which worked to bring a Medal of Honor for display at the Lindstrom Colorado Springs Community-Based Outpatient Clinic.

Much has been said about the battle that compelled Lindstrom to act above and beyond the call of duty where he earned his place in the Hall of Heroes. According to the citation, Lindstrom acted with "conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity" in defeating a German counterattack on a hill near Mignano, Italy, November 11, 1943. When the enemy counterattacked, Lindstrom and his platoon were forced to fall back to a defensive position. Unable to eradicate the enemy nest from this position, Lindstrom fearlessly picked up his heavy machine gun and ran up the hillside to gain a new position, only 10 yards away from the enemy machine gun; yet again, Lindstrom was unable to reach the gunners who were hiding behind a large rock. Lindstrom charged uphill once more facing a steady stream of fire and killed both gunners with his pistol. In this moment, Lindstrom embodied the true spirit of self-sacrifice.

Every day, men and women in uniform like Lindstrom heroically serve on the front lines of our Nation's defense. I stand with Coloradans today to honor his sacrifice and his memory.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### TRIBUTE TO MARILYN MADDOX

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the honor of recognizing Marilyn Maddox of Lewis and Clark County. This week marks Marilyn's 100th birthday. She is being honored this week at the Montana State capitol, not only for her birthday, but also for 80 years of service with the Montana Federation of Republican Women.

Marilyn was born in Chicago on January 31, 1919, and grew up in Ohio. She

attended Ohio State University where she performed as a professional dancer and concert violinist. She joined the National Federation of Republican Women in 1939 and still has her original membership card.

While in Ohio, she married Thomas Maddox to whom she would be married for 71 years. Tom, was a journalist with the Associated Press, and they lived in several Midwestern cities before Tom received a transfer out West to Helena, MT. They packed up their 1951 Plymouth station wagon with two young daughters and two dogs and headed for Montana. Like many folks who find themselves in Montana, the Maddoxes fell in love with Big Sky Country.

Marilyn is an avid outdoors woman and loves hunting and fishing. She also worked for the Montana Stockgrowers Association for many years. Marilyn has 2 daughters, 6 grandchildren, 14 great-grandchildren, 6 great-great-grandchildren, and a Shihtzu named Toby Wong.

I congratulate Marilyn on reaching this milestone and thank her for her many years of service to the people of Montana and the Helena community.●

#### RECOGNIZING CARROLL BRADFORD, INC.

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, it is my privilege to honor a Florida small business that exemplifies what it means to provide quality service and to give back to the community when it matters the most. As chairman of the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I recognize a small business that exemplifies the value of hard work and the unique American entrepreneurial spirit. This week, it is my pleasure to recognize Carroll Bradford, Inc., of Orlando, FL, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

Carroll Bradford, Inc., is a full-service construction and landscaping company that was founded in 2010 by Stephen Barnett and Jon Menke, who were both born and raised in central Florida. Stephen and Jon are related by marriage and were driven to follow in the footsteps of their grandfathers, who were both successful small business owners in the 1940s. The company's name combines the names of each co-founder's grandfather: Stephen's grandfather, Carroll Barco, and Jon's grandfather, G.L. Bradford.

Carroll Bradford started in the Baldwin Park community in Orlando and now has expanded to Jacksonville. Through hard work and dedication, Stephen and Jon built a reputation of providing quality construction and landscaping services, being honest with their customers, and giving back to the community.

In its first 8 years, Carroll Bradford has grown exponentially, leading the company to create an app to respond to the expanding base of customers. A testament to this growth is the company's partnership with the Orlando Magic



basketball team, for which Carroll Bradford proudly serves as the Magic's "Official Builder." As a result of its exceptional work, Carroll Bradford has won numerous awards and accolades, including an A+ rating from the Better Business Bureau and recognition from the Orlando Business Journal as a "Fast 50" business in 2017.

Carroll Bradford not only constructs many of the buildings and homes that form the Orlando and Jacksonville communities, but it is also dedicated to serving the people who live there. Carroll Bradford supports its community in a variety of ways, including sponsoring the Coaches and Friends Toy Drive Challenge golf tournament each December, providing meals at Orlando's Ronald McDonald House, and hosting an annual Arnold Palmer Hospital trick-or-treat event. In March of this year, Carroll Bradford will sponsor the 2019 Arnie's March Against Children's Cancer for the Arnold Palmer Hospital for Children. Additionally, the family at Carroll Bradford established the CB Foundation, which provides financial assistance to families in need.

Carroll Bradford, Inc., is an outstanding example of what it means for a small business to be more than just a workplace for a community. The team at Carroll Bradford combines a desire to provide a useful service for Floridians, while remaining committed to enhancing the community through service. I would like to congratulate Stephen, Jon, and all of the employees at Carroll Bradford, Inc., on being named the Senate Small Business of the Week. I wish you the best of luck as you continue to grow your business and serve your community.●

#### VERMONT STATE OF THE UNION ESSAY FINALISTS

● Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD some of the finalist essays written by Vermont High School students as part of the ninth annual State of the Union essay contest conducted by my office.

The essays follow, in alphabetical order according to the finalists' names.

ISABELLE DESROCHES, BURR AND BURTON  
ACADEMY, SENIOR, FINALIST

Civility in local politics is a topic of increasing importance. As we attempt to compromise on enormous national issues such as immigration, health care, and foreign policy, intense polarization has created unbearable tension between parties, and leads almost daily to an absence of civil discourse. Even more terrifying a sight in recent years is the aggression and polarity that has seeped into local elections through overly-aggressive yard signs, tempestuous town meetings, and neighborhood altercations that craft rifts in our communities. Hopefully, we can shift these themes before courtesy in both national and local politics dies, and my generation is left sans civility in our system.

We seem to be coming upon an age of wildly strong convictions. Although

history classes dive into both pros and cons of political circumstances (such as the eras of Andrew Jackson or Lincoln), citizens and politicians are more resistant than ever to accept the yin/yang relationship that can be found in any political situation. Anyone who follows news is chronically frustrated by this double standard. What we must come to accept as a nation is that none of the pressing issues that face us today can be solved without a common language of civility.

Rollo May, an existential psychologist, wrote about conviction in *The Courage to Create*. "The relationship between commitment and doubt is by no means an antagonistic one. Commitment is healthiest when it is not without doubt, but in spite of doubt," he wrote. May understands what we must come to embrace and apply to our politics: our convictions are strongest when we can cast doubt upon our own stance. A position without doubt causes ignorance and paralyzation of thought. It is courageous to doubt yourself and keep an open mind. We learn this in school, yet students are often hard-pressed to find admirable examples of these philosophies in our lives and on the national stage. As politics become increasingly heated, we can agree that it is more important than ever to preserve integrity and traditional decorum in local elections as well; movements like this must initiate in the strong roots of our society—our tight-knit communities. Our government must set a precedent of positive influence and etiquette so that progress and compromise can finally begin. We must work to create a climate of dialogue instead of hostile debate, both in communities and gradually on a national scale. Civility in politics is the foundation of the progress we need to make in the coming years. Actively working towards an attitude in politics that allows us to work in a bipartisan fashion, and incorporate doubt in our convictions and empathy in our approach is the only way we can ensure the survival of our American political system as it was intended.

LIVIA GREENBERG, STRATTON MOUNTAIN  
SCHOOL, JUNIOR, FINALIST

The chest closes as the throat tightens like a python strangling its prey, the skin burning as it breaks out in angry hives and rashes, forcing one to claw at their body as a lack of oxygen begins to shut down vital organs. This is an allergic reaction—one that can be experienced by the 15 million Americans with food allergies, one of whom sent to the hospital due to a reaction every three minutes. The device used to stop reactions, called an EpiPen, can be made for thirty dollars; however, the lifesaving instrument retails for 600 dollars. The exorbitant price of the EpiPen is a result of domination over the healthcare market, with nothing stopping the company from raising prices exponentially. Unfortunately, the EpiPen is not the only example of why monopoly capitalism is

an immoral system that abuses the consumers who are in need of medical help. Multiple monolithic companies are forcing those with medical needs to pay prodigious amounts for necessities, a practice that must be broken apart with government intervention.

Shattering medical monopolies needs to be one of the country's priorities, and the most feasible solution to do so is to create a new act that would outlaw inflexible patents and bolster smaller companies financially. The federal government currently uses three anti-trust acts as a guideline for what is a legal or illegal trust, but because none of the acts address copyright, colossal companies have avoided punishment by patenting products or drugs in a manner that makes an alternative product illegal to sell. Even remotely similar products have been banned by the FDA and are not allowed to be sold. By creating a law that prohibits exceedingly unalterable patents, cheaper products would be allowed into the healthcare market. With a government loan, small-scale companies can develop the alternative competition, which would drive the companies that currently have a monopoly into lowering their prices in order to sell their product. In addition to reducing the cost of medical necessities, the consumers would have more freedom to choose which product they trust in case of an emergency and better access to medication essential for life.

While both an ethical and economic issue, trusts are a problem that can be solved with strong government action that keeps the wellbeing of the American citizens at the forefront of concern. No one in the United States should die because of an inability to afford medication due to corporate greed. Creating a new anti-trust act will allow for more companies to develop and sell vital medications at a more accessible price, and will stop companies from nailing in innocent people's coffins.

SETH HARTE, BURLINGTON HIGH SCHOOL,  
FRESHMAN, FINALIST

I'm the kid that dreams of writing movies but is reluctant because I've heard too many stories of writers that fail. I love soccer and want to play in the MLS but know how few make it. I want to be an attorney someday but all I hear is how expensive it is to go to law school. All of this noise makes me feel like there is no way to succeed. But can't I try? I am starting to believe that we close the door before we can open it because defeat feels inevitable. Our society does not see the beauty in failing so we instead we just quit. I believe this is because of our history, our grading systems, and social media.

We learn from an elementary school age that we should never fail and this philosophy is exhibited repeatedly throughout our schooling and into adulthood. We are taught that to mess up is the worst thing we can do because we have survived so long with a

mindset that believes we will succeed. Although believing in ourselves is good it makes it hard for us to fail with dignity and the knowing that messing up is okay. According to MedBroadcast, one of the main reasons for suicide is because of failure. We just can not handle failing, in fact, we cannot deal with it so much that we end everything because of a setback.

Our grading system has made it so only a specific type of learner will succeed. It has also taught us that the word failure means that we have been defeated or we did something wrong. The reality is that if we tried we didn't fail. I believe that children should not be punished for that. Psychology Today said that one of the leading reasons for stress for students was the need to get A's. I believe that Vermont should lean toward proficiency-based learning because it gets away from the letter grade and lets kids learn at their own pace.

Social media has taken the 21st-century teens by a storm. According to a 2015 study, the Washington Post said that teens consume nine hours a day of social media. As a teenager myself, I constantly see examples of people showing off their success which is nice; however, it makes a lot of people feel bad about themselves. We should work towards a goal of producing more positive content.

Our views of failure are false and missed interpreted, however, if you can treat failure as not what we've been taught all our lives but treat it as a way to improve as a human race and individuals we will grow tremendously know that one failure will not determine your life, getting straight A's are not needed to succeed and that there is more behind what looks like that perfect photo. If I can go through life believing this I know I will become that pro soccer player, that attorney or that writer.

ALEXIS JABLONSKI, ST. JOHNSBURY ACADEMY,  
SENIOR, FINALIST

Aldous Huxley, the author of "Brave New World," seems to have predicted the Trumpian era of disillusion and fear of immigrants. However, the basic idea of welcoming immigrants is central to our way of life; our diversity makes us stronger. Unfortunately, these values are being threatened. Current immigration policy is shifting toward exclusion of immigrant populations and has awakened an anti-immigrant sentiment that does not align with the historical importance of immigration in the U.S. These concepts are essential to America's identity of inclusivity, and they need to be protected as we have gone under such a dramatic shift in power and ideals. Trump continually spews blatant falsehoods which undermine that character of immigrant communities, in order to secure his campaign promise of a wall. It has become evident that our president will continue to use hateful rhetorical devices toward immigrant populations simply for his own benefit.

When in fact, his beliefs and promises do not align with that of the American people. As demonstrated in Huxley's novel, when we isolate those we deem as the other, we are constricting our growth as a nation.

A prime example of an attempt to dehumanize and marginalize people through the news is Trump's commentary on the Migrants passage through Mexico. Trump has continually used fear tactics to dehumanize outsiders and justify our hostility toward them. The media typically presents the migrants through an overhead image of a crowd, thus neglecting their humanity. "The Caravan" is an excuse to not view people as human. According to our president, they are rapists, drug dealers, killers, deceitful, job stealing terrorists coming in by the thousands. This information is simply false, and aimed to incite fear among Americans. Unfortunately today, our President's hateful rhetoric toward outsiders has reframed our former charitable nature toward immigrant populations. The image of the migrant people must be adjusted. We must look at their faces to see their individual humanity, rather than a single entity.

We must remember the pillars by which our Nation was founded on, those of which make it great. The fundamental notion of inviting immigrants into our communities and providing them with equal opportunities to thrive is integral to our lifestyle. We have promised ourselves as Nation to provide stability to outsiders. We are an entire nation based on blended cultures and thoughts; these values are what offer us strength.

During Donald Trump's presidential campaign Americans were fascinated by his explosive personality. Unfortunately, over the past two years, we have learned that was not merely a campaign tactic. His continual attacks on American democracy have activated catalysts for change. We will no longer stand by, entranced and misinformed. We must encourage activism and open discussion to promote understanding, we must evaluate our media consumption and make educated decisions, and we must actively seek the truth, in a world that is overwhelming us with inflamed rhetoric. Only then, will we escape this self-inflicted Brave New World.

SIMON ROSENBAUM, VERMONT COMMONS  
SCHOOL, FRESHMAN, FINALIST

When I was thirteen, I had twenty-one cents thrown at me. For a moment, I didn't process what was happening. I looked up to see one of my classmates looking back at me, waiting to see how I would react. I left the change on the table, and left the lunchroom in the direction of my next class. Instead, I shut myself in a bathroom stall and cried. My name is Simon Rosenbaum and I've been Jewish my entire life. I wear a yarmulke to school and often can't attend school events that are on Friday nights because they interfere with the sabbath. However, I haven't always practiced self-acceptance.

I began wearing a yarmulke halfway through seventh grade. I remember weeks of emotional preparation for the snide remarks and lost friends that were sure to come. Before the morning bell had even rung, my kippah had already been grabbed and torn off. This was the result of the few Jewish kids in the school pretending that they weren't Jewish for fear of retribution from their classmates. I'm sad to say that they were right. Vermont is an extremely non-diverse state. According to Pew Research Center, over 93% of Vermonters are white, and approximately 94% of Vermonters are Christian or have majority Christian heritage. Approximately two percent of Vermonters are Jewish, out of the eight to eleven percent of Vermonters that practice non-Christian faiths. These non-diverse societies lead to non-tolerant kids.

When I was in eighth grade, a paraeducator made Mein Kampf required reading for students who she did not believe were working hard enough. I later learned that she only engaged in this behavior around Jewish students. To this day, she works in a Vermont middle school after a school investigation "didn't find any incriminating evidence". Anti-Semitic incidents are far more commonplace in schools today than most educators like to admit. According to a study for The Washington Post, in 2018 a study reported that 69% of young Jews in America said that they had "personally experienced discrimination because of their faith". This is up from 39% in 2013 from the same study.

We can solve the issue of anti-Semitism in our schools by a variety of actions. We should begin by instituting diversity experts as consultants on three month pilot periods in every Vermont school to observe systematic and ignorance based anti-semitism. Those consultants would then make recommendations in the changing of diversity education to the school board. If the board were to refuse the recommendations by the consultant, the consultant could then appeal to the State Board of Education. Another course of action we should be taking is to create a zero-tolerance policy on anti-Semitism both inside and outside of schools. If kids are shown the right examples while seeing the wrong ones punished, then the precedent will be set for an effective change in our diversity education. No educated child or adult would ever take joy from a thirteen year old crying in the bathroom.

ANDY SIKI, WINOOSKI HIGH SCHOOL, SENIOR,  
FINALIST

CLIMATE CHANGE

"It's not enough to think it's important. We must make it urgent," says Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, a congresswoman from New York.

Vermont is taking action on global warming by reducing energy use and investing in clean energy. It is accomplishing these goals by using low carbon transportation, protecting farms,

making the community green and resilient, and recycling and composting. By 2050 Vermont should be using 90% of clean energy sources. I'm part of The Youth Lobby For Climate Change. We organize an annual rally at the State House to show legislators that young people care about their future. We talk about what we're doing right now, our future as a state, and what will help our communities.

In 2016 electricity made up 28% of emission in our environment. Solar power and other renewable energy sources can reduce that number. Vermont already started putting solar panels in homes, businesses, and schools to make a cleaner environment. Recently Elon Musk made a Tesla battery to store the energy from solar panels inside a house. The length of Vermont winters might make that storage difficult, but that's a problem we need to fix. By using solar energy, Vermont could reach the goal of using 90% renewable energy sources by 2050. Transportation makes up 28% of the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. And Vermont can reduce this greenhouse gas emission. We could have more bikes on the road, even an electric assisted bike and a bike path. Karl Kemnitzer works with solar bikes, and he said: "Bikes and solar are a good combination, and it's also been a lot of fun! An average solar panel puts out around 16 watts per square foot . . . the bike is so efficient. I find that over a long term, I am using about 200 watts on average as I ride along." Kemnitzer now needs to fit enough solar panels on a bike. He's taking an engineering class and working on that problem.

Schools should start getting students involved in their community. Schools can help affect our environment by recycling, reducing, and composting food waste. At the Youth Climate Leaders Academy students from Vermont and New Hampshire came together to make goals for their schools. We worked on composting and made a goal to start composting by January 2019. We would start in our classrooms then move to the cafeteria.

Everyone wants to take action to change things but not everyone does. At the Climate Leaders Academy I learned that you have to start by making small changes and that will lead to big changes. If Vermonters fix the small problem in their communities, we can not only affect the whole state but also influence other states around us.

RAGULAN SIVAKUMAR, SOUTH BURLINGTON  
HIGH SCHOOL, JUNIOR, FINALIST  
THE WASTE LAND

In the year 2015, the United States produced 262.4 million tons of waste, 130.63 million tons of which were landfilled. That is equivalent to 2.23 lbs./day/American person of waste landfilled. Landfilling at such a great rate requires us to create new landfills, taking away from scenic beauty while also requiring us to use more natural resources to create new products, cost-

ing us with long-term sustainability as well. To address the United States' waste problem, taxes must be put on the producers of materials that become waste, a governmental recycling program must be created, and stricter recycling laws must be imposed.

Firstly, a landfill tax should be imposed on producers to reduce the net amount of waste. Landfills they take up areas that could otherwise be used and lose us many recyclable components, making them a detriment economically. Environmentally, landfills enhance climate change by forcing decomposition to occur anaerobically, producing methane, which, according to the EPA, is over 25 times as efficient as carbon dioxide at trapping heat. Since landfills hurt economically and environmentally, a landfill tax should be imposed by ton of waste. This tax would cause producers to reduce their landfill waste while also creating an incentive for corporations to create more sustainable and effective waste management programs. As the United Kingdom has shown, a landfill tax can be incredibly effective, reducing the number of landfills by 2/3 in 8 years. With the passing years, the tax could progressively increase, further incentivizing the movement from waste, reducing our waste problem all the while.

Secondly, a governmental recycling program should also be created to complement the landfill tax. While the waste-reducing reasons are obvious, the other incentive is that recycling is a massive industry. As China has shown, recycling is a \$200 billion industry. Thus, the United States could create its own governmental recycling program via some of the revenue from the landfill tax project, providing countless jobs while also alleviating our waste problems by making waste management feasible. Moreover, the recycling program would obtain the base materials for industry through recycling which could then be resold off, making the entire ordeal economically viable while also reducing our waste.

Lastly, stricter recycling laws must be imposed. According to the EPA, only 67% of paper is recycled, 26% of glass, 34% of metals, and 9% of plastics, making it is obvious that stricter recycling laws are needed. Imposing a fine for violators would ensure that recycling guidelines are followed. Since no one would want to incur a fine for something so menial, stricter recycling laws would enable the U.S. to tackle the waste problem.

In summation, the U.S. has a waste problem and must address the issue. We cannot continue with 130.63 million tons of landfilled waste each year. By implementing the policies noted above, our country would no longer be "the waste land": it would be a model for the rest of the world in waste management.

FIONA THERESE, COMPASS SCHOOL,  
SOPHOMORE, FINALIST

There is a picture of me on the wall, near our kitchen table. It was taken

when I was five years old and entering kindergarten. I was wearing a yellow dress and wearing a big sun hat. The girl standing next to me, Ashley, was leaning on me and smiling. She was to become my best friend.

School is supposed to be safe and fun. It's supposed to be where you learn about new things and experiment with new ideas. It's supposed to prepare you for challenges in the future. But today, too many of us are scared of school because we don't know what might happen while we are there. I was ten when I heard about the shooting in Sandy Hook. It was the first time I realized that school might also be unsafe and that someone might want to harm us. The state of our country is one of confusion for us, as students. We are expected to go to school trusting that nothing can happen. But the truth is, every day across the country there are reports of gun violence. Even in my small school, we have drills so that we'll know what to do if someone comes to school to attack us.

In 2018, 113 people have been killed or injured in a school shooting. On average, a shooting takes place at least once every eight days that school is in session. After a shooting takes place, I have heard what people express their sympathy through 'thoughts and prayers.' The time for prayers is over. We need change. Children should not fear going to school. I should not have to look around my classroom and plan a possible escape. I should be able to go to school with the same optimism that I had when I was five.

The state of our union is one of fear because our country has not passed adequate gun control. How many people need to speak out about their lost children, family or friends before a change happens?

Guns rights advocates argue that our right to bear arms is protected in the Constitution. I disagree. I believe that the Constitution is a living document, one that transcribes our aspirations and hope. In a letter to James Madison in 1789, Thomas Jefferson wrote: "No society can make a perpetual constitution. The earth belongs always to the living generation and not to the dead." It is time to demand change. The state of our union might be one of fear, but I have also seen hope. The hope that I see comes not from our legislature in Washington, D.C., but in the protests across the country. My generation is on the move. We are working hard to make our country and our schools safe again. Although these are difficult times, I have seen that even young people can be powerful when they work together. The state of our union is in the hands of those who protest, those who march, those who write letters, and those who demand change. So what is the state of our union? It's one where fear must be met with strength and I'm proud to be a member of a generation who is rising up to meet the challenges that lie ahead.

HENRY WU, ESSEX HIGH SCHOOL, JUNIOR,  
FINALIST

It is the year 2060. You and your grandchildren are watching the charred Earth slowly recede from view within your space capsule. "What happened?" they ask. You breathe a deep sigh fraught with regret and anger as you reluctantly tell the story of the Earth's demise. "It all began in the 1970s . . ."

When Exxon researchers learned that the burning of fossil fuels influences climate, they hid their findings from the public. Other fossil fuel companies were complicit in denying the existence of the greenhouse effect for decades. Today, the oil and coal industries are still the main drivers of carbon emissions, and \$20 billion in annual U.S. government subsidies perpetuates our dependence on them.

"Our hunger for oil and coal was insatiable. We ate and ate, but it poisoned us. We loved our cars and our plastics, but they killed us . . ."

The use of fossil fuels for transportation, electricity, and plastic production releases carbon dioxide into the atmosphere, trapping heat. Rising global temperatures and more severe and frequent natural disasters have already devastated human lives. In as few as twelve years, rising sea levels and droughts will lead to severe food shortages, heightened political instability, and widespread poverty. A recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report found that limiting global temperature increase to 1.5°C, the target of the Paris Agreement, will still cause \$54 trillion in damage.

"Back in Vermont, I was a teenager when I first noticed the unbearable summer heat that made breathing difficult and forgot what a white Christmas felt like. These were merely inconveniences, but that all change in a few years. The searing wildfires and crippling hurricanes that made headlines in California and the Carolinas soon became commonplace. Entire cities vanished from the map because they were submerged underwater. Could we have avoided this?"

The efforts of individuals—taking shorter showers, using public transit, going vegetarian—can only do so much, but it's large companies that wield influence over our government and society. A carbon tax that fines businesses for pollution is an effective method of keeping them in check. It's a regenerative economic measure that could fund renewable energy research and implementation.

However, ordinary citizens still must help avoid catastrophe. In the end, our politicians and business leaders have a say in our nation's energy infrastructure, but it is our duty to convince them to adopt necessary changes. We must write to our members of Congress and tell them to resist corporate power. We must elect officials who will champion a carbon tax, and we must fulfill our end of the deal in giving up

fossil fuels for renewable energy sources. So, what story will we tell our grandchildren? A lament of despair and regret, or a tale of teamwork and hope? The decisions we make today will provide the answer. Breaking our fossil fuel addiction and investing in renewables are drastic yet necessary efforts. The best time for action was forty years ago, but the next best time is now.●

#### TRIBUTE TO HARDY MCCOLLUM

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Judge Hardy McCollum, probate judge and chairman of the Tuscaloosa County Commission, who retired earlier this month after 42 years of honorable service. Judge McCollum will be long remembered for his remarkable career and his dedication to the rule of law.

A native of Tuscaloosa, Hardy grew up selling peanuts, popcorn, and programs at Denny Stadium, which is now known as Bryant-Denny Stadium. Following graduation from Tuscaloosa High School, Hardy married his high school sweetheart, Juanita. They both went on to earn their degrees from the University of Alabama.

Following college, Hardy began working in Tuscaloosa and serving as an active member of the the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce, commonly known as the Jaycees. He has always told me that his first political experience was campaigning for me in the 1970 Alabama State Senate race.

In his first run for office in 1976, Hardy was elected to the position of probate judge. Following his initial election, he was reelected to six more 6-year terms, serving in the esteemed role from 1977 to 2019, a total of 42 years.

During his time as probate judge and chairman of the Tuscaloosa County Commission, Hardy also served as president of the Association of County Commissions of Alabama, the National Association of Counties Transportation Steering Committee, and the National College of Probate Judges. Additionally, he held the role of chairman of the West Alabama Planning and Development Council, the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, and the University of Alabama Commerce and Business Administration Executive Society.

Outside of his professional career, Hardy has volunteered over the years with the Boys and Girls Club of America, Boy Scouts of America, and United Way. He also served as chairman of the Heart Association and the Alabama Institute for Deaf and Blind Foundation.

Another noteworthy accomplishment in Hardy's career is that he has been the longest serving probate judge in the State of Alabama, and at the time of his first election in 1976, he was the youngest probate judge in the State. His dedication and service have been immensely valued in the State and will be greatly missed.

It is with great pleasure that I join Hardy's family and friends in recognizing his accomplishments. Our State and community have been fortunate to have a leader like Hardy McCollum, and I wish Hardy the very best as he transitions into the next chapter of his life.●

#### 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF COLSTRIP, MONTANA

● Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize an important anniversary in Montana's history: the city of Colstrip is celebrating its 20th anniversary this month.

For decades, Colstrip has been the engine that powers Montana and the Pacific Northwest, carrying on a long and proud tradition of energy production in our State and employing thousands of Montanans.

Colstrip represents the very best of our State. The hard-working folks here are unafraid to get their hands dirty, working each day to provide power—and the economic opportunity that comes with it—to people in Montana and across the region.

In this transition, Colstrip has boldly looked to the future, working to strengthen the local economy so its citizens' children and grandchildren can have the same opportunities afforded to the older generations. The city motto, "Tomorrow's Town, Today," befits a community working once again to define itself for the decades to come.

I am proud of Colstrip and its citizens, led by Mayor John Williams. Their civic passion, their dedication to each other, and their resilience in the face of change will ensure this community remains strong for years to come.●

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:05 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 790. An act to provide for a pay increase in 2019 for certain civilian employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

#### MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 311. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives and abortion or attempted abortion.

#### 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-176. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Three Rivers, Southeast Arkansas Navigation Project; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-177. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "2012 and 2014 Regional Partnership Grants to Increase the Well-Being of and to Improve the Permanency Outcomes for Children Affected by Substance Abuse: Fourth Annual Report to Congress"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-178. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Supplement Not Supplant Under Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as Amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act" received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 29, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-179. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-558, "Structured Settlements and Automatic Renewal Protections Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-180. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-559, "Driver's License Revocation Fairness Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-181. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-560, "Rear-Facing Car Seat Safety Amendment Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-182. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-561, "Study of Long-Term Care Facilities and Long-Term Care Services Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-183. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-562, "Electronic Proof of Motor Vehicle Insurance and Registration Amendment Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-184. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-566, "Healthy Students Amendment Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-185. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-567, "Lead Water Service Line Replacement and Disclosure Amendment Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-186. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-568, "Behavioral Health Parity Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-187. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-569, "Revised Synthetics Abatement and Full Enforcement Drug Con-

trol Amendment Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-188. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-570, "Mental Health Information Disclosure Amendment Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-189. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-571, "Eviction with Dignity Amendment Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-190. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-572, "Program of All-Inclusive Care for the Elderly Establishment Amendment Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-191. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-573, "Conversion Therapy for Consumers Under a Conservatorship or Guardianship Amendment Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-192. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-574, "Rent Charged Definition Clarification Amendment Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-193. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-577, "Office of Public-Private Partnerships Delegation of Authority Amendment Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-194. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-578, "Campaign Finance Reform Amendment Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-195. A communication from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report of the Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States" for the September 2018 session; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-196. A communication from the Chief of the Office of Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Bump-Stock-Type Devices" (RIN1140-AA52) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 29, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## 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 Ms. ERNST (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SASSE, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. COTTON, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. INHOFE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 285. A bill to require U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to take into custody certain aliens who have been charged in the United States with a crime that resulted in the death or serious bodily injury of another person, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 286. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. SASSE, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KING, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 287. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to impose limitations on the authority of the President to adjust imports that are determined to threaten to impair national security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. UDALL):

S. 288. A bill to amend the Indian Civil Rights Act of 1968 to extend the jurisdiction of tribal courts to cover crimes involving sexual violence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. TESTER, and Mrs. HYDE-SMITH):

S. 289. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to support rural residency training funding that is equitable for all States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Ms. SMITH):

S. 290. A bill to protect Native children and promote public safety in Indian country; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BLUNT, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 291. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to carry out a housing choice voucher mobility demonstration to encourage families receiving the voucher assistance to move to lower-poverty areas and expand access to opportunity areas; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. ROSEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. KING, Mr. CARPER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BENNET, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. REED, Mr. Kaine, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. UDALL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CASEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. WARREN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. JONES, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 292. A bill to limit the separation of families at or near ports of entry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. 293. A bill to enhance border security to reduce drug trafficking and related money laundering; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. WARREN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Ms. SMITH):

S. 294. A bill to establish a business incubators program within the Department of the Interior to promote economic development



in Indian reservation communities; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 295. A bill to establish the Rural Export Center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 296. A bill to amend XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 297. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to modify the amount in controversy requirement and remove the complete diversity requirement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 298. A bill to establish the Springfield Race Riot National Historic Monument in the State of Illinois, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 299. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize programs that support interprofessional geriatric education and training to develop a geriatric-capable workforce, improving health outcomes for a growing and diverse aging American population and their families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 300. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to carry out a program relating to physical security and cybersecurity for pipelines and liquefied natural gas facilities; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PORTMAN:

S. 301. A bill to enforce work authorization requirements for immigrants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. DAINES, Ms. ERNST, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. KING, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. 302. A bill to permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. COLLINS, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 303. A bill to reform the GEAR UP program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. TESTER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. JONES, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. MANCHIN, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 304. A bill to reauthorize section 340H of the Public Health Service Act to continue to encourage the expansion, maintenance, and the establishment of approved graduate medical residency programs at qualified teaching health centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. MORAN):

S. 305. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to recognize Indian tribal governments for purposes of determining under the adoption credit whether a child has special needs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KING, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 306. A bill to promote merger enforcement and protect competition through adjusting premerger filing fees, increasing antitrust enforcement resources, and improving the information provided to antitrust enforcers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 307. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to modify the standard for an unlawful acquisition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 308. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal lands in San Bernardino County, California, to the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District, and to accept in return certain non-Federal lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 309. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reinstate estate and generation-skipping taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CARPER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. UDALL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 310. A bill to amend the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act to reauthorize the Act; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. SASSE (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BURR, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. ENZI, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 311. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives and abortion or attempted abortion; read the first time.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. WARREN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BROWN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 312. A bill to prevent a nuclear arms race resulting from weakened international restrictions on the proliferation of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. KING, and Mr. COONS):

S. 313. A bill to amend the American History and Civics Education program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require inclusion of programs that educate students about the history and principles of the Constitution of the United States, including the Bill of Rights; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WARNER:

S. 314. A bill to improve the processing and oversight by the Federal Government of security clearances and background investigations and for other purposes; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 315. A bill to authorize cyber hunt and incident response teams at the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

## SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. Res. 35. A resolution supporting democratic principles and standards in Bolivia and throughout Latin America; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Res. 36. A resolution supporting the observation of National Trafficking and Modern Slavery Prevention Month during the period beginning on January 1, 2019, and ending on February 1, 2019, to raise awareness of, and opposition to, human trafficking and modern slavery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. DAINES, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. UDALL, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BENNET, Ms. SMITH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MORAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. THUNE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. PETERS):

S. Res. 37. A resolution designating the week beginning February 3, 2019, as "National Tribal Colleges and Universities Week"; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CASEY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. KING, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. COONS, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. Res. 38. A resolution designating the week of February 4 through 8, 2019, as "National School Counseling Week"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. ENZI, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SCHUMER,



Ms. SMITH, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WICKER, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. Res. 39. A resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of the American Farm Bureau Federation and celebrating the long history of the American Farm Bureau Federation representing the farmers of the United States; considered and agreed to.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 29

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 29, a bill to establish the Office of Critical Technologies and Security, and for other purposes.

S. 80

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 80, a bill to repeal the annual fee on health insurance providers enacted by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 104

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 104, a bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for automatic continuing resolutions.

S. 105

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 105, a bill to amend title X of the Public Health Service Act to prohibit family planning grants from being awarded to any entity that performs abortions, and for other purposes.

S. 130

At the request of Mr. SASSE, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 130, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion.

S. 131

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 131, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to prohibit Federal Medicaid funding for the administrative costs of providing health benefits to individuals who are unauthorized immigrants.

S. 135

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 135, a bill to prioritize the

allocation of H-2B visas for States with low unemployment rates.

S. 153

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 153, a bill to promote veteran involvement in STEM education, computer science, and scientific research, and for other purposes.

S. 162

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 162, a bill to provide back pay to low-wage contractor employees, and for other purposes.

S. 169

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. 169, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exemption from gross income for civil damages as recompense for trafficking in persons.

S. 172

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 172, a bill to delay the reimposition of the annual fee on health insurance providers until after 2021.

S. 177

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 177, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 190

At the request of Mr. LEE, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) were added as cosponsors of S. 190, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to prohibit assistance to nonprofits, foreign nongovernmental organizations, and quasi-autonomous nongovernmental organizations that promote or perform abortions.

S. 246

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 246, a bill to block the implementation of certain presidential actions that restrict individuals from certain countries from entering the United States.

S. 262

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 262, a bill to provide for a pay increase in 2019 for certain civilian employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

S. 272

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 272, a bill to establish the policy of the United States regarding the no-first-use of nuclear weapons.

S. 274

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 274, a bill to ensure that organizations with religious or moral convictions are allowed to continue to provide services for children.

S. 280

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 280, a bill to reauthorize the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation program.

S.J. RES. 3

At the request of Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 3, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to balancing the budget.

S.J. RES. 4

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 4, a joint resolution requiring the advice and consent of the Senate or an Act of Congress to suspend, terminate, or withdraw the United States from the North Atlantic Treaty and authorizing related litigation, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 20

At the request of Mr. LEE, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 20, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Protecting Life in Global Health Assistance policy should be permanently established.

S. RES. 30

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 30, a resolution condemning efforts to undermine democracy in Hungary and urging President Trump to defend the universal human rights and democratic norms under attack by the Orban government.

AMENDMENT NO. 65

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from South

Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 65 proposed to S. 1, a bill to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 77

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 77 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. ERNST (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SASSE, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. COTTON, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. INHOFE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 285. A bill to require U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to take into custody certain aliens who have been charged in the United States with a crime that resulted in the death or serious bodily injury of another person, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. ERNST. Thank you, Mr. President.

Today I rise on the 3-year anniversary of the tragic death of a constituent of mine, Sarah Root. On January 31, 2016, the same day as her college graduation, Sarah was killed in nearby Omaha, NE, by an illegal immigrant named Edwin Mejia. He was drag racing with a blood alcohol level more than three times the legal limit.

Despite requests by local law enforcement, Immigration and Customs Enforcement failed to detain Mejia because of a nonsensical policy that allows ICE to use discretion when determining whether to detain an illegal immigrant. He posted bond, he was released, and 3 years later remains a fugitive. It has been 3 years, and he is still a fugitive, denying Sarah's loved ones any sense of closure or justice.

As a mom, I can't fathom the grief her family and friends continue to feel after such a devastating loss. My own daughter is approaching the age at which Sarah was killed.

Just 21 years old, Sarah was bright, she was gifted, she was full of life and

ready to take on the world. What a talented young lady.

She had just graduated from Bellevue University with a 4.0 GPA. She was dedicated to her community, and she wanted to pursue a career in criminal justice. Sarah had her whole future ahead of her, but her opportunity to make her mark on the world was taken away from her. Her life was tragically cut short. Yet even in death, Sarah touched the lives of others. Sarah saved six different individuals through her organ donation.

Sadly, what happened to Sarah Root is not an isolated incident.

We have seen this story play out time and again in the 3 years since Sarah's killing—innocent lives taken by criminals who entered the United States illegally through a porous border. Crimes committed by those here illegally are truly among the most heartbreaking and senseless, and that is because these crimes are completely preventable, as the perpetrators should not be in the United States in the first place.

Although nothing can bring Sarah back to her family, we can ensure that ICE never makes this same mistake again. That is why I rise today and, again, join with my colleagues from Iowa and Nebraska, including the Presiding Officer; thank you again for joining in this legislation. We are introducing Sarah's Law again in honor of Sarah Root.

Sarah's Law would require that ICE take custody of a person who is in the country illegally and who is charged with a crime that seriously injures another person. Sarah's Law would also require better victim notification and amend the law to require that the Federal Government take custody of anyone who enters the United States legally but violated the terms of their immigration status or had their visa revoked and is later charged with a crime that resulted in the death or harm of another person.

President Trump implemented parts of Sarah's Law through an Executive order in 2017, and I commend him for that. It included directing the Secretary of Homeland Security to prioritize the removal of criminals who are here illegally. The Executive order also establishes an office to implement notification requirements of Sarah's Law.

Despite provisions of Sarah's Law being put into place by President Trump's order, it is critical that the Senate take up this legislation in order to codify these enforcement priorities so that any future administration cannot remove these provisions. No family should ever have to endure such a tragedy, especially one that could have been prevented. The fact remains that Sarah's killer would not have been in our country if it weren't for our country's broken immigration system.

Sarah's Law is commonsense reform. It recognizes the simple fact that all criminals should be held accountable

for their actions. How much more commonsense can this be, folks? Hold criminals accountable. We should not allow them simply to slip back into the shadows.

I recognize that the immigration debate has become a political football. We see that every day here in Washington, DC, but the security of our borders and enforcement of our immigration laws is not a game. We must honor the lives of these innocent victims and do better. We must work to stop future crimes.

I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues to fulfill the promise I made to Sarah's loving parents, Michelle Root and Scott Root. I will do everything I can to ensure that not one more parent has to go through what the Roots have faced—the loss of their daughter and the promise of justice.

Madam President, I thank you for joining me on this legislation. It means a lot to this family and many others.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. ROSEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. KING, Mr. CARPER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BENNET, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. REED, Mr. Kaine, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. UDALL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CASEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. WARREN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. JONES, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 292. A bill to limit the separation of families at or near ports of entry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to reintroduce legislation that will finally put an end to the separation of families at our southern border. I have believed from the outset that the administration was wrong to pursue a zero tolerance policy of family separation, which is cruel and detrimental to children and parents alike.

The President claimed to end this policy in June by executive order, but we have learned that the practice of separating families continues today. In fact, the separations may have been broader in scope than we previously knew.

Last year, the American people were rightly horrified when thousands of children, including babies and toddlers, were taken from their parents, to be separated for weeks and months. Dozens of these children spent days and weeks in cages with nothing but thin mats and aluminum blankets.

In response, people from all walks of life—Republicans, Democrats, clergy, the medical community, business leaders, labor organizers—stood up and

said, “enough is enough.” Average Americans spoke out, marched, and called their members of Congress pleading for us to stand up to the President and demand he reverse his policy.

But we still may not know the full scope of the harm that was caused. We still do not know just how many families were torn apart as a result of the zero tolerance policy.

Litigation has identified over 2,700 children who were separated from their parents by DHS, including nearly 100 children under the age of 5. However, in January the Inspector General for Health and Human Services found that “this number does not represent the full scope of family separations.” Indeed thousands—thousands—more children may have been separated from their parents in 2017, before the start of the accounting period required by the court.

We have also learned in recent weeks that this crisis is not over. Families are still being separated from one another.

In June, the Trump administration issued an executive order that ended the “zero tolerance” family separation policy. Despite that order, the practice of family separation did not end.

Instead, the Inspector General for Health and Human Services reported that separations are ongoing with little oversight or accountability. In fact, at least 118 children were separated from their parents between June 2018, when the executive order was issued, and early November.

These family separations could not have happened if Republicans had joined me and all Senate Democrats to pass the Keep Families Together Act last Congress. The Keep Families Together Act prohibits Border Patrol from separating children from their parents or legal guardians, without good cause.

Good cause is defined with a focus on the best interest of the child, and cannot be based on the parent's migration or crossing of the border. No separation can be made without consulting a child welfare specialist, and all presumptions are made in favor of family unity, including unity of siblings.

The Keep Families Together Act includes vital oversight mechanisms that will ensure that every child separated under the zero tolerance policy is accounted for. These include a requirement for DHS to publish transparent guidance on separations, as well as annual reporting requirements and a requirement for a GAO report on criminal prosecution of asylum seekers.

These are basic protections for children that should not be controversial. Parents who try to protect their children from violence and poverty abroad, should not be punished by having those children ripped from their arms. Children should not be subjected to severe trauma in the interest of deterring migration.

Instead, families should be kept together and given a fair chance to

present their cases for asylum. The Keep Families Together Act will provide these fundamental necessities and protect children from further harm. We have a fresh start in a new Congress. It is time to make these vital protections a reality.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 296. A bill to amend XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise to introduce legislation with my colleague Senator CASEY that would reauthorize the only federally funded programs that are specifically designed to develop a health provider workforce to care for our older Americans. The Geriatrics Workforce Improvement Act would reauthorize the Geriatrics Workforce Enhancement Program and also reinstate the Geriatrics Academic Career Award Program.

The number of Americans aged 65 and older is growing rapidly. In my State of Maine, we are reaching an aging milestone faster than are other States. By 2020, the number of Maine seniors is projected to exceed the number of Maine children. This is 15 years ahead of the nationally projected date of 2035, at which point the number of Americans aged 65 and older will outnumber those under the age of 18 for the first time in our Nation's history.

The United States is facing a critical shortage of geriatric health professionals and direct service workers to support our aging population. Today, we need 20,000 geriatricians. However, fewer than 7,300 of our Nation's nearly 1 million physicians are board certified as geriatricians. By 2030, we will need 30,000 geriatricians and even more geriatric health professionals and direct service workers. To achieve this goal, we will need to train 1,600 geriatric specialists per year over the next 12 years.

For the State of Maine, with an aging population of more than a quarter million Mainers over the age of 65 and with only 40 geriatricians, there is an acute need to quickly train more geriatric health professionals and direct service workers to meet the growing demand. The University of New England, College of Osteopathic Medicine has joined the University of Maine this year in proposing the “Aging Maine Transformation Collaborative.” I was pleased to lend my support to this collaboration earlier this year. If funded, AgingME would become our State's first Geriatric Workforce Enhancement Program and would bring with it much needed assistance to communities and families throughout our State.

Nationwide, our bill would reauthorize this workforce enhancement program at \$45 million per year over the next 5 years and would reinstate the Geriatrics Academic Career Award Pro-

gram at \$6 million per year. Together, these programs would train the current workforce and family caregivers while simultaneously developing a cadre of emerging leaders in geriatric education in a variety of disciplines. By doing both, we will ensure that older Americans will be cared for, for decades to come, by a healthcare workforce that will be specifically trained to meet their unique and complex healthcare challenges. This training of using the most efficient and effective methods for older adults will result in improved care while reducing unnecessary costs.

I am pleased to say that our legislation is supported by the leading organizations in gerontology and geriatrics, including the Eldercare Workforce Alliance, the American Geriatrics Society, the Alzheimer's Impact Movement, and the National Association of Geriatric Education Centers.

I ask unanimous consent that these letters of support be printed in the RECORD.

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

ELDERCARE WORKFORCE ALLIANCE,  
Washington, DC, January 25, 2019.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,  
Chair, Special Committee on Aging,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. BOB CASEY,  
Ranking Member, Special Committee on Aging,  
U.S. Senate Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SUSAN COLLINS AND SENATOR BOB CASEY: On behalf of the Eldercare Workforce Alliance (EWA), we are writing to express our support of the Geriatrics Workforce Improvement Act.

EWA is a coalition of 32 national consumer, health care professional, direct-care worker and family caregiver organizations. The number of Americans over age 65 is expected to reach 70 million by 2030, representing a 71% increase from today's 41 million older adults. Today's health care workforce is inadequate to meet the needs of older Americans, many of whom have multiple chronic physical and mental health conditions and cognitive impairments. Without a national commitment to expand training and educational opportunities, the workforce will be even more constrained in its ability to care for the elderly population as the baby boom generation ages.

This bipartisan bill supports two critical objectives. First, it would formally establish funding for the Geriatrics Workforce Enhancement Program (GWEP). Second, it would reestablish the Geriatric Academic Career Awards (GACAs), a previously funded program for developing clinician-educators. By supporting the GWEP and the GACAs, the Geriatrics Workforce Improvement Act would:

Foster education and engagement with family caregivers by training providers who can assess and address their care needs and preferences.

Promote interdisciplinary team-based care by transforming clinical training environments to integrate geriatrics and primary care delivery systems.

Improve the quality of care delivered to older adults by providing education to families and caregivers on critical care challenges like Alzheimer's disease and related dementias.

Reach underserved and rural communities by ensuring clinician-educators are prepared to train the geriatrics workforce of today and tomorrow.

This investment protects our most vulnerable elders and invests in our country's future. We ask that you continue your support for the programs at this crucial time, and thank you for your leadership on this issue.

Sincerely,

NANCY LUNDEBJERG, MPA,  
EWA Co-Convener.  
MICHELE J. SAUNDERS,  
DMD, MS, MPH,  
EWA Co-Convener.

AMERICAN GERIATRICS SOCIETY,

New York, NY, January 25, 2019.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,  
Chair, Special Committee on Aging,  
U.S. Senate Washington, DC.

Hon. BOB CASEY,  
Ranking Member, Special Committee on Aging,  
U.S. Senate Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SUSAN COLLINS AND SENATOR BOB CASEY: The American Geriatrics Society (AGS), an organization devoted to improving the health, independence and quality of life of older adults, supports the Geriatrics Workforce Improvement Act. The AGS is thankful for your support of the geriatrics workforce training programs and for your efforts to improve care of older Americans.

The Geriatrics Workforce Improvement Act would authorize the Geriatrics Workforce Enhancement Program (GWEP) and the Geriatrics Academic Career Awards (GACAs) program under Title VII of the Public Health Service Act. The AGS believes that both programs must be authorized and funded if all Americans are to have access to high-quality, person-centered care as we grow older.

The GWEP is currently the only federal program designed to increase the number of providers, in a variety of disciplines, with the skills and training to care for older adults. The GWEPs educate and engage the broader frontline workforce including family caregivers and focus on opportunities to improve the quality of care delivered to older adults, particularly in underserved and rural areas. The GACA program is an essential complement to the GWEP program. GACAs ensure we can equip early career clinician educators to become leaders in geriatrics education and research.

The introduction of this important legislation follows announcements of related funding opportunities from the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) in November 2018. Authorization of the GWEPs and GACAs as outlined in the Geriatrics Workforce Improvement Act will help ensure that HRSA receives the funding necessary to carry these critically important workforce training programs forward.

At a time when our nation is facing a severe shortage of both geriatrics healthcare providers and faculty with the expertise to train these providers, the AGS believes the number of educational and training opportunities in geriatrics and gerontology should be expanded, not reduced. Thank you for your leadership on this issue.

Sincerely,

LAURIE JACOBS, MD,  
AGSF,  
President.  
NANCY E. LUNDEBJERG,  
MPA,  
Chief Executive Officer.

ALZHEIMER'S IMPACT MOVEMENT,  
Washington, DC, January 31, 2019.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,  
Chairman, Senate Committee on Aging,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. BOB CASEY,  
Ranking Member, Senate Committee on Aging,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN COLLINS AND RANKING MEMBER CASEY: On behalf of the Alzheimer's Association and the Alzheimer's Impact Movement (AIM), including our nationwide networks of advocates, thank you for your continued leadership on issues and legislation important to Americans living with Alzheimer's and other dementias, and to their caregivers. The Alzheimer's Association and AIM are pleased to support the Geriatrics Workforce Improvement Act.

More than 5 million Americans are living with Alzheimer's and, without significant action, nearly 14 million Americans will have Alzheimer's by 2050. Today, another person develops the disease every 65 seconds; by 2050, someone in the United States will develop the disease every 33 seconds. This explosive growth will cause Alzheimer's costs to increase from an estimated \$277 billion in 2018 to \$1.1 trillion in 2050 (in 2018 dollars). These mounting costs threaten to bankrupt families, businesses and our health care system. Unfortunately, our work is only growing more urgent.

The Geriatrics Workforce Improvement Act would develop a workforce capable of providing complex, high-quality care that improves health outcomes and reduces costs for a diverse and growing aging population. It would reauthorize the Geriatrics Workforce Enhancement Program (GWEP), and reinstate the Geriatrics Academic Career Awards (GACAs) Program, a previously funded program for developing clinician-educators, two critical objectives to ensure communities across the nation have access to health professionals and other critical supports, improving care for all of us as we age. By supporting the GWEP and GACAs the Geriatrics Workforce Improvement Act would, foster education and engagement with family caregivers by training providers who can assess and address care needs and preferences, reach underserved and rural communities by ensuring clinician-educators are prepared to train the geriatrics workforce of today and tomorrow, and improve the quality of care delivered to older adults by providing education to families and caregivers on critical care challenges.

The Alzheimer's Association and AIM deeply appreciate your continued leadership on behalf of all Americans living with Alzheimer's and other dementias. We look forward to continuing to work with you and your colleagues to improve care and support for individuals and families affected by Alzheimer's disease and other dementias. If you have any questions about this or any other legislation, please contact Rachel Conant, Senior Director of Federal Affairs.

Sincerely,

ROBERT EGGE,  
Chief Public Policy Officer,  
Executive Vice President, Government Affairs, Alzheimer's Association.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF  
GERIATRIC EDUCATION CENTERS,  
January 25, 2019.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,  
Chair, Special Committee on Aging,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. BOB CASEY,  
Ranking Member, Special Committee on Aging,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN COLLINS AND RANKING MEMBER CASEY: On behalf of the HRSA Title

VII and Title VIII funded Geriatrics Workforce Enhancement Programs (GWEPs) across the country, thank you for your past support of geriatric education and for introducing the Geriatrics Workforce Improvement Act. The National Association for Geriatric Education (NAGE) is pleased to offer our support for the Geriatrics Workforce Improvement Act, which will reauthorize the GWEP and once again make the Geriatrics Academic Career Award program (GACA) a part of the effort to prepare the geriatrics workforce for the aging of our population. We and the growing numbers of older adults, caregivers, and clinicians caring for elders will urge Congress to move quickly to pass your bill and provide the resources to address our nation's growing demand for geriatric care.

We appreciate the many discussions that your staff facilitated with NAGE, as well as with the Eldercare Workforce Alliance, the American Geriatrics Society, and the Gerontological Society of America during the process of developing this legislation. This authorization and related funding are needed for the development of a health care workforce specifically trained to care for older adults and to support their family caregivers. Currently there are only 44 GWEP sites in 29 states. The modest increase in the authorization in your bill will have an important impact on training in geriatric care. Likewise, the funds you have authorized for the GACA program complement the GWEP, and support faculty that will teach and lead geriatrics programs. The bill will also assist in ensuring that rural and underserved areas will have geriatrics education programs.

NAGE is a non-profit membership organization representing GWEP sites, Centers on Aging, and Geriatric Education Centers that provide education and training to health professionals in the areas of geriatrics and gerontology. Our mission is to help America's healthcare workforce be better prepared to render age-appropriate care to today's older Americans and those of tomorrow.

Thank you for your continued support for geriatric education programs.

Sincerely,

CATHERINE CARRICO, PHD,  
President NAGE/  
NAGEC, Associate  
Director, Wyoming  
Geriatric Workforce  
Enhancement Program,  
Wyoming Center on Aging,  
Clinical Assistant Professor,  
College of Health Sciences,  
University of Wyoming.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill that would ensure geriatric education for our current workforce while it would optimize resources to bolster academic careers in geriatrics and help to attract the best and the brightest into this field. Together, these programs would develop exactly the kind of highly qualified workforce that we need to care for Americans as our Nation grows older.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. TESTER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. JONES, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. MANCHIN, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 304. A bill to reauthorize section 340H of the Public Health Service Act

to continue to encourage the expansion, maintenance, and the establishment of approved graduate medical residency programs at qualified teaching health centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation with my colleague from Montana, Senator TESTER, to fund Teaching Health Centers, a time-tested model for success to train the next generation of primary care doctors in communities where they are needed the most. I am pleased that Senators CAPITO, JONES, BOOZMAN, MANCHIN, and HARRIS have joined us as cosponsors.

Over the next decade, the severe shortage of primary care doctors could reach crisis levels in a growing number of rural and underserved communities in Maine and across our Nation. Alarmingly, these communities are often those hardest hit by the opioid epidemic. By 2030, we will need an estimated 120,000 physicians to meet the growing demand for health care services across the Country. In clinics and health centers in Northern Maine, I frequently hear stories about vacancies forcing Mainers to travel many miles simply to see a primary care doctor or dentist.

For the past eight years, one program, the Teaching Health Centers Graduate Medical Education Program, has worked to fill these gaps. This program trains medical residents in community-based settings, including low-income, underserved rural and urban neighborhoods. For example, since its inception in 2011, the Penobscot Community Health Care Center has trained 34 residents and served more than 15,000 dental patients in Bangor, Maine.

Nationwide, this program has produced real results. Since the program began, 632 new primary care physicians and dentists have graduated and entered the workforce, and the number of Americans served is in the millions. Those who train at teaching health centers are very likely to practice primary care and remain in underserved or rural communities. Last Congress, this Committee considered and successfully passed my legislation to fund teaching health centers for two years. As a result, for the 2017–2018 academic year, this program supported the training of 732 residents in 57 primary care residency programs, across 24 states.

The legislation I have introduced today would reauthorize the Teaching Health Centers Graduate Medical Education Program for five years and provide additional funding for expansion and the creation of new programs. This bill is widely supported by leading community health and physician organizations, including the American Association of Teaching Health Centers, National Association of Community Health Centers, American Academy of Family Physicians, American Association of Colleges of Osteopathic Medicine, and Council of Academic Family Medicine.

In the face of nationwide physician shortages, our legislation would provide a solution for communities today and a path forward to train the physicians of tomorrow. I urge all of my colleagues to join in support of this important legislation, the Training the Next Generation of Primary Care Doctors Act of 2019.

Mr. President, I ask to include these letters into the RECORD.

Mr. PRESIDENT: With no objection so ordered.

COUNCIL OF  
ACADEMIC FAMILY MEDICINE,  
January 28, 2019.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,  
*U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

Hon. SHELLEY CAPITO,  
*U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

Hon. DOUG JONES,  
*U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

Hon. JON TESTER,  
*U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATORS COLLINS, JONES, CAPITO, AND TESTER: On behalf of the Council of Academic Family Medicine (CAFM), including the Society of Teachers of Family Medicine, Association of Departments of Family Medicine, Association of Family Medicine Residency Directors, the North American Primary Care Research Group, we thank you for introducing the Training the Next Generation of Primary Care Doctors Act of 2019. This legislation is an important step to providing sustainable funding and growth for a critical program that helps address the primary care physician shortage in our country. We appreciate your leadership on this issue and give you our whole-hearted support for the legislation.

To help sustain this important graduate medical education program your legislation provides suitable funding for current Teaching Health Center Graduate Medical Education (THCGME) programs to help address the crisis-level shortage of primary care physicians. The funding level included in the bill will allow for a per resident amount to be paid for training that is on par with the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) funded study identifying a median cost of approximately \$157,600 per trainee. It allows for programs to regain previous losses of residency positions due to lower funding levels and instability. We are particularly pleased that the legislation would provide a five year reauthorization, giving the program some much needed financial stability.

In addition, we are gratified that the proposed legislation supports and funds the creation of new programs and/or centers, with a priority for those serving rural and medically underserved populations and areas. Evidence shows that the THC program graduates are more likely to practice in rural and medically underserved communities. Recognizing the importance of growing this successful program to help address geographic maldistributions of physicians across the country is significant.

The current authorization for this vital program expires at the end of this fiscal year. Without legislative action, the expiration of this program would mean an exacerbation of the primary care physician shortage, and a lessening of support for training in underserved and rural areas. Your efforts in support for this program since its inception have been key to keeping it alive. We are grateful to all of you for your exceptional leadership in supporting and sustaining this vital program by introducing this bill and helping to shepherd it toward enactment.

The CAFM organizations and our members are pleased to work with you to secure this legislation's enactment.

Sincerely,

BEAT STEINER, MD,  
*President, Society of Teachers of Family Medicine.*

FRED MISER, MD,  
*President, Association of Family Medicine, Residency Directors.*

JUDITH BELLE BROWN, PHD,  
*President, North American Primary Care Research Group.*

JOINT STATEMENT FOR THE RECORD

HEARING OF THE HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSION COMMITTEE ON ACCESS TO CARE: HEALTH CENTERS AND PROVIDERS IN UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES, JANUARY 29, 2018

On behalf of the more than 145,000 osteopathic physicians and medical students we represent, we applaud the committee's leadership and bipartisan effort to address the shortage in our health care workforce. We are thankful for the Chairman and Ranking Member for introducing legislation that would reauthorize the Teaching Health Centers Graduate Medical Education Program (THCGME) in anticipation of the upcoming hearing, Access to Care: Health Centers and Providers in Underserved Communities, we would like to highlight the need, and encourage the committee, to support funding for growth in the reauthorization of the THCGME program to help address the shortage in our health care workforce.

The majority of THCGME programs are currently accredited by the AOA or are dually accredited (DO/MD) programs, supporting nearly 800 osteopathic resident physicians through their training since the program's inception. Located in 27 states and the District of Columbia, THCGME programs train residents in much-needed primary care fields that have the largest shortages nationally, including family medicine, internal medicine, pediatrics, obstetrics and gynecology, psychiatry, geriatrics, and dentistry. It is a vital source of training for primary care residents to help expand access to care in rural and underserved communities throughout the country.

Osteopathic physicians (DOs) are fully-licensed to practice in all specialty areas of medicine, with nearly 57% of active DOs in primary care. Our training emphasizes a whole-person approach to treatment and care, where we partner with our patients to help them get healthy and stay well. Osteopathic medical education also has a long history of establishing educational programs for medical students and residents that target the health care needs of rural and underserved populations. Given this strong presence in primary care, osteopathic medicine aligns naturally with the mission and goals of the THCGME program that has proven successful in helping address the existing gaps in our nation's primary care workforce.

Residents who train in THC programs are far more likely to specialize in primary care and remain in the communities in which they have trained. Data shows that, when compared to traditional postgraduate trainees, residents who train at THCs are more likely to practice primary care (82% vs. 23%) and remain in underserved (55% vs. 26%) or rural (20% vs. 5%) communities. It is clear that a well-designed THCGME program not only plays a vital role in training our next generation of primary care physicians, but helps to bridge our nation's physician shortfall. The program also tackles the issue of

physician maldistribution, and helps address the need to attract and retain physicians in rural areas and medically underserved communities. In the 2016–2017 academic year, nearly all residents received training in primary care settings and 83% of residents trained in Medically Underserved Communities.

However, reauthorizing the THCGME program at its current level funding, for the next five years, would lead to a reduction of approximately 70 residency slots from the currently funded 737 residency positions.

We respectfully ask the committee to consider legislation by Senators Susan Collins (R-ME), Doug Jones (D-AL), Shelley Moore Capito (R-WV), and John Tester (D-MT) the “Training the Next Generation of Primary Care Doctors Act of 2019.” In addition to reauthorizing the THCGME program for the next five years, this bill also provides funding and a pathway for growth in the number of residents trained in underserved rural and urban communities. This represents a much needed expansion to address the physician shortages in our country.

We would also like to briefly highlight the broader role osteopathic physicians have in reducing our nation’s physician shortage. Since 2010, the number of DOs has increased by 54%. Today, more than 65% of all DOs are under the age of 45, and if current enrollment trends continue, DOs are projected to represent more than 20% of practicing physicians by 2030. Because of the whole-person approach to patient care that is inherent in osteopathic medicine, the increasing share of DOs in the physician workforce, and the number of DOs in primary care specialties, we have a unique and important perspective on the needs of our nation’s health care workforce and would welcome the opportunity to contribute to your work on this issue.

We appreciate your bipartisan effort to address the shortage in our country’s health care workforce, and we stand ready to assist in your effort.

Sincerely,

AMERICAN COLLEGE OF  
OSTEOPATHIC FAMILY  
PHYSICIANS.  
AMERICAN COLLEGE OF  
OSTEOPATHIC INTERNISTS.  
AMERICAN COLLEGE OF  
OSTEOPATHIC  
OBSTETRICIANS AND  
GYNECOLOGISTS.  
AMERICAN COLLEGE OF  
OSTEOPATHIC  
NEUROLOGISTS AND  
PSYCHIATRISTS.  
AMERICAN COLLEGE OF  
OSTEOPATHIC  
PEDIATRICIANS.  
AMERICAN OSTEOPATHIC  
ASSOCIATION.

AMERICAN ACADEMY OF  
FAMILY PHYSICIANS,  
January 28, 2019.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.  
Hon. SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.  
Hon. DOUG JONES,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.  
Hon. JON TESTER,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS COLLINS, JONES, CAPITO, AND TESTER: On behalf of the American Academy of Family Physicians (AAFP), which represents 131,400 family physicians and medical students across the country, I

write to support your legislation to reauthorize the Teaching Health Center Graduate Medical Education (THCGME) program. Thank you for your commitment to this important, innovative program.

The AAFP is pleased to support the Training the Next Generation of Primary Care Doctors Act because it updates the THCGME program for five years, authorizes adequate and sustainable funding for existing residency programs, and supports expansion into rural and underserved communities. In addition, the legislation maintains the program’s strong transparency and accountability requirements. The THCGME program directly addresses three major physician workforce challenges: the serious shortage of primary care physicians, geographic maldistribution of physician training, and the need to increase health care access for medically underserved populations. Recognizing the importance of supplying well-trained primary care physicians into communities that need them most, we look forward to working with you to update and expand the THCGME program early this year.

Again, we are pleased to support this important legislation. For more information, please contact Sonya Clay, Government Relations Representative.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL L. MUNGER, MD,  
FAAFP Board Chair.

AMERICAN ACADEMY OF FAMILY  
PHYSICIANS, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION  
OF COLLEGES OF OSTEOPATHIC  
MEDICINE, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION  
OF TEACHING HEALTH CENTERS,  
THE AMERICAN COLLEGE OF OBSTETRICIANS  
OF GYNECOLOGISTS,  
AMERICAN OSTEOPATHIC ASSOCIATION,  
COUNCIL OF ACADEMIC FAMILY  
MEDICINE, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION  
OF COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS.

[January 29, 2019]

PHYSICIANS, MEDICAL EDUCATORS, COMMUNITY  
HEALTH CENTERS STRONGLY SUPPORT  
TRAINING THE NEXT GENERATION OF  
PRIMARY CARE DOCTORS ACT OF 2019

Our organizations applaud the introduction of the Training the Next Generation of Primary Care Doctors Act of 2019 and urge the Senate to quickly pass this important legislation. We thank Senators Susan Collins (R-ME), Doug Jones (D-AL), Shelley Moore Capito (R-WV), Jon Tester (D-MT), and John Boozman (R-AR) for their commitment to ensuring that our nation has a strong and robust primary care workforce. Furthermore, we thank Senate HELP Committee Chairman Lamar Alexander (R-TN) and Ranking Member Patty Murray (D-WA) for their leadership in introducing the Community and Public Health Programs Extension Act, which will extend for five years federal funding for the Teaching Health Center Graduate Medical Education (THCGME) Program, community health centers, the National Health Service Corps, and two other federal health programs. These programs are set to expire at the end of the fiscal year.

The THCGME Program, established in 2010 and reauthorized in 2015 and 2018 has been, by any measure, an overwhelming success. In the 2017–2018 academic year, the program supported the training of 732 residents in 57 primary care residency programs, across 24 states. Since 2011, the program has supported the training of over 630 new primary care physicians and dentists that have graduated and entered the workforce. Importantly, physicians trained in teaching health center programs are more likely to practice in underserved communities, increasing access to care for the country’s most vulnerable patient populations.

The value of primary care is well documented. In fact, individuals who have a continuous relationship with a primary care physician are more likely to be healthier and use fewer health care resources. Research shows that our nation faces a primary care physician workforce shortage. The THCGME Program has proven its ability to efficiently increase the number of primary care physicians trained.

This highly successful and impactful program is set to expire on September 30, 2019 unless Congress takes action to reauthorize and fund it. The legislation introduced today not only reauthorizes the program, but also provides enhanced funding and a pathway for increasing the number of residents trained. Most important, the legislation will continue to build the primary care physician pipeline necessary to reduce costs, improve patient care, and support underserved rural and urban communities.

We are extremely pleased that members of both parties are working together to extend this vital program that brings health care to medically underserved communities across the nation. Our organizations strongly support Training the Next Generation of Primary Care Doctors Act of 2019 and call on the House of Representatives and Senate to ensure that the THCGME Program is reauthorized and appropriately financed by September 30.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF  
COLLEGES OF OSTEOPATHIC MEDICINE,  
January 28, 2019.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.  
Hon. SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.  
Hon. JOHN BOOZMAN,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.  
Hon. DOUG JONES,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.  
Hon. JON TESTER,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS COLLINS, JONES, CAPITO, TESTER, AND BOOZMAN: On behalf of the American Association of Colleges of Osteopathic Medicine (AACOM), thank you for your unceasing bipartisan commitment and leadership in championing the Health Resources and Services Administration’s Teaching Health Center Graduate Medical Education (THCGME) Program by introducing the Training the Next Generation of Primary Care Doctors Act of 2019. We offer our strong support of this legislation.

AACOM represents the 35 accredited colleges of osteopathic medicine in the United States. These colleges are accredited to deliver instruction at 55 teaching locations in 32 states. In the current academic year, these colleges are educating more than 30,000 future physicians—25 percent of all U.S. medical students. Six of the colleges are public and 29 are private institutions. AACOM was founded in 1898 to support and assist the nation’s osteopathic medical schools, and to serve as a unifying voice for osteopathic medical education. The association leads and advocates for the osteopathic medical education community to improve the health of the public.

With your introduction of the Training the Next Generation of Primary Care Doctors Act of 2019, the osteopathic medical education community commends your bipartisan efforts to support this critical program that produces primary care physicians in medically underserved communities across our country by reauthorizing it for five years



and providing enhanced funding and a pathway for growth in the number of residents trained.

Established in 2010 and reauthorized in 2015 and 2018, the THCGME Program has been a notable success. In the 2017-2018 academic year, the program supported the training of 732 residents in 57 primary care residency programs, across 24 states. Since 2011, the program has supported the training of over 630 new primary care physicians and dentists that have graduated and entered the workforce. Importantly, physicians trained in THC programs are more likely to practice in underserved communities, increasing access to care for the country's most vulnerable patient populations.

As you know, the continuation of this program is vital to addressing primary care physician workforce shortages and delivering health care services to vulnerable patients in need. It has encouraged greater connections and services between traditionally underserved areas and the emerging physician workforce by creating opportunities for medical students to carry out their required training where their services are most needed. The THCGME Program has been highly effective in transitioning residents into medically underserved areas, with more than 80 percent remaining in primary care practice and over half remaining in high-need communities.

On behalf of the nation's osteopathic medical schools and the students they train, thank you for your steadfast leadership, and I look forward to continuing our work together to support a health care system that will enable osteopathic medical students and future physicians to provide primary health care to the patients they serve. We look forward to working together on this important legislation.

Respectfully,

STEPHEN C. SHANNON, DO, MPH,  
*President and CEO.*

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 308. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal lands in San Bernardino County, California, to the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District, and to accept in return certain non-Federal lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to reintroduce the "Santa Ana River Wash Plan Land Exchange Act." This legislation would help implement a consensus-driven regional land management plan by directing the Bureau of Land Management to exchange land with the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District in San Bernardino, California.

Before I continue, I would like to thank Senators LISA MURKOWSKI and MARIA CANTWELL, as well as their staffs, for their hard work to move this bill forward last Congress. With their assistance, this legislation passed out of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee in August 2018 and was included in a bipartisan public lands package.

I thank Senator MURKOWSKI for introducing a bipartisan lands package bill this Congress and including this legislation in it. I look forward to working once again with Senator MUR-

KOWSKI, as well as the newly designated Ranking Member, Senator MANCHIN, to maintain our momentum and pass this bill as quickly as possible.

I also would like to express my gratitude to Representative PAUL COOK and his staff for their continuing work and collaboration on this legislation. Lastly, I welcome working with Representative COOK and Representative AGUILAR who are cosponsoring companion legislation in the House of Representatives. Lastly, I thank Senator HARRIS for cosponsoring this legislation.

This bill is an excellent example of how smart, sustainable, land planning can be accomplished through inter-agency cooperation. Federal and State agencies, private industry, and municipalities representing mining, flood control, water supply, wildlife conservation, and other interests all came to the table to develop a land management plan that accounts for the array of land uses in this area.

The land exchange facilitated by this bill is broadly supported, including by: County of San Bernardino, City of Redlands, City of Highland, San Bernardino Water Conservation District, San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District, East Valley Water District, Endangered Habitats League, CEMEX Construction Materials Pacific, Robertson's Ready Mix, Inland Action.

This diverse group of entities formed the "Wash Committee" in 1993 to address mining and land management in the upper Santa Ana River wash area.

I applaud the Committee, along with federal, state and local stakeholders, for working together to develop a strategy for comprehensive land management planning for the area. This group has shown that through cooperation, it is possible to both protect the environment and support local business and community interests.

The land exchange between the San Bernardino Water Conservation District and the Bureau of Land Management will consolidate open space for conservation purposes and optimize the efficiency of mining operations and water conservation efforts.

The exchange will also set aside new land for conservation purposes near land already managed by BLM.

This bill will lead to increased habitat protection, groundwater recharge, and public access while allowing for the continued use of land and mineral resources.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass the "Santa Ana River Wash Plan Land Exchange Act" as soon as possible.

Thank you Mr. President, I yield the floor.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 309. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reinstate estate and generation-skipping taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, all across our country—in Vermont, in Illinois, in California—all across this country, people are asking a very simple question. That question is, How does it happen that in the midst of the extraordinary wealth that exists in our country—how does it happen that so many people continue to hurt financially and struggle desperately to keep their heads above water economically?

Today, despite unemployment being relatively low, some 40 million Americans continue to live in poverty. We don't talk about poverty very much here in the Senate, but we have 40 million Americans living in poverty. Many of them are struggling to adequately feed their kids. Many of them are forced to go, despite working, to emergency food shelters just to stay alive.

Despite the United States having a GDP—gross domestic product—of more than \$20 trillion, we in this country embarrassingly continue to have the highest rate of childhood poverty of almost any major country on Earth. We don't talk about that either. Children are obviously the future of America, and we continue to have one of the highest rates of childhood poverty of any major country, and that includes 29 percent of African-American children who live in poverty.

How does it happen that in a so-called booming economy—and we hear from President Trump every other day about how the economy is booming—the bottom 40 percent of our population does not have \$400 in cash in order to address a financial emergency? Think about that. The bottom 40 percent—almost half of Americans—don't have \$400 in their pocket, in the bank to address a financial emergency. Maybe the car breaks down, maybe the kid gets sick, maybe one loses one's job, maybe one undergoes a divorce; something happens, and 40 percent of the American people don't have \$400 in the bank to address that crisis.

In other words, today—and we saw this in the recent government shutdown; today in America, many, many millions of families live paycheck to paycheck in order to survive. That should not be happening in the wealthiest country on Earth, and it is time we begin to talk about that. It is not good enough to talk about a so-called booming economy, forgetting about tens of millions of families who are not seeing that booming economy but, in fact, are living under incredible financial stress.

How does it happen that, in the so-called booming economy, tens of millions of American workers today are working for wages that are so low they cannot afford the escalating cost of housing? Some of them are spending 40, 50 percent of their limited incomes on housing. For many of these people, there is no health insurance available; the idea of a vacation for the family is something not even to be thought about; and the idea of being able to send one's kids to college is something that is also not on the table. By the

way, many of these individuals are working two or three jobs, 50, 60, 70 hours a week, just to survive.

This, again, is the wealthiest country in the history of the world. Yet 30 million Americans today, as we speak, have zero health insurance—no health insurance at all; 41 million people are underinsured—which means their deductibles and their copayments are so high that even though they have insurance, they still can't afford to go to the doctor, and one out of five Americans today cannot afford the prescription drugs their doctors prescribe.

In my view—a view I have held for a very, very long time, and it is a view shared by people not only in this country in wide numbers, but all over the world—healthcare is a human right, not a privilege. Whether you are rich or whether you are poor, you have the right to go to a doctor when you get sick, and you have the right to know that if you end up in a hospital, you are not going to go bankrupt or suffer from financial distress.

We are an aging population—no great secret there. We are an aging population. In this Congress, instead of dealing with government shutdowns precipitated by the President, we should be talking about how we respond to the reality of an aging population. Yet what we don't talk about is that about half of older Americans—half of older Americans, those 55 and older—have no retirement savings and no idea about how they will retire with dignity.

Think about what that means. Somebody is 60 years of age, they are coming to the end of their work-life, and they have no money—or virtually no money—in the bank. Maybe all they are going to get is Social Security. They turn on the TV, and they hear folks around here talking about cutting Social Security. Talk about why people in this country are angry and why they are stressed out.

Here is the bottom line. We are the wealthiest country on Earth. In fact, we are the wealthiest country in the history of the world, but despite that wealth, a significant percentage of our population—our children, our elderly people, our working men and women—struggle each and every day to keep their heads above water economically. Not only are they struggling, I think the pain they are feeling has to do with the worry they have about the future for their kids because they know, as many of us know, that unless we make some bold changes in our economy, the younger generation today will have a lower standard of living than their parents.

Imagine that—a so-called booming economy, yet we are looking at a situation where the younger generation may well have a lower standard of living than their parents.

I want to also say a word about another reality that currently exists. While so many of our people are struggling, while so many of our children

are living in poverty, while 20 percent of folks on Social Security are trying to live on less than \$13,000 a year, there is another pervasive reality in American society today; that is, the people on top—the very wealthiest people in this country—have never had it better, and the gap between the very, very rich—I am not just talking about the rich; I am talking about the very, very rich—is growing wider.

Here is the simple truth, a truth that we virtually never talk about here in the Senate, a truth that is not heard much in the corporate media; that is, the United States of America today has the most unequal distribution of wealth and income of almost any major country on Earth, and that level of inequality is worse today than at any time since the 1920s, the so-called Gilded Age of American society.

Today, if you can believe it, the three wealthiest people in this country—three—own more wealth than the bottom half of America, 160 million people. Let me repeat that. The three wealthiest people in this country own more wealth than the bottom half of America, 160 million people. Today, the top one-tenth of 1 percent—not 1 percent; one-tenth of 1 percent—own almost as much wealth as the bottom 90 percent. Today, and since the Wall Street crash in 2008, about 46 percent of all new income goes to the top 1 percent. Roughly speaking, half of all new income goes to the bottom 99 percent, and half goes to the top 1 percent, and our great task here in the U.S. Senate is to keep the government open while Trump tries to shut it down. Maybe, just maybe, we should be talking about those issues. Maybe, just maybe, we should be talking about an economy that works for all of us, not just the people on top.

Today, the top 25 hedge fund managers on Wall Street—25 hedge fund managers—earn nearly double the income of all 140,000 kindergarten teachers in America.

What all of the psychologists tell us is that the most important years of a human being's development are 0 to 4. Those are the most impressionable years in terms of how we develop intellectually and emotionally, and our childcare workers, our kindergarten teachers play a very important role. Does anybody think it makes sense that you have 25 hedge fund managers on Wall Street who, today, earn nearly double what 140,000 of our kindergarten teachers make? By the way, public teachers in America are falling further and further behind other occupations.

Having stated that reality—the fact that the middle class is struggling and the fact that the people on top are doing phenomenally well—I think it is fair to ask what the views are of the Republican leadership here in the Senate—Republicans control the Senate—and what our Republican President, President Trump, is proposing to address these massive levels of injustice and inequality. Three people own more

wealth than the bottom half of America. What does the President and what does Leader McConnell have to say about that? The sad truth is that the Republican leadership today wants to make an embarrassingly bad situation even worse.

After passing a \$1 trillion tax giveaway for the top 1 percent and large corporations last year, Republican leadership is coming back and saying: Hey, we only gave 83 percent of the tax benefits to the 1 percent. That is not good enough. That is not good enough. We have to do even better for our billionaires and corporate sponsors.

This time, the Republican leadership and the President want a tax break of hundreds of billions of dollars that would go exclusively to the wealthiest of the wealthy. I am not talking about the wealthy; I am talking about the wealthiest of the wealthy—the top one-tenth of 1 percent, the wealthiest 1,700 families in America.

We have 127 million families in our country—a population of some 320 million people. As I have indicated, many of these families are struggling. Many of these families are hurting. Today, many of these families are wondering how they are going to pay their rent, pay their mortgage, keep their lights on. Yet the legislation to repeal the estate tax that Senator McConnell and President Trump are proposing would benefit less than the top one-tenth of 1 percent of them—99.9 percent would see no tax reduction from the legislation.

Can anyone actually imagine bringing forward a piece of legislation that does not help the bottom 99.9 percent? Can you imagine that? The middle class are struggling. The gap between the rich and the poor is growing wider. There are 30 million people without health insurance. Our infrastructure is crumbling. And they come forward with a piece of legislation that is designed to protect and benefit the top one-tenth of 1 percent. The legislation would be of no benefit to 99.9 percent of the people of this country.

I think it is clear that when the people of this country look at Congress and say “Those folks in Washington are not representing me. They are representing their wealthy campaign contributors. They are representing the billionaire class,” there can be no clearer example of that reality than this proposed legislation.

Once again, with all of the economic problems, all of the inequality we face, imagine legislation that comes forward from the Republican leadership and the President that benefits the top one-tenth of 1 percent—the 1,700 wealthiest families in this country.

It is no secret that our infrastructure—our roads and our bridges, water systems, airports, wastewater plants—is crumbling all over this country. All over this country, there are major infrastructural problems. But I hear over and over again: We don't have the

funding to rebuild our crumbling infrastructure and put millions of Americans to work at good-paying jobs rebuilding that infrastructure. We just don't have the money.

Our schoolteachers are underpaid, but we don't have the money to provide attractive salaries in order to get the best and the brightest to do the most important work in this country; that is, teaching our young people.

Today, we have veterans—people who put their lives on the line—sleeping on the streets, but we don't have the money to house them.

Families in America cannot afford childcare, and public schools are underfunded.

We don't have the money to address those crises, but somehow we do have hundreds of billions of dollars available to provide tax breaks for the top one-tenth of 1 percent.

We apparently have enough money to provide the Walton family—the wealthiest family in America, the folks who own Walmart, the people who pay their own employees starvation wages—by repealing the estate tax, as Senator MCCONNELL and President Trump would like to do, we have enough money to provide the Walton family, the wealthiest family in America, with a tax break of up to \$63 billion. Veterans sleep out on the street, teachers are underpaid, and 30 million Americans have no health insurance. We can't address those issues, but we do have legislation that would provide up to \$63 billion in tax breaks for one family.

We have, apparently, enough money available to provide the Koch brothers—a family who spent some \$400 million during the midterm election to help elect Republican candidates; the Koch brothers, one of the wealthiest, most politically active families in America—we have enough money to provide them with up to a \$39 billion tax break.

Under this legislation, we can provide a tax break of up to \$27 billion to the Mars candy bar family and up to a \$13.4 billion tax break to the Cox cable family.

In other words, at a time of massive needs in this country, we don't have enough money available to protect working families and the middle class, but we certainly have more money than we know what to do with in order to give incredible tax breaks to the richest people in this country.

The estate tax that we are going to be proposing does not give massive tax breaks to the wealthiest people in this country—quite the contrary. It says to those people that at a time of massive income and wealth inequality, instead of repealing the estate tax, we must substantially increase this tax on the multimillionaires and billionaires of this country and in doing that, not only come up with much needed revenue to address the needs of working families but also to reduce wealth inequality in America.

That is why this week I will be introducing legislation for an estate tax bill that would do exactly the opposite of what my Republican colleagues propose to do. Let me briefly explain what is in the legislation I am offering.

Under my bill, anytime someone inherits an estate in America of \$3.5 million or less, that person will not pay one penny in estate taxes. They will get to keep that inheritance tax-free. That population includes 99.8 percent of the American people. The legislation I am proposing would not raise taxes by a penny on 99.8 percent of the American population.

If you are in the top two-tenths of 1 percent of the population—the population that inherits over \$3.5 million—your taxes will, in fact, be going up, and they should be going up.

My legislation establishes a 45-percent tax on the value of an estate between \$3.5 million and \$10 million, a 50-percent tax on the value of an estate between \$10 million and \$50 million, a 55-percent tax on the value of an estate in excess of \$50 million, and a 77-percent tax on the value of an estate above \$1 billion. In other words, this bill begins to create a progressive tax system in America, which is based on ability to pay.

I know some may think otherwise, but the truth is, this is not a radical idea. From 1941 through 1976, the top estate tax rate was, in fact, 77 percent on estate values above \$50 million. Back to 1976, the top estate tax rate was 77 percent.

This bill would also close tax loopholes that have allowed billionaire families, such as the Waltons, to pass fortunes from one generation to the next without paying their fair share of taxes.

Under this legislation, the families of all 588 billionaires in our country, who have a combined net worth of over \$3 trillion, would pay up to \$2.2 trillion in estate taxes.

Let me make a confession here. This idea, this approach, was not developed by BERNIE SANDERS. It is not a new idea. More than a century ago, a good Republican President named Teddy Roosevelt fought for the creation of a progressive estate tax to reduce the enormous concentration of wealth that existed during the Gilded Age.

What is really quite remarkable is that what Teddy Roosevelt talked about over 100 years ago during the Gilded Age of the 1920s, when little children were working in factories and fields and the wealthiest people were enjoying incredible wealth and luxury—the idea Teddy Roosevelt proposed then is as relevant today as it was back then. Let me quote what Teddy Roosevelt said more than 100 years ago:

The absence of effective state, and, especially, national restraint upon unfair money-getting has tended to create a small class of enormously wealthy and economically powerful men, whose chief object is to hold and increase their power. The prime need is to

change the conditions which enable these men to accumulate power. Therefore, I believe in a graduated inheritance tax on big fortunes, properly safeguarded against evasion and increasing rapidly in amount with the size of the estate.

That was Teddy Roosevelt over 100 years ago. What Roosevelt said then is absolutely true for today.

From a moral and an economic perspective, our Nation will not thrive when so few people have so much wealth and power and so many people have so little wealth and power. This wealth and income inequality is not only unjust and unfair; the truth is, it is a real threat to our economy and our democracy.

We need a tax system in this country that tells the billionaire class that they are going to have to pay their fair share of taxes so that we do not have 30 million people without health insurance, so that we do not have young people graduating college \$50,000, \$100,000 in debt, so that we do not have an infrastructure that is crumbling, and so that we do not see our great country moving toward an oligarchic form of society where a handful of families enjoy incredible wealth and power at the expense of everybody else.

In my view, the fairest way to reduce wealth inequality, to invest in the middle class and working families of our country, and to preserve our democracy is to enact a progressive estate tax on the inherited wealth of multimillionaires and billionaires. That is exactly what I will be proposing.

#### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 35—SUPPORTING DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES AND STANDARDS IN BOLIVIA AND THROUGHOUT LATIN AMERICA

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 35

Whereas the nation of Bolivia proclaimed independence from Spain on August 6, 1825, with Simón Bolívar as its president;

Whereas Bolivia endured more than a century of fragile governance and instability, with more than 150 changes of leadership since it gained independence and at least six military coups between 1952 and 1981 alone;

Whereas, between October 6 and 7, 1970, and again on July 21, 1978, Bolivia experienced a succession of military coups resulting in three different governments over each respective period;

Whereas a transition to civilian democracy occurred in 1982, after the ruling military junta handed over power to a civilian government, which managed to maintain control despite major economic upheavals and painful market reforms;

Whereas elected President Gonzalo Sanchez de Lozada and his successor Carlos Mesa both resigned in the face of destabilizing protests in 2003 and 2005, respectively;

Whereas, in 2005, Evo Morales won his first term as president, becoming Bolivia's first indigenous citizen elected to the office;

Whereas Bolivia's historically marginalized indigenous peoples represent approximately 41 percent of the country's population, according to the 2012 Bolivian census;

Whereas, in 2006, the people of Bolivia elected a constituent assembly to write a new constitution recognizing greater political and economic rights for the country's indigenous population, while key opposition parties boycotted the constituent assembly election;

Whereas, in 2008, a recall referendum on President Morales was rejected by 67 percent of voters in Bolivia;

Whereas, in 2008, amidst growing protests in the country and rising tensions between Bolivia and the United States, President Morales expelled the United States ambassador to Bolivia;

Whereas, in 2009, Bolivians approved, by a vote of more than 60 percent in a nationwide referendum, a new constitution that included a limit of two five-year presidential terms;

Whereas, in 2009, President Morales won reelection to a second term with more than 60 percent of the vote;

Whereas, in 2013, President Morales' loyalists in Bolivia's Legislative Assembly approved legislation allowing him to run for a third term—a law that President Morales' political allies in the Bolivian Constitutional Tribunal affirmed, ruling that the two-term limit in the country's new constitution did not apply because President Morales' first term was under the old constitution;

Whereas, in 2013, President Morales expelled the United States Agency for International Development for trying to “conspire against Bolivia”;

Whereas, in 2014, President Morales won his third term as president, with 60 percent of the vote;

Whereas, in 2016, the Government of Bolivia called a national referendum to modify the constitution in order to allow for an additional term for Morales;

Whereas, that same year, more than half of voters in Bolivia rejected the proposed lifting of presidential term limits that would have allowed President Morales to run for a fourth term and serve at least 20 years in office;

Whereas, after the referendum, the Morales Administration increased its troubling rhetoric against opposition media and advanced a narrative suggesting a plot to prevent President Morales from staying in power;

Whereas, in 2017, President Morales' loyalists on the Bolivian Constitutional Tribunal lifted constitutional term limits arguing that they violated the candidates' human rights, citing the American Convention of Human Rights, adopted at San Jose November 22, 1969, the main human rights treaty in the Americas, as the legal foundation for its decision;

Whereas the Convention states that political rights can only be limited under very specific circumstances, a provision which, when drafted in 1969, was intended to prevent abusive governments from arbitrarily barring opposition candidates and not to impede constitutional reelection limits designed to reduce corruption and abuse of power given Latin America's long history of violent and prolonged dictatorship;

Whereas the Bolivian Constitutional Tribunal's ruling rendered Bolivia one of a very small number of countries in the Western Hemisphere that does not place limits on presidential reelection;

Whereas the Secretary General of the Organization of American States said the cited clause “does not mean the right to perpetual power . . . Besides, presidential re-election

was rejected by popular will in a referendum in 2016.”;

Whereas, in March 2018, a report commissioned by the Organization of American States specifically related to this issue stated that—

(1) “There is no specific and distinct human right to re-election.”;

(2) “Term limits . . . are a reasonable limit to the right to be elected because they prevent an unlimited exercise of power in the hands of the President.”; and

(3) “The limits on a president's re-election do not therefore unduly restrict his/her human and political rights.”; and

Whereas the Morales era has seen many social and economic gains, but also a weakening and undermining of key democratic institutions in order to favor the ruling party: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) supports the important transitions to democracy and the regular peaceful transfers of power through elections that have taken place in the majority of Latin American and Caribbean countries in recent decades;

(2) recognizes the historic significance of Bolivia's 2005 election;

(3) expresses concern for efforts to circumvent presidential terms limits in the Bolivian constitution;

(4) supports presidential term limits prevalent in Latin America as reasonable checks against a history of coups, corruption, and abuses of power;

(5) expresses the belief that the 2016 referendum vote to maintain presidential term limits reflected the legitimate will of the majority of voters in Bolivia;

(6) agrees with the Organization of American States Secretary General's interpretation of the American Convention of Human Rights as not applicable to presidential term limits;

(7) calls on the Government of Bolivia to respect, and where necessary restore, the independence of key electoral and governing bodies and administer the October 2019 election in adherence with international democratic norms and its own constitutional limits on presidential terms; and

(8) calls on Latin American democracies to continue to uphold democratic norms and standards among members states.

# SENATE RESOLUTION 36—SUPPORTING THE OBSERVATION OF NATIONAL TRAFFICKING AND MODERN SLAVERY PREVENTION MONTH DURING THE PERIOD BEGINNING ON JANUARY 1, 2019, AND ENDING ON FEBRUARY 1, 2019, TO RAISE AWARENESS OF, AND OPPOSITION TO, HUMAN TRAFFICKING AND MODERN SLAVERY

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 36

Whereas the United States abolished the transatlantic slave trade in 1808 and abolished chattel slavery and prohibited involuntary servitude in 1865;

Whereas, because the people of the United States remain committed to protecting individual freedom, there is a national imperative to eliminate human trafficking and

modern slavery, which is commonly considered to mean—

(1) the recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, or obtaining of an individual through the use of force, fraud, or coercion for the purpose of subjecting that individual to involuntary servitude, peonage, debt bondage, or slavery; or

(2) the inducement of a commercial sex act by force, fraud, or coercion, or in which the individual induced to perform that act is younger than 18 years of age;

Whereas the Department of Justice has reported that human trafficking and modern slavery has been reported and investigated in each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia;

Whereas, since 2007, the National Human Trafficking Hotline has identified more than 45,000 cases of human trafficking;

Whereas victims of human trafficking are difficult to identify and are subject to manipulation, force, fraud, coercion, and abuse;

Whereas, to help businesses in the United States combat child labor and forced labor in global supply chains, the Department of Labor has identified 148 goods from 76 countries that are made by child labor and forced labor;

Whereas the Department of State has reported that the top 3 countries of origin of federally identified trafficking victims in fiscal year 2017 were the United States, Mexico, and Honduras;

Whereas forced labor and human trafficking generates revenues of approximately \$150,000,000,000 annually worldwide and there are an estimated 40,000,000 victims of human trafficking across the globe;

Whereas, to combat human trafficking and modern slavery in the United States and globally, the people of the United States, the Federal Government, and State and local governments must be—

(1) aware of the realities of human trafficking and modern slavery; and

(2) dedicated to stopping the horrific enterprise of human trafficking and modern slavery;

Whereas the United States should hold accountable all individuals, groups, organizations, and countries that support, advance, or commit acts of human trafficking and modern slavery;

Whereas, through education, the United States must also work to end human trafficking and modern slavery in all forms in the United States and around the world;

Whereas victims of human trafficking deserve a trauma-informed approach that integrates the pursuit of justice and provision of social services designed to help them escape, and recover from, the physical, mental, emotional, and spiritual trauma they endured;

Whereas combating human trafficking requires a whole-of-government effort that rests on a unified and coordinated response among Federal, State, and local agencies and that places equal value on the identification and stabilization of victims, as well as the investigation and prosecution of traffickers;

Whereas laws to prosecute perpetrators of human trafficking and to assist and protect victims of human trafficking and modern slavery have been enacted in the United States, including—

(1) the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.);

(2) title XII of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (Public Law 113-4; 127 Stat. 136);

(3) the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-22; 129 Stat. 227);

(4) sections 910 and 914(e) of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-125);

(5) section 1298 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (22 U.S.C. 7114);

(6) the Abolish Human Trafficking Act of 2017 (Public Law 115-392);

(7) the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2017 (Public Law 115-393);

(8) the Frederick Douglass Trafficking Victims Prevention and Protection Reauthorization Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-425); and

(9) the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2017 (Public Law 115-427);

Whereas the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-22; 129 Stat. 227) established the United States Advisory Council on Human Trafficking to provide a formal platform for survivors of human trafficking to advise and make recommendations on Federal anti-trafficking policies to the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking established by the President;

Whereas the Department of Defense, the General Services Administration, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration issued a final rule (80 Fed. Reg. 4967) to implement Executive Order 13627, entitled "Strengthening Protections Against Trafficking in Persons in Federal Contracts", that clarifies the policy of the United States on combating trafficking in persons as outlined in the Federal Acquisition Regulation by strengthening the prohibition on contractors from charging employee recruitment fees;

Whereas, although such laws and regulations are currently in force, it is essential to increase public awareness, particularly among individuals who are most likely to come into contact with victims of human trafficking and modern slavery, regarding conditions and dynamics of human trafficking and modern slavery precisely because traffickers use techniques that are designed to severely limit self-reporting and evade law enforcement;

Whereas January 1 is the anniversary of the effective date of the Emancipation Proclamation;

Whereas February 1 is—

(1) the anniversary of the date on which President Abraham Lincoln signed the joint resolution sending the 13th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States to the States for ratification to forever declare, "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude . . . shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction"; and

(2) a date that has long been celebrated as National Freedom Day, as described in section 124 of title 36, United States Code; and

Whereas, under the authority of Congress to enforce the 13th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States "by appropriate legislation", Congress, through the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), updated the post-Civil War involuntary servitude and slavery statutes and adopted an approach of victim protection, vigorous prosecution, and prevention of human trafficking, commonly known as the "3P" approach: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate supports—

(1) observing National Trafficking and Modern Slavery Prevention Month during the period beginning on January 1, 2019, and ending on February 1, 2019, to recognize the vital role that the people of the United States have in ending human trafficking and modern slavery;

(2) marking the observation of National Trafficking and Modern Slavery Prevention Month with appropriate programs and activities, culminating in the observance on February 1, 2019, of National Freedom Day, as described in section 124 of title 36, United States Code;

(3) urging continued partnerships with Federal, State, and local agencies, as well as social service providers and nonprofit orga-

nizations to address human trafficking with a collaborative, victim-centered approach; and

(4) all other efforts to prevent, eradicate, and raise awareness of, and opposition to, human trafficking and modern slavery.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to introduce a resolution in observance of "National Trafficking and Modern Slavery Prevention Month." This resolution is meant to bring awareness to the worldwide scourge of human trafficking.

All of us, as Americans, must raise our awareness of this pernicious crime that often goes unnoticed and undetected in our communities. Human trafficking claims over 40 million victims globally. It has also created an estimated \$150 billion global industry, an industry that affects every State in America.

Traffickers prey on vulnerable populations, like those in the juvenile justice system, and use physical and psychological techniques to control their victims behind closed doors: isolating them from the public, exploiting language and cultural barriers, and threatening victims with violence. These techniques often prevent victims from coming forward. All of us can do better in recognizing warning signs.

I have been heartened that recently, various private entities, such as hotels, the travel industry, and those in the convenience-store industry, have all come together to commit to training their employees to better detect human trafficking. In addition to raising awareness, January is also a month to renew our commitment to enforce, and enact, laws to help eradicate trafficking.

For example, in 2000, Congress enacted the Trafficking Victims Protection Act, which marked a strong commitment to prosecute human traffickers and better aid victims.

Last Congress, then-Judiciary Chairman CHUCK GRASSLEY and I authored the Trafficking Victims Protection Act, which was complemented by Senators CORNYN's and KLOBUCHAR's Abolish Human Trafficking Act. Both of those bills update our trafficking laws to better aid victims.

Bipartisan members of Congress worked together to address this critical issue, and I am proud that both bills were signed into law last month.

Finally, in introducing today's resolution, I would like to thank Senators GRASSLEY, LEAHY, CORNYN, KLOBUCHAR, ISAKSON, MARKEY, SHAHEEN, BLUMENTHAL, BROWN, TOOMEY, and RUBIO for cosponsoring the resolution.

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I yield the Floor.

**SENATE RESOLUTION 37—DESIGNATING THE WEEK BEGINNING FEBRUARY 3, 2019, AS "NATIONAL TRIBAL COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES WEEK"**

Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. DAINES, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. UDALL, Ms.

WARREN, Mr. BENNET, Ms. SMITH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MORAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. THUNE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. PETERS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 37

Whereas there are 37 Tribal Colleges and Universities operating on more than 75 campuses in 16 States;

Whereas Tribal Colleges and Universities are tribally chartered or federally chartered institutions of higher education and therefore have a unique relationship with the Federal Government;

Whereas Tribal Colleges and Universities serve students from more than 230 federally recognized Indian tribes;

Whereas Tribal Colleges and Universities offer students access to knowledge and skills grounded in cultural traditions and values, including indigenous languages, which—

(1) enhances Indian communities; and

(2) enriches the United States as a nation;

Whereas Tribal Colleges and Universities provide access to high-quality postsecondary educational opportunities for—

(1) American Indians;

(2) Alaska Natives; and

(3) other individuals that live in some of the most isolated and economically depressed areas in the United States;

Whereas Tribal Colleges and Universities are accredited institutions of higher education that prepare students to succeed in the global and highly competitive workforce;

Whereas Tribal Colleges and Universities have open enrollment policies, and approximately 15 percent of the students at Tribal Colleges and Universities are non-Indian individuals; and

Whereas the collective mission and the considerable achievements of Tribal Colleges and Universities deserve national recognition: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week beginning February 3, 2019, as "National Tribal Colleges and Universities Week"; and

(2) calls on the people of the United States and interested groups to observe National Tribal Colleges and Universities Week with appropriate activities and programs to demonstrate support for Tribal Colleges and Universities.

**SENATE RESOLUTION 38—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF FEBRUARY 4 THROUGH 8, 2019, AS "NATIONAL SCHOOL COUNSELING WEEK"**

Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CASEY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. KING, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. COONS, and Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 38

Whereas the American School Counselor Association has designated February 4 through 8, 2019, as "National School Counseling Week";

Whereas school counselors have long advocated for equal opportunities for all students;

Whereas school counselors help develop well-rounded students by guiding students through academic, social and emotional, and career development;

Whereas personal and social growth results in increased academic achievement;

Whereas school counselors play a vital role in ensuring that students are ready for both college and careers;

Whereas school counselors play a vital role in making students aware of opportunities for financial aid and college scholarships;

Whereas school counselors assist with and coordinate efforts to foster a positive school climate, resulting in a safer learning environment for all students;

Whereas school counselors have been instrumental in helping students, teachers, and parents deal with personal trauma as well as tragedies in their communities and the United States;

Whereas students face myriad challenges every day, including peer pressure, bullying, mental health issues, the deployment of family members to serve in conflicts overseas, and school violence;

Whereas a school counselor is one of the few professionals in a school building who is trained in both education and social and emotional development;

Whereas the roles and responsibilities of school counselors are often misunderstood;

Whereas the school counselor position is often among the first to be eliminated to meet budgetary constraints;

Whereas the national average ratio of students to school counselors is 464 to 1, almost twice the 250 to 1 ratio recommended by the American School Counselor Association, the National Association for College Admission Counseling, and other organizations; and

Whereas the celebration of National School Counseling Week will increase awareness of the important and necessary role school counselors play in the lives of students in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of February 4 through 8, 2019, as “National School Counseling Week”; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe National School Counseling Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities that promote awareness of the role school counselors play in schools and the community at large in preparing students for fulfilling lives as contributing members of society.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 39—RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION AND CELEBRATING THE LONG HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION REPRESENTING THE FARMERS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. ENZI, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HYDESMITH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD,

Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. SMITH, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WICKER, and Ms. STABENOW) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

#### S. RES. 39

Whereas, on November 12, 1919, a group of farmers met in Chicago, Illinois, to found the American Farm Bureau Federation, with the goal of “making the business of farming more profitable and the community a better place to live”;

Whereas James Howard, the first president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, said in 1920, “What’s good for the farmers is good for America”;

Whereas, with State farm bureaus in all 50 States and Puerto Rico, 2,800 county farm bureaus, and 6,000,000 member families, the American Farm Bureau Federation is one of the largest farmer organizations in the United States;

Whereas the mission of the American Farm Bureau Federation is to “enhance and strengthen the lives of rural Americans and to build strong, prosperous agricultural communities”;

Whereas the American Farm Bureau Federation fulfills its mission—

(1) by representing farm and ranch families united for the purpose of formulating action to improve the rural United States;

(2) by supporting educational improvement, economic opportunity, and social advancement; and

(3) by promoting the well-being of the people of the United States;

Whereas the American Farm Bureau Federation has represented the interests of farmers with respect to the consideration and enactment of all major legislation impacting farmers since the founding of the American Farm Bureau Federation; and

Whereas the American Farm Bureau Federation plays a vital role in promoting the well-being of the people of the United States—

(1) by analyzing the problems faced by farm and ranch families; and

(2) by formulating action to achieve the goals of farm and ranch families: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates the 100th anniversary of the American Farm Bureau Federation;

(2) recognizes the American Farm Bureau Federation for 100 years of promoting farm and ranch interests for the benefit of the people of the United States; and

(3) applauds the American Farm Bureau Federation for its past, present, and future efforts to advocate for farm interests that are critical to the United States.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 89. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 90. Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 91. Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 92. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 65 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BURR, Mr. ROMNEY, Ms. ERNST, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SASSE, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. BOOZMAN) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 93. Mr. PETERS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 94. Mr. PETERS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 95. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 96. Mr. MENENDEZ proposed an amendment to amendment SA 65 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BURR, Mr. ROMNEY, Ms. ERNST, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SASSE, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. BOOZMAN) to the bill S. 1, supra.

SA 97. Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 98. Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 99. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 100. Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 89. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC. 335. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this title may be construed as an authorization for the use of military force.

SA 90. Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan



Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 205(a), insert after “establishment of the United States Development Finance Corporation” the following: “(which means the end of the transition period, as defined in section 1461 of the Better Utilization of Investments Leading to Development Act of 2018 (division F of Public Law 115–254))”.

**SA 91.** Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 18, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

(3) FORM OF REPORT.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

**SA 92.** Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 65 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BURR, Mr. ROMNEY, Ms. ERNST, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SASSE, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. BOOZMAN) to the bill S. 1, to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike “ON WITHDRAWALS OF UNITED STATES FORCES FROM SYRIA AND AFGHANISTAN” and all that follows through “Syria or Afghanistan” and insert:

“SENSE OF CONGRESS ON TRANSITION OF MILITARY AND SECURITY OPERATIONS IN AFGHANISTAN.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) After al Qaeda attacked the United States on September 11, 2001, the United States Government rightly sought to bring to justice those who attacked us, to eliminate al Qaeda’s safe havens and training camps in Afghanistan.

(2) Members of the Armed Forces, intelligence personnel, and diplomatic corps have skillfully achieved these objectives, culminating in the death of Osama bin Laden.

(3) Operation Enduring Freedom was the longest military operation in United States history, and combined with Operation Freedom’s Sentinel the United States’ involvement in Afghanistan has exceeded \$1,000,000,000,000 in costs to the United States taxpayer and continues to cost taxpayers over \$45,000,000,000 a year.

(4) Members of the United States Armed Forces have served in Afghanistan valiantly and with honor, and many have sacrificed their lives and health in service to their country;

(5) The United States has suffered more than 2,000 deaths in Afghanistan (including at least 13 in 2018), and the United States has dropped more than 5,200 bombs in 2018, a record high.

(6) Former Secretary of Defense Jim Mattis, reflecting consensus within United States and international security experts, has concluded that there is no military solution to the conflict in Afghanistan, stating, “It’s all working to achieve a political reconciliation, not a military victory. The victory will be a political reconciliation.”

(7) Over the past 17 years, the mission of the United States has evolved to include a prolonged nation-building effort in Afghanistan.

(8) Such nation-building efforts in Afghanistan are undermined by endemic corruption, high illiteracy, tribal fractions, and a historic aversion to a strong central government in that country.

(9) The United States Government will continue to support the development of Afghanistan with a strong diplomatic and counterterrorism presence in the region.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the announcement by Special Representative for Afghanistan Reconciliation Zalmay Khalilzad that the United States and the Taliban agreed on a draft framework that could lead to the withdrawal of U.S. military forces from Afghanistan and that “[t]he Taliban have committed, to [the Administration’s] satisfaction, to do what is necessary that would prevent Afghanistan from ever becoming a platform for international terrorist groups or individuals” should be welcomed and a reflection of an appropriate diplomatic approach to end U.S. military involvement in the country.

(2) the President should complete the transition of the responsibility for military and security operations in Afghanistan to the Government of Afghanistan as soon as possible but no later than September 18, 2021, the 20th anniversary of the enactment of Public Law 107–40, the Authorization for Use of Military Force against those responsible for the attacks on September 11, 2001, in conjunction with efforts to turn the draft framework into a durable peace between the Government of Afghanistan and the Taliban;

(3) the U.S. should re-double diplomatic efforts to support our Afghan partners as they prepare to hold presidential elections in 2019;

(4) any cost savings resulting from a troop withdrawal should be re-programmed to increase bilateral humanitarian assistance and to maintain gains in human rights to include advances made for women and girls to Afghanistan in an amount no less than one percent of the annual cost to the U.S. budget of our military engagement in Afghanistan in fiscal year 2018; and

(5) not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President should submit to Congress a report—

(A) including a plan for the complete transition of all military and security operations in Afghanistan to the Government of Afghanistan.

(B) assessing the likely humanitarian needs of Afghanistan in the ten years following a U.S. military withdrawal; and

(C) assessing efforts by Special Representative Khalilzad to turn the draft framework reached with the Taliban into a durable peace agreement between the Government of Afghanistan and the Taliban.

**SA 93.** Mr. PETERS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to make improvements to certain defense and security assist-

ance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 43, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

(5) THRESHOLD FOR APPLICATION TO CONTRACTS.—The authority to adopt and enforce measures under subsection (a) to restrict contracting for goods and services shall not apply to contracts with a value of less than \$1,000,000.

**SA 94.** Mr. PETERS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 43, strike lines 12 through 20.

**SA 95.** Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

#### TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

##### SEC. 501. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON UNITED STATES BILATERAL ASSISTANCE TO THE WEST BANK AND GAZA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The dire health and economic conditions facing the Palestinian people has created a humanitarian crisis in the West Bank and Gaza. The United States has long been a leader in helping address the plight of innocent civilians.

(2) These fragile conditions could contribute to circumstances that would undermine Israel’s security and stability in the region.

(3) The Department of State has failed to obligate any of the funds Congress appropriated in fiscal year 2017 and fiscal year 2018, \$302,750,000 and \$257,500,000, respectively, for bilateral assistance to the West Bank and Gaza.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Executive branch should expend during fiscal year 2019 for bilateral assistance to the West Bank and Gaza—

(A) \$196,500,000 for the Economic Support Fund;

(B) \$60,000,000 for International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement; and

(C) \$1,000,000 for Nonproliferation, Anti-Terrorism, Demining and Related Programs; and

(2) this funding is focused primarily on providing food, medical care, and other humanitarian goods and services and these expenditures must be consistent with the restrictions outlined in the Taylor Force Act (title X of division S of Public Law 115-141) and shall only be provided through nongovernmental organizations and shall not directly benefit the Palestinian Authority.

**SA 96.** Mr. MENENDEZ proposed an amendment to amendment SA 65 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BURR, Mr. ROMNEY, Ms. ERNST, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SASSE, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. BOOZMAN) to the bill S. 1, to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of the amendment, add the following:

(c) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed as a declaration of war or an authorization of the use of military force.

**SA 97.** Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . CLARIFICATION OF DEADLINE FOR REPORT ON ESTABLISHING AN ENTERPRISE FUND FOR JORDAN.**

For purposes of section 205(a), the term “establishment of the United States Development Finance Corporation” means the end of the transition period, as defined in section 1461 of the Better Utilization of Investments Leading to Development Act of 2018 (division F of Public Law 115-254).

**SA 98.** Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . FORM OF REPORT ON THE COOPERATION OF THE UNITED STATES AND ISRAEL WITH RESPECT TO COUNTERING UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEMS.**

The report required under section 123(d) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

**SA 99.** Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . REPORT ON UNITED STATES POLICY IN SYRIA.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The regime of Bashar al Assad has committed gross atrocities against the people of Syria.

(2) The commission of these atrocities led to the eruption, and continuation, of the Syrian civil war.

(3) The ensuing conflict has resulted in the death of over 400,000 Syrian civilians.

(4) The Syrian civil war has caused over 5,500,000 Syrians to flee their country as refugees and over 6,000,000 others to be displaced from their homes inside Syria.

(5) The Assad regime has repeatedly used chemical weapons against its own people.

(6) In 2011 the Assad regime released from its prisons many of the terrorists who would subsequently lead the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (ISIS).

(7) ISIS has organized, executed, and inspired countless terror attacks throughout the world since its emergence, including in the United States.

(8) By the end of 2014, ISIS controlled one third of the territory of Syria and one third of the territory of Iraq.

(9) Since 2014, the United States has lead Operation Inherent Resolve, with the help of allies, to degrade and destroy ISIS.

(10) Approximately 2,000 members of the United States Armed Forces are deployed to Syria under Operation Inherent Resolve.

(11) The United States and its allies have succeeded in seizing back nearly all the physical territory held by ISIS in 2014.

(12) Tens of thousands of ISIS terrorists remain in Syria and Iraq despite having lost much of their territorial “Caliphate”.

(13) The Islamic State continues to pose a threat to the security of the United States and that of its allies.

(14) Syrian Kurdish fighters in the People’s Protection Units, or YPG, have served as effective and trustworthy allies in the fight against ISIS.

(15) The Government of Turkey views these Kurdish forces as an enemy and has expressed its intention to destroy them.

(16) The support of the Russian and Iranian regimes in Syria has been invaluable to the reinforcement of the Assad government.

(17) Russian-backed forces have directly assaulted United States Armed Forces deployed in Syria on at least one occasion.

(18) The Government of Iran seeks to entrench its presence in Syria as a means of supporting its terrorist proxies, like Hezbollah and Hamas, and harming its enemies, like Israel.

(19) Ensuring the existence of Israel, America’s most important ally in the Middle East, remains a key United States interest in the region.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the pursuit of a clear, publicly-articulated strategy will guide any withdrawal of United States Armed Forces in Syria;

(2) such a strategy aims to ensure that the Syrian civil war ends through peaceful, political means;

(3) such a strategy includes the consideration of and planning for the security interests of the Syrian Kurdish allies of the United States;

(4) such a strategy recognizes that ISIS and al Qaeda terrorists in Syria continue to pose a threat to the United States and its allies;

(5) such a strategy includes among its objectives the complete degradation and long-term destruction of ISIS;

(6) such a strategy will seek to prevent the emergence of another terrorist group in Syria capable of threatening the security of the United States once ISIS is defeated;

(7) such a strategy recognizes the destabilizing impact of Iran in Syria; and

(8) such a strategy includes among its objectives the removal of all Iranian-commanded forces from Syria.

(c) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report detailing United States policy in Syria.

(2) **FORM.**—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

**SA 100.** Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

**TITLE V—CYBERSECURITY SANCTIONS  
WITH RESPECT TO IRAN**

**SEC. 501. MANDATORY SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO IRAN RELATING TO SIGNIFICANT ACTIVITIES UNDERMINING CYBERSECURITY.**

(a) **INVESTIGATION.**—The President shall initiate an investigation into the possible designation of an Iranian person under subsection (b) upon receipt by the President of credible information indicating that the person has engaged in conduct described in that subsection.

(b) **DESIGNATION.**—The President shall designate under this subsection any Iranian person that the President determines has directly or indirectly—

(1) engaged in significant activities undermining cybersecurity conducted by the Government of Iran; or

(2) acted for or on behalf of the Government of Iran in connection with such activities.

(c) **SANCTIONS.**—The President shall block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of any Iranian person designated under subsection (b) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(d) **SUSPENSION OF SANCTIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The President may suspend the application of sanctions under subsection (c) with respect to an Iranian person only if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees in writing a certification described in paragraph (2) and a detailed justification for the certification.

(2) **CERTIFICATION DESCRIBED.**—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A certification described in this paragraph with respect to an Iranian person is a certification by the President that—

(i) the person has not, during the 12-month period immediately preceding the date of the certification, directly or indirectly engaged in activities that would qualify the person for designation under subsection (b); and

(ii) the person is not expected to resume any such activities.

(B) FORM OF CERTIFICATION.—The certification described in subparagraph (A) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(c) REIMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—If sanctions are suspended with respect to an Iranian person under subsection (d), such sanctions shall be reinstated if the President determines that the person has resumed the activity that resulted in the initial imposition of sanctions or has engaged in any other activity subject to sanctions relating to the involvement of the person in significant activities undermining cybersecurity on behalf of the Government of Iran.

(f) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the authority of the President pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.), or any other provision of law.

(g) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that describes significant activities undermining cybersecurity conducted by the Government of Iran, a person owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by that Government, or any person acting for or on behalf of that Government.

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the extent to which a foreign government has provided material support to the Government of Iran, to any person owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by that Government, or to any person acting for or on behalf of that Government, in connection with the conduct of significant activities undermining cybersecurity.

(B) A strategy to counter efforts by Iran to conduct significant activities undermining cybersecurity directed against the United States that includes a description of efforts to engage foreign governments in preventing the Government of Iran, persons owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by that Government, and persons acting for or on behalf of that Government from conducting significant activities undermining cybersecurity.

(3) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in an unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

#### APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, and upon the recommendation of the Democratic Leader, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2761, appoints the following Senator as Vice Chairman of the Senate Delegation to the British-American Interparliamentary Group Conference during the 116th Congress: The Honorable PATRICK J. LEAHY of Vermont.

The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, and upon the recommendation of the Majority Leader, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2761, appoints the following Senator as Chairman of the Senate Delegation to the British-American Interparliamentary Group Conference during the 116th Congress: The Honorable JOHN BOOZMAN of Arkansas.

#### NATIONAL TRIBAL COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES WEEK

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 37, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 37) designating the week beginning February 3, 2019, as “National Tribal Colleges and Universities Week.”

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no further debate, the question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 37) was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

#### NATIONAL SCHOOL COUNSELING WEEK

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 38, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 38) designating the week of February 4 through 8, 2019, as “National School Counseling Week.”

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no further debate, the question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 38) was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pre-

amble be agreed to and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

#### RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 39, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 39) recognizing the 100th anniversary of the American Farm Bureau Federation and celebrating the long history of the American Farm Bureau Federation representing the farmers of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measure?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, that the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions 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. 39) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

#### ORDERS FOR MONDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, February 4; further, that following the prayer and 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. 1; further, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the postcloture time on McConnell amendment No. 65 expire and the cloture motions filed during today’s session ripen at 5:30 p.m., Monday; finally, that the filing deadline for today’s cloture motion with respect to S. 1 be Monday at 4 p.m. for first-degree amendments.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,  
FEBRUARY 4, 2019, AT 3 P.M.

sent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous con-

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:36 p.m., adjourned until Monday, February 4, 2019, at 3 p.m.