



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

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

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2019

No. 29

## Senate

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

### PRAYER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Today's opening prayer will be offered by Pastor Eddie Edmonds of Moler Avenue Church of the Brethren from Martinsburg, WV.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Creator God, we give You thanks and praise for the phenomenal country in which we live, move, and have our being. Our thanks also for the men and women You have called to serve in this government and specifically the Senate. Our prayer is that You will equip, empower, and encourage each individual Senator as they work to answer the call to serve the people of this great Nation. Their decisions impact the lives of not only those they serve but also people the world over. Help them to remember those who have little, need much, and are challenged each day of their lives. Give each Senator strength to make wise decisions and the courage to stand up in the face of adversity, doing the right thing, first time, every time, putting others first in each decision rendered. May Your peace fill the lives of each Senator and those they serve until You come again to claim Your Kingdom.

We pray in the Most Holy Name of Christ Jesus our Lord. 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.

### MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 483 and S.J. RES. 8

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I understand there are two measures at the desk due a second reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the measures for the second time en bloc.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 483), to enact into law a bill by reference.

A bill (S.J. Res. 8) recognizing the duty of the Federal Government to create a Green New Deal.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, in order to place the measures on the calendar under provisions of rule XIV, I would object to further proceedings en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The measures will be placed on the calendar under rule XIV.

### GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, last night, our colleagues Chairman SHELBY and Ranking Member LEAHY filed the final text of a bipartisan, bicameral legislative agreement. For the past couple of weeks, in conference with their House counterparts, they have worked in good faith to reach a compromise to address urgent priorities, including funding for our Nation's border security.

The product of this work is a compromise that no side will view as a perfect deal. For instance, I am frustrated by House Democrats' cynical opposition to including commonsense extensions of the Violence Against Women Act and other important items. Nevertheless, this agreement is something

both sides should view as an important step, and today, I hope we will vote to advance it.

When the Senate votes on the agreement, we will be voting to avoid a second partial shutdown and provide the certainty of a fully functioning Federal Government. We will be voting to deliver another downpayment on the President's commitment to securing our Nation's borders and keeping American communities safe. And we will do it free from the influence of poison pills that sought to derail progress and stifle compromise.

To be sure, in recent months, we have seen the radical left go out of its way to try to gum up the works. Even the Speaker of the House threw her support behind wild assertions that tried-and-true methods of securing sovereign borders were now immoral. They said there wouldn't be more than one dollar for border barriers. They said there should be fewer tools for the men and women who enforce our immigration laws. Fortunately, none of that nonsense has carried the day.

So here we are, with a solemn deal in front of us. As the Senate prepares to vote later today, I want to extend my deepest gratitude to Chairman SHELBY, along with Ranking Member LEAHY and my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee. This legislation will mark success for our bipartisan process by finalizing all the regular appropriations bills for the fiscal year. Thanks, as well, to Shannon Hines and the entire Appropriations staff, whose hard work made this agreement and all of last year's progress possible.

Later today, I hope each of my colleagues will join me in moving forward with the agreement produced by this hard work, and the President will sign it into law.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S1337

UNANIMOUS CONSENT  
AGREEMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to H.J. Res. 1 occur at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Democratic leader.

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING  
BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of William Pelham Barr, of Virginia, to be Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF THE  
VICTIMS OF THE SENSELESS AT-  
TACK AT MARJORY STONEMAN  
DOUGLAS HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, a year ago this afternoon, I was sitting in my office in the Russell Office Building when a news report began to flash about a shooting at a high school in South Florida. I was the father at the time—in the case of one of my two older children—of a child who was still a high school student in South Florida. You would normally be interested, just in being a Senator from the State, but you would be most particularly interested as a parent. As it turns out, the incident and the shooting took place at a school that was about 50 miles—about 50 minutes—from my home, and we all know of the story and of the lives that were lost in this terrible tragedy.

On a personal level, it is clearly an issue that has affected me, first, because I am one of two Senators who represent the State. Every person who was impacted—every victim, everyone who was wounded—is a constituent of ours. Yet, as I have also pointed out, my two oldest children are the same ages as the victims. When you see the pictures and you hear the stories, you can't help but recognize the stories and the pictures, maybe just not individ-

ually. I didn't know any of the victims personally, but the stories are familiar. They are the stories of my children and their friends, who are of the same age and are at the same times in their lives.

It is impossible to fully comprehend unless you have gone through the loss of a child—by the grace of God, I have not—particularly under such tragic and traumatic circumstances. Throughout the last 12 months, as we have reached different milestones in my two daughters' lives, whether it was their proms or graduation days, or whether it was dropping off my oldest at college or attending a class ring ceremony for a junior, we have been almost reminded, for just a moment, of the parents who had expected to have been doing the same during this time of the year but have been unable.

I have learned a lot from those parents, many of whom I have gotten to know personally and have worked alongside, in the last year, on a number of issues. In the year that has passed, they have, as have the students, turned their grief into effective activism. The parents, in particular, are the ones with whom I have interacted the most here in Washington on a regular basis, and it is why I thought it appropriate to come to the floor today. I think they would say that the best way to honor the memories of the children they lost is to take actions that will work to make sure that no other parent will ever have to face this again.

Several of the parents have publicly described what happened a year ago today as the most avoidable mass murder in American history, but what was it that enabled this to happen? Why was it avoidable? What could have been done to address it?

In the brief moments that we have here—my colleague from Florida will have additional statements as well—I want to point to some of the things we now know that we didn't know a year ago today or in the days that followed.

From it, not only should that spark outrage, but it should also spark ideas about how to fix those things so never again will any parent have to face what they did and none of my colleagues will have to stand here and give a speech like the ones my colleague from Florida and I have to give today.

At the outset, let me say that the credit for much of what I am about to speak about belongs to the extraordinary journalists at the South Florida Sun Sentinel, who have done a remarkable job over the last 10 months of revealing to the public many facts that would have been unknown otherwise.

At a time when there is so much debate about journalism and its role in our society and in public service and in politics, they deserve tremendous credit for bringing this to light, and I think it is an example of why journalism remains an important institution in our country.

A lot of the attention in this debate has been paid to the issues that we are

familiar with and have been debating long before this tragedy: a ban on certain weapons, universal background checks, taking on what is described as the gun lobby. These issues dominated the national media coverage, and support for these positions is not new. They predate this tragedy.

In our Republic, people most certainly have the right to advocate for this or against it. They have the right to lobby for it. They have the right to vote for candidates who support these positions and to vote against those who do not. They are valid issues to debate on public policy, but at the end of the day, neither go directly to the heart of this particular case and to the facts that led up to it.

At the heart of this is that the killer, the perpetrator of this terrible tragedy, was known to be dangerous for a long time by many people in positions of power and authority at the school district, the sheriff's office, and at the FBI, and no one did anything about it. This is now a documented fact.

Early in the days after this, we saw images of the sheriff and the superintendent lecturing people and talking about what a great job they had done, but the facts will show that it was their incompetence that allowed this to happen, and, then, even worse, they tried to cover it up.

There is an article entitled "Schools culture of tolerance lets students like [the killer] slide," by Megan O'Matz and Scott Travis, reporters at the South Florida Sun Sentinel. I am going to read from it, and then I am going to introduce it into the RECORD. I am not going to read the whole article.

Here is how it opens:

Broward schools have grown so tolerant of misbehavior that students like [the killer] are able to slide by for years without strict punishment for conduct that could be criminal.

The culture of leniency allows children to engage in an endless loop of violations and second chances, creating a system where kids who commit the same offense for the 10th time may be treated like it's the first.

[The killer] was suspended at least 67 days over less than a year and a half at Westglades Middle School, and his problems continued at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School. . . .

The South Florida Sun Sentinel obtained the killer's discipline records, they reviewed discipline policies, and here is what they found:

Students can be considered first-time offenders even if they commit the same offense year after year.

The district's claim of reforming bad behavior is exaggerated.

Lenient discipline has an added PR benefit for the district: lower suspensions, expulsions and arrests along with rising graduation rates.

It goes on to say:

Many teachers and parents say Broward has created a culture in which teachers are expressly told or subtly pressured not to send students to the administration for punishment so a school's image is not tarnished.

One teacher who taught for 37 years in the district before retiring said she

retired early due to her concerns about student discipline.

Here is a quote:

It was so many things. I had three students bring knives to my classroom. One was out of the classroom for one day. Another had so many things on his record, he was gone for five days. None were expelled.

Part of this leniency is a program called the Promise program, which the superintendent of the district claims has a 90-percent success rate by keeping students from reoffending. That is a misleading statistic because, "A student can commit a subsequent infraction without being considered a repeat offender as long as it's not the exact same violation, in the exact same year.

Each year they start with a clean slate.

In the interest of time, I ask unanimous consent that the rest of this article be entered into the RECORD.

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

[From the Sun Sentinel, May 12, 2018]  
SCHOOLS' CULTURE OF TOLERANCE LETS  
STUDENTS LIKE NIKOLAS CRUZ SLIDE  
(By Megan O'Matz and Scott Travis)

Broward Schools have grown so tolerant of misbehavior that students like Nikolas Cruz are able to slide by for years without strict punishment for conduct that could be criminal.

The culture of leniency allows children to engage in an endless loop of violations and second chances, creating a system where kids who commit the same offense for the 10th time may be treated like it's the first, according to records and interviews with people familiar with the process.

Cruz was suspended at least 67 days over less than a year and a half at Westglades Middle School, and his problems continued at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School, until he finally was forced to leave.

The South Florida Sun Sentinel obtained Cruz's discipline records, reviewed discipline policies and found:

Students can be considered first-time offenders even if they commit the same offenses year after year.

The district's claim of reforming bad behavior is exaggerated.

Lenient discipline has an added PR benefit for the district: lower suspensions, expulsions and arrests along with rising graduation rates.

SCHOOL DISTRICT SHUTS DOWN INFORMATION  
AFTER STONEMAN DOUGLAS SHOOTING

The forgiving attitude goes beyond the schools' controversial Promise program, the target of considerable public scrutiny for enabling students to avoid criminal charges for misdemeanor offenses.

The program, the pride of Superintendent Robert Runcie, was designed to use counseling and mentoring to help students avoid the school-to-prison pipeline. Under former zero-tolerance policies, black students ended up suspended, expelled and arrested at rates that were widely disproportionate to their peers.

Desmond Blackburn, then Broward's chief school performance and accountability officer, specifically instructed teachers and staff in a video years ago to challenge and nurture students, while using suspensions, expulsions and arrests as "absolute last resorts."

Now, many teachers and parents say Broward has created a culture in which teachers are expressly told or subtly pres-

sured not to send students to the administration for punishment so a school's image is not tarnished.

Mary Fitzgerald taught for 37 years in the district before retiring from Sunrise Middle in Fort Lauderdale in 2016. She said she retired a year early due to her concerns about student discipline.

"It was so many things. I had three students bring knives to my classroom. One was out of the classroom for one day. Another had so many things on his record, he was gone for five days. None were expelled."

NO ONE HEADED WARNING SIGNS ABOUT NIKOLAS CRUZ BEFORE SCHOOL SHOOTING

Safety concerns at Sunrise were brought up at faculty meetings. "The message out there is that the students are untouchable. Habitual negative behavior means nothing anymore," state the minutes of a Faculty Council meeting on Feb. 2, 2015.

"My principal basically would tell me it was his job to market the school. He was adamant about not looking bad," Fitzgerald said.

Runcie, in an interview with the Sun Sentinel, acknowledged there are complaints that discipline isn't consistently enforced.

In a memo to principals Wednesday, Runcie said he reinforced that "we have to be vigilant in reporting every incident so that we can ensure our students who are victims, as well as offenders, get the appropriate intervention and support.

"We're going to try to make sure, from the top, we're sending the right message related to discipline and holding our schools accountable," he said.

The superintendent said in the memo that he will propose the School Board create a Climate and Discipline Department to "better monitor and support school teams as they address students with major challenges and concerns."

#### THE PROMISE PROGRAM

The Pine Ridge Education Center, just outside Fort Lauderdale, houses the Promise program, as well as secure classrooms for other children who have been expelled from their regular school but need supervision and guidance.

The principal describes it as a "school of promise and encouragement, not a school of punishment." Students call it the "Zap School," as in you've been "zapped" and sent there as punishment.

Runcie claims the Promise program has a 90 percent success rate at keeping children from re-offending, but that statistic can be deceiving.

A student can commit a subsequent infraction without being considered a repeat offender, as long as it's not the exact same violation, in the exact same year.

The following year, they start with a clean slate.

"It's extremely problematic," said Tim Sternberg, a former assistant principal at Pine Ridge Educational Center who administered the Promise program. "You can develop a psyche that it is OK to commit crime because you can refresh the clock every year."

Sternberg says he doesn't have confidence in the district's data. "They aren't tracking kids over time."

Asked about kids starting each year anew, without marks against them from prior semesters, Runcie told the Sun Sentinel he will review it.

"We'll make whatever adjustments we need to. We review the discipline policy every year and have made some adjustments and continue to take feedback."

#### INSIDE THE MATRIX

The district's Student Code of Conduct, first created in 2004-05, includes a com-

plicated discipline "matrix" that lists the prescribed punishment for a litany of offenses: skipping school, violating rules, being disruptive, having drugs, fighting, destroying property, committing a crime.

It was designed to help staff make fairer and more equitable decisions in handing out penalties. But potential punishments have become more lenient over the years.

More than five years ago, a high school student who used profanity toward a staff member would receive a three- to 10-day suspension. That was reduced to one to two days after the discipline chart was revised.

The first violation for disruptive classroom behavior called for an in-school suspension of one to five days. Later, it was reduced to a suspension of under one day.

Since the 2012-13 school year, suspensions have declined 27 percent, according to the Florida Department of Education. Incidents reported to law enforcement have fallen 8 percent. The number of arrests per 1,000 students: down 64 percent.

The district's menu of choices for dealing with rule-breaking students include detention, internal suspension, out-of-school suspension and expulsion, where children can be sent to an alternative education center.

Or another option: the Promise program.

#### UNDER ATTACK

Runcie is proud and protective of the program, which was launched under his leadership in November 2013 when the Broward Sheriff's Office, the Public Defender's Office, the NAACP, the state Department of Juvenile Justice and the State Attorney signed an agreement to reduce school-based arrests.

But the program is under attack because of widespread allegations that Cruz, the Marjory Stoneman Douglas school shooter, benefited from it.

Runcie had insisted that Cruz was not in the Promise program, but he did an abrupt shift this week and said Cruz had been referred to it in 2013 for vandalizing a bathroom. Cruz did not complete the three-day stint, the district said, but administrators haven't said why.

BROWARD SCHOOLS BACKTRACK ON GUNMAN  
NIKOLAS CRUZ'S PROMISE PROGRAM CONNECTION

A couple of months later, he was sent to a special school for children with severe emotional and behavioral disorders. As a tot, he was found to be developmentally delayed and had been considered a special needs child in school, entitled to certain services and protections under law.

Some parents and community leaders have criticized the superintendent for misleading the public about Cruz, and the school district appears not to be able to make sense of all of the records it has on him.

"To me, it's an indication that the various discipline programs in place at the district are confusing, poorly implemented and executed, and clearly if we take the district at its statement, they've been difficult to track," said Ryan Petty, whose daughter Alaina was one of 17 people shot to death in Cruz's Valentine's Day massacre. "If the records are this difficult to find, clearly it would be difficult to know whether this is helping students or not."

Despite Cruz's history of discipline problems, neither the schools nor police ever steered him to the justice system.

Mr. RUBIO. The second article—I will be brief on this—is from the Sun Sentinel, by Scott Travis: "Broward schools fought against 2013 plan for more security money."

They turned down a proposal to levy \$55 million in tax dollars for school safety, and one of the quotes is this:

One of the school board members slammed the proposal. They said they'd rather ask voters for money to improve technology and renovate old schools, which they did in November of 2014.

In hindsight, that was a terrible mistake.

There is another article from the Sun Sentinel: "What's being done to stop another school shooting." Again, it is a very long article. I will just say this:

Once he decided to shoot up a school, there wasn't much to stop [the killer].

His threats were ignored, the campus was wide open, the school doors were unlocked and students had nowhere to hide.

What has changed after 10 months since the shooting? This was back on December 29, 2018.

At least a quarter of campuses do not have single-entry points to control intruders. Safe spaces to protect children in classrooms haven't been identified.

The killer wasn't welcome at that high school, by the way.

He was known by former classmates and even administrators as a potential school shooter. And still he walked right onto campus.

It goes on to say:

[The killer] didn't keep his homicidal urges quiet. But the schools incompetently handled the threat he represented to his fellow classmates and teachers.

[The killer's] lust for violence had been documented officially 69 times in his life. At least 30 people knew of his troubling behavior before the shooting.

In fact, I have here with me the record of those 69 discipline points. It is extensive, and I ask unanimous consent that that record be entered into the RECORD.

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

The table below shows the history of incidents involving Nikolas Cruz as reported by school officials during his time at Westglades Middle School and Marjory Stoneman Douglas High. In between those schools, Cruz attended Cross Creek, a public school in Pompano Beach for students with emotional and behavioral disorders.

Date	School	Type of incident
5/15/12	WESTGLADES	PROFANITY/USE OF INSULTING/OBSCENE LANG
5/17/12	WESTGLADES	PROFANITY/USE OF INSULTING/OBSCENE LANG
5/30/12	WESTGLADES	PROFANITY/USE OF INSULTING/OBSCENE LANG
6/5/12	WESTGLADES	DISOBEDIENCE/INSUBORDINATION
8/12/12	WESTGLADES	Profanity towards Staff
8/28/12	WESTGLADES	FIGHTING
2/20/13	WESTGLADES	PROFANITY/USE OF INSULTING/OBSCENE LANG
2/20/13	WESTGLADES	PROFANITY/USE OF INSULTING/OBSCENE LANG
2/25/13	WESTGLADES	PROFANITY/USE OF INSULTING/OBSCENE LANG
3/4/13	WESTGLADES	PROFANITY/USE OF INSULTING/OBSCENE LANG
3/4/13	WESTGLADES	PROFANITY/USE OF INSULTING/OBSCENE LANG
3/11/13	WESTGLADES	DISRUPTIVE (UNRULY) BEHAVIOR
3/11/13	WESTGLADES	DISRUPTIVE (UNRULY) BEHAVIOR
3/20/13	WESTGLADES	FALSE ALARM/911
4/8/13	WESTGLADES	OUT OF ASSIGNED AREA
4/10/13	WESTGLADES	RULES VIOLATION (Includes Classroom Rules)
4/10/13	WESTGLADES	DISRUPTIVE (UNRULY) BEHAVIOR
4/17/13	WESTGLADES	DISRUPTIVE (UNRULY) BEHAVIOR
4/17/13	WESTGLADES	PROFANITY/USE OF INSULTING/OBSCENE LANG
4/22/13	WESTGLADES	PROFANITY/USE OF INSULTING/OBSCENE LANG
5/6/13	WESTGLADES	PROFANITY DIRECTED TOWARDS STAFF MEMBER
5/20/13	WESTGLADES	OUT OF ASSIGNED AREA
5/21/13	WESTGLADES	DISRUPTIVE (UNRULY) BEHAVIOR
5/22/13	WESTGLADES	DISRUPTIVE (UNRULY) BEHAVIOR
8/23/13	WESTGLADES	DISRUPTION ON CAMPUS (MINOR)
8/27/13	WESTGLADES	PROFANITY/USE OF INSULTING/OBSCENE LANG
9/3/13	WESTGLADES	DISRUPTIVE (UNRULY) BEHAVIOR
9/11/13	WESTGLADES	PROFANITY/USE OF INSULTING/OBSCENE LANG
9/16/13	WESTGLADES	PROFANITY/USE OF INSULTING/OBSCENE LANG
9/18/13	WESTGLADES	PROFANITY/USE OF INSULTING/OBSCENE LANG
9/23/13	WESTGLADES	DISRUPTIVE (UNRULY) BEHAVIOR
9/24/13	WESTGLADES	PROFANITY/USE OF INSULTING/OBSCENE LANG
9/30/13	WESTGLADES	PROFANITY/USE OF INSULTING/OBSCENE LANG
10/1/13	WESTGLADES	LEVEL 3 BUS VIOLATION
10/2/13	WESTGLADES	LEVEL 3 BUS VIOLATION
10/3/13	WESTGLADES	VANDALISM <\$1000
10/15/13	WESTGLADES	DISOBEDIENCE/INSUBORDINATION
10/22/13	WESTGLADES	DEFIANCE OF AUTHORITY/HABITUAL
10/29/13	WESTGLADES	DISRUPTIVE (UNRULY) BEHAVIOR
10/29/13	WESTGLADES	PROFANITY/USE OF INSULTING/OBSCENE LANG
11/4/13	WESTGLADES	DISRUPTIVE (UNRULY) BEHAVIOR
11/8/13	WESTGLADES	LEVEL 3 BUS VIOLATION
11/12/13	WESTGLADES	PROFANITY DIRECTED TOWARDS STAFF MEMBER
11/12/13	WESTGLADES	PROFANITY DIRECTED TOWARDS STAFF MEMBER
11/19/13	WESTGLADES	PROHIBITED/DISTRACTION ITEMS-POut-of-School
11/19/13	WESTGLADES	Suspension/ESSTION/USE
11/20/13	WESTGLADES	DISRUPTION ON CAMPUS (MINOR)
11/25/13	WESTGLADES	DISRUPTION ON CAMPUS (MINOR)
12/11/13	WESTGLADES	VANDALISM <\$1000
12/12/13	WESTGLADES	PROFANITY DIRECTED TOWARDS STAFF MEMBER
12/17/13	WESTGLADES	ASSAULT (VERBAL)/THREAT—LOW LEVEL NON CRIMINAL
12/19/13	WESTGLADES	DISRUPTION ON CAMPUS (MINOR)
1/29/14	WESTGLADES	PROFANITY DIRECTED TOWARDS STAFF MEMBER
2/24/16	STONEMAN	FALSE ALARM/911
9/20/16	STONEMAN	PROFANITY/USE OF INSULTING/OBSCENE LANG
9/29/16	STONEMAN	FIGHTING MEDIUM
12/22/16	STONEMAN	PROFANITY/USE OF INSULTING/OBSCENE LANG
1/19/17	STONEMAN	PROFANITY DIRECTED TOWARDS STAFF MEMBER
		ASSAULT (VERBAL)/THREAT—LOW LEVEL NON CRIMINAL

Mr. RUBIO. Wrapping up on this point, there is another article from the Sun Sentinel entitled "Hide, deny, spin, threaten: How the school district tried to mask failures that led to Parkland shooting." It talks about efforts that were made by the school district to keep from the public the sorts of things that we are now finding out.

Finally, "Here's what the [school district] knew about the Parkland shooter" is another article that talks about, time and again, how this killer told people he was going to do this—not just one person, but multiple people—

and nothing was in place to do anything about it.

I wrap up with a couple of points. The first is that the Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School Public Safety Commission empaneled by the State looked at these shootings and from it, I think, are pretty instructive of some of the things I hope we can work on together. It looked at a 20-year period and found that 48 individuals committed 46 of these attacks, and 35 were students, and 10 were former students. So 45 of the 48 were either students or former students.

It found that the most typical weapon used was a semiautomatic pistol. It found that 50 percent of these attacks were done with weapons that were taken from the home—not even purchased, but taken from the home. It found that in four of five incidents, at least one person had some knowledge that they were going to do this, and in more than half of the cases, at least two people knew they were going to do this.

It is on the basis of these discoveries, working with many of the parents whose children lost their lives a year

ago today, that last year we pursued on a bipartisan basis and passed the STOP School Violence Act, which provides, over a 10-year period, \$100 million a year for strengthening school security, providing school training to identify threats before they take action, and creating school threat assessments and crisis intervention. That has passed.

It is why this year I have reintroduced the Extreme Risk Protection Order and Violence Protection Act, which will dedicate the Department of Justice funds to incentivize States to give law enforcement the authority to prevent individuals that pose a threat to themselves or others the ability to purchase or possess firearms, so that if information like what was available to authorities in Parkland is available to people now, they can actually go to court—to prove their case with due process, and take the guns away from this person before they go out and commit this crime. More importantly, they can alert their parents to secure the guns at home so they don't use that gun to commit the crime.

I have also introduced a bipartisan bill, the Threat Assessment Prevention and Safety Act. It creates a task force of experts to provide recommendations for a national strategy to keep our communities safe from targeted violence through threat assessment and management, which experts say is the best way to identify potential killers before they act.

If something like this had been in place, it is highly likely that authorities, putting all this together—what we know today—would have said this individual is a serious threat and we need to do something about it before they take action.

And, finally, yesterday, Senator GRASSLEY and I reintroduced the EAGLES Act, which would reauthorize and expand the U.S. Secret Service National Threat Assessment Center to help communities proactively mitigate threats of violence in schools.

It is my hope that this terrible tragedy and what we have learned about it will guide us and will provide us a road map of concrete steps that we can take to empower communities, schools, and police departments and parents and families with the tools they need, not just to identify people who are potentially violent but to prevent it from happening and to get out ahead of it—maybe it is a risk assessment or maybe it is institutionalized mental health or wraparound services, but anything that can be done.

I raise all of this today because if you were to speak to the families, as I know my colleague from Florida and I often do, they will tell you that the most important thing we can do to honor the memory of their children whom they lost in this terrible tragedy is to make sure it doesn't happen to anybody else.

Now, there is one more thing we would like to do to honor the victims of this tragedy. My colleague Senator

SCOTT and I have put forth a resolution that commemorates this day. It honors the survivors. It pledges continued support for their recovery. It recognizes the strength and resiliency of Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School and the community that surrounds it. It expresses gratitude to the emergency medical and healthcare professionals of the community for their efforts in responding and caring for the victims and survivors. Most of all, it commemorates the victims who were killed in the attack, and it offers the Senate's heartfelt condolences and deepest sympathies to the families, loved ones, and friends of the victims.

Madam President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 71, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 71) honoring the Memory of the Victims of the Senseless Attack at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School 1 Year Ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. RUBIO. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and 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. 71) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. RUBIO. I yield the floor.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Florida be given 3 minutes to speak on the resolution of his colleague from Florida, and then I speak on leader time, to be followed immediately by Senators WHITEHOUSE, SCHATZ, and MERKLEY.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, I thank my colleague Senator RUBIO for standing with me to remember the victims and their families on this tragic anniversary and for his unwavering commitment to school safety.

Alyssa Alhadeff, Scott Beigel, Martin Duque Anguiano, Nicholas Dworet, Aaron Feis, Jaime Guttenberg, Chris Hixon, Luke Hoyer, Cara Loughran, Gina Montalto, Joaquin Oliver, Alaina Petty, Meadow Pollack, Helena Ramsay, Alex Schachter, Carmen Schentrup, Peter Wang—one year ago today, these 17 souls were taken from us in a brutal act of violence. They were sons and daughters, brothers and

sisters; they were students and athletes and musicians and teachers. Not a day goes that I don't think about that day and the amazing people who were snuffed out by the deranged actions of a madman.

Over the course of the last year, I have spent countless hours with the families of the victims. Unfortunately, I wish we had never met like this. They have been partners in our efforts to ensure that this never happens again. We worked together, along with educators, mental health professionals, and law enforcement, to pass the Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School Public Safety Act, to make sure our State does everything in its power to prevent tragedies like this from happening again.

Today, the State of Florida stands united with heavy hearts. Nothing we say here today can bring back the lives that were lost. Nothing we do can replace the angels of Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School who were taken from us too soon. But we must never forget them. We must honor their memory every day, and we must rededicate ourselves to the goal of ending violence in our schools.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

##### GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, later today we will vote on the agreement by the conference committee to keep the government open, as well as provide additional border security. Once again, I applaud the members of the conference committee and their staffs. They were the nub here, and they did outstanding work, nights and weekends, to reach an agreement. We knew that if the conference committee were allowed to work, they could bring this together. The agreement is a validation of the idea that when you put Members of both parties in a room to negotiate in good faith, when everyone is willing to give and take, progress is never out of reach. So, again, I thank the members of the committee.

The agreement is a reasonable compromise. It provides additional funding for smart, effective border security. It does not fund the President's wall, but it does fund smart border security initiatives that both parties have always supported, including increased security at our ports of entry and humanitarian assistance at our border. Most importantly, it will keep our government open.

Everyone, I believe, including the President, wants to avoid a repeat of what happened before Christmas. Everyone wants to avoid another senseless government shutdown. I expect Congress will pass this bill sometime this afternoon, and President Trump should sign it immediately.

## THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Madam President, on another subject, this morning, I challenge Leader MCCONNELL to say that our climate change crisis is real, that it is caused by humans, and that Congress needs to act. Let me elaborate.

The Republican leader fashions himself as someone who doesn't waste time with political stunts. I am not sure I could count the number of times he has shrugged off a piece of legislation by calling it a "futile gesture" because the President will not sign it or because he thinks it would be a waste of the Senate's time.

Yet, on Tuesday, the Republican leader announced he would bring up his Green New Deal resolution for a vote because he wants to make sure everybody has the "opportunity to go on record and see how they feel" about it, knowing full well his entire party will vote against it, including himself, and that it will not pass.

Since Republicans took control of this Chamber in 2015, they have not brought a single Republican bill to meaningfully reduce carbon emissions to the floor of the Senate—not one bill. Republicans have controlled this Chamber for 4 years and have not brought a single bill to significantly reduce carbon emissions.

We are supposed to conduct the business of the Nation. We are supposed to tackle our country's greatest challenges. Well, climate change is the No. 1 threat to our planet, yet not a single Republican bill that addresses climate change in a meaningful way has reached the floor—not a one. In fact, the Republican majority has spent the Senate's time on legislation that would make climate change even worse. In one instance, the Republican leader moved to repeal a commonsense and vital program to reduce methane emissions, and it failed only because a few brave Republicans joined all of the Democrats in voting no.

Now, with amazing irony, the first measure to address climate change from the Republican leader—the first one in 4 years—will be one that he wants all of his Members to vote against. Let me say that again. The Republican leader announced he is going to bring up a resolution he intends to vote against.

That is what the American people hate about Congress, the pointless partisan games. Next time you see congressional approval level hovering around 15 percent, don't ask why. This is why: Leader MCCONNELL proposing resolutions so he can vote against them and never proposing anything on this subject, climate change, that is constructive.

I hope the American people are paying attention because they need to see what is going on here. The American people need to see that this is all there is to the Republican plan to deal with climate change. This is all they can muster—a political stunt, not designed to make progress, not designed to move

the ball forward. They are bringing a resolution forward so that they can all vote against it.

This cheap, cynical ploy evidently represents the sum total of Senate Republicans' leadership on the vital issue of climate change, an issue that cries out for serious engagement by Members of both parties. But rather than seriously engage on the issue, our Republican colleagues are taking a page from President Trump's petty playbook, trying to make this a game of political "gotcha." They are taking their lead from the President, a man who is so willfully ignorant and foolish that he thinks he is clever by ridiculing the global scientific consensus on climate change whenever it snows.

Well, the American people are not laughing. They weren't laughing when a U.S. Senator brought a snowball to the floor of this Chamber to mock climate science. They weren't laughing when President Trump called climate change a hoax perpetrated by the Chinese. The rest of the world isn't laughing either, not when basically every country in the world—including Syria, North Korea, and Iran—is working together to reduce carbon emissions while the Trump administration has forced the United States to sit on the sidelines. I would say to our Republican colleagues that this is no game, and it is no joke. Climate change is deadly serious, and the time for all of us to treat it that way is now, before it is too late.

So when the Republican leader says he wants to bring the Green New Deal resolution up for a vote, I say: Go for it. Bring it on. You think it might embarrass Democrats to vote on a non-binding resolution that some of us may support but not others. Trust me, we will be fine because the American people know that our entire party actually believes that climate change is happening and it is caused by humans. We actually believe the consensus of the worldwide scientific community that climate change is an existential threat to this planet, one that threatens not only our children and our grandchildren but all of us right now.

We actually believe that we need to do something about climate change. Do Republicans believe that? Do Republicans agree with the overwhelming consensus of the scientific community? Does Leader MCCONNELL? I seriously want to know, and so do the American people.

So today, I am issuing a challenge to the majority leader. I don't do this often, and my colleagues know I would rather work in a bipartisan way on climate change, but this stunt—his cynical stunt—demands a response.

I challenge Leader MCCONNELL to say that our climate change crisis is real, that it is caused by humans, and that Congress needs to act. That is what two-thirds of the American people agree with—two-thirds.

My strong suspicion, unfortunately, however, is that McConnell can't say

that and won't. Leader MCCONNELL has voted six times against sense-of-the-Senate resolutions that climate change is real and human activity has contributed to it. He has dodged the issue time and again, but maybe his opinion has changed. So when Leader MCCONNELL brings his Green New Deal resolution forward for a vote, we Democrats demand our own amendment votes. Let's see if anything has changed since 2015, when only five brave Republicans were able to vote yes on a resolution saying climate change is real and caused by humans. Two of them aren't even here anymore.

If Leader MCCONNELL blocks amendments, we will know where he and his party stand: against science, against fact—ostriches with their heads buried in the sand as the tide comes in.

If Leader MCCONNELL allows amendments, allows an actual, real debate on climate change, we will see which of our Republican friends are finally ready to admit that climate change is real—is happening right now—and are ready to act on it. Unlike what Leader MCCONNELL is proposing, that would be actual progress.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, let me start by thanking Leader SCHUMER for his incredible remarks this morning. There is a surge of energy around this issue. He has represented that surge of energy very well. He challenged the other side of the aisle to bring it on. Let me sign up right now as the proud member of the "bring it on" caucus. Bring it on. We are looking forward to this conversation on our side.

It is clear that the people of America want action. The polling is immensely strong on this issue. It is clear that the people of America see this issue in their daily lives. This is not academic theory any longer. They see the wildfires. They see the droughts. They see the floods. They see the sea level rise. They see the fish moving about. This is in their lives now, and the polling shows that.

A vast majority of Americans say they are—and this is the word in the poll—"worried" about climate change. The world has reported they see this as the No. 1 issue facing the world's security.

Against that backdrop of an active, engaged, and knowledgeable American population and a world that is looking for the United States to lead, the city on the hill, what—what—do we get from the Republican majority in the Senate? We get a bill, a measure brought to the floor—the first time, as Leader SCHUMER pointed out, that the Republican-controlled majority has brought any meaningful legislation related to climate change to the floor—that they intend to vote against.

Who brings a bill to the floor that you intend to vote against? How is that possibly sincere or serious, and what is

your alternative? If you don't like the Green New Deal, what is your plan? Where is there one?

The fact is, since the Citizens United decision and since the fossil fuel industry powered up its political efforts, there is now no Republican Senator in the Senate who has cosponsored any serious bill to significantly reduce carbon dioxide emissions. They stay away from this issue like the plague.

The world has changed around us. The 2020 election has already begun, in many respects. Voters are alert to this. A Democratic House is ready to produce real legislation, meaningful legislation. With any luck—actually on the House side, somewhat bipartisan legislation, and here in the Senate, the blockade continues, and the only measure brought to the floor is a trick vote that its sponsors will actually vote against. That is a pathetic statement of where our friends on the other side are on this.

I hope this actually turns into a breakthrough moment in which there are some serious conversations on the other side to say this is not tenable; this is ridiculous; we are going to be embarrassed by this; but on our side, we say bring it on.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, our friends on the other side of the aisle—the Republicans—are misreading the moment. The planet is in an emergency situation, and instead of coming to the table with ideas on how to fix it, they are running the same play they always run; that is, that they take a popular idea—investing in clean energy, maybe making college more affordable, making the Tax Code more fair—and they try to characterize it as a liberal project so people put on their partisan uniforms.

Our ideas are popular, and what they have done recently is, they have taken a batch of our ideas and have said: Socialism. You are going to turn into Venezuela if you do all of these things. I know you think you want affordable college. I know you think you want climate action. I know you think you want to not get ripped off by the Tax Code, but that will cause you to be Venezuela.

This is the play they run every time, and they run it with cover from the Wall Street Journal's editorial board and FOX News to try to trick the American people into opposing ideas they actually like.

That is what is happening with this nonbinding resolution that 12 Senators have cosponsored. Republicans are trying to take frequently asked questions—a document that was posted on the website of a new Member of Congress, and then subsequently taken down and disavowed, and make you believe this is what Democrats want to do when it comes to climate action. They want you to believe we want to

take away ice cream and aviation and everything that is good in the world because they know their position on climate change is absolutely untenable.

Over the last couple of days, I read some what we call very serious people in Washington, DC, sort of marveling at Leader MCCONNELL's trolling exercise. This is supposed to be the world's greatest deliberative body. It is not Twitter. This is supposed to be where we solve the greatest problems facing the United States. This is not where we troll each other. This is where we are supposed to have the great debates.

Senate Democrats have done all sorts of work on climate: the ITC and the PTC for solar and wind, conservation and efficiency, carbon pricing, fighting deforestation. So Republicans do not have the high ground here. They are trying to make this a partisan exercise, where you have several news organizations churning because they don't want to deal with climate change.

If the Senate Republican leadership wants to bring up anything about climate, I echo the words of Senator SCHUMER and Senator WHITEHOUSE: We have never been more fired up. We are going to take this opportunity to have a real debate about climate because Republicans do not have a plan to address climate change. That is not a rhetorical flourish. That is not an accusation. That is just an observation. They don't have a plan to stop climate pollution. They do not agree with 99 percent of the scientific community saying not just that this problem exists but that Congress must act.

If you look at the last session of Congress, it is actually worse than that. I want to put this in context. The last session of Congress spanned two of the worst years of weather in U.S. history.

In 2017, there were about 10 million acres that were burned by wildfires. There were Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria. In 2018, we had the costliest and deadliest wildfires California had ever seen. In these two record-setting years, climate change cost the economy and the taxpayers billions of dollars. Communities all across the country struggled to rebuild and recover. People lost their lives, their homes, and their livelihoods.

In these 2 years, the number of pieces of legislation that Republicans put forward to address climate change—even if I thought they were inadequate, even if I thought they were the wrong approach, even if I thought they were half measures or too private sector-oriented, whatever the criticism might have been, I can't even make criticisms of their climate policy. They have no climate policy other than to make things worse.

They have allowed coal companies to leak dirty water and waste into streams without having to clean it up. They voted to make it easier for oil and mining companies to pay foreign governments. They allowed the President to start the process of pulling out

of the Paris accords. They allowed him to begin the process of rolling back your fuel efficiency standards, to repeal the Clean Power Plan, to prop up coal—even though it makes no economic sense in a lot of instances anymore—and they put climate deniers in top science positions in the government.

They put Secretary Zinke in charge of the Department of the Interior, and the first thing he did was to open up lands for oil and gas leases. They put Scott Pruitt in charge of the EPA, and when he finally proved to be a political liability—not for his climate policy but because of his personal habits—they replaced him with someone with the same policies, Andrew Wheeler, who is literally a coal lobbyist.

If you wrote all of this into a screenplay, people would say: That is a little too on the nose. That is a little too obvious. This is ridiculous. This is not actually how Washington works. They wouldn't put a coal lobbyist in charge of the Environmental Protection Agency, would they? They did. They did.

It is not just that Republicans don't have a plan to make things better, it is that the Democratic approach is to treat this like the emergency it is and invest in clean air, clean water, and smarter infrastructure, and the Republican approach is to put polluters in charge to actively, aggressively, and proudly make climate change worse.

I have seen the right approach work in Hawaii. For decades, since the demise of the sugar plantation, we relied on imports of fossil fuels for our energy needs. As recently as 2010, we got more than 90 percent of our electricity from burning oil, which is the dumbest way to do things. It is very expensive and very dirty. Less than a decade later, we are well on our way to 100 percent clean energy.

We have addressed the legitimate concerns, we ignored trolls, and we moved forward together. We have quintupled clean energy, lowered electricity rates, and created tons of jobs. Clean energy is the future for Hawaii, and it is the future for the United States. This can be done. Do not be afraid.

If Republicans think the Democratic ideas are no good, fine; then offer a different plan. They are the only major political party in the developed world that doesn't even believe climate change is a problem. There is no other issue where the majority party denies that the problem exists at all, not cyber security, not healthcare, not even income inequality. This is not tenable.

Whenever a Senate Democrat or a group of Senate Democrats come to the floor to talk about climate change, we usually have a good little group over here, and always—always—in my 7 years in the U.S. Senate, there is always an empty Chamber on the Republican side—empty. The only Republican I am ever talking to is someone who is maybe waiting to give a speech about

something else or the Presiding Officer. That is because Republicans in the Senate have no plan at all as it relates to climate change.

We have trillions of dollars in infrastructure that needs to be addressed over the next couple of decades. We could make those investments in ways that also address climate. We could offer tax breaks for clean energy. We should reenter the Paris accord, but they are pulling the same play they always do, to make this so partisan, to mock the issue itself so they can continue to do nothing. They are whistling past the graveyard.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, how do we make our communities, our States, our Nation, and our planet better for our children? How do we make it better for our children's children and their children? Isn't that the task we have in the U.S. Senate, to make things work better, not worse?

We have this question before us: Do we have a carbon pollution problem? What is the answer, yes or no? I ask each of my colleagues, yes or no?

Presiding today is a new Member of the Senate from Florida. I have been down to Florida. I will tell you that I heard about the rising seawater polluting the aquifers and creating freshwater supply problems for communities in Florida. I heard about coastal erosion. I heard about coral reefs being damaged and the fish offshore. I heard about the toxic red algae on the gulf side—so toxic it is killing fish and dolphins and turtles and manatees, and they are washing up on the shore of Florida on the gulf side.

The people have two problems. The toxic algae is creating breathing problems, and then there is a stench arising from the dying sea life. People on the gulf side of Florida say: We have to take inland vacations.

I know my colleague presiding today knows about these issues in his State because we see the impacts of carbon pollution and climate chaos in every single State. We certainly see it in my State. We see it through the more powerful forest fires—hotter, more acreage, and more destruction. We see it in the smoke affecting the communities and the economies throughout Oregon. Of course, we saw the devastating forest fires in California, wiping out the town of Paradise and afflicting so many other communities.

It is not just the impact on the natural world; it is the impact on the people. When you affect the fisheries, you affect the fishermen. When you affect the forests, you affect the timber industry. When you proceed to produce conditions of more floods and more droughts, you affect the farmers and ranchers of America. It is the people of America.

How about the Panhandle of Florida. It was wiped out by a more powerful hurricane, driven by those warmer

ocean temperatures. What does one say to them—that there is not an issue; that we don't have a problem?

The entire scientific community of the world has said you can see the facts on the ground, but we don't need them to see the facts on the ground. We see it through the everyday impacts on Americans, on our farmers, our ranchers, and on our communities plagued by smoke or wiped out by hurricanes.

So we do have a problem. The answer is, yes, we do have a problem. If you say there is no problem, then your head is stuck in the tar sands, and you are failing your responsibility not just as a U.S. Senator, you are failing your responsibility as a human being. You are failing your constituents if you think there is no problem, while their lives and their economy are being so dramatically impacted by this issue.

I ask my colleagues, did you come here to fail your constituents, to fail as a Senator, to fail as a human being to address this issue? Did you come to fail, or did you come to take on the issues that face us and build a better world for your children?

If you believe there is a significant challenge, what are you doing about it? What actions are you planning? Because if you believe there is a problem and you are not putting forward a plan to address it, then your leadership is a failure.

So we have a choice on the Republican side of the aisle. Is it that you are too obsessed with the power of the Koch Brothers to address the needs of the citizens of the United States of America, that you have your heads stuck in the tar sands? Is that the issue, or is it that you want to sit on the sidelines? You know there is a problem, but you want to sit on the sidelines and do nothing, in which case you are a failed leader.

So how about reject ignorance, and how about reject failed leadership and come together to make a better world for our children. That is what we need to do, all of us, together, because the impacts we see from carbon pollution and climate chaos—those are not impacts affecting blue America or red America; they touch the lives of every citizen, no matter which political party they belong to. It is going to affect every child we have now and every child born in the future, whether they register as a Democrat or a Republican. We have already wasted decades in getting at this issue. Let's waste no more time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Pursuant to the order of February 13 with respect to the Barr nomination, I ask the Chair to put the question on the nomination of William Barr to be Attorney General at 12:30 p.m. today.

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

The Senator from West Virginia.

#### GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, before I begin with my remarks, I would like to take a moment, as I think everybody here in the country should, to remember and honor all the lives lost 1 year ago today during the shooting at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, FL. It was a horrible act, as the Presiding Officer of the Senate is well aware, and its reverberations are still felt deeply today, especially among those who lost friends and loved ones, many of whom work day in and day out to keep their memory alive.

We have before us on the floor today a bipartisan government funding measure, and as the chairman of the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee, I rise in support of the conference agreement to secure our border and fund our government and end any possibility of a shutdown at the same time. This agreement is a compromise between Republicans and Democrats, between the House and the Senate, and because it is a compromise, none of us really got everything we wanted.

When you are working to reach an agreement, whether you are in government or in a family, it is important to understand the difference between compromising on details and compromising on your principles. While this agreement may compromise on some of the specifics, it does not compromise on our commitment to our Nation and to secure our Nation. That commitment is also shared by our President, who has been unwavering in his promise to strengthen our border. It is a goal we must achieve in a smart and informed way to address the real and ever-changing challenges we face as a nation.

On the border itself, I have been very clear that our agreement had to include three critical elements, three legs of the stool: physical barriers, technology, and personnel.

There were a few sticking points with our Democratic colleagues. We did hear from the Speaker of the House that there would be no wall or there would not be \$1 for the wall. Instead, this agreement provides almost triple the money for new wall construction that we appropriated last year. In fact, we will pay for 55 new miles of wall in the Rio Grande Valley where Customs and Border Protection has told us it is desperately needed. This agreement will build twice as many miles of new wall as last year's appropriations, despite the fact that we were negotiating with those who didn't want to have any wall.

Would I have preferred more money for the wall? Of course. But this bill provides the most money ever in a single appropriations bill for a barrier. I drafted legislation—passed by the Senate Appropriations Committee last June—that would have fully funded the President's budget request for the wall. I would have voted for higher amounts—and did, actually, in committee—of funding for the wall. That is



because I believe strongly that physical barriers are a vital part of securing our border. I saw it myself when I toured the borders in California and Texas. I saw the need. I saw how the walls work. And I will stand side by side with the President as he works to secure additional money to construct a border wall in the future.

We got \$1.375 billion, and that is a long way from \$1. It is a critical downpayment on the President's ultimate border security goal. The best path forward to secure our border today is to pass this agreement.

The bill also stands with the men and women of ICE, Immigration and Customs Enforcement. A statutory cap on the number of ICE detention beds would have required dangerous criminals to be released from ICE custody. It would have posed a threat to families and communities across the country, and it would have compromised an important principle. This agreement rejects that anti-ICE proposal.

I have said many times that I support the men and women of ICE and their important work to secure our Nation, and that is why the agreement before us gives ICE the operational flexibility it needs to accomplish its goals. Taking advantage of the flexibility this bill provides, ICE can utilize 18 percent more detention beds than they are currently using. That means ICE can continue interior enforcement efforts and be ready to respond to any surges on the border, so it gives ICE the flexibility they need.

I say to my friends who, like me, want more money for the wall: This agreement is better for the wall and better for ICE than any other alternative. Rejecting this agreement will cost dozens of miles of new wall and jeopardize ICE's ability to detain dangerous criminals.

Another government shutdown cannot and should not be allowed to happen. We need to provide certainty to our Federal workers and the American people whom we serve. I also think we need to restore trust in our ability to work across the aisle, to work across party lines to reach settlement, negotiated settlement that moves us forward, because if we are in a stalemate, we are standing still. In my opinion, if you are standing still, you are actually going backward, and we don't want to do that as a nation.

The work done by the men and women in our Federal workforce during the shutdown should continue to be applauded. Without pay and in a period of great uncertainty, thousands of men and women did their jobs at the highest level. We should be thankful for their service, and we are.

One of the things I am proud of in this bill is a 1.9-percent pay increase for the men and women of the Department of Homeland Security. This is ICE. This is Border Patrol. To the Coast Guard, Secret Service, FEMA, we salute you.

Under this agreement, we will also hire 200 new Border Patrol agents over

the fiscal year 2018 funded level to defend and police our border, and we will add \$600 million for nonintrusive inspection technology.

As I have said before, border wall, personnel, and technology are all vital parts of securing our border. They are very critical in addressing the drug epidemic that has plagued my State of West Virginia and many other parts of this country.

This bill includes the highest level of funding ever in a homeland security appropriations bill to combat the opioid epidemic—more than \$700 million—and it has funds for investigations when it comes to human trafficking, looking into the dark web, and other crimes.

The homeland security portion of this agreement also takes a major step forward in advancing our Nation's Coast Guard by building a new polar security cutter to help address operational needs in the Arctic. This is critical to our homeland security. We also address the needs of the TSA, the Secret Service, and FEMA—to name just a few of the other entities within this title.

This bill is not the bill I would have written alone. I don't get to do that. It is the product of give-and-take that is necessary to forge a bipartisan consensus. It is a strong compromise that will help secure our border and make America safer.

Senator JON TESTER, the ranking member of our subcommittee and the Senator from Montana, has been an excellent partner as we have worked to deliver a bill worthy of the men and women of the Department of Homeland Security. So I thank him for his efforts throughout this process. We have worked very well together.

I also want to thank Chairman SHELBY and Vice Chairman LEAHY for their work in guiding the Appropriations Committee to a deal. These are seasoned appropriators who know how to get the job done. Their leadership has demonstrated that the Appropriations Committee can come together and forge bipartisan consensus in the national interest.

The leaders of the House Appropriations Committee, Chairman NITA LOWEY, whom I know very well; and Ranking Member KAY GRANGER, who is a good friend of mine from my service in the House; as well as my counterpart in the House and chairman of Homeland Security, LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD; and Ranking Member CHUCK FLEISCHMANN, of the Homeland Security Subcommittee. They deserve our gratitude for forging ahead with a willingness to negotiate.

I also appreciate the contributions of all the members of our conference committee, and I would like to thank a group of individuals who have dedicated a lot of nights, weekends, and family time to this effort. Their knowledge of the facts and their commitment to the cause never waned, even though their time to sleep did wane. Shannon

Hines, who is Chairman SHELBY's right-hand woman on the committee, was fantastic. Thank you to Adam Telle, Peter Babb, Christian Lee, Chris Cook, and Thompson Moore of the Homeland Security Subcommittee staff, which I chair, as well as to my own appropriations staffer, J.T. Jezierski. I say thank you—a big thank you.

I have spent the majority of my time today and the last several weeks on my bill—our bill. My thanks and congratulations also go to my fellow chairmen who have titles in this package. They have produced legislation that will help West Virginia expand access to broadband, combat the opioid epidemic, enhance our transportation, foster economic development, and advance scientific research and discovery. They, too, faced similar challenges to draft bipartisan legislation, and they too got it done.

In closing, although conferees compromised on details, we did not compromise our principles. Passing this conference agreement is in our national security interest. It will provide the resources, the direction, and the support that the President has said many times he needs to protect our Nation.

I am very proud to have been a part of this process, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in a bipartisan fashion in passing this bill later this afternoon.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

#### JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF LYNCHING ACT OF 2019

Ms. HARRIS. James Baldwin once said:

Not everything that is faced can be changed. But nothing can be changed until it is faced.

That is why we are here again today, to face the history of lynching in this country. From 1882 to 1986, the U.S. Congress failed to pass anti-lynching legislation when it had the opportunity more than 200 times.

We have an opportunity, once again, to right this wrong and face the ugly history of lynching in America. Let's recall this stain on America's history. Lynching is an act of terror. It is murder.

These were summary executions. Victims of lynching were dragged out of their homes. They had ropes wrapped around their necks. They were hanged on trees. In many cases, they were castrated and burned as crowds of people watched and applauded. The premise underlying all of these acts was that Black people were not full human beings.

According to the Equal Justice Initiative, lynching was used as an instrument of terror and intimidation 4,084 times during the late 19th and 20th centuries.

In 1955, Emmett Till, a 14-year-old African-American boy, was lynched in

Mississippi after being accused of offending a woman in her family's grocery store. When Emmett Till's mother held open her son's casket at his funeral, the image of his body became one of the starkest examples of racial violence in America.

These lynchings, I think no one can deny, were acts of violence. They were needless, horrendous acts of violence, and they were motivated by racism. Lynchings were crimes that were committed against innocent Americans. These crimes, for the most part, did not go without consequence. They rarely were followed by an arrest or the charging of a crime or the prosecution of a crime or the punishment for the crime. Of course, the victims of these acts and their families never received justice in our courts of law or in their community.

This is an uncomfortable history to think of, to talk about, and understandably makes many people uncomfortable because of the violence we are describing, because it is part of America's history, because it is something we have never truly acknowledged and recognized, in terms of the crime it was, the crime it is, and how we, through our laws, must recognize the seriousness of it.

Today we have that opportunity, and we must recognize the context in which we discuss it today. Just in the last month, we have had difficult and high-profile conversations about slavery and blackface, issues that are claimed to be part of a bygone era. However, it is clear that in many ways our past is our present.

Lynching is not a relic of the past. In 2011, three men in Brandon, MS, murdered an African-American man, James Craig Anderson. They robbed him, beat him, and ran him over with a truck. That is modern-day lynching.

Let's be clear. No one should have to fear for their life because of their race, national origin, religion, or sexual orientation. We must confront hate directly.

In December of 2018, our Senate colleagues, I am proud to say, voted unanimously, in a bipartisan way, to pass the Justice for Victims of Lynching Act, which I proudly introduced with Senators BOOKER and SCOTT. After 100 years and more than 200 failed attempts in the U.S. Congress, the U.S. Senate finally spoke the truth about lynching.

Today I have reintroduced the bill and will ask the Senate to pass it again. The Justice for Victims of Lynching Act is a historic piece of legislation that would make lynching a Federal crime for the first time in American history. With this bill, we finally have a chance to speak the truth about our past and make clear that these hateful acts should never happen again and, God forbid, they do, we are making clear there will be swift, serious, and severe consequences.

We can now finally offer some long overdue justice and recognition to the

victims of lynching and their families. As Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., said: "The time is always right to do what is right."

I now yield the floor to my friend and colleague, the great Senator from the great State of New Jersey, CORY BOOKER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. Thank you.

Mr. President, I thank Senator HARRIS for her partnership and leadership on this bill. I also thank my colleague and my friend, TIM SCOTT from South Carolina, for his leadership and partnership on this legislation.

As Senator HARRIS just said, this is not the first time we have come down to the floor of the U.S. Senate to implore this body to recognize lynching for what it is—bias-related terror. It is not the first time we have come down to this body to try to right the wrongs of history. After numerous attempts—dozens and dozens—during the height of lynchings in the United States, this body failed to act. This body did not stand up to protect American citizens and condemn the horrors of lynching.

In December of last year, as Senator HARRIS and I were standing here, this body actually made a historic decision. It was a profound moment, an emotional moment. They made the decision to pass the Justice for Victims of Lynching Act by unanimous consent—no opposition.

After a long, painful, and shameful history of this body, the U.S. Senate finally voted unanimously to make lynching a Federal crime. Unfortunately, the bill was not taken up in the House before the end of the last Congress. So we are here today with the hope and expectation that for the second time this body will make history by passing Federal anti-lynching legislation and that, for the first time in history, this bill will actually become the law of the land.

Senator HARRIS referenced the Equal Justice Initiative, which documented over 4,000 cases of racially motivated lynchings between 1877 and well into the 20th century. Lynchings were used to terrorize, marginalize, and oppress Black communities, to kill human beings in order to sow deeper fear, inequality, and injustice for generations.

The use of lynching to inflict racial terror is ugly, disturbing. It is a tragic part of our history, but we know its legacy does not just live in our history books. Less than 2 weeks ago, an actor and activist was brutally attacked in Chicago by two men yelling racial and homophobic epithets.

Lynching is not a relic of the past. We are seeing in the present pernicious evil, and we still have yet to confront this in this body. Bias-motivated acts of violence and intimidation in America are actually on the rise. Hate crimes are on the rise for the third year in a row. Hate crimes against Black Americans are on the rise. Hate crimes against Jewish Americans are

on the rise. Hate crimes against LGBTQ Americans and Muslim Americans are on the rise. This is unacceptable. Justice for the victims of lynching has been too long denied, and as we look forward we must collectively in this body make a strong, unequivocal statement.

The last time Senator HARRIS and I came to the floor with this request, I read from an excerpt of a speech given by Congressman George Henry White, the first Member of Congress to introduce an anti-lynching bill more than a century ago and the last Black Member of Congress to serve for decades following Reconstruction.

In 1901, in the last speech he ever gave on the floor, the last speech of a Black Congressman for decades, he said about the terror of lynching: "This evil peculiar to America, yes, to the United States, must be met somehow, some day."

For too long in this body, in the U.S. Congress, we have relied on the inevitability of "some day" when it comes to addressing this profound injustice. For too long we have failed—failed—to ensure justice for the victims of lynching, and failed to make clear that in the United States of America, in this great country, lynching is and always has been not just a Federal crime but a moral failure.

We have the opportunity right now, again, to make history in this moment. We have the opportunity right now to recognize the wrongs of both our history and our recent past, to honor the memories of those so brutally murdered, and to leave a legacy that future generations can look back on. We will know, after some 200 attempts in this body in more than 100 years, that on this day, this moment in American history—notably Valentine's Day; as one leader once said, "Never forget that justice is what love looks like in public"—that on this day, we can right this wrong.

I would like to recognize the Senator from California.

Ms. HARRIS. Thank you, Senator BOOKER. Happy Valentine's Day to you.

Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 488, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 488) to amend title 18, United States Code, to specify lynching as a deprivation of civil rights, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Ms. HARRIS. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 488) was passed as follows:

S. 488

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the “Justice for Victims of Lynching Act of 2019”.

**SEC. 2. FINDINGS.**

Congress finds the following:

(1) The crime of lynching succeeded slavery as the ultimate expression of racism in the United States following Reconstruction.

(2) Lynching was a widely acknowledged practice in the United States until the middle of the 20th century.

(3) Lynching was a crime that occurred throughout the United States, with documented incidents in all but 4 States.

(4) At least 4,742 people, predominantly African Americans, were reported lynched in the United States between 1882 and 1968.

(5) Ninety-nine percent of all perpetrators of lynching escaped from punishment by State or local officials.

(6) Lynching prompted African Americans to form the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (referred to in this section as the “NAACP”) and prompted members of B’nai B’rith to found the Anti-Defamation League.

(7) Mr. Walter White, as a member of the NAACP and later as the executive secretary of the NAACP from 1931 to 1955, meticulously investigated lynchings in the United States and worked tirelessly to end segregation and racialized terror.

(8) Nearly 200 anti-lynching bills were introduced in Congress during the first half of the 20th century.

(9) Between 1890 and 1952, 7 Presidents petitioned Congress to end lynching.

(10) Between 1920 and 1940, the House of Representatives passed 3 strong anti-lynching measures.

(11) Protection against lynching was the minimum and most basic of Federal responsibilities, and the Senate considered but failed to enact anti-lynching legislation despite repeated requests by civil rights groups, Presidents, and the House of Representatives to do so.

(12) The publication of “Without Sanctuary: Lynching Photography in America” helped bring greater awareness and proper recognition of the victims of lynching.

(13) Only by coming to terms with history can the United States effectively champion human rights abroad.

(14) An apology offered in the spirit of true repentance moves the United States toward reconciliation and may become central to a new understanding, on which improved racial relations can be forged.

(15) Having concluded that a reckoning with our own history is the only way the country can effectively champion human rights abroad, 90 Members of the United States Senate agreed to Senate Resolution 39, 109th Congress, on June 13, 2005, to apologize to the victims of lynching and the descendants of those victims for the failure of the Senate to enact anti-lynching legislation.

(16) The National Memorial for Peace and Justice, which opened to the public in Montgomery, Alabama, on April 26, 2018, is the Nation’s first memorial dedicated to the legacy of enslaved Black people, people terrorized by lynching, African Americans humili-

ated by racial segregation and Jim Crow, and people of color burdened with contemporary presumptions of guilt and police violence.

(17) Notwithstanding the Senate’s apology and the heightened awareness and education about the Nation’s legacy with lynching, it is wholly necessary and appropriate for the Congress to enact legislation, after 100 years of unsuccessful legislative efforts, finally to make lynching a Federal crime.

(18) Further, it is the sense of Congress that criminal action by a group increases the likelihood that the criminal object of that group will be successfully attained and decreases the probability that the individuals involved will depart from their path of criminality. Therefore, it is appropriate to specify criminal penalties for the crime of lynching, or any attempt or conspiracy to commit lynching.

(19) The United States Senate agreed to unanimously Senate Resolution 118, 115th Congress, on April 5, 2017, “[c]ondemning hate crime and any other form of racism, religious or ethnic bias, discrimination, incitement to violence, or animus targeting a minority in the United States” and taking notice specifically of Federal Bureau of Investigation statistics demonstrating that “among single-bias hate crime incidents in the United States, 59.2 percent of victims were targeted due to racial, ethnic, or ancestral bias, and among those victims, 52.2 percent were victims of crimes motivated by the offenders’ anti-Black or anti-African American bias”.

(20) On September 14, 2017, President Donald J. Trump signed into law Senate Joint Resolution 49 (Public Law 115-58; 131 Stat. 1149), wherein Congress “condemn[ed] the racist violence and domestic terrorist attack that took place between August 11 and August 12, 2017, in Charlottesville, Virginia” and “urg[ed] the President and his administration to speak out against hate groups that espouse racism, extremism, xenophobia, anti-Semitism, and White supremacy; and use all resources available to the President and the President’s Cabinet to address the growing prevalence of those hate groups in the United States”.

(21) Senate Joint Resolution 49 (Public Law 115-58; 131 Stat. 1149) specifically took notice of “hundreds of torch-bearing White nationalists, White supremacists, Klansmen, and neo-Nazis [who] chanted racist, anti-Semitic, and anti-immigrant slogans and violently engaged with counter-demonstrators on and around the grounds of the University of Virginia in Charlottesville” and that these groups “reportedly are organizing similar events in other cities in the United States and communities everywhere are concerned about the growing and open display of hate and violence being perpetrated by those groups”.

(22) Lynching was a pernicious and pervasive tool that was used to interfere with multiple aspects of life—including the exercise of Federally protected rights, as enumerated in section 245 of title 18, United States Code, housing rights, as enumerated in section 901 of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3631), and the free exercise of religion, as enumerated in section 247 of title 18, United States Code. Interference with these rights was often effectuated by multiple offenders and groups, rather than isolated individuals. Therefore, prohibiting conspiracies to violate each of these rights recognizes the history of lynching in the United States and serves to prohibit its use in the future.

**SEC. 3. LYNCHING.**

(a) OFFENSE.—Chapter 13 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“§ 250. Lynching**

“Whoever conspires with another person to violate section 245, 247, or 249 of this title or section 901 of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3631) shall be punished in the same manner as a completed violation of such section, except that if the maximum term of imprisonment for such completed violation is less than 10 years, the person may be imprisoned for not more than 10 years.”.

(b) TABLE OF SECTIONS AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 13 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 249 the following:

“250. Lynching.”.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Congratulations.

Ms. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you to all of our colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

**EXECUTIVE CALENDAR**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

**GOVERNMENT FUNDING**

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, late last night, we received the text of the appropriations agreement to fund the remaining portions of the government through the end of this fiscal year, which is through the end of September.

We were successful in doing something that we had not done in a long time previously, which was to fund 75 percent of the Federal Government, leaving 25 percent remaining. Unfortunately, the remaining 25 percent was held hostage to this unreasonable and unnecessary debate over whether we should fund border security. I say the debate was unnecessary because I thought that we all shared a conviction that it was important to secure our border.

It is important to note that most of the bill that we will vote on later today has been out in the public domain for more than 6 months. It is the product of bipartisan deliberation by the Appropriations Committee and has been available to any Senator who might want to be acquainted with the details.

The part that is relatively new is the detail relative to border security. I am pleased that, notwithstanding Speaker PELOSI’s statement that physical barriers are somehow immoral, this does authorize and fund up to 55 miles of additional fencing along the U.S.-Mexico border.

I believe that border security consists of three components: physical barriers in hard-to-control locations; technology, which is important as a force multiplier; and then, of course, the boots on the ground—the Border Patrol agents, who are absolutely essential. I am pleased to say that this piece of legislation incorporates all

three of those components of what makes up smart and sensible border security.

I am also happy to see that the initial demands made by our colleagues across the aisle that we limit the number of detention beds are not in this bill and that law enforcement can continue to detain people with criminal records who happen to be illegally in this country so that we can discourage and deter further illegal immigration.

One of the worst aspects of our broken immigration system is this notion of catch-and-release. During the George W. Bush administration, I remember talking to Secretary Chertoff about this huge upsurge in Brazilians coming across our border. I asked Secretary Chertoff why we were seeing all these Brazilians coming. He said it was catch-and-release. They knew that if there were no penalty associated with coming across or if they wouldn't be detained, there was no deterrence.

I am glad to see that this appropriations bill, which will prevent another government shutdown, contains no cap on detention beds to detain criminal aliens and others who are exploiting vulnerabilities in our immigration system.

I would say, though, one of the things that is notably absent in this bill is an extension of the Violence Against Women Act, which provides resources to assist women who are victims of domestic violence and sexual assault. Republicans made absolutely clear from the get-go that we wanted to extend the current law. I am incredulous that our Democratic colleagues objected to extending the current law, the Violence Against Women Act.

It is really hard for me to believe that Speaker PELOSI and House Democrats object to a modest extension of this critical legislation, which helped countless victims receive the support they need, but because of the political jockeying, the Violence Against Women Act will expire at midnight tomorrow. There were two options available to us. One was to provide an extension through the end of the fiscal year—through the end of September—which would have allowed us to work on a long-term reauthorization under regular order. The second option, which our Democratic colleagues chose, is to do nothing and let this important legislation expire while trying to plot out a long-term plan. The choice seemed pretty obvious to me, but apparently not to Speaker PELOSI and not to the Democratic leader here in the Senate.

Since my days as attorney general, I have long been a believer in advocating for victims' rights. I am beyond disappointed that we have ended up in this situation. It is shameful to play politics with the Violence Against Women Act. But because of their obstruction, this important resource for victims across the country will lapse tomorrow night at midnight.

#### THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. President, we have seen a lot of discussion lately about the so-called Green New Deal. It has been stealing headlines and capturing people's imaginations. It has been the subject of a lot of social media interaction and certainly has had a lot of coverage on TV and in the papers.

It has ended up causing quite a headache for our colleagues across the aisle who have tried to explain exactly what they are trying to do and how they are trying to do it. Last week, the junior Senator from Massachusetts introduced with Congresswoman OCASIO-CORTEZ of New York a resolution that was framed as a way to create jobs and fight climate change. A number of Presidential aspirants here in the Senate—and there are a lot—quickly embraced this resolution.

If you lived in a vacuum and you saw only the text of the resolution, you might say: Well, this is a pretty good idea. It mentions things like creating high-wage jobs, ensuring economic prosperity, investing in infrastructure and industry, and securing clean air and water for all. That sounds pretty good. But the resolution does not spell out how we are supposed to achieve all of those things.

Fortunately, one of the authors released a summary, which, oddly enough, provided more details on what the Green New Deal strives to do. It tells us more than the actual resolution does. One of the lines of the resolution says to ensure "prosperity and economic security for all people of the United States." But the summary clarifies that this is, in reality, a new entitlement program on steroids. This, at a time when our national debt just hit \$22 trillion, adds additional entitlement spending on top of it.

This provision would guarantee every person in the United States a job, healthcare, education, healthy food, and paid vacations. They might have thrown in free beer and pizza too. But they take it even a step further. According to the Green New Deal, the government will foot the bill for any person who is "unable or unwilling to work." If you don't like your job, don't want to get out of bed in the morning, don't feel like going to the office today, no worries. The Green New Deal says you don't have to go to work. And the people who do go to work—the hard-working taxpayers of America—will foot the bill.

Another component of this Green New Deal is to move to 100 percent clean and renewable energy in just 10 years. I come from an energy State, the State of Texas. When people think about Texas, they think about oil and gas, but we actually believe in all of the above. We generate more electricity from wind than any other State in the country because we have more infrastructure deployed for that.

I actually think moving toward cleaner and renewable energy is a good thing. But they want to do it in 10

years, and they don't answer the question about how much it will cost. Some estimates put the pricetag at \$5.7 trillion. That is \$2 trillion more than our annual tax revenue. In other words, it would add \$3.7 trillion to the national debt.

Remember, that is just for the energy portion of the Green New Deal. There are other components, as well. There is Medicare for All, which, of course, would destroy the private insurance industry and employer-provided coverage and would be unaffordable. They offer free college, paying the way for people who are able but don't want to work.

This is an extraordinary wish list, combining the most costly ideas of the radical fringes on the left in one place. It is really remarkable they were able to condense all of these into one place, where we could understand the entire picture.

The resolution also commits to update "all existing buildings . . . to achieve maximal energy efficiency, water efficiency, safety, affordability, comfort, and durability." I am all for local and State government and, where it is appropriate, Federal Government to talk about building codes and energy efficiency. That is a desirable thing. But to try to retrofit every government building, every airport, every football stadium, every home, every grocery store, and every shopping mall—every single building in the United States would have to be updated. How crazy is that? How much would that cost?

On second thought, I guess we don't have to worry about updating airports because the Green New Deal also calls for building "high-speed rail at a scale where air travel stops becoming necessary." I saw an interview with our friend the Senator from Hawaii, who was asked about that component of the Green New Deal. She said: Well, that wouldn't work very well for Hawaii. High-speed rail wouldn't exactly get you from the west coast out to Hawaii.

I hate to burst their bubble, but this is not something that is feasible or easy to do. Look at California talking about high-speed rail. Earlier this week, Gov. Gavin Newsom announced the State was hitting the brakes on a high-speed rail project because it would take too long and cost too much. I bet Governor Newsom and I don't agree on a lot from a political standpoint, but I agree with him on that.

Last March, California estimated that the project would cost between \$77 and \$98 billion, and that is just to connect Northern and Southern California. I can't imagine how much it would cost to build a high-speed rail to connect California to Maine. If the word "green" refers to the amount of money this would cost, then at least that point is accurate.

There are no details on how we are going to pay for all of this, of course, because our Democratic colleagues know that the Green New Deal is entirely fantasy—it is unrealistic. These

are just talking points that have been designed to appeal to the fringe of their political party and to make a political statement. That is why a number of our colleagues on the Democratic side changed their tune once the majority leader announced that the Senate would vote on this resolution.

Generally speaking, in my experience in the Senate, if you introduce a bill or a resolution, you are thrilled to hear the majority leader say he is going to schedule it for a vote on the floor—but not the Senator from Massachusetts, one of the proponents of the Green New Deal. Following the leader's announcement, he released a statement that derided Senator MCCONNELL's effort to "sabotage" the Green New Deal by his giving them a vote on their resolution. Apparently, holding a vote on something you have introduced is now a form of sabotage in this wild and wacky world in which we currently live. The Senator from Minnesota, who announced her bid for President, later downplayed her support and brushed it all off as aspirational.

Our constituents didn't send us to Washington to advocate for partisan wish lists that will never be voted on. They want us to be accountable as their elected Representatives. They sent us here to craft legislation that can and will make our country stronger. This Green New Deal is nothing more than a Socialist agenda that is being disguised as feel-good environmental policy, and it is indicative, unfortunately, of the hard left turn our friends across the aisle, the Democratic Party, have taken.

The Green New Deal is not what our country needs, and as we have heard from both Republicans and Democrats over the last several days, it is not what our country wants.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill 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.

#### GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, later today, we hope we will have an opportunity to vote on legislation that will fund the government and provide much needed support for border security. While no agreement is perfect and not everybody gets everything one wants, this makes a significant downpayment on a border wall as well as on other border security measures. At the same time, it funds all of the appropriations bills for this fiscal year.

I hope, as our Members review the text, they will have an opportunity to conclude that we will be able to get the votes that will be necessary to move the legislation through the Senate and, hopefully, ultimately, through the House and to the President and that

the President will be able to sign it into law. So stay tuned on that. Hopefully, that will all transpire later today.

#### TAX REFORM

Mr. President, tax reform is working. When Republicans took office 2 years ago, we had one goal in mind, and that was to make life better for the American people. Key to that goal was getting our economy going again after years of economic stagnation under the Obama administration. We took action to lift burdensome regulations, and in December of 2017, we passed the historic, comprehensive reform of our Nation's Tax Code.

Why the Tax Code?

Well, the Tax Code plays a huge role in the health of our economy. It helps to determine how much money individuals and families have to spend and to save. It helps to determine whether a small business can expand and hire. It helps to determine whether larger businesses hire, invest, and stay in the United States. A small business owner who faces a huge tax bill is highly unlikely to be able to expand her business or to hire a new employee. A larger business is going to find it hard to create jobs or to improve benefits for employees if it is struggling to stay competitive against foreign businesses that pay much less in taxes. A larger business is also unlikely to keep jobs and investment in the United States if the Tax Code makes it vastly more expensive to hire American workers.

Before we passed tax reform a year ago in December, our Tax Code was not helping our economy. It was taking way too much money from American families, and it was making it harder for businesses, large and small, to create jobs, increase wages, and grow. That is why, after months of work, we passed the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

This legislation cut tax rates for American families, doubled the child tax credit, and nearly doubled the standard deduction. It lowered tax rates across the board for owners of small- and medium-sized businesses, farms, and ranches. It lowered our Nation's massive corporate tax rate, which, up until January 1 of last year, was the highest corporate tax rate in the developed world. It expanded business owners' ability to recover the costs of the investments they make in their businesses, which frees up cash that they can reinvest in their operations and in their workers. It also brought the U.S. international tax system into the 21st century so that American businesses would not be operating at a competitive disadvantage next to their foreign counterparts.

I am proud to report that the Republicans' economic policies are working. Our economy is thriving. The economy grew at a robust 3.4 percent in the third quarter of 2018. January marked the 11th straight month that unemployment has been at or below 4 percent. That is the longest streak in nearly five decades. The number of job

openings hit a record high in December. Once again, there were more job openings than job seekers. In fact, job openings outnumbered job seekers by more than a million jobs. Think about that. There are more job openings than there are people who are looking for work. It is not just by a little but by a lot—by a million job openings.

The Department of Labor reports that the number of job openings has outnumbered the number of job seekers now for 10 straight months. Wage growth has accelerated. Wages have now been growing at a rate of 3 percent or greater for 6 straight months. The last time wage growth reached this level was in 2009—a decade ago.

A Bloomberg article from yesterday reported:

A strong labor market is proving to be [a] blessing for job switchers as they pocket bigger raises amid record openings. Median wage growth for those who jumped to new positions picked up to 4.6 percent in January from a year earlier—the fastest pace since October of 2007.

Median household income is at an all-time, inflation-adjusted high of \$61,372, and the list goes on.

These are a lot of statistics, but behind those numbers are American families whose lives are improving, thanks to Republican economic policies—American families who no longer have to choose between a car repair and a dentist's bill; American families who now have a little extra every month to put away for the kids' college or for their retirement. Thanks to Republican economic policies, Americans are feeling more optimistic and more hopeful about their futures.

Gallup reports: "Americans' optimism about their personal finances has climbed to levels not seen in more than 16 years, with 69 percent now saying they expect to be financially better off 'at this time next year.'"

There are 57 percent of Americans who "rate the economy as excellent or good," according to Gallup, which is the highest level since January of 2001.

There are 69 percent of Americans who say that now is a good time to find a quality job, which is the highest percentage that Gallup has ever recorded.

There is optimism in this country. There is optimism within families, and there is optimism within small businesses. There is optimism at every level when it comes to this economy and the jobs and the wages that are being created as a result of these economic policies.

When it came time to draft tax reform, we had hoped it could have been a bipartisan endeavor. After all, many of the ideas that we included were the product of both Republican and Democratic proposals. As someone who has been around tax policy for a number of years and had served as a member of the Senate Finance Committee when tax reform was written, I have seen many of the bills that have been introduced.

A few years ago, I led a task force that took ideas from both sides and incorporated them into a document that

we put out there that provided for many of the ideas that were included in tax reform, and some of those were Democratic ideas. What happened, unfortunately, was that the Democrats were not over the 2016 election, and they absolutely refused to collaborate on tax reform legislation. Now they are trying to pretend that the economic progress we have made over the past 2 years doesn't exist.

In a recent tweet, one Democrat Presidential hopeful here in the Senate went so far as to actively mislead Americans about tax reform by falsely suggesting that tax reform raised taxes for the middle class when, instead, it lowered taxes for an estimated 90 percent of middle-class Americans. The Washington Post called her tweet "nonsensical and misleading." Presumably, most Americans are well aware that the size of their tax refunds has nothing to do with the size of their tax bills.

That statement—made by a Democratic candidate for President—peddles a blatantly false narrative in the hopes of scoring political points, and for that statement, she was awarded four Pinocchios by the Washington Post, which is about as big a whopper as you can get. Luckily, no matter how much the Democrats try to pretend that our economy isn't improving, they can't hide the reality that Republican economic policies are making life better for American families.

I am proud of everything we have accomplished so far, and we are going to keep working to ensure that our economy can thrive for the long term and to make sure that every American will have access to a secure and prosperous future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

#### GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on the government funding agreement announced last night. I greatly appreciate the work of Senator SHELBY, Senator LEAHY, and the Appropriations Committee in their efforts to reach a bipartisan agreement. I appreciate the efforts of Senator MCCONNELL, Senator SCHUMER, and our House counterparts, as well, to reach an agreement.

I am glad we will avert another government shutdown and also make critical investments in several areas that are important to my home State of Minnesota; however, there is an important piece of unfinished business that wasn't included in the agreement, and that is to provide backpay for the employees of Federal contractors who were forced out of work for more than a month during the shutdown.

During the longest Federal shutdown in history, thousands of Americans who serve as contractors to the Federal Government lost over a month's pay through no fault of their own, and these are people who work as security guards and clean office buildings, and

they work shoulder to shoulder with Federal employees for all of us. Unfortunately, and this is important, while Federal employees have received backpay—a bill this Chamber passed unanimously—their contractor counterparts have been left out in the cold with no backpay.

I have introduced legislation, which has bipartisan support, which would right this wrong, and it should have been included in the final budget deal, but it appears that the White House blocked it.

I have talked with many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle here in the Senate Chamber, and I have not found a single person who says contractors don't deserve backpay. We all agree on this, and that is why every Democrat in this Chamber has cosponsored my bill, and that is why several of my Republican colleagues and many others in this room have not only cosponsored but have also expressed support for finding a solution to this challenge.

So why not provide backpay to contractors in the funding bill before us today? Because it appears the White House apparently has said not to do it. But I have talked to the White House just in the last week. I didn't hear any fundamental reasons why our plan couldn't go forward and why challenges couldn't be resolved.

While I don't claim to know the White House's motivation in opposing this bill, I do know there are several misconceptions about this legislation that I would like to address today.

First, some have claimed that the problem is just too complicated to solve or that it would involve an untested process, but that is not right.

My bill would allow Agencies to make what is called equitable adjustment to contract prices to compensate contractors who provide backpay to their furloughed employees. This equitable adjustment process is used regularly by contracting officers and contractors. It has already been used to address other shutdown-related claims, including hundreds of claims for shutdown-related compensation this year alone. This process has already been used to pay contractors, just not for backpay. So my bill would build on the existing processes already in place. These processes are established, and it is just not that complicated.

Second, some have claimed that the administrative costs of the bill would just be too large, and that is simply false.

It is true that Agencies would need to take administrative steps to implement the bill, just as they do with the passage of any legislation. But, again, my bill builds on an existing administrative process that is used regularly and efficiently without large administrative costs.

Let me be clear. If the White House or anyone has suggestions on ways to improve this legislation to make it easier to implement, we are all ears.

We would be happy to accommodate any reasonable suggestion; we just haven't seen any. We haven't received any specific suggestions.

Too often, contractors are invisible to the public, but they suffered greatly during this recent shutdown. Representative AYANNA PRESSLEY and I recently authored an op-ed about this, and it included a story about a woman named Tamela, whom we both met. We wrote in our op-ed:

Tamela was worried that she would fall behind on her mortgage and car payments, ruining the good credit she'd worked so long and so hard to build. And as she spoke, beads of sweat rolled down her face. Was she nervous about speaking in front of a crowd? No. As Tamela explained, she's diabetic and has high blood pressure. Without her regular paycheck, she hadn't been able to afford the co-pay for a doctor's appointment to have her blood pressure tested and her prescription renewed. So she was going without her medicine.

I recently received a letter from Annie, a Federal contractor in Duluth. Annie wrote to me:

I am losing wages that I count on each month to make significant payments towards my student loans and contributions to my savings, (including my retirement savings). I can honestly say I never thought I'd be applying for unemployment, especially as a 31-year-old, but today I did just that.

These employees deserve backpay. They had nothing to do with creating this crisis, and we should all be able to come together in a bipartisan way to make sure these Federal contract employees receive backpay. So I stand here today to say I am going to continue working to get this bill passed, and I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to find a path forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, today we hope to vote on a bipartisan, bicameral agreement that will fully fund the government and provide additional measures to strengthen our border security.

I want to applaud all of the members of the conference committee who worked on this agreement. I particularly want to recognize those Senate Members, led by Chairman SHELBY and Vice Chairman LEAHY, for negotiating a bipartisan compromise that will keep the government's doors open. Neither side got everything they wanted—that is why it is called a compromise—but in the end, fully funding the government and keeping it open is what is best for the American people.

What we saw during the 35-day government shutdown was that it took a terrible toll on our Federal workers, and it cost the U.S. economy \$11 billion—including \$3 billion that is gone forever, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

Across the country, Federal workers have been very anxiously waiting to see if we were going to come to an agreement, if they were going to be

able to pay their mortgages, afford groceries, and get their prescriptions. Well, today, hopefully we can put their minds at ease. We can pass this legislation, and hopefully the President will sign it, because failure to do so would once again deprive Americans of important government services and throw our economy into a tailspin.

I urge all of our colleagues in Congress to take up this funding legislation, to pass it, and the President to sign it as soon as it reaches his desk.

Protecting our borders should not be an exercise in partisanship, and I am glad to see that this bill supports commonsense investments that focus on the technology, infrastructure, and personnel that are needed at the southern and northern borders to provide actual security that works.

The bill provides \$1.375 billion for targeted fencing in vulnerable areas along the southern border and more than \$800 million for Border Patrol agents, better surveillance and screening technologies, and increased security at our ports of entry. When resourced and deployed appropriately, these types of smart investments are far more likely to interrupt the flow of narcotics than a costly and ineffective border wall.

Importantly, the legislation also includes \$77 million for opioid equipment and staffing to interdict fentanyl and other synthetic opioids that are shipped through international mail and express consignment facilities. This is particularly important to States like mine, New Hampshire, where we have the second highest overdose death rate from opioids in the country. So many of those deaths are caused by the synthetic fentanyl. The opioid epidemic is a true national emergency, and Federal investments like these are needed to stop the illegal flow of these drugs into the country.

When Congress takes up and passes this deal, it will not only pass the appropriations bill for the Department of Homeland Security but also six other appropriations bills that have unfortunately been waylaid by our shutdown. This appropriations package supports critical Federal investments across all government Agencies, and I want to highlight just a few of those, starting with the programs funded in the bipartisan Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 2019.

As ranking member of the CJS Subcommittee, I worked closely with my colleague Senator MORAN from Kansas, who chairs the subcommittee, and we crafted what I believe is a truly bipartisan bill that will promote the economy, protect the American people, and secure our Nation's leadership in science and innovation.

For example, the fiscal year 2019 CJS bill provides \$468 million in dedicated Justice Department grant programs to tackle the opioid epidemic. The legislation will provide funding to State and local governments and those organiza-

tions working on the frontlines—providing a balanced approach of law enforcement, treatment, and recovery resources to help our communities that are dealing with opioid and fentanyl deaths. This amount is \$21 million higher than the fiscal year 2018 level and \$336 million higher than the President's budget request. For communities desperately fighting opioid addiction, any further delay in funding is dangerous and could be deadly, so it is critical that we pass this bill today.

Importantly, the legislation also contains the highest funding level ever for the Office on Violence Against Women—\$497.5 million for critical programs that provide training for police officers and prosecutors, rape prevention programs, and funding for women's shelters.

While I am glad that the appropriations package provides funding for these Violence Against Women Act programs, more work needs to be done to better support survivors of domestic and sexual violence. I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to address the complex issue of domestic violence.

The appropriations package also supports investments in our national infrastructure and provides more than \$49 billion to the Federal Highway Administration to modernize our highways and repair our bridges.

This legislation would also provide a \$1.3 billion increase for housing programs like rental assistance and homeless support services. For us in New Hampshire, that means that 9,500 low-income households will continue to have a place they can call home.

I am pleased that the appropriations package includes a 1.9-percent pay increase for Federal civilian employees. This is a cost-of-living increase that is long overdue.

During the shutdown, I had a chance to meet with a number of our Federal workers, and one of the things that impressed me the most was the dedication those workers had to their jobs and to serving the people of this country. They were going to work without getting paid and without knowing when they were going to get paid. Yet they showed up every day because of their commitment to the people of this country.

In addition to passing this appropriations package, Congress should take further action to provide financial security to Federal employees and contractors. We just heard our colleague TINA SMITH talking about the importance of providing the pay to those people who so far are not slated to get backpay. I have cosponsored legislation to secure backpay for the Federal contractor employees, including janitorial, food, and security service workers who were furloughed or forced to accept reduced work hours as a result of the shutdown. I hope we in Congress will take up and pass the bills Senator SMITH outlined as soon as possible.

I know you know this, Mr. President, because we have talked about it, but

Americans are tired of partisanship. They expect their elected officials to work together to come to a bipartisan compromise and to do what is good for the country, and I couldn't agree more.

The Senate will soon consider an appropriations package to supply Federal investments for programs that support national defense, small businesses, conservation of public lands, food assistance for low-income families, and so much more. This package also includes compromised proposals to improve our border security.

I hope that we will pass this package this afternoon and that the President will sign this legislation into law as soon as it passes the House.

Federal workers are dedicated to serving the American people, and they have families to care for. They should never again be used as pawns. We should never again use shutting down the Federal Government as an excuse over disagreements over policy issues. It is time for our elected leaders to move away from the partisan politics and to live up to the expectations of our constituents. Let's fund the government, and let's do it today.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, William Barr is unquestionably qualified to serve as Attorney General, a position to which he was confirmed unanimously in 1991, in President George H.W. Bush's administration. Mr. Barr's record of public service and long career in the law are exemplary. I have carefully reviewed his record, listened to his testimony before the Judiciary Committee, and questioned him for an hour in my office. Given the significant issues before the Department of Justice and the fact that it is currently led by an unconfirmed, Acting Attorney General, I will vote to confirm Mr. Barr.

It is imperative that the Senate confirm an Attorney General who is committed to allowing the Special Counsel to complete his investigation unimpeded. Mr. Barr gave this commitment under oath to the Judiciary Committee and again to me in our private meeting. He testified clearly that he will not permit any interference in Special Counsel Mueller's investigation into Russian attempts to influence the 2016 election. In fact, Mr. Barr told the committee that he believes "the overarching public interest is to allow [Special Counsel Mueller] to finish." He also said he would resign if he were ordered by the President to fire the Special Counsel without good cause. Mr. Barr testified, "The country needs a credible resolution to these issues, and if confirmed, I will not permit partisan politics, personal interests, or any other improper consideration to interfere with this or any other investigation. I will follow the Special Counsel regulations scrupulously and in good faith, and on my watch, Bob [Mueller] will be allowed to finish his work."

Not only must the Special Counsel be allowed to finish his work, but also his conclusions must be as open and transparent to the public as possible. The

Special Counsel regulations, put in place during the Clinton administration, have guided administrations from both parties for two decades. Those regulations instruct the Special Counsel to submit a confidential report to the Attorney General, and Mr. Barr testified that he will be as transparent as possible about the report, consistent with the law. He told me he will always err on the side of disclosure and believes transparency is critical to the public's confidence in the investigation. When asked whether he would allow the President or his attorneys to edit any report, Mr. Barr told the committee, "That will not happen."

Mr. Barr and I also discussed the memo he wrote in 2018 about obstruction of justice and his views on executive power. I asked him whether suborning perjury would be obstruction. He said yes. I asked him what he would do if the President asked him to stop an otherwise lawful investigation. He said he would resign. We discussed the political checks that exist to limit Executive power, and he described the Special Counsel as a "super charged political check."

Some have suggested, however, that Mr. Barr's memo means he believes the President cannot obstruct justice at all. In a letter to Chairman Graham, Mr. Barr responded: "Quite the contrary, [the memo] expressed my belief that a President, just like anyone else, can obstruct justice if he or she engages in wrongful actions that impair the availability of evidence. Nor did the memorandum claim, as some have incorrectly suggested, that a President can never obstruct justice whenever he or she is exercising a constitutional function. If a President, acting with the requisite intent, engages in the kind of evidence impairment the statute prohibits—regardless whether it involves the exercise of his or her constitutional powers or not—then a President commits obstruction of justice under the statute. It is as simple as that."

Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein has said publicly that Mr. Barr's memo had no impact on the investigation. Mr. Rosenstein also noted, "Lots of people offer opinions to the Department of Justice, but they don't influence our own decision making."

Mr. Barr's views on executive power, while legitimate, differ from my own and do concern me as a member of the legislative branch. His opinions highlight the tension that sometimes emerges among the branches of government and which is rooted in the separation of powers. On any given matter, I would likely argue for a more limited approach to Executive power. Regardless of his philosophy, Mr. Barr has noted correctly that the President is not above the law.

Mr. Barr brings considerable experience to bear on important legal policy matters at the DOJ. He testified that he supports efforts to protect the civil rights of LGBT individuals and that he

is against discrimination against anyone on account of their gender identity or sexual orientation. He further stated that he is willing to support "red flag laws" as a step toward preventing gun violence.

Mr. Barr offered his commitment to implementing the newly enacted FIRST STEP Act, a bill I supported and that he described as one that "recognizes the progress we have made over the past three decades in fighting violent crime." Mr. Barr is also committed to combating scams and fraudulent schemes that target seniors, which, as chairman of the Senate Aging Committee, I have investigated and urged the Department to prioritize.

Finally, Mr. Barr has served our country previously with distinction. One hundred and twenty former officials and employees from various administrations have praised Mr. Barr's "character of unwavering commitment to the rule of law without regard to favor or politics." His nomination is supported by many leaders from the law enforcement community, including the Fraternal Order of Police and the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association. In his testimony before the Judiciary Committee, Mr. Barr pledged to run the Department of Justice with professionalism and integrity. He noted that the President did not seek any promises from him and that he made none to the President.

Mr. Barr has pledged his allegiance to the rule of law, the Constitution, and the American people. He has served our country honorably in the past, and I believe he will do so once again.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise to support William Barr's nomination to be Attorney General of the United States. After meeting with Mr. Barr, I am convinced he is a qualified candidate and is committed to upholding our constitutional liberties.

Mr. Barr's record of achievement and civil service to our country stretches back over 30 years. Early in his career, he served as an intelligence analyst at the CIA and an assistant attorney general in the Department of Justice Office of Legal Counsel. He was later appointed Deputy Attorney General in the George H.W. Bush administration before becoming our 77th United States Attorney General. Mr. Barr's suitability for the role of attorney general has been tested before; in fact, he has excelled in that capacity.

Concerns have been raised regarding Mr. Barr's position with respect to the Second Amendment. Wyoming is a State of gunowners, and I am a strong defender of our Second Amendment rights, so naturally I probed these concerns. I had the opportunity to personally meet with Mr. Barr and directly ask him about his stance on the Second Amendment. He gave me direct answers and made it clear that he does not support limiting our Second Amendment rights.

Ultimately, the Constitution solely grants Congress power of law-making. I

am prepared to work with my Senate colleagues to protect against any efforts that would undermine our constitutional rights, and I will continue to conduct congressional oversight on the executive branch, a duty I take very seriously.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I rise to vote against William Barr's nomination to serve as Attorney General. Although Mr. Barr has served as Attorney General in the past, I do not believe he is the right candidate to lead the Department of Justice at this time.

Americans are facing unprecedented times. The President fired former FBI Director James Comey to circumvent and frustrate a Federal investigation. Former Deputy Director of the FBI Andrew McCabe confirmed today that he opened an investigation into the President himself regarding his potential ties to Russia after Comey's firing. Special Counsel Robert Mueller is investigating President Trump and his campaign for collusion and Russian interference in the 2016 Presidential elections. Some of the President's close confidants have been indicted, pled guilty and are cooperating with the Special Counsel. Yesterday, a judge ruled that President Trump's former campaign manager, Paul Manafort, lied to Federal investigators about his interactions with Russians during the campaign.

During this tumultuous time, Americans need an Attorney General who values transparency, who is independent, and who can stand up to a President who has shown repeatedly that he believes that the Attorney General of the United States is his personal attorney and not the attorney of the American people. After closely following Barr's nomination hearing and analyzing his record, I do not believe he will stand up to the President and effectively lead the Department.

Before Barr was formally nominated to be Attorney General, he wrote and distributed a 19-page memo where he characterized the Mueller investigation as "fatally misconceived" with "potentially disastrous implications not just for the Presidency, but for the Executive branch as a whole and for the Department in particular." Barr wrote this memo well aware that his knowledge of the facts surrounding the Mueller probe is severely limited to public reporting.

Nevertheless, Barr concluded that Trump's publicly reported interactions with former FBI Director James Comey could not constitute obstruction of justice and sent the memo to Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein, Assistant Attorney General Steve Engel, the Solicitor General, White House Special Counsel, Jared Kushner's attorney, and Donald Trump's personal attorneys. He made certain that everyone in Trump's orbit knew his name and knew about this memo.

This behavior should alarm not only Senators but every American. Former



FBI Director Comey testified under oath that President Trump said to him, "I need loyalty, I expect loyalty." President Trump publicly railed against former Attorney General Sessions for following the guidance of Department of Justice ethics officials and recusing himself from anything pertaining to the Russia investigation. During his confirmation hearing, Barr would not commit to following the advice of career ethics officials at DOJ if they recommend that he recuse himself from the Russia investigation to avoid any appearance of conflicts of interest. Instead, he said that he would rely on his own judgment. Mr. Barr is essentially asking Senators to trust him and his judgment. Why should Senators trust his judgment when there are systems and processes in place that were created for this exact circumstance? Mr. Barr cannot call himself an institutionalist concerned with maintaining the rule of law while seemingly being unwilling to submit to the rule of law when it applies to him.

It is not surprising that the President would select as his next Attorney General someone who not only refuses to recuse himself from the investigation but also believes that elements of Mueller's probe are "fatally misconceived."

Finally, during his confirmation hearing, Barr was repeatedly pressed by Republicans and Democrats on whether or not he would agree to release the final Mueller report in its entirety. Barr would not commit to do so. I believe that the report should be made available not only to Members of Congress but to all Americans so that they can see the evidence for themselves and reach their own conclusions. If we want Americans to trust their judicial system, we must insist on transparency and honesty.

Beyond those issues, I am concerned about Mr. Barr's commitment to civil rights. During his confirmation hearing, he seemed ignorant about the disparate treatment between Whites and Blacks in our criminal justice system. When he served as Attorney General under President George W. Bush, he advocated for policies that have in turn led to mass incarceration of nonviolent offenders. In 2015, he publicly opposed the Sentencing Reform and Corrections Act, bipartisan legislation that would have reduced Federal mandatory minimums, and required the Bureau of Prisons to provide more rehabilitative programming to prisoners.

Last year, Congress passed the First Step Act with broad bipartisan support. The First Step Act included similar provisions to the Sentencing Reform and Corrections Act. The First Step Act will not be successful without direction from the Attorney General. I intend to use my position on the Appropriations Committee to hold Barr accountable and to make sure he is proactively implementing this law.

Americans deserve to have an Attorney General who is loyal to the office

and not to the President. I do not believe Mr. Barr is that Attorney General.

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

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

VOTE ON BARR NOMINATION

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR).

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

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 45, as follows:

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 24 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Alexander	Gardner	Perdue
Barraso	Graham	Portman
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hawley	Roberts
Boozman	Hoeven	Romney
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Capito	Inhofe	Rubio
Cassidy	Isakson	Sasse
Collins	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Jones	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Kennedy	Shelby
Cramer	Lankford	Sinema
Crapo	Lee	Sullivan
Cruz	Manchin	Thune
Daines	McConnell	Tillis
Enzi	McSally	Toomey
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Fischer	Murkowski	Young

NAYS—45

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

NOT VOTING—1

Burr

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for 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.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS OVERSIGHT

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, it is no secret that the 116th Congress got off to a rocky start as we tried to address the ongoing partial shutdown. Despite that, I remain optimistic that we can work together to get things done for the American people.

Those looking for an example of how to find common ground should look no further than the important work Congress has done, and continues to do, for our veterans. The hearing room of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee is traditionally one of the most bipartisan places in Washington. It is also one of the busiest.

Last Congress, under Chairman ISAKSON's leadership, we held 30 hearings, considered 56 pieces of legislation, and sent to the full Senate 17 of President Trump's nominees to serve our veterans.

That spirit of cooperation continued here on the floor. During the last session of Congress, the Senate passed 23 major pieces of veteran-related legislation. As a result, the President signed into law bills that significantly enhance healthcare, education, retirement, and other benefits for our veterans.

I want to talk briefly about two of the more notable measures—the VA MISSION Act and the Forever GI bill—to underscore why it is so important for Congress to operate in a collaborative manner. Bipartisan oversight of the Departments and Agencies that implement the laws we pass in that Chamber is critical to ensuring that the executive branch follows the intent of Congress. These two laws highlight just how important that is.

Let's start with the VA MISSION Act. This law was passed to replace the Veterans Choice Act, which was created in response to the VA Health Administration scandal of 2014. This was a good first step. The Choice Program addressed many shortcomings within the VA system. However, my colleagues and I quickly learned it had its own share of troubles. Specifically, we heard repeated stories of difficulties navigating the complex and confusing bureaucratic process. Despite the new reforms, many veterans were still facing unacceptably long wait times at VA medical centers.

Through our oversight of the Choice Program, we recognized that more needed to be done to strengthen and streamline VA healthcare services and its community care programs. That was the genesis of the VA MISSION Act. One of the key reforms in the VA MISSION Act is that it enables veterans to seek quality healthcare services in their own communities, whether inside the VA system or from a private sector provider.

Specifically, the law requires the Department to establish access and quality standards that will be used as the framework for the VA and the veteran to decide when to get care in a VA facility and when to get care in the community. If the VA is unable to meet certain designated access standards, veterans will be given the option to receive care in the community. Last week, the VA announced the proposed new access standards to determine a veteran's eligibility for the community care that will take effect this June.

I am pleased that the VA maintained the spirit of the law in its proposed access standards. We understood that by providing additional access to community healthcare resources, there would be an added cost. As chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee that has jurisdiction over the VA, the entire committee will be closely working with the Department and my colleagues. Together, we will have the responsibility of making sure that the allocation of resources to support veterans' healthcare is spent wisely.

Oversight is also crucial to uncover negligence on the part of the Agencies charged with implementing the law. This is exactly what happened when the VA failed to fully comply with the housing stipend rates set by the Forever GI bill.

Passage of the initial GI bill after World War II was seen as a turning point in the way our Nation treated those who have served. The program is designed to give service men and women the building blocks they needed to succeed after leaving the military. The problem is, those building blocks have changed in the 70-plus years since the GI bill was first instituted. Since then, Congress modernized the GI bill when it passed the post 9/11 GI bill. After 17 years of war, it was once again time for an update.

The Harry W. Colmery Veterans Educational Assistance Act—also known as the Forever GI bill—brings educational benefits to veterans so that they can receive them in this modern era. It became apparent, however, that the VA was implementing key provisions of the law incorrectly. When Secretary Wilkie testified before the VA Committee last September, I pressed him about the Department's failure to fully award the housing allowances for more than 340,000 Forever GI bill beneficiaries.

According to the statute, the VA should have used the Department of Defense's 2018 basic allowance for hous-

ing rates. This should have been calculated based on the ZIP Code where the student takes the majority of classes, rather than on the ZIP Code in which the school's main campus is located. Instead, some GI bill recipients were receiving housing stipends at the 2017 rate and based on the school's ZIP Code. This was clearly unacceptable.

Once it was evident that the VA was not following the statute, Congress had an obligation to act. That is why Senator SCHATZ and I introduced the Forever GI Bill Housing Payment Fulfillment Act to demand an immediate fix from the VA. That bill became law within a matter of weeks from its introduction.

With this law, what we are asking of the VA is really threefold. The first is to make every unpaid or underpaid veteran whole. The second is to be accountable for the errors that have happened and prevent them from recurring in the future. The third is to fix the problems to prevent them from recurring so that we will not go through this problem again. It is promising to see that the VA has begun to carry out some of the requirements that have been dictated in the Forever GI Bill Housing Payment Fulfillment Act.

The VA recently announced the members of the tiger team that the VA is required to assemble per the statute. For those who are unfamiliar with the term, a tiger team is a team of specialists tasked to achieve a specific goal. In this case, it is comprised of six senior benefits and IT officials at the VA who will be tasked with providing Congress a detailed plan to correct this egregious error. Hopefully, the move to quickly establish this team is reflective of the seriousness with which the Department takes this mandate. It is frustrating that it has taken another act of Congress to get to this point, but all of us are committed to ensuring that the VA follows the law as written.

In a spirit of cooperation, the leadership of the congressional committees who oversee the Department recently sent a letter to Secretary Wilkie to request that the VA work collaboratively with Congress throughout the implementation process. This message was echoed during a recent subcommittee hearing I chaired about the VA's implementation of a modern, commercial, electronic health record. It is important to ensure that the VA is able to share information with the Department of Defense and community healthcare providers while it undertakes the largest health record modernization project in the Nation's history. With all of the reforms getting underway simultaneously, it is vital for the VA to share information openly, even predecisional information, so that we can work together and have a common understanding of the impact of changes, including costs, and can assess the challenges that may arise.

The laws we pass in this Chamber are a key part of our legacy, but our oversight responsibilities are of equal im-

portance. The bipartisan manner in which the Veterans' Affairs Committee works to uphold that oversight responsibility sets an excellent example for the rest of Washington to follow.

We appreciate the hard work of Secretary Wilkie and that of his team and all of those in the VA system who work so very hard on behalf of our Nation's veterans. In working together, we can ensure that veterans receive the benefits they deserve and were promised.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

#### VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, from time to time, I come to the floor of the Senate to share with my colleagues stories of the victims of gun violence. I had hoped the statistics that consistently show this country has a gun violence rate that is 10 to 20 times higher than those of other similar high-income nations—data that shows this continuing epidemic of mass slaughter during which we average a mass shooting almost every day—would have compelled my colleagues to action. It hasn't. So I have tried to come down to the floor as often as I can to explain who these people are and to explain the genius that has been lost from this world when lives are cut so short by gun violence—gun violence that is largely preventable in this country.

I come to the floor with an unusually heavy heart because I want to talk about some of the lives that were lost a year ago today at the shooting in Parkland, FL, at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School. It was a year ago that I was actually walking to the floor to give a speech on immigration when I learned of another mass shooting. It hits hard for those of us who represent Connecticut because we are still working through the ripples of grief that never ever disappear in a community that has been shattered by an episode of catastrophic gun violence—in our case, in Sandy Hook, CT.

In February of last year, 17 students and teachers were gunned down in their classrooms at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School. One of them was Peter Wang.

Peter was 15 years old. He was a U.S. Army Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps cadet. He was getting ready to celebrate the Chinese New Year with his family. His two younger siblings and many other friends called him a natural leader.

When the shooter entered the high school, Peter had a choice to make: He could run and protect himself or he could try to help his fellow students in need. He chose the latter. He chose to hold a door open to help his classmates escape. He saved other people's lives while he lost his own.

Classmate Jared Burns said: "For as long as we remember him, he is a hero."

“He yanked open a door that allowed dozens of classmates, teachers and staffers to escape,” officials said.

His middle school basketball coach said that he was just a “joyful person.” His sacrifice, according to his coach, “just made perfect sense” because he was that selfless.

Peter was posthumously accepted to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point for his heroic actions on that day.

Alex Schachter was a freshman who played the trombone and baritone in the marching band, and he loved to play basketball. He loved music so much that in middle school, he took two band classes so that he could get ready to join the marching band in high school, which was his dream. His Eagle Regiment Marching Band actually won the State championship in Tampa.

His dad said that he was just a sweet-heart of a kid. He said that he just wanted to do well to make his parents’ happy.

His dream was to attend the University of Connecticut. He told everybody. He was only a freshman, but he knew where he was going to college. He wanted to go to my State, to Connecticut. He wore a UConn sweatshirt almost every single day to school. His favorite song was an old one by Chicago, “25 or 6 to 4,” which is kind of an odd choice for a 14-year-old. Yet UConn’s band actually chose to play that song at halftime at one of UConn’s football games, and UConn admitted Alex posthumously because his dream was to be a UConn Husky.

Helena Ramsay was full of laughter and had this infectious smile. She was 17 when she was shot that day. She loved all kinds of music, although she was mostly into K-pop. She had all sorts of other interests too. She was interested in human rights and the environment. She joined the school’s United Nations Club and the Christian faith-based First Priority Group. She was always looking out for her friends.

One of her friends said: “When I was stressed out from my chemistry lab that I thought I was going to fail, she calmed me down and told me that it was going to be OK.”

One of her best friends said that she was “one of the kindest people I’ve ever met.”

When the gunman walked into her classroom, she turned to her friend to make sure that her friend was safe and told her to shield herself with books. People described it as a “moment of bravery in the face of horror.”

Another hero that day was Aaron Feis. He was an assistant football coach, and he was a security guard. He threw himself in front of his kids. That is how he died that day.

The football program’s spokesperson said:

[Aaron] died the same way he lived—he put himself second. . . . He was a very kind soul, a very nice man. He died a hero.

One of his football players who had been going through leukemia treat-

ments remembered that Aaron had guided him through those treatments.

He would send me prayers. He would send me Bible scripts and just stuff to cheer up my day.

Aaron died while protecting the kids at that school.

These 4 stories are amongst those of the 17 people who died at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School. Yet 93 people die every day from gun violence. Most of those are suicides. A bunch of them are homicides. Others are accidental shootings, but they are all preventable.

As we remember today the mass shooting at Parkland, it is important that even on those days on which nobody puts up on cable news a mass shooting, there are still somewhere around 90 people who die every day, and I will tell you about one of them.

Corey Dodd was 25 years old when he died last month in Baltimore, MD. That morning, he told Marissa, his wife, to stay home and rest with their 3-year-old and their 3-week-old while he took the 5-year-old twins to school. After he dropped the twins off at school and pulled up outside their home, he was shot to death. The 3-year-old was inside. Marissa had to tell her kids that Daddy wasn’t coming home.

She said:

I’ve told the kids that Daddy is done. He’s not coming back.

Their family was planning to move because Corey was looking for work, and they were going to move to wherever he found work. He had recently finished a program to earn his commercial driver’s license. Things were looking up for Corey and Marissa and their four kids.

I didn’t know Corey, but I know something about his death because I happened to be in Baltimore on that day. I happened to be at Corey’s kids’ school at the moment he was shot. I was inside that school when an announcement came over the loud speaker that there was a code green. I didn’t know what a code green meant. A few minutes later, I found out that it is what happens inside schools in Baltimore when there is a shooting in the neighborhood. They locked down the school and our classroom and pulled down the shades, and we turned off the lights. A few minutes later, the police notified us that the scene was clear, that the school was safe, and that the day could go on. Yet, unbeknownst to me, just down the hall from me inside that school were two twins whose father had been shot blocks away from that school. Their lives will never be the same.

Part of the reason we care so much about this epidemic is that it is not just the victims; it is also about the people who are left behind. Imagine going to an elementary school in which you fear for your life when you walk to and from school and where parents of your friends are shot at 10:30 in the morning. It changes their brains, the trauma these kids go through in a

school like that. It makes their little, tiny, developing brains unable to learn. There is a biological process that actually happens to these kids. That trauma is what Parkland has been going through for the last year, and that trauma is what kids in Baltimore, New Haven, Hartford, Chicago, and New Orleans go through every single day. We are ruining millions of children all across this country because of an epidemic that we could choose to solve, that we could choose to do something about.

This week, the House of Representatives had a hearing and a meeting to move forward with a universal background checks bill that is supported by 97 percent of Americans. It will pass the House of Representatives, with Republican and Democratic support, with flying colors. Do you know what that tells us? It tells us that the most important thing we could do to save lives, to cut down on the 93 people who are killed every day, is to pass that universal background checks bill. In States that have universal background checks, there is about 30 percent less gun crime and fewer gun homicides than in States that don’t have those universal background checks.

As we remember 1 year since the massacre at Parkland and as we strive to understand that this is an epidemic that takes 90 people every day, know that it is within our power to do something about it. We can’t eliminate every single gun death. We can’t stop every suicide or every homicide, but with commonsense legislation that is supported by 97 percent of Americans, we can make a big difference, and we can send a signal to would-be shooters who are contemplating violence that they should not interpret our silence as a quiet endorsement. It is up to us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

#### REMEMBERING WALTER JONES

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I come to the floor with a heavy heart today. A colleague in the House passed away, and right at this very moment, down in Greenville, NC, we have a number of Congressmen and friends and family members congregated to celebrate the life and mourn the death of Congressman Jones.

Congressman Jones served in Congress for over 24 years. His dad served before that. Between the two of them, the Jones family has represented the eastern portion of North Carolina for 50 out of the last 53 years.

Now, Congressman Jones was somebody who was a bit of a maverick and a bit of an independent spirit on the House side, and we didn’t agree on certain measures. But I never doubted his sincerity and his heart and his commitment to North Carolina and to this great Nation.

He is survived by his wife Joe Anne of over 50 years. In fact, they were married in 1966.

He has a number of people in the statehouse who served with him, in a chamber where I was speaker of the house. They are mourning his death today. I couldn't be there in person because we have to be here for the votes that we are taking up this afternoon, but I wanted the Jones family to know, and all the people in Eastern North Carolina, how much I cared for and loved Walter Jones.

#### GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, one of the reasons why I continue to be here in Washington rather than visiting with family and friends of Congressman Jones is that we have a very important vote that we expect the Senate to take up here sometime this afternoon.

It is a vote that is borne out of compromise. To quote Winston Churchill—I think it was—it is the worst possible option except for all the other options considered up to this point.

It is not perfect, but it is important that we get the votes and that we encourage the President to sign this bill into law.

Now, I walked through the hallway this morning, and I had the press come up to me. Some in the press probably want to report honestly, but others want to create a narrative.

So the latest narrative is this: Senator, how do you feel about a bill that just got published last night—1,200 pages—and you are going to be asked to vote on it today?

I told them, specifically, because I have been following this measure since the last Congress. I said: Are you referring to the almost-1,200-page bill, of which all but 41 pages were matters that were taken up in the Appropriations Committee, voted out of committee unanimously in all but one case and with 26 votes in the other case? Are you referring to that bill?

If the Senators are doing their job and the Congressmen are doing their job, they read that months ago when they were passed out of the Appropriations Committee. Most of this is not new information. About 41 pages of it relates to the compromise that ultimately—because we couldn't get a compromise back in December—resulted in the government shutdown.

It absolutely funds some of the President's priorities for border security. There are people that get caught up on either end of the spectrum. It reminds me of how my kids used to fight in the back of the minivan when we used to take them on vacations. It is a childish argument: It is a wall.

No, it is not.

It is a wall.

No, it is not.

Look, it is steps taken forward in a positive way for border security. It is a structure that makes sense. It is technology. It is personnel. It is what we need to ultimately secure the border.

Some people can call it a wall because you could argue that in total it

is. Other people could say it is not a wall. I don't care as long as you ultimately recognize that voting for this measure and sending the signal to the President that we have his back, that we understand his priorities, and that we will continue to work on other measures on a bipartisan basis makes sense.

So I intend to support it today. It is not a vote that I am going to enjoy, but sometimes we have to do things here to make progress, to compromise, and to move on. We owe it to the American people to keep the government open. We owe it to border security to listen to their recommendations to fund people, technology, and infrastructure. This is a step in the right direction.

#### VALENTINE'S DAY

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, it was a year ago today that I was presiding and something occurred to me. One is that in the 12 years that I have been in public service, I have virtually spent none of those Valentine's Days at home. Last year, I was thinking about how I messed up. I didn't even order flowers or do the things that I would normally do, although, I usually get flowers on Valentine's Day.

But then I started contemplating the Senate rules, and I know that there are a number of, well, things you just can't do on the floor.

I determined, for example, that you can't do an ad hoc prop and say something because it would be a violation of the rules. So although I thought about putting this heart up and presenting this and saying, "I love my wife Susan Tillis of 32 years," I am not going to do that because I think it would be a violation of the rules.

But in the event that someday we do change the rules and we are able to come to the floor and express our love for our spouses and people who sacrifice as much as we do, I hope someday to be able to give that speech on the Senate floor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

#### BORDER SECURITY

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about an experience I had this weekend that was extremely memorable to me.

I used to live in Texas. I used to be involved in businesses in the Valley, as they call it there—from Brownsville to Weslaco, to Edinburg, to McCowan. This past weekend, a good colleague of mine, Senator STEVE DAINES from Montana, and I traveled to the southern border to visit the Customs and Border Patrol people, to visit with ICE people, and to see firsthand what goes on in a typical night. We were there overnight on Sunday night. We had a remarkable evening, and we saw firsthand what these people are up against.

Before I make my comments, I want to say that from Deputy Chief Ortiz all the way down in the organization in that sector—the McCowan sector that we were in—the best of America is in uniform right now, every day and night, protecting our rights and privileges here in the United States. I was proud to meet these people and to be a part of this trip.

What we saw this weekend is disturbing on many levels. We spoke directly to Border Patrol agents. We went to the retention center. We saw firsthand that we have not just illegal immigration there, but we have a national security crisis. We saw it firsthand.

This is a situation that the border agents face every day, and it is a grim situation. It is shameful that we here in Congress have not given Border Patrol agents adequate resources to do their jobs.

First, the real tragedy at the border is the dramatic increase in illegal drug trafficking. Even though the conversation in this room deals mainly with illegal immigration across that border, in this sector, the drug traffic increases are remarkable.

This year alone, fiscal year 2018—this is from October 1 to today—we had a 22-percent increase of heroin seized at the southern border, a 38-percent increase of methamphetamine and a 73-percent increase in fentanyl.

The amount of fentanyl seized by ICE so far this year is enough to kill every American citizen by overdose. Let me say that again. The tonnage of fentanyl seized is up 73 percent this year across the entire southern border, and that is not 100 percent of what is crossing that border. That is a 73-percent increase over the last year. The tonnage that has been seized this year is enough to kill every American citizen by overdose.

What is so remarkable is the estimate that only 7 to 10 percent of the drugs that they are attempting to bring across the border are actually interdicted—less than 10 percent. That is consistent with what our SOUTHCOM combatant commander tells us repeatedly year after year. By the end of fiscal year 2019, CPB—Customs and Border Patrol—will have seized 1.7 million pounds of narcotics at the border.

The Border Patrol agents we spoke to estimate that they are only able to stop, again, about 10 percent, and that is because they don't have the resources.

The movement of drugs from Mexico to the United States at the southern border is the greatest drug threat to our country. These drugs pouring across the border are destroying communities across the Nation. Congress has to act to give these Border Patrol agents and our ICE agents the infrastructure they need to address this dramatic spike in illegal drug trafficking.

I know that the illegal immigration topic is a hot topic. I don't disagree

with that, but we are not talking about this at the level that we should.

We have had historic opioid legislation. I was a supporter of that. Now we need to move on and make sure we secure the southern border.

The second point I want to make is that agents on the ground told us how Mexican drug cartels just across the border use migrants—illegal immigrants coming up out of Central America—to camouflage what they are doing and to distract our border agents from the real war that is going on, and that is the intrusion of illegal drugs into the country.

The cartels charge a toll for every individual who comes through their area of control. It is amazing right now. The charge is \$8,000 per person. There are some estimates that this toll business on illegal immigrants coming across the southern border is somewhere around \$2.1 billion in revenue for the cartels. These are the illegal cartels just south of the Rio Grande Valley in Texas. This doesn't account for the billions of dollars these cartels earn from the drug trade every year, which is a primary business.

There are some estimates that the \$2 billion they get in tolls for illegal immigrants coming into the United States is overshadowed by tenfold, relative to the drug trade. Some estimates are \$25 to \$30 billion of first cost value in revenue from the drugs that are coming across that border.

Many of the illegal immigrants being exploited by these cartels are unaccompanied children and family units. We met some of these people. It breaks your heart. The number of these to claim asylum has surged at our southern border since 2014. This massive surge is due to loopholes in our asylum and immigration laws.

These laws allow unaccompanied minors and family units to easily assert broad asylum claims. Again, the number of family units, individuals with children, and unaccompanied children has skyrocketed over the last 5 years.

Due to certain provisions in the law and court rulings currently enforced, these children and individuals are released into the United States while they are theoretically waiting for their formal removal proceedings to begin months or years down the road.

These loopholes, combined with programs like DACA, have led to a staggering increase in the number of unaccompanied children and family units at the border.

In fiscal year 2019 to date, there is a 280-percent increase in the number of family units apprehended at the border compared to the same point in fiscal year 2018. From just 1 year ago, there is a 280-percent increase.

The monthly apprehension numbers we are currently seeing even surpass those during the Obama administration. I think this chart shows it best. We see what happened over here, in blue, under the last administration. This is a dramatic increase in the num-

ber of illegal apprehensions at the southern border, primarily driven by catch-and-release and the implementation of some of these loopholes we are talking about right now. That was a dramatic increase—more than a 2½ times increase—250 percent in just 8 years.

The word got out that the new President, who was elected in November—right here—said: Well, we are going to enforce the law. They began to do that, and we saw a dramatic decrease in illegal immigrants coming across the border—a dramatic decrease.

Then there was a court case that said: Well, you can't really do that. That court case is being appealed, and what we have seen since then is that the cartels are back in business. This is one measure of the drug trade that we don't talk about. These are the poor souls who are coming across our border illegally right now.

By the way, we are at a point now that is higher than at the peak during the Obama administration. People say: Well, you know, we don't have a crisis here. It is not a problem. Well, the numbers are down.

I don't know what numbers they are looking at, but these are the numbers. These are facts. I believe right now we have a full-blown crisis at the southern border.

I am not trying to define how we use money to put up a border wall or anything. That is not what I am trying to do in this speech. What I am trying to do is point out that we have a full-blown crisis of illegal immigrants and illegal drugs crossing the southern border. I saw it firsthand on patrol with our border agents over the weekend. I am contrasting that with years ago, when I used to go across that same border, when this was not a crisis.

The last four Presidents have built 654 miles of barriers. We saw some of it in this sector. They have built 654 miles of barriers. Now we have 2,000 miles of total southern border. The four Presidents—from George H. W. Bush all the way to President Obama—have built border barriers because they all agreed that this is a crisis. It was intended to stop or slow down drug trafficking and the illegal incursion of illegal immigrants.

President Obama built 135 miles. President Trump has 124 miles under construction right now. What we have been talking about here in the last few weeks is just 55 miles; we heard today it is an additional 55 miles.

The question is, Do these barriers work? Well, we have three areas where, over the last 30 years, border barriers have been built—San Diego, Tucson, El Paso—and we have actual numbers to show that the illegal crossing of drugs and illegal immigrants in those sectors where those barriers were put up dropped 95 percent. But what they have done is, they have pushed this traffic to areas that don't have those barriers. One of those was the McCowan district, which we visited this weekend.

There are 250 miles of border across 19 counties. It is a crisis down there. Right now, what we have there is 55 miles of barrier with 35 gaps in it. They have 55 miles that were built in 2006 in this sector. It is totally ineffective. The quickest thing we could do in that sector is close the 35 gaps. There were supposed to be gates, but there are no gates there. There is some litigation regarding that, but we need to fix that and make that barrier effective.

The U.S. Capitol Police—who do such an outstanding job protecting Members of Congress, our staffs, the Capitol building, and several blocks around every day—employs about 2,000 officers. The Metropolitan Police Department here in Washington has over 4,000 employees to help protect an area of 68 square miles.

Let's put that in perspective. There are 55 miles of barrier with 35 miles of gaps in it, and only 3,000 agents in that entire sector. I think you can see where the problem might be.

We have to give these men and women the tools they need to be successful and to protect our country. The longer we wait to take action, the more money cartels will make off drug trafficking, the more people will die, the more families will be destroyed, and the longer our communities will be in danger.

Some estimates show that my home State of Georgia has over 70,000 gang members in it—70,000. It is a destination for these people.

There were Hondurans who were apprehended that night while we were on patrol. We asked them where they were going. One said New York; one said Miami; and one said Woodstock, GA.

As we continue to debate this issue, I want to say clearly and unequivocally that Congress has to do better. We all must do better. For the men and women who put their lives on the line every day to protect our Nation's border, we must do better for our country.

We can start by passing disaster funding for the people in Georgia and other States who are hurting from historic hurricanes and fires. It is outrageous that the funding package being considered here today does nothing to help these farmers and victims of these wildfires out west and of the hurricanes in the southeast.

When President Trump came to Georgia to tour the damage after the hurricane, he said:

Farmers really got hurt, especially in Georgia, but we're going to get it taken care of.

Vice President PENCE said:

We will rebuild these crops and these communities. We will restore southwest Georgia. We will restore the Sunbelt region bigger and better than ever before.

We have a moment right now in time where Congress needs to act. Today we have to get this funding done and move forward. We have to get this disaster relief, I think, moved forward in a supplemental, if that is what we are going to do, but this has to happen immediately. Disaster relief should be considered right now—no more excuses.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

#### GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today I want my colleagues to listen to some ideas that I have about tariffs, generally, and where we are on tariffs and where we might be on tariffs in a couple of weeks, depending on what the Secretary of Commerce says, because in a few days, that Secretary is expected to provide the President a report.

This report will detail his Department's findings in the investigation of whether imports of automobiles and auto parts pose a national threat to the United States. Common sense tells me it doesn't. Let me repeat that because I think it is important for us to understand whether the cars that everyday Americans rely on to get to work, to drive their children to schools, to visit their families—whether or not the importation of those automobiles threatens national security.

Now, having said that, you might think that I disagree with the President—and I don't—that we must have fair and enforceable trade agreements that benefit Americans. Sometimes we have to make hard decisions in order to get and have fair and enforceable agreements. I do not agree that we should alienate our allies or jeopardize the health of our economy to achieve the good outcomes of fair and enforceable agreements.

The Tax Foundation has found that a 25-percent tariff on auto imports would amount to roughly a \$73.1 billion tax increase. According to the Center for Automotive Research, a 25-percent tariff on auto imports would also result in the loss of 700,000 jobs and raise the price of an average car by nearly \$7,000.

Dealers would see a decline in annual sales by as many as 2 million vehicles. Consumers would face up to a 10-percent increase in the cost of repairs and replacement parts. In short, raising tariffs on cars and parts would be a huge tax on consumers who buy or service their cars, whether those cars are imported or domestically produced. Make no mistake, Americans will be paying those taxes.

Tariffs are a tax paid at the time of import. Historically, they have been a protectionist tool intended to prop up domestically produced goods by making foreign goods more expensive. Tariffs are not a long-term solution, and nobody wins with the producing of tariffs.

While they may provide short-term protection for domestic industries, they do so at the expense of ordinary consumers and industries increasingly dependent on a complex global supply chain. On the whole, I think this all adds up to damaging the economy. For an administration, including this Senator and most Republicans on this side

of the aisle, who have been crowing about the benefits of the tax bill of late 2017 and the jobs it has created and the good it has done for workers, why would you want to put on a \$73 billion tax increase through tariffs that would undo a lot of good that we say and the President says the tax bill has done. Let me repeat it again. On a whole, this is going to be damaging to the economy.

A 2018 study by the International Monetary Fund reviewed tariff changes across 151 countries between the decades of the 1960s to 2014. The International Monetary Fund found that tariff increases led to less output and less productivity, and, then, you know what happens. There is more unemployment, and when you have more unemployment, you get greater inequality.

The recent U.S. tariff increases have invited tariff retaliation from our trading partners. I know because Iowans are bearing the brunt of this retaliation. Imposing tariffs on auto parts will inevitably invite more retaliation, and we simply can't afford more of that.

The United States must continue to lead the world on trade and economic issues, as we have for at least the period of time since World War II. We have benefitted from one of the most open markets in the world, and we must continue to lead the world by providing a good example. We have led to a better world since World War II, and the results have been these. Several decades ago, 50 percent of the world's population was in poverty. Today, it is less than 10 percent. Recently, in two or three references I have seen, the fact is that right now or next year, as for major middle class status in the various countries around the world and in different ways around the world, half of the world is middle class. President Trump is right to hold our trading partners accountable. So I don't find fault with him there.

We can't take benefits we have received from international trade for granted. International trade has been a tremendous benefit to farmers and businesses in my State of Iowa and across the country. We are better off because we can sell our products around the world.

Our farmers say they don't want aid from the Federal Treasury. They want markets. They want to trade. You develop those markets and you keep those markets. Tariffs and retaliation send a signal to other countries that you might not be a reliable supplier, and they go elsewhere to create relationships that they can depend on. America ought to be able to be depended upon any place in the world from the standpoint of trade.

When you talk about America and Iowa exporting products, these are some of the best products in the world. In this vein, then, I hope the President will heed my call to forego the auto tariffs and instead focus on opening up new markets.

The U.S. auto industry is a major driver of our economy, supporting nearly 10 million American jobs and accounting for 3 percent of the gross domestic product. Without question, any tariffs that are imposed will have a negative effect on the U.S. auto industry and our economy.

Our focus, instead, should be on strengthening our relationships with our allies, while targeting China's harmful trade practices and policies. Tariffs on autos and auto parts will not help us achieve these critical priorities.

#### TAX POLICY

Mr. GRASSLEY. On another subject, I would like to, as I did yesterday, remind my colleagues about some of the benefits of tax policy. This is speaking about tax policy that I thought would be adopted as part of the upcoming appropriation bill to make sure we don't shut down government.

For several months now, we have been working to extend a set of tax provisions that expired at the end of 2017. Around here we commonly refer to these as "tax extenders." We have also been working to enact bipartisan disaster tax relief to help families and businesses that continue to recover from the disasters that occurred across the country in 2018, and I thought that, too, would be in the bill we are going to vote on later today.

The best and most timely option to advance these provisions is with the government funding deal being worked on this week, but that isn't going to happen. There have been press reports stating that if the extenders aren't part of the funding bill, they are dead, and I reject that conclusion.

Regardless of what happens on the bill to keep the government open, I will continue to fight to get the extenders enacted and to work toward a longer term resolution. Since the House has failed to send us a government funding bill that includes the tax extenders and disaster tax relief provisions, look for me to introduce a bill addressing these tax matters here in the Senate, and I would ask my colleagues on the Finance Committee to join me in that effort.

When these provisions were extended early last year, the tax extenders had been expired for more than a year already. Now we are back in the very same place, with these tax incentives now expired for more than a year, again.

It seems to me that the right thing to do now is to extend these provisions for 2018 and 2019. Some people are saying you ought to do it longer. Why 2 years?

First, we need to provide clarity for taxpayers trying to file their 2018 returns, which are due in just over eight weeks. Even though the year has obviously ended, a repeated extension of many of these provisions has led individuals and businesses to assume that we will do so again.

FEBRUARY 5, 2019.

These business people relied on last year to make business decisions. In other words, people did what we wanted them to do when these provisions were created. We shouldn't retroactively punish them now for making those decisions that we wanted them to make.

Second, we should provide certainty for this year to give room to take a long-term view on all of the tax extenders. I want to stress that I want to find a long-term resolution of these provisions so that we can stop repeated extensions of temporary tax policy, but while we work on that, these extenders are intended to be incentives, and, to be successful, they need to be in effect when individuals and businesses are considering whether to make the investments required to take advantage of these particular tax extenders.

I want to go into more detail on what the tax extenders are. The numbers have changed over time, but there are now currently around 26 temporary tax provisions that expired at the end of 2017. At one time we were dealing with 50 to 55 such tax extenders, so we have reduced the number considerably. What we are dealing with now include provisions incentivizing alternative fuels, electric vehicles, and the construction of energy-efficient homes. These are provisions that incentivize the production of coal on Indian lands, provide an exclusion from income of the discharge of indebtedness on a principal residence, and provide a deduction for tuition and related expenses. Within these 26 provisions there is probably something that is very important to all 100 Senators, whether you are Republican or Democrat.

I want to focus on two of them in particular. The first is the railroad track maintenance credit, otherwise known as the short line credit. This provision provides short line railroads a credit equal to a percentage of the capital they invest to maintain and improve their tracks.

Short line railroads are small business railroads that are vital to keeping rural and small town America connected to the national economy. They are a particularly important part of our transportation system for getting agricultural and other products to market across the country and, hopefully, abroad.

For example, the Iowa Interstate Railroad, which operates between Council Bluffs and Chicago, connects Iowa companies such as the Elite Octane ethanol plant in Atlantic, IA, to the world market.

According to the American Short Line and Regional Rail Association, short line railroads operate more than 47,500 miles of track and make up 29 percent of the freight rail network of our Nation.

In a report prepared by PWC last year, it was noted that the short line industry directly provided more than 17,000 jobs in the United States in 2016 and supported more than 61,000 jobs

overall. This credit has been extended many times since it was first enacted on a temporary basis in 2004. Legislation introduced in the last Congress would have made the short line credit permanent, and the bill had 56 cosponsors in the Senate. The bill is led by Senators CRAPO and WYDEN and has already been reintroduced for this Congress.

Another tax extender that is very important, particularly for Iowa, is the biodiesel tax credit. Generally, this provision provides a tax credit of \$1 per gallon for biodiesel and renewable diesel. This credit helps provide for a more sustainable future by reducing our dependency on fossil fuels and promoting a renewable domestic resource.

Plans for promoting environmental efficiency have been in the news lately, and an extension of the biodiesel tax credit is needed to keep more people working at their jobs in this industry. For example, I have learned that Western Iowa Energy in Wall Lake, IA, has reduced runtime forecasts by 60 percent, consequently running at 40 percent capacity. They are also putting capital improvement projects on hold.

In Wall Lake, this reduction in runtimes means that there are 26 trucks per day that are not operating, and potential layoffs are on the horizon if the tax credit is not extended as soon as possible.

According to the National Biodiesel Board, the U.S. biodiesel industry supports more than 60,000 jobs and generates more than 11 billion in economic impact.

A group of renewable energy stakeholders wrote to congressional leaders last week. Their letter reads in part: "Allowing these tax incentives to lapse has created uncertainty for investors and the industry—"

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRAUN). Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRASSLEY. "jeopardizing the long-term investments necessary for the development of these biofuels."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD letters to Congress regarding tax extenders from biofuel and biodiesel businesses and associations across the United States.

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

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
*Speaker of the House,*  
Washington, DC.  
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,  
*Senate Majority Leader,*  
Washington, DC.  
Hon. RICHARD NEAL,  
*Chairman, House Committee on Ways & Means,*  
Washington, DC.  
Hon. CHARLES GRASSLEY,  
*Chairman, Senate Finance Committee,*  
Washington, DC.  
Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,  
*House Republican Leader,*  
Washington, DC.  
Hon. CHARLES SCHUMER,  
*Senate Democratic Leader,*  
Washington, DC.  
Hon. KEVIN BRADY,  
*Ranking Member, House Committee on Ways & Means,*  
Washington, DC.  
Hon. RON WYDEN,  
*Ranking Member, Senate Finance Committee,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI, REPUBLICAN LEADER MCCARTHY, MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL, DEMOCRATIC LEADER SCHUMER, CHAIRMAN NEAL, RANKING MEMBER MCCARTHY, CHAIRMAN GRASSLEY, AND RANKING MEMBER WYDEN: As you continue your negotiations on the final Continuing Resolution Fiscal Year 2019, the advanced and cellulosic biofuels industry urges you to extend a suite of critical advanced biofuels tax incentives—the Second Generation Biofuel Producer Tax Credit, the Special Depreciation Allowance for Second Generation Biofuel Plant Property, the Biodiesel and Renewable Diesel Fuels Credit, and the Alternative Fuel Vehicle Refueling Property.

These tax extenders expired at the end of 2017 after having been extended retroactively in the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018. Allowing these tax incentives to lapse has created uncertainty for investors and the industry about the availability of these credits; jeopardizing the long-term investments necessary for the development of these biofuels. Availability of these credits are critical as our companies make significant investments to create new agricultural supply chains, build infrastructure for liquid biofuels, and develop innovative new technologies. These credits have enabled our industry to create new jobs, contribute to rural prosperity, and diversify our nation's energy supply. However, the continued delays in extending these credits puts these investments and benefits at risk.

In the interest of job creation, infrastructure development, innovation, and energy security, we respectfully ask Congress to immediately pass a seamless multi-year extension, which includes 2018 retroactively, to ensure companies will be able to account for these credits in this year's tax filings.

We look forward to working with you to achieve this important goal.

Sincerely,

ADVANCED BIOFUELS  
BUSINESS COUNCIL,  
ALGAE BIOMASS  
ORGANIZATION,  
BIOTECHNOLOGY  
INNOVATION  
ORGANIZATION,  
GROWTH ENERGY,  
NATIONAL BIODIESEL  
BOARD,  
RENEWABLE FUELS  
ASSOCIATION.

FEBRUARY 5, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,  
*Republican Leader, House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

Hon. Richard Neal,  
*Chairman, House Committee on Ways and*  
*Means, Washington, DC.*

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,  
*Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,*  
*Washington, DC.*

Hon. CHUCK SCHUMER,  
*Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,*  
*Washington, DC.*

Hon. CHARLES GRASSLEY,  
*Chairman, Senate Committee on Finance,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR LEADER MCCONNELL, SPEAKER PELOSI, LEADER SCHUMER AND LEADER MCCARTHY, AND CHAIRMEN GRASSLEY AND NEAL: On behalf of the entire biodiesel supply chain—including biodiesel producers, feedstock providers, blenders, fuel marketers and consumers—we urge you to maintain and extend the biodiesel blenders' tax credit as soon as possible. In light of Congress's past practice of retroactively extending the tax credit after it lapses, our industry has been compelled since January 1, 2018 to operate on the assumption that the credit would be extended, effectively pricing the credit's value into our costs of doing business. It is essential that the businesses that have priced product artificially low are made whole. In addition, we urge Congress to extend the credit prospectively, thereby augmenting consumer benefits and encouraging additional investment in clean-burning biofuels.

The blenders' credit has worked successfully to build a robust biodiesel and renewable diesel industry in the United States. As a result, the U.S. biodiesel and renewable diesel market has grown from roughly 100 million gallons in 2005 to nearly 2.6 billion gallons in 2017. The tax credit is an important demand stimulus, which improves plant efficiencies, encourages investment in U.S. distribution infrastructure, and supports high-paying jobs throughout the country, all while incentivizing consumption of fuels that significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The biodiesel tax credit lowers the price that truck drivers pay for fuel, and lowers the price that heating oil customers pay to heat their homes.

Extending the biodiesel blenders credit will allow us to continue to provide these economic and environmental benefits.

Unfortunately, the uncertainty caused by the "on-again, off-again" tempo of legislative extensions, including the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 which retroactively extended the biodiesel tax incentives through the end of 2017, has somewhat frustrated our sector's ability to anticipate the availability of the incentives and make the necessary investments. This severely disrupts access to capital, as well as the ability to hire and expand.

Since the credit's inception, the market responded as Congress intended. The undersigned trade associations are united in urging Congress to act on a multiyear extension of this successful program and provide our industry long-term certainty as expeditiously as possible.

Sincerely,

Advanced Biofuels Association, American Farm Bureau Federation, American Trucking Associations, National Association of Convenience Stores, National Biodiesel Board, National Rerders Association, NATSO, Representing America's Travel Centers and Truckstops, New England Fuels Insti-

tute, Petroleum Marketers Association of America, Society of Independent Gasoline Marketers of America.

FEBRUARY 11, 2019.

Hon. CHARLES GRASSLEY,  
*Chairman, Committee on Finance,*  
*U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

Hon. RICHARD NEAL,  
*Chairman, Committee on Ways & Means, House*  
*of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

Hon. RON WYDEN,  
*Ranking Member, Committee on Finance,*  
*U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

Hon. KEVIN BRADY,  
*Ranking Member, Committee on Ways & Means,*  
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMEN GRASSLEY AND NEAL, AND RANKING MEMBERS WYDEN AND BRADY: The undersigned organizations represent users, retailers, customers, fleet managers, utilities, and producers of clean alternative transportation fuels.

We ask your support for including a reinstatement of the \$0.50/gallon alternative fuels tax credit (AFTC) (26 USC 6426(d) and 6427(e)) in a fiscal year 2019 government spending package. The AFTC is a credit of \$0.50 per gasoline gallon equivalent (GGE) of certain transportation fuels, including natural gas, liquefied petroleum gas, P Series Fuels, liquefied hydrogen and others. Extending the AFTC retroactively for 2018 and prospectively for 2019 will allow businesses and customers to continue to deploy cleaner alternative fuel technologies. A full five-year extension of the AFTC would provide business certainty along with a significant contribution to our nation's economic growth. Unfortunately, the credit has currently lapsed as of December 31, 2017 and many fleets, businesses, and manufacturers are unable to plan future investments as they manage current uncertainty. Immediately reinstating the AFTC for 2018 and 2019 is necessary to encouraging further deployment of new, clean transportation technology.

Extending the AFTC will bring significant environmental benefits, improved air quality, and enhance our energy independence by lowering our dependence on foreign oil. Renewal of the AFTC also promotes increased private-sector investment in infrastructure and equipment, which leads to more jobs and economic output.

Thank you for your continued support for the AFTC and for the use of cleaner-burning alternative transportation fuels. We appreciate your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

NGV America; National Propane Gas Association; American Public Gas Association; Hydrogen Fuel Cell and Energy Association; American Natural Gas; Clean Energy Fuels Corp.; Schwan's Company; Trillium; United Parcel Service; VIA Metropolitan Transit Authority; Waste Management; 1975; 1st Class Real Estate; 21st Century Coop; 3G CNG Corporation; 4th Generation Home Builders, LLC; A&B Propane; A-1 Propane & Services, Inc.; ACE Solid Waste.

Ace-Robbins, Inc.; Acme Propane Gas; Advanced Propane, Inc.; Advantage Propane; Aero Propane Gas, Inc.; Agility Fuel Solutions; AGL Welding Supply Co. Inc.; AgVantage FS; AgWest Commodities LLC; Air & Gas Technologies, Inc.; Airpark; Alabama Propane Gas Association; Alameda County Industries; Algas Inc.; Allaround Propane Inc.; Allgas Inc. of Montgomery; Allied Propane Service; Ameresco; American Biogas Council; American Fueling.

American Natural Gas; American Public Gas Association; AmeriGas; AmeriGas Propane; Amp Americas; Anderson BlueBird Bus Sales of NE; AnywhereEnergy L3C; Apadana Inc.; Apex Gas and Appliance Co.; Apex Trucking Inc.; Applebee Oil & Propane; Ap-

plied LNG; Aria Energy; Armory Advisors; Arrick's Bottle Gas INC; Arrick's Propane; ARRO Autogas; Arrow Disposal Service; Arrowhead LP Gas; Associated Development.

Athens Services; Atlantic City Jitney Association; Atlas Disposal; Atlas Disposal of Utah; Atlas Road Clean Fuels, LLC; ATZ, Inc. dba Doug Fox Parking; Automatic Gas Co.; Auxier Gas, Inc.; Aviation CNG; AVSG LP; Bair Propane LLC; Bakers Propane; Barrett Propane; BayRunner Shuttle; Beaudry Oil & Propane; Bergquist, Inc.; Berico Fuels; Black Hills Energy; Blackburn Propane Service, Inc.; Blackhawk Propane.

Blossman Gas and Alliance Autogas; Blossman Gas, Inc.; Blue Bird Bus Sales of Pittsburgh, Inc.; Blue Diamond Disposal, Inc.; Blue Energy Group; Blue Line Transfer, Inc.; Blue Springs School District; Blue Star Gas; Blue Star Gas SLC Co.; Bluhms Gas Sales; Boehlke Bottled Gas Corp.; Bolinger's Propane Service; Bosselman Energy; Boulden Brothers Propane; Boyertown Oil & Propane; Boye's Gas Service, Inc.; Brooks Gas Co., Inc.; Buatane & Propane Gas Co.; Budget Meter; Building Products Plus LLC.

Burke County BOE Transportation; Buster Brown Propane; Butane Propane News (BPN); C. Blackburn Inc.; C.A.T. Inc.; C3H8 Consulting LLC; Caglia Diversified Management; Caglia Environmental; Calif Renewable Power; Callahan's Gas Inc.; CalMet Services; CalPortland Company; Cans Unlimited (CUI); Cardinal Bus Sales & Service, Inc.; Carlson Home & Auto; Carolina Wholesale Gas Company Inc.; Carson Gas Company; Catalina Composites; Cavagna North America; Cedar Avenue Recycling & Transfer Station.

Cedarburg Police Department; Centennial SD; CenterPoint Energy; Central Butane Gas Co.; Central Energy Co LLC; Central Gas Service; Central Jersey Propane, Inc.; Central Montana Propane; Central Oklahoma Transportation and Parking Authority; Central States Bus Sales, Inc.; Certified Contracting; Champagne's Energy, Inc.; Cherry Energy; Chesapeake Utilities; Chilton Oil Company; Chilton Propane Gas Company; CHS Brandon; CHS Devils Lake; CHS Herman; CHS Inc.

CHS Rochester; Citizen; City of Albuquerque, NM; City of Beverly Hills; City of Columbia, MO; City of Commerce; City of Edmonds; City of Montebello City of Port Washington Police Department; City of Redmond, Washington; Clean Communities of CNY; Clean Energy Fuels Corp.; Clean Fuels Consulting; Clearwater Gas System, FL; Cleburne Propane, LLC; CNG Center; CNG Services of Arizona; CNG Source, Inc.; CNG-One, LLC; CoEnergy Propane.

Cokesbury Transportation; Colorado & New Mexico Propane Gas Associations; Comfurt Gas, Inc.; Community Transportation Association of America; Consolidated Gas; Consolidated Utilities Corp.; Consulting Solutions, LLC; Consumer Oil & Propane, Inc.; Contract Transport Services LLC; Coombs Gas, Inc.; Core-Mark; Core-Mark Carolina; Core-Mark International Tampa Division; Core-Mark International, Inc.

Cornerstone Environmental Group—A Tetra Tech Company; Corporate Green, LLC; Council Rock School District; Country Propane Inc.; Coyne Oil & Propane; CR&R Incorporated; CS Gas Inc.; Cultural Care Au Pair; Cummins Westport Inc.; Cycle World; Cylinder Exchange Service LLC; D and D Gas; D. Fox Consulting; D.F. Richard Energy; Davidson-Macri Sweeping, Inc.; D-B Cartage, Inc.; DCC Propane, LLC.

Dead River Company; Deftor Bros. Heating Cooling Energy; DeKalb County Fleet Management; Delco Foods; Delta Liquid Energy; Delta Liquid Energy/ARRO Autogas; DFI Transport LLC; Dick's Sanitation Service, Inc.; Dillon Logistics, Inc.; Dixie Gas & Oil



Corp.; Dixie Land Energy; Dominion Energy; Doonan Truck & Equipment of Wichita, Inc.; E. G. Smith Inc.; E.J. Harrison & Sons, Inc.; Early Dawn Refreshment Services, Inc.; Eastern Propane Inc; ECI; Eco Friendly LLC; Edco Disposal Corporation; EDGE Gathering Virtual Pipelines 2, LLC; EDL.

Edmonston & Associates; Edward Zengel and Son Express Inc.; Ehrhart Energy; EIV Capital, LLC; Electric Motor Shop, Inc.; Emerald Alternative Energy Solutions, Inc.; Eneidyne; Energy Distribution Partners; Energy Technology Training; Energy Vision; Energy's USA Inc.; EnergyUnited Propane, LLC; Enviro Express Inc; Estes Express Lines; Evergreen FS Inc.; EVO CNG; EVO Transportation and Energy; Services, Inc.

Expo Propane/Sal's Propane/Energy Distribution Partners; Express Mondor; Farmers Co-op Oil; Farmers Cooperative Assn; Farmers Union Oil; FCA Transport LLC.; Federal Signal.

Felker Truck and Equipment Inc.; Fend Oil & LP Co., Inc.; Filter Supply; First Alt. Fuel, Inc.; First Coop Association; Fisk Tank Carrier; Flinthills Environmental, LLC; Florida Propane Gas Association; Florida Public Utilities; Florida Transportation Systems, Inc.; Foothill Transit; France Propane Service, Inc.; Franger Gas Co, Inc.

Frank Lamparelli Oil Co., Inc.; Fred Garrison Oil Company; Freedom CNG; Freedom Fuel Equipment, LLC; Freeway Propane; Fresno Chamber of Commerce; Fuel Cell and Hydrogen Energy; Association; Gala Gas Co., Inc.; Garrow Propane; Gateway FS; G-Energy, LLC; Georgia Gas Distributors, Inc.; Gibson's Heating & Plumbing Inc.; Gladstein, Neandross & Associates; Gold Coast Transit District; Golden Empire Transit District; Granite Propane Inc; Great River CNG, LLC; Greens Propane Gas Co. Inc.; Greentree Consulting LLC.

Greenwood RRST, LLC; Growmark, Inc.; GS Hydraulic Hose Corp; G's Logistics, Inc.; Guard Construction and Contracting; Corporation; Guntown LP Gas Company; GW Ehrhart Inc; H&M Gas Co.; H&S Bakery Inc.; Hall Oil and Propane, Inc.; Hamilton Utilities; Harris Feeding Company; Heetco Inc.; Hempfield School District; Henry County Schools Transportation; Heritage Propane; Hexagon; High Plains Cooperative; Hisway Partners Inc. DBA.

Hometown Comfort; Hocon Gas, Inc.; Holland Bus Company; Homewood Disposal Service, Inc.; Honeyville Propane Inc.; Hoover Truck & Bus Centers; Houston Distributing Company; Hudson Fire Protection District; Hunt Propane, Inc.; ICOM North America; IGS CNG Services; Illini FS; Independence Fuel Systems, LLC; Independent Propane Co; InduMar Products, Inc.; Indy Propane LLC; Innovative Ag Service.

Iowa Propane Gas Association; J&J Compression, LLC; J. Rayl Transport, Inc.; J.S. West Propane; Jack's Butane Service; Jaycox Construction CNG; JaySan Gas Service, Inc.; JBI; JEB Lease Service Inc.; JG Energy Solutions; JM Reynolds Oil Co., Inc.; Johnson Oil; JR Leonard Construction Co; KALM Transport; Kamps Propane; Kansas City Area Transportation Authority; KB Johnson Oil & Gas Co.; Kentuckiana Cleanfuel, LLC.

Kentucky Propane Gas Association; KI BOIS Area Transit System; Kinetrex Energy; Klemm Tank Lines; Knight Waste Services Ltd; Kopy's Propane, Inc.; L H Dickens & Son Inc.; L&L Enterprises of Waupaca, Inc.; L.G. Jordan Oil Co., Inc.; LA Gas Autogas station; LaFerry's LP Gas Co. Inc.; Lamers Bus Lines, Inc.; Lampton Love Inc.; Landi Renzo USA; Landmark Services Cooperative; Leaf River Ag Service; Lee's Propane Service, Inc.; Lee's Summit RVII Schools; Level Lifestyle; Liberal CNG Coop; Liberty Propane.

Lincoln Liquefied Gas Company; Lindens Propane; Livermore Sanitation Inc.; Locks Mill Propane; Long's Propane Gas LLC; Louisiana Clean Fuels; Louisiana Propane Gas Association; LP Gas Insurance Specialists of America; LPG & NH3 Supply, Inc.; M & B Products, Inc.; M&M Cartage Co Inc.; M. A. Brightbill Body Works, Inc.; MacAllister Transportation; Maschmeier fuels; Mascott Equipment Co; Mbg enterprises; McAbee Trucking, Inc.

McCraw Oil Company, Inc.; McMahan's Bottle Gas; McNeill Oil and Propane Inc; Medstar transportation; MFA Oil Company; Michigan Propane Gas Association; Mid States Propane; Mid Valley Disposal; Midwest Energy Solutions, Inc.; Midwest Roofing & Construction LLC; Mississippi Propane Gas Associations; MN Propane Association; Modern Disposal Services Inc.; Modern Gas Company; Modern Welding Company; Momentum Fuel Technologies; MOR-GAS, INC; Morongo Basin Transit Authority; Morrissey Consulting, LLC.

Morrow Renewables; Mountain Gas; Moyers Gas Service, Inc.; Mt. Diablo Resource Recovery; MTankCo; MTC Transportation; Municipal Gas Authority of Georgia; Muskogee County Public Transit Authority; Mutual Liquid Gas & Equipment Co., Inc.; MVP Airport Parking; Napa County Recycling & Waste Services, LLC; NASA Services Inc; Nat G CNG Solutions; National Propane Gas Association; National Waste & Recycling Association; Natural Gas Supply LLC; NC Propane Gas Assoc.

Neill Gas Inc.; Nel Hydrogen; Nevada Propane Dealers Association; New Century Farm Service; New Frontier Holdings, LLC; New Jersey Natural Gas; Newport News Public Schools; Newport West LLC; Nexceris; NGV Solutions; NGV America; NICE Bus; NiteHawk Sweepers; NJ Propane Gas Association; Normandy Distributing DBA; AAA Advanced Chem-Dry; North Central Bus and Equipment; North County Transit District.

North Kansas City #74 School District; North Kansas City Schools; North Star Energy LLC; Northern Recycling and Waste Services; Northern Resources Cooperative; Northwest Propane Gas Company; Northwest Transport, Inc.; NOVUS Wood Group; Nutrien Ag Solutions; NW Alliance for Clean Transportation; NW Natural; O'Connor Bus Sales; Oden Polar; Ohio Fuel Cell Coalition; Ohio Propane Gas Association; Oklahoma Liquefied Gas, Inc.; Oklahoma Propane Gas Association; Oklahoma State University and; Stillwater Community Transit; Oklahoma Transit Association.

Old Dominion Freight Line, Inc.; OLG Propane; OMetro, Inc.; Omnitek Engineering Corporation; Omnitrans; Onboard Dynamics; OnCue; O'Nealgas, Inc.; Orange Avenue Disposal, Inc.; Owens Energy; Pacific Coast Propane; Paladin Propane Partners, LLC; Palm Springs Disposal Services; Palmer Gas & Oil; Palmetto Gas Corp.; Palmetto Propane; Palmetto Propane, Fuels & Ice; Paraco Gas Corporation & Subsidiaries; Parden LP Gas & service Co., Inc.; Pariso Logistics Inc.; Parker Gas Co., Inc.; Paso Robles Country Disposal, Inc; Paso Robles Roll Off; Paso Robles Waste & Recycle; Payne Oil Company; Pecos Propane, Inc.

PELGAS; Penn Valley Gas; Pennsylvania Propane Gas Association; PepsiCo; Phelps Sungas, Inc.; Philadelphia Gas Works; Phillips Energy; Phoenix Energy Corp; Piece of Mind, LLC; Polk-Burnett Propane; Portage Area Regional Transportation; Authority; Porter Gas Service Inc.; Postal Fleet Services; Prairieland FS, Inc.

Premier Cooperative; Prescott Transit and Executive; Transportation; Presto Tap, LLC; Pro Image Communications; Professional Propane Services; ProGas Inc.; Progressive Power, LLC; Propane Autogas LLC; Propane

Education and Research Council Member; Propane Gas Association of New England; Propane Marketers Association of Kansas; Propane People Inc.; PS Logistics FL; PT Risk Management Insurance Services L; Quantum Fuel Systems LLC; R.D. White and Sons; R.E. Michel Co; Rand Wade OilCo; Ray Murray Inc; RCLegacy Holdings LLC.

Recology CleanScapes; Red Baker Propane Inc.; Reddaway; Redigas Inc.; Redmark Cng Services L.L.C.; ReFuel Energy Partners; Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada; Rego Products; Renergy, Inc.; Renzenberger, Inc; Republic Services, Inc.; Rhoads Energy; Riverside Transit Agency; RNGA Energy Group; Robert H. Hoover & Sons Inc.; ROUSH; ROUSH CleanTech; Ruan Transportation Management Systems; Rush Enterprises; Rutherford Equipment.

Safety, Training, and More LLC; Salem Area Mass Transit District; Salmon River Propane; San Diego Metropolitan Transit System; Sapp Bros Inc.; SchagrinGAS; School Lines, Inc.; Schwan's Company; Select Milk Producers, Inc.; Self Heating & Cooling, Inc.; Sentara; Sequoia Gas Company; Sharp Energy; Shaw Propane LLC; Sheehy Mail Contractors Inc.; Shifflett Safety and Support; Shuttle Park Two Inc.; Simple-Fill, Inc.; Slate Spring LP Gas Co., Inc.; South Central FS.

South Central Oil and Propane; South Florida Gas Co.; South Jersey Industries; South San Francisco Scavenger Co Inc.; South West Transit Association; Southwest Transportation Agency; Southwestern Energy Company; Sparq Natural Gas, LLC; Specialized Biogas Services; SporTran; Stanfords Propane Autogas Service Center; Stanfords Propane Gas Conversion Center; Stanfords Propane Gas Appliance Center; Stanfords Propane Gas LLC; Stark Area Regional Transit Authority; Stirk Compressed Natural Gas; Stuck Enterprises, Inc; Suburban Disposal Corp.; Sullivan Propane; Sumter County Board of Education.

Superior Energy Systems; Superior Gas Inc., Notasulga; Superior Gas, Inc.; Superior Plus; Superior Propane Incorporated; Superior Ready Mix; Supervalu/UNFI; Tankfarm LLC; Tarantin Industries; Taylor Gas Company, Inc.; Tech Air dba Scully Propane Service; Tech Air Mid-Atlantic; Ted Johnson Propane Co.; Tennessee Propane Gas Association; Tesei Petroleum, Inc.; Texas Natural Gas Vehicle Alliance; Texas Propane Gas Association; The American Trucking Associations; The Coalition for Renewable Natural Gas (RNG Coalition); The Rural Gas Company.

ThompsonGas, LLC; Thornton's Gas Service; Three Rivers FS Company; Thunder Ridge Transport Inc.; Time Transport, Inc.; TN GAS, LLC; Tops Markets; Torrance Transit System; Town of Berthoud; Transfuels LLC and Capital Fuels, LLC; Transportation Energy Partners; Tri-Gas Company; Trillium; TruStar Energy; Tucker Properties; U.S. Gain; UBCR LLC; United Parcel Service; United Propane Autogas Solutions Group; United Rail Partners, Ltd.

United Truck Body Co, Inc.; Unitrans (ASUCD/City of Davis); USA Hauling & Recycling; USBiogas; USF Holland LLC.; Van Unen Miersma Propane; Vegas Propane Inc.; Veriha Trucking, Inc.; VIA Metropolitan Transit Authority; Viafield; VT Accounting Associates, LLP; Walters Gas Service, Inc.; Warco Inc.; Warco Transportation; Ware Disposal Inc.; Waste Connections Lone Star; Waste Connections of California Inc.dba Greenteam of San Jose; Waste Connections, Inc.; Waste Industries.

Waste Management; Waste Pro; Waste Pro of Florida; Waste Pro of Georgia; Waste Pro USA; Waste Pro USA, Waste Pro of Florida; Waukon Feed Ranch Inc.; WCA Waste Corporation; Webbtown Propane Company; Webster & Garner Inc.; Wells Propane Inc. dba:

Baygas Propane; Wessels Oil Co. Inc.; West Propane; West Virginia Propane Gas Association; Western Natural Gas Co.; Western Propane Gas Association; Western Propane Services, Inc.; Westhoff, Cone & Holmstedt; WGL; Whidbey Seatac Shuttle; White River Distributors.

Williams Energy Group; Wilson Oil & Propane; WIN Propane; Winnebago County Sheriff's Office; Wisconsin Bus Sales; Wittenberger Bus Service; WJDAYTECH Inc.; WoodFuel.com LP; Woodruff Energy; Worthington Industries; X3CNG; XPO Sales INC.; Yavapai Bottle Gas; YRC Worldwide; Zebulon Innovations.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I hope the next time I have a chance to have the floor, I will not be interrupted.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I just had an opportunity to speak to President Trump, and I will state to all of my colleagues, he is prepared to sign the bill.

He will also be issuing a national emergency declaration at the same time, and I indicated to him that I am going to support the national emergency declaration.

So for all of my colleagues, the President will sign the bill we will be voting on shortly.

#### MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the conference report to accompany H.J. Res. 31.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 31), having met, have agreed that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment and the Senate agree to the same, signed by a majority of the conferees on the part of both Houses.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of February 13, 2019.)

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for the conference report.

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 con-

ference report to accompany H.J. Res. 31, making further continuing appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes.

Richard C. Shelby, Shelley Moore Capito, John Cornyn, John Boozman, John Thune, Johnny Isakson, Lindsey Graham, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Kevin Cramer, John Hoeven, Roger F. Wicker, Steve Daines, James E. Risch, Jerry Moran, Mike Rounds, Mitch McConnell.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote on the conference report to accompany H.J. Res. 31 occur at 3:30 p.m. today; further, that if cloture is invoked, all postcloture time be yielded back and the Senate vote on the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, as someone who has been here for some period of time, I was glad to see Republicans and Democrats, both in the House and the Senate, come together in the past few weeks, especially this week.

We ignored the distractions and tweetstorms coming from the White House. We reached an agreement to fund our government and make responsible investments for the American people.

Not one of us—none of the final four who did the negotiations, sitting in that room, felt that this was an agreement that any one of us would have individually written.

There are things in this bill that I support and things I disagree with, but that could be said by all four of us, Republicans and Democrats. You try to find as much common ground as you can. Everybody had to give something, but we ended up with a bipartisan compromise. We had to deal with facts that are based on reality, not rhetoric based on political fantasy.

Democrats have always supported border security, but we support smart border security, targeted strategies that address the real problems facing us at our southwest border. That is what we tried to accomplish here. We stood together. We rejected the toxic and hate-filled immigration tweets coming from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

The agreement does not fund President Trump's wasteful wall. After all, he gave his solemn promise to the American public that Mexico would pay for it, so let them work on that. It does not fund President Trump's requested deportation force, and it rejects the unjustified and dramatic increase in the detention bed levels the President would have used to enforce his extreme immigration policy.

But just as important as what this agreement rejects is what we were able to accomplish.

We invested hundreds of millions of dollars in new technology to stop the

flow of illegal drugs through our ports of entry. All Republicans and all Democrats supported that. We provide funds to hire more judges to address the immigration backlog in our country. We provide more than half a billion dollars to support Central American countries, addressing the root causes of undocumented migration. We included \$400 million to improve medical care and address the humanitarian concerns at the border. Every one of us has seen enough of what is going on there; we are trying to show that America—the greatest Nation on Earth, also the wealthiest and the most humanitarian—will address it.

This is what a compromise looks like. This is how the American people expect our government to function—not by tweets but by reasonable, reality-based compromise.

Unfortunately, often lost in this debate over border security were the more than 800,000 public servants and their families who were held hostage by the Trump shutdown for weeks. They once again lived in fear and uncertainty that their next paycheck may not come because the President chose to use them as hostages. This agreement ensures that these public servants remain on the job doing the important work of the American people through the end of the fiscal year, and also all those who are not on a government payroll but support all our different Agencies that were involved in this. They weren't paid either.

This agreement funds nine Federal Departments. Keep in mind—it is not just the borders; it is nine Federal Departments and their related Agencies. I will give a couple of examples. It increases funding for the Environmental Protection Agency. It supports our national parks. It rejects the anti-science know-nothingism of the administration by supporting research and our dedicated scientists.

This is extremely important to me because Senator CRAPO and I wrote the last Violence Against Women authorization. We wrote the expansion of that law. Our bill today provides the highest funding level ever for the Office on Violence Against Women to support programs that prevent domestic violence. It also provides more than half a billion dollars to combat the opioid crisis. In my earlier career, I saw too many deaths because of the violence against women. I saw too many deaths of young people from drug overdoses, and the numbers have only dramatically increased from the days when I was a prosecutor. Supporting the Violence Against Women Act brought Republicans and Democrats together.

The agreement invests in rural America, secures our interests abroad, rebuilds our highways, and supports public housing.

This week, four of us met—first in Chairman SHELBY's Appropriations Committee office and then later into the evening several times in my office here in the Capitol. Senator SHELBY,

Representative LOWEY, Representative GRANGER, and I proved that we can set aside the political struggles in Washington to find a path to progress for the American people—two Republicans and two Democrats who are four of the most senior Members of the House and the Senate. I thank them for their effort.

If I can go to a personal matter for just a moment, I want to thank Senator SHELBY for his friendship and his partnership. Senator SHELBY and I come from different parts of the country. We are much different politically, but he is one of the closest friends I have here. He and his wonderful wife, Dr. Annette Shelby, my wife Marcelle, and I have traveled to so many places together. Some were very grim areas of this world. But we understand how grownups have to act in the Congress and how they have to work together. We worked together with our House counterparts—the senior Democrat and senior Republican in the House—on this conference. We worked together. We didn't pass just Homeland Security; we passed all 12 appropriations bills on a bipartisan basis. I hope we do the same thing for fiscal year 2020. I hope that we can begin very soon, with Senator SHELBY and me working together, to pass the fiscal year 2020 bills. We passed the ones last year out of our committee virtually unanimously. We were able to get Members of both parties to join us. I thank him.

I also thank the Appropriations Committee staff on both sides of the aisle for their hard work. I joke that Senators are merely constitutional impediments to their staff. Evening after evening, sometimes into the wee hours of the morning, weekend after weekend, I saw dedicated men and women in the Appropriations Committee staff working line by line to try to get us through this.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of their names be printed in the RECORD.

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

Charles E. Kieffer, Chanda Betourney, Jess Berry, Jay Tilton, Hannah Chauvin, Dianne Nellor, Adrienne Wojciechowski, Teri Curtin, Jean Toal Eisen, Jennifer Eskra, Blaise Sheridan, Jordan Stone, Ellen Murray, Diana Gourlay Hamilton, Reeves Hart, Scott Nance, Chip Walgren, Drenan E. Dudley, Rachael Taylor, Ryan Hunt, Tim Rieser, Alex Carnes, Kali Farahmand, Dabney Hegg, Christina Monroe, Jordan Stone, Shannon H. Hines, Jonathan Graffeo, David Adkins, Margaret Pritchard, Carlisle Clark, Patrick Carroll, Elizabeth Dent, Hamilton Bloom, Amber Beck, Allen Cutler, Matt Womble, Sydney Crawford, Andrew Newton, Lauren Nunnally, Brian Daner, Courtney Bradford, Adam Telle, Peter Babb, Chris Cook, Thompson Moore, Christian Lee, Leif Fannesbeck, Lucas Agnew, Emy Lesofski, Nona McCoy, Clare Doherty, Gus Maples, Rajat Mathur, Jason Woolwine, LaShawnda Smith, Robert W. Putnam, Christy Greene, Blair Taylor, Jenny Winkler, Hong Nguyen, Clint Trocchio, George A. Castro, Elmer Barnes, Penny Myles, Karin Thames, Shalanda Young, Chris Bigelow, Anne Marie Chotvac,

Johnnie Kaberle, Gerry Petrella, Meghan Taira.

Mr. LEAHY. I conclude by saying it takes a lot of long days and it takes a lot of long nights to produce a bill of this magnitude. I appreciate their hard work.

I think we may have others who will want to speak.

Mr. President, how much time do we have before the vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four minutes remains.

Mr. LEAHY. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, the Senate will soon vote on the agreement by the conference committee and keep the government open. The agreement was a product of a lot of hard work and long nights and weekends by members of the conference committee and their staffs. I want to salute Senator LEAHY and Senator SHELBY. I want to salute all of the conferees.

When Leader MCCONNELL and I met—as we moved to open up the government for a short period of time—I suggested that we do a conference committee because I had a great deal of faith in the members of the conference committees on both sides of the aisle, and that faith has proved to be vindicated. I thank Senator LEAHY, Senator SHELBY, their staffs, and all the members of the conference committee for the great job they have done.

The agreement will provide smart border security, increasing support for technologies at our ports of entry. It will not fund the President's expensive, ineffective wall. It will provide desperately needed humanitarian assistance—medical support, transportation, food, and clothing—for children and families in detention. It will provide funding to our neighbors in Central America to fight the actual root causes of migration—the violent gangs and drug cartels.

In short, it represents a fair compromise that includes priorities from both sides of the aisle. I expect the legislation will pass this Chamber with a significant bipartisan majority, pass the House, and be sent to the President with plenty of time to avoid a government shutdown tomorrow at midnight.

There is word that the President will declare a national emergency. I hope he won't. That would be a very wrong thing to do. Leader PELOSI and I will be responding to that in short order, but before that, I just want to say that in order to reach this point, in order to attain this bipartisan compromise, 800,000 public servants were forced to suffer without pay for over a month as President Trump put the country through a completely unnecessary shutdown that snarled airports, delayed loans for farmers and small businesses, trashed our national parks, and took billions of dollars out of our economy.

We still need to address the plight of government contractors who still have

not been made whole. Regrettably, we were unable to include that in the agreement, but we are going to keep working and fighting for Senator SMITH's proposal to ensure our contractors are made whole again.

The Senate was in the very same position just before Christmas, with a deal in hand, when the President reversed himself and engineered the longest shutdown in American history. After all of the pain of the shutdown caused by President Trump, we are basically right back where we started, with nearly the same parameters of a bipartisan agreement we were ready to pass around Christmas. Leader PELOSI and I, for instance, offered the President \$1.37 billion for border security with the same language that would have prohibited the wall then as is in the agreement now.

Let this be a lesson. Government shutdowns don't work. I hope President Trump has learned that lesson once and for all. I hope we never go down the road to shutdowns again. The American people suffer and very little is accomplished.

President Trump should sign this bill ASAP.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I will be brief.

First of all, I thank Senator LEAHY, the vice chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who worked diligently for the past year to get to where we are today in a bipartisan way and also, recently, in the conference committee, which we thought last week had broken down. I also thank MITCH MCCONNELL, the majority leader, and CHUCK SCHUMER, the Democratic leader. I thank everybody else who has contributed to get us to this point.

Nothing is perfect, but we think this is a good bill for the American people. It opens up all of the government—the 25 percent that we had not addressed.

The conference report includes a robust and comprehensive investment in border security, providing funding for personnel, technology, and infrastructure that is critical to keeping our nation secure and our people safe. Critically, the bill provides nearly \$1,400,000,000 to further construction of a barrier along the southwest border. But that is only a down payment. More resources are required. Fortunately, the President has at his disposal both constitutional and existing statutory authorities that allow him to supplement the congressional investment in border security that was made today. This bill preserves those authorities, and I support action by the President to use them to the fullest extent permissible to secure our border. In particular, this bill does not restrict the President's ability to declare a national emergency or to exercise emergency authorities under such a declaration. Nor does this bill further restrict the Administration's ability, previously granted by the Congress, to

transfer funds in support of efforts to gain operational control of our southwest border and to cease the trafficking of persons and drugs across it.

I am going to get on with the vote.

I want to say thank you to everybody, including Shannon Hines on our staff and everybody else who contributed to this.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture vote on the conference report to accompany H.J. Res. 31.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 bill 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 conference report to accompany H.J. Res. 31, making further continuing appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes.

Richard C. Shelby, Shelley Moore Capito, John Cornyn, John Boozman, John Thune, Johnny Isakson, Lindsey Graham, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Kevin Cramer, John Hoeven, Roger F. Wicker, Steve Daines, James E. Risch, Jerry Moran, Mike Rounds, Mitch McConnell.

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 the conference report to accompany H.J. Res. 31, an act making further continuing appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2019, 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 bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 84, nays 15, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 25 Leg.]

YEAS—84

Alexander	Crapo	King
Baldwin	Daines	Klobuchar
Barrasso	Duckworth	Lankford
Bennet	Durbin	Leahy
Blackburn	Enzi	Manchin
Blumenthal	Ernst	McConnell
Blunt	Feinstein	McSally
Boozman	Fischer	Menendez
Braun	Gardner	Merkley
Brown	Graham	Moran
Cantwell	Grassley	Murkowski
Capito	Hassan	Murphy
Cardin	Heinrich	Murray
Carper	Hirono	Perdue
Casey	Hoeven	Peters
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Portman
Collins	Isakson	Reed
Coons	Johnson	Risch
Cornyn	Jones	Roberts
Cortez Masto	Kaine	Romney
Cramer	Kennedy	Rosen

Rounds	Sinema	Udall
Sanders	Smith	Van Hollen
Schatz	Stabenow	Warner
Schumer	Sullivan	Whitehouse
Scott (FL)	Tester	Wicker
Shaheen	Thune	Wyden
Shelby	Tillis	Young

NAYS—15

Booker	Hawley	Rubio
Cotton	Inhofe	Sasse
Cruz	Lee	Scott (SC)
Gillibrand	Markey	Toomey
Harris	Paul	Warren

NOT VOTING—1

Burr

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 84, the nays are 15.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate adopt the Conference Report to accompany H.J. Res. 31?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR).

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

The result was announced—yeas 83, nays 16, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 26 Leg.]

YEAS—83

Alexander	Gardner	Portman
Baldwin	Graham	Reed
Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Bennet	Hassan	Roberts
Blackburn	Heinrich	Romney
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rosen
Blunt	Hoeven	Rounds
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Sanders
Brown	Isakson	Schatz
Cantwell	Johnson	Schumer
Capito	Jones	Scott (FL)
Cardin	Kaine	Shaheen
Carper	Kennedy	Shelby
Casey	King	Sinema
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Smith
Collins	Lankford	Stabenow
Coons	Leahy	Sullivan
Cornyn	Manchin	Tester
Cortez Masto	McConnell	Thune
Cramer	McSally	Tillis
Crapo	Menendez	Udall
Daines	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Moran	Warner
Durbin	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Enzi	Murphy	Wicker
Ernst	Murray	Wyden
Feinstein	Perdue	Young
Fischer	Peters	

NAYS—16

Booker	Hawley	Sasse
Braun	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lee	Toomey
Cruz	Markey	Warren
Gillibrand	Paul	
Harris	Rubio	

NOT VOTING—1

Burr

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 83 and the nays are 16.

The conference report is adopted. The majority leader.

PROVIDING FOR A CORRECTION IN THE ENROLLMENT OF H.J. RES. 31

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Con. Res. 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 4) providing for a correction in the enrollment of H.J. Res. 31.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measure?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 4) was agreed to.

(The concurrent resolution is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT—Motion to Proceed

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 17, S. 311.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 17, 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 an abortion or attempted abortion.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for 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 bill 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. 17, 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 an abortion or attempted abortion.

Mitch McConnell, David Perdue, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, John Cornyn, Johnny Isakson, James M. Inhofe, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Lindsey Graham, Ben Sasse, Roy Blunt, John Thune, John Boozman, John Barrasso, Joni Ernst, James E. Risch.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 16.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Eric D. Miller, of Washington, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

## CLOTURE MOTION

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

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 nomination of Eric D. Miller, of Washington, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, David Perdue, Mike Crapo, Johnny Isakson, John Cornyn, Pat Roberts, James M. Inhofe, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Lindsey Graham, Roy Blunt, John Thune, John Boozman, John Barrasso, James E. Risch, Richard Burr, John Hoeven.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 6.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Michael J. Desmond, of California, to be Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service and an Assistant General Counsel in the Department of the Treasury.

## CLOTURE MOTION

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

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 nomination of Michael J. Desmond, of California, to be Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service and an Assistant General Counsel in the Department of the Treasury.

James E. Risch, Johnny Isakson, Todd Young, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, John Thune, Rob Portman, Roy Blunt, Thom Tillis, John Boozman, Roger F. Wicker, James Lankford, Tim Scott, Steve Daines, Michael B. Enzi, John Hoeven, Mitch McConnell.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Andrew Wheeler, of Virginia, to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

## CLOTURE MOTION

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

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 nomination of Andrew Wheeler, of Virginia, to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, John Hoeven, Shelley Moore Capito, Roger F. Wicker, John Barrasso, Joni Ernst, Mike Rounds, John Thune, John Cornyn, Jerry Moran, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 12.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of John L. Ryder, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for a term expiring May 18, 2021.

## CLOTURE MOTION

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

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 nomination of John L. Ryder, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for a term expiring May 18, 2021.

Mitch McConnell, Steve Daines, John Thune, John Cornyn, James M. Inhofe, Pat Roberts, Mike Crapo, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, John Barrasso, Jerry Moran, Roy Blunt, Shelley Moore Capito, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, Thom Tillis, John Hoeven.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions be waived.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

## GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, let me congratulate the Chamber on the overwhelming vote for the appropriations bill. It is good news that we passed it by a lot of votes, and I hope the House does it by a lot, too.

I need to comment on the news that President Trump may declare a national emergency in an attempt to build his border wall. If President Trump decides to go forward with a disaster declaration, he will be making a tremendous mistake.

Declaring a national emergency would be a lawless act, a gross abuse of the power of the Presidency, and a desperate attempt to distract from the fact that President Trump broke his core promise to have Mexico pay for the wall. It will be another demonstration of President Trump's naked contempt for the rule of law and congressional authority.

Congress just debated this very issue. There was not support for the President's position. Congressional intent on this issue is very clear. The President's wall has been before Congress several times and has never garnered enough votes to even merit consideration. For the President to declare an emergency now would be an unprecedented subversion of Congress's constitutional prerogative.

The fact is, this is not an emergency, and the President's fearmongering doesn't make it one. A policy dispute about our southern border does not constitute a national emergency.

Democrats support and have always supported strong border security, but the fact is, according to the CBP, apprehensions at our southern border are at historic lows.

President Trump couldn't convince Mexico, he couldn't convince the American people, and he couldn't convince their elected representatives to pay for his ineffective and expensive wall. Now he is trying an end run around Congress in a desperate attempt to put taxpayers on the hook for it. Make no mistake—Congress will defend our constitutional authorities in every way that we can.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

RUSSIA

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, over the last 2 years, many of us have grappled with a very difficult question about our President. It is a question that never before could we even imagine thinking about an American President, let alone saying it out loud on the floor of the Senate. I am talking about the entirely legitimate question of whether Donald Trump could be compromised by the Russian Government. It is more than a legitimate question; it is the natural question that comes to mind every time we learn more about the links between President Trump, his associates, and the Russian Government.

With the Mueller investigation possibly coming to a close in the near future, we may be forced to deal with—both Congress and the American public—some very stark facts about the President's ties to Russia. Just think about the reported revelations over the last month or so.

We have learned that President Trump took unprecedented steps to conceal the contents of his conversations with Putin from his own advisers.

We have learned that following one of the meetings with Putin, Trump phoned a New York Times reporter to argue that Russia did not interfere in the 2016 election—once again carrying the Kremlin's water in direct conflict with the entire U.S. intelligence community.

We have learned that over the past year, President Trump repeatedly argued for pulling the United States out of NATO—something that Putin desires.

We continue to learn new details about Paul Manafort's—President Trump's campaign chairman—meetings with Konstantin Kilimnik, a Russian national with suspected ties to Russian intelligence and an associate of Oleg Deripaska's. We know that Manafort met with Kilimnik repeatedly, provided him with polling data, and discussed ending U.S. sanctions and adopting a Russia-friendly peace plan for Ukraine. This is perhaps the most significant indication that Trump's inner circle was discussing pro-Kremlin policies in the months before the election.

Tellingly, just last night, we learned that Manafort has lied again and again about the truth of his contacts and his conversations. Did Manafort determine that lying to prosecutors was a better alternative to telling the truth?

Finally, let's not forget the revelation from just a few weeks ago that the Nation's top law enforcement agency reportedly opened a counterintelligence investigation into the President, in part for firing the FBI Director because of "this Russia thing."

You can't make this stuff up. Not even in your wildest dreams, not even on the TV set of "Homeland" could you make this stuff up. The news of a possible counterintelligence investigation against a sitting President should shake us all to the core. Instead, we are barely even surprised.

For the rightwing pundits who spoon-feed a warped reality to President Trump every hour of the day, it is just one more excuse to paint him—the most powerful man in the world—as a victim, but for the rest of us, these revelations only sharpen the dread that gnaws at us as we search our minds for any explanation for President Trump's perplexing posture toward Russia.

Look, I may have my differences with the President on tax policy, on immigration policy, on healthcare policy, and more, but let me assure you, every time he was set to meet with Putin, I, for one, hoped and prayed that our President would prove our suspicions wrong.

I hoped that the President of the United States would stand up to Putin and demand accountability for Russia's interference in the 2016 elections—the cyber attacks, the stolen data, the malign social influence campaigns designed to stoke division and doubt in the American people. I hoped President Trump would make clear to Putin that legal aggression against Ukraine and the continual denial of Ukrainian sovereignty is unacceptable and will result in consequences. I hoped President Trump would not congratulate Putin on another sham election victory but operate from a position of truth about his grip on power—that it comes from the oppression of the Russian people, the seizure of their assets, the torture and murder of dissenters, the building of a chemical weapons arsenal, and the denial of a free press and basic human rights. And of course I hoped President Trump would not budge an inch on sanctions on the Kremlin.

But time and again, our President has let us down. He has let our country down. He has left Americans to lie awake at night asking themselves: What does Putin have on our President? Why won't he hold Russia accountable? Why won't he champion the values of democracy, freedom, and human rights that transcend political parties and define our greatest ideals as a nation?

Instead, our President champions talking points that could have only come out of the Kremlin. Let me provide just a few examples.

He told the leaders of the G7 that Crimea should be a part of Russia. He told the President of France to leave the EU. He said that Montenegro, a NATO member, could start World War III because they are "very aggressive people." He said that the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan because "terrorists were going into Russia" and Russia was "right to be there."

The Wall Street Journal rightly said that "we cannot recall a more absurd misstatement of history by an American President."

I challenge anyone to find one person—one person in the State Department, the Defense Department, the National Security Council—who believes these statements and would have put them in the President's ear. So who does he get these ideas from? I can think of only one person—his good friend Vladimir Putin.

Thus far, our greatest insights into what may be driving President Trump's peculiar behavior toward Russia have come out of Special Counsel Mueller's investigation and the additional investigations spawned by it. With every new court filing, we learn that the tentacles of Russian influence over the President and his associates are wrapped tighter than we previously thought.

Meanwhile, the President and his cheerleaders on FOX News continue to discredit the Mueller probe as some kind of partisan witch hunt, when the truth is that it has already resulted in 4 individual sentences, 7 guilty pleas, and a total of more than 30 people and 3 Russian entities charged.

But all of this still begs the question why. Why does President Trump behave as though he has been compromised by the Russian Government? Why is he so deferential to Putin? We saw that at the Helsinki summit. Why have those around the President gone to such great lengths to cover up and lie about the extent of their interactions with Russia and with Russians?

Of course, if we can consider the possibility that the President is an asset of the Russian Government, we then have to wonder whether he is a witting or an unwitting asset.

On the one hand, it seems as though most of what President Trump does is unwitting. Perhaps his refusal to take Russian interference in 2016 seriously is merely an outgrowth of his narcissism, a symptom of a fragile ego that cannot accept that maybe, just maybe the unprecedented malign influence campaign orchestrated by the Kremlin did indeed sway some votes on election day.

On the other hand, the more I learn about President Trump's strange behavior toward Russia, the more I wonder if he knows exactly what is going on; the more I wonder if he knows that his campaign was making promises about pro-Kremlin positions and rolling back sanctions; the more I wonder if Trump knows that he is indebted to Russia and cannot allow the truth of

his business dealings to come to light, for the truth may tell us that Trump's overtures to Putin, his disparaging of NATO, his refusal to fully apply congressionally mandated sanctions, and his mixed messages on Ukraine are actually instances of conspiracy with the Kremlin in real time.

Perhaps it is because I am from New Jersey and I have lived through decades of Donald Trump's questionable business dealings, but I cannot understand why anyone would flat out reject the proposition that he is indebted to Russia. He is the first Presidential candidate in decades to refuse to disclose his tax returns. He is the first President in modern history to refuse to divest from his business interests, leaving us wondering whether he and his family are profiting from his position in the Oval Office.

Beyond the myth of the man, Trump is no business genius. He was a millionaire by age 8, thanks to his father. He ran the business into the ground. He defaulted on debt, refused to pay workers, and declared multiple corporate bankruptcies. Eventually, American banks saw through him and refused to lend him money, so Trump had to look elsewhere for cash. When you have been essentially blacklisted from the U.S. banking system, where do you turn? You turn to less savory sources.

The fact that the Trump Organization courted and sold real estate to wealthy Russian buyers and financiers is no secret, nor is the reality that to be wealthy in Putin's Russia means to have close ties to the Kremlin. Much of the stolen wealth amassed by Putin and his cronies must be hidden from the global financial system, so where do you turn? Real estate.

After a string of bankruptcies and racking up debt for years, the Trump Organization suddenly began making a spate of large, unexplainable cash purchases, totaling \$400 million over 9 years. Giant, mysterious, inexplicable cash transactions are the hallmark of money laundering. So where did they get the cash? Well, if we are to believe the words of the President and his sons, much of it came from Russia. In fact, it was Donald Junior who said in 2008 that "we see a lot of money pouring in from Russia" and Eric Trump who reportedly said in 2014 that "we don't rely on American banks. We have all the funding we need out of Russia."

We know that several Trump projects, like Trump SoHo and Trump Toronto, received significant funding from Kremlin-linked financiers. In fact, Trump Toronto was funded by an asset sale by the Russian bank VTB—a transaction that would have likely needed approval from Putin himself. We now know that the Trump Organization pursued the Trump Moscow project for far longer than he led on, including well into his campaign for President.

The President has unequivocally said that he has "zero investments in Russia." Well, here is the problem: Donald

Trump may not have investments in Russia, but it is quite possible that the Kremlin has an investment in him.

That is what keeps me up at night.

That is why I believe the time is now to pass legislation requiring all Presidential candidates to disclose their tax returns and why I am the sponsor of such legislation.

So many of my colleagues decried Trump's shattering of this norm, but since he arrived at White House, the Republicans have done nothing to stop it from becoming the new normal.

We still don't know who is behind the vast majority of the Trump organization projects around the world, many of which continue to this day. We have to follow the money to get to the truth. How else will we ever know why our President is either unable or unwilling to publicly stand up to Putin?

What too many of my Republican colleagues seem to forget is that at the end of the day, this is not about Donald Trump; it is about the American people. It is about whether an American President may be beholden to foreign interests and how those interests fare against our own.

When the President embraces our greatest adversaries and gives the back of the hand to our closest allies; when he continually denies Russia's interference in 2016 and belittles the findings of our entire intelligence community; when, in spite of those findings, he suggests lifting sanctions on the Russians; when he backs down from challenging Putin after Russia commits an unacceptable act of aggression against Ukraine in the Sea of Azov, an international border, then we need a Congress willing to live up to its role as a coequal branch of government.

We cannot blindly follow a potentially compromised President down this dangerous path in which our alliances are suffering, our leadership on the global stage is waning, and our competitors are seeking to fill the void.

We need to know the facts—not the latest spin dropped by Rudy Giuliani—the facts. The American people deserve to know whom they elected to be their President. They deserve to know if he is, in fact, putting America's interests first. They deserve to know if Donald Trump is wittingly or unwittingly an agent for the Russian Federation.

Congress must carry out its constitutional duty to fully and thoroughly investigate where the facts lead. That is why we must protect the integrity of all oversight efforts including the objective, sober investigation still being conducted by Robert Mueller, and that is why we must push for his final report to be made public to the American people.

At the same time, this administration's deference to the Kremlin demands Congress be proactive in shaping U.S. foreign policy toward Russia, especially with respect to sanctions. We saw that with the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanc-

tions or CAATSA law passed in 2017 with the support of 98 Senators.

Given the circumstances we face today, we need additional legislation to protect American interests. That is why Senator GRAHAM and I introduced just yesterday the Defending America's Security from Kremlin Aggression Act or DASKA, a bipartisan piece of legislation that is joined by several of our Republican colleagues.

This comprehensive legislation will ensure our diplomats have the tools to advance our interests and stand up to the bully in the Kremlin. It includes new sanctions, as well as provisions designed to harden our democratic institutions and make us less vulnerable to attack. Perhaps most urgently, DASKA requires Senate consent, should the President act on his desire to pull the United States out of NATO. To risk letting this President pull our Nation out of a military alliance so vital to America's security would be a tragedy fit for the ages.

The collapse of NATO is No. 1 on Mr. Putin's wish list, and with leaders like Secretary Mattis no longer around to babysit this President, Congress has a responsibility to act. This bipartisan bill is essential to giving the United States a more solid footing against the Kremlin moving forward.

We should treat DASKA with urgency. The time to pass this legislation is now. We need hearings, a vote on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and swift consideration on the floor of the Senate.

Likewise, we must finally pass legislation to protect the Mueller investigation and to require that all Presidential candidates release their tax returns.

I know, deep down, that many of my Republican colleagues share my concerns. I have talked with them, a fair number of them, yet they are afraid of angering the Party of Trump. Well, I believe that they would be seen as American heroes.

Should the facts confirm our greatest fears to be true, I ask my colleagues to consider what the history books will say about those who knew the President of the United States might very well be compromised by a foreign power, yet still did nothing. I am talking about my Republican colleagues who seem to have numbed themselves to the latest bombshell revelations about the President's posture on Russia. Apparently, they don't want to know why Russia interfered in 2016 to help Trump win. They don't want to know why the Republican platform's strong language on Russia was watered down by the Trump team. They don't want to know how someone deeply indebted to Russian oligarchs and later caught giving polling data to Russian intelligence contacts became chairman of the campaign. They don't want to know why Russia began hacking Hillary Clinton's emails the same day that Candidate Trump asked them to do so.

They don't want to know why the President undermines our intelligence community and attacks law enforcement for investigating Russian interference. They don't want to know why he seeks to dismantle NATO, a pillar of security, prosperity, and the defense of western democratic ideals. They don't want to know why he shares Putin's joy when discord unfolds in Europe. They don't want to know why Trump forbade his interpreter from disclosing the contents of his conversations with Putin and took his notes. In short, they don't want to know the truth.

Well, now is not the time to ignore the facts or avoid the truth. We are living in a time of unthinkable questions, and should the facts reveal the most unthinkable of answers, we must do what is necessary to protect the interests of the United States of America.

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. 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. REED. Mr. President, first, let me commend the Senator from New Jersey for his very articulate, detailed, and factually specific discussion of Russian malign influence across the globe but, particularly, here in the United States.

#### RUSSIAN HYBRID WARFARE

Mr. President, today I rise to continue my series of speeches with regard to Russian hybrid warfare and, specifically, to provide policy recommendations in response to the threat from Russia, particularly the threat from information warfare, which was exhibited so substantially in the 2016 election.

The first part of the speech I gave on January 24 of this year, but let me briefly recap. As I described in my previous speech, Russia is prosecuting an ongoing, persistent campaign of information warfare targeted at the United States and Western democracies. These information operations are conducted along specific lines of effort and employ tactics, techniques, and procedures that Russia has developed over years of experimentation. Russia has been particularly effective in adapting its information warfare playbook to the digital age, weaponizing social media to magnify fear and mistrust, create chaos, and undermine our ability to respond effectively.

There are four steps we must adopt to more effectively counter Russian information warfare. First, we need the President to fulfill the obligations of his office and unite the American people in confronting this national security threat. Second, we need a coordinated strategy across our government and society to counter those threats.

Third, and flowing from the coordinated strategy, we need to ensure our government and society are organized and have the right capabilities to manage this ongoing confrontation in the information space. Finally, we need to develop, in coordination with our allies and partners, our own playbook to fight back.

Let me address each of these proposals in turn.

First of all, we need the President to be straight with the American people. The President's own national security officials and intelligence community agree about the existence and seriousness of the attacks being conducted by Russia against our democracy. The President, as our Nation's leader, must embrace the same conclusion. By conveying to the American people the urgency of this national security threat, the President can ensure that as a nation we are responding with the same level of commitment as we would to a military threat. This will elevate the urgency and gravity of the matter and help ensure we are committing the necessary level of resources for both military and nonmilitary measures to counter the Russian threat and build resilience against these malign activities.

Presidential leadership is necessary to help us move past domestic parochial politics. We have already seen how the failure to put national security over partisan politics all but decimated our ability to counter Russian information warfare during the 2016 election. The German Marshall Fund concluded in their policy blueprint from last year that "removing partisanship from the calculus in responding to this threat is critical." This is not a Democratic or a Republican problem. This is a national security problem, and it is severe. If we are going to overcome Russian efforts to magnify fear and distrust, we need our President to put our national security first.

Presidential leadership is just as imperative beyond our borders. The President speaks to the American people. His words must send a clear and consistent message to the Kremlin that we will not tolerate attacks against the United States. A real opportunity was missed when the President did not use his platform during the State of the Union to denounce Russian attacks on our democracy and showcase to the world the depth of his commitment in countering this threat.

The world must understand that the President is serious and committed to protecting the United States, its allies, and its partners against information warfare and will do so for as long as required. As a recent report by the Treasury Department on efforts by the United States to combat illicit finance noted: "Russia must . . . realize that the United States and its allies will not waver in our determination to prevent it from undermining our democracies, economies, institutions, and the values on which these pillars of global sta-

bility—ensured by United States leadership—will continue to stand."

The President should heed his own administration's guidance. He should do so publicly and with the resolve expected of the Commander in Chief.

Unfortunately, the President's history on this subject to date is far from encouraging. His policy positions do not follow dictums outlined by the Treasury Department and others in his administration but, instead, mirror Russian strategic objectives. His foreign policy goals and those of Russia seem to overlap. The President's devastating threats to withdraw from NATO and his denigration of the European Union, our trading partners, and those he considers his domestic political adversaries create or exacerbate internal divisions. The President must be made to realize that Russia supports his approach to foreign relations and domestic politics.

The President is, of course, by no means alone in demonizing those with whom he disagrees, but his voice is far more powerful as a result of the office he holds, and it is his obligation and duty to lead. Not only must the President distinguish his policy positions from those that Russia promotes overtly and through disinformation campaigns to tear up the fabric of the West, he must wholeheartedly reject those tactics and defend our Nation against them.

The President needs to get on the same page with much of the rest of the U.S. Government and Congress. The heads of the Department of Justice, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of Homeland Security, and the Director of National Intelligence all came together to send a tough message to Russia ahead of the 2018 midterm elections. Congress has been united, as well, as evidenced by the overwhelmingly bipartisan passage of the Russia sanctions bill as part of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act or CAATSA.

Yet this tough messaging to Russia is completely undermined when the President fails to confront Putin over Russian malign activities and, instead, repeatedly downplays the significance of Russian interference with our democracy and society.

It is further undermined when he mirrors Putin's talking points and dismisses the Russian nationals indicted by the special counsel, including 12 Russian military intelligence or GRU agents, as merely "bloggers from Moscow." It is further undermined when the administration unwinds sanctions against a business of Putin crony Oleg Deripaska. I would note that this deal went forward in spite of bipartisan action in the Congress to try to block it. The President's mixed messages and failure of leadership in mounting sustained and credible deterrence must end.

Despite the lack of Presidential leadership, there is work underway to counter Russian hybrid warfare—and



specifically information warfare—at the Departments of Homeland Security, State, Treasury, Justice, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, as well as the National Security Agency, Cyber Command, and broader elements of the Department of Defense.

These efforts include standing up task forces between DHS and the FBI to target foreign influence within our borders, reorganizing the internal structures of DHS, and establishing the Russia Influence Group across several national security agencies. NSA and Cyber Command also established a working group called the Russia Small Group to counter Kremlin information warfare campaigns.

We must recognize the results these efforts have yielded to date. As authorized by this year's National Defense Authorization Act, or the NDAA, Cyber Command has undertaken offensive cyber operations. Treasury has sanctioned more than 270 Russian individuals and related entities. The Department of Justice has used our legal system to expose GRU and the Kremlin-linked troll organization activities.

These efforts signify that our capable civil servants and military officials have developed ways to mitigate aspects of the threat against us, but what is lacking is a synchronized campaign, prosecuted in a unified manner, to counter Russian hybrid warfare against the United States, our allies, and our partners.

General Scaparrotti, the head of European Command—who is on the frontlines of this threat—testified to the Armed Services Committee last March: “[I] don’t believe there is effective unification across the interagency, with the energy and the focus that we could attain.”

The Trump administration’s national defense strategy emphasizes the “re-emergence of long-term strategic competition,” including with Russia. I agree that this is an appropriate place to focus attention, but I have yet to see the changes needed to align with those priorities.

We must develop wholesale, scalable strategy to counter these threats below the level of armed conflict, including on the 21st-century battlefields of information and cyber space. It must be noted that Congress, including in the NDAA, has repeatedly urged the administration in this direction.

Two years ago, I secured a provision, along with my colleagues, to require the Department of Defense, in conjunction with the Department of State and other Agencies, to craft a Russian malign influence strategy. That strategy was finally delivered a few months ago, and it highlights the various efforts U.S. Government Departments and Agencies are undertaking. However, as I have said before, the administration must build on and implement that strategy, and these efforts must be conducted in a unified manner at the direction of the President both operationally and also as the chief spokesperson to the Nation and to the world.

This year’s NDAA authorized the appointment of a foreign influence coordinator on the National Security Council staff. This would be a good step toward organizing a whole-of-government approach to counter Russian information warfare. However, it remains to be seen whether the administration will stand up such a position.

Once we have laid out a comprehensive strategy, we must ensure that it can be successfully executed. This will require the support of the right organizational structures across the government and the whole of society.

The National Defense Strategy Commission concluded in its report that Russia “developed national strategies for enhancing their influence and undermining key U.S. interests that extend far beyond military competition . . . [C]omprehensive solutions to these comprehensive challenges will require whole-of-government and even whole-of-nation cooperation extending far beyond DOD.

As the Commission notes, we need to be institutionally capable of anticipating Russian information warfare developments. As a nation, we have been too slow, too late, and too divided in acknowledging the severity of these attacks on our governmental institutions and society. We watched Kremlin-directed information attacks in the Ukraine, the United Kingdom, and elsewhere, but we didn’t conceive that this Russian playbook would be deployed against us.

What is more, we are starting from a deficit in terms of the way our government is organized. After the Cold War, we dismantled the apparatus in place to recognize and counter threats from the Soviet Union. More recently, we found ourselves embroiled in two long counterinsurgency wars, which reoriented our planning, our systems, and our weapons to counter those threats of insurgents in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere. We took our eye off the growing challenges to the international order in Europe, and frankly we were late to realize that the Russians had either pushed past any reset in U.S.-Russia relations or had never actually stopped seeing us as their enemy. So we need to rebuild our capacity to challenge this threat.

First, we must ensure that we have the intelligence capabilities in place to yield a more complete understanding of the nature of the threat. One of the reasons that the Kremlin caught us off guard is because we significantly downsized the office in the CIA unofficially called Russia House, which was tasked with countering Russia during the Cold War.

While the number of Russian analysts has grown in recent years, we must make sure that we grow and retain the expertise and the budget dedicated to analyzing, attributing, anticipating, and exposing Russian information warfare campaigns on a persistent basis.

As I quoted in part 1 of this speech, the senior vice president of the Center

for European Policy Analysis, Edward Lucas, explained that we “are still playing catch up from a long way behind. We are looking in the rearview mirror, getting less bad at working out what Russia just did to us. We are still not looking through the windshield to find out what’s happening now and what’s going to be happening next.”

If we are ever going to get out from looking at this problem through the rearview mirror, we need to understand the patterns of Russia’s aggressive behavior and be able to anticipate the next attack.

In addition to ramping up Russia expertise, there needs to be a coordinating body across the national security apparatus to provide intelligence and analysis sharing. This body would work to provide a common operating picture for our government and help with strategic coordination across U.S. Government Agencies involved in countering hybrid warfare.

A proposal to stand up an inter-agency fusion cell similar to what I am describing was recommended in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee minority staff report from January 2018. That report envisioned that such a center “should include representatives from the FBI, CIA, the Departments of Homeland Security, State, Defense, and Treasury, and it should immediately produce a strategy, plan, and robust budget that coordinates all current and projected government programming to counter Russian Government interference and malign influence.”

Similarly, the Defending American Security from Kremlin Aggression Act, or DASKA, a bill that Senator MENENDEZ indicated was reintroduced yesterday in a bipartisan fashion—Senator MENENDEZ and Senator GRAHAM are leading this effort—includes language to establish such a fusion center. I urge my colleagues to support this type of a center. It will go a long way toward further integrating a whole-of-government approach.

In conjunction with standing up such a center, Congress may need to examine the authorities of some intelligence agencies, as it becomes harder to detect and counter Russian operations that look increasingly “American” in nature.

Our military institutions also need to be structured to counter Russian information operations—in particular those conducted by the GRU. As laid out in part 1 of this speech, these operations are persistent and ongoing, reflecting current Russian military doctrine, and follow discernable lines of effort. We must bring appropriate military tools to counter this threat.

Last November, General Nakasone, who serves as both the head of Cyber Command and the Director of the NSA, explained that America’s adversaries, including Russia, “are looking to take us on below the level of armed conflict. Our military must be able to . . . compete below the level of armed conflict.

This is what great power competition looks like today, and it's what we will look at as we look to the future."

Indeed, this type of conflict requires new tools in cyber space, including offensive cyber operations and updated protocols for using them.

It should be noted that Cyber Command took important steps to safeguard the 2018 midterm elections. Several days prior to the election, National Security Advisor Ambassador John Bolton acknowledged this role, stating that the United States was "undertaking offensive cyber operations . . . aimed at defending the integrity of the electoral process." Similarly, the Department of Defense explained that it worked to "frustrate and prevent adversary interference in the 2018 election cycle." It appears that these cyber operations contributed to more successful deterrence or a blunting of the Russian information warfare campaign than during the 2016 Presidential election.

That said, we also must acknowledge that the Russians have not stopped their operations against us, and they don't undertake information warfare campaigns only at election time. As we learn to counter their operations, they learn better methods to attack us, often with increased sophistication and less detectability. In order to stay up to speed, we must institutionalize the temporary arrangements that the Department of Defense assembled for addressing information warfare operations in the midterm elections and make them permanent. Our efforts must be persistent and scalable to ensure we have the operational capacity to respond to these attacks against our democracy.

Along those same lines, in last year's NDAA, we required the Secretary of Defense to establish a process to integrate strategic and cyber-enabled information operations across the Department. While information operations were a feature of military operations during the Cold War, today they are sometimes an afterthought. Having better integrated procedures for these types of operations would be a good start for getting organized inside DOD to effectively counter Russian information warfare below the level of conventional conflict.

Just as important as ensuring that we have the right military and intelligence tools, is ensuring that we have the appropriate nonmilitary tools to counter the threat. An additional cast-off after the Cold War was the U.S. Information Agency, which was devoted to advancing public diplomacy, building narratives, and extolling American virtues to foreign audiences. We should consider carefully whether it makes sense to revive some of these capabilities for today's information age.

One important step toward reestablishing such a capability was enlarging the mission of the State Department's Global Engagement Center in the fiscal year 2017 NDAA to "lead, synchronize,

and coordinate efforts of the Federal Government to recognize, understand, expose, and counter" foreign state propaganda and disinformation targeting U.S. national security interests. However, the Global Engagement Center has been under resourced and slow to execute its mission. We need to accelerate this effort.

We also need to look at our tools and tactics for informing our domestic audience, including how best to address concerns about the integrity of elections arising as a result of Russian meddling.

As a recent report from CSIS on election security stressed, "Credibility is as important as accuracy." We should examine what approach would best serve the American people in terms of validating the integrity of election results, as well as mobilizing to respond should our elections come under attack.

This effort could be centered around a dedicated office or assigned to a group of current or former trusted government officials. Their mission would be to rapidly communicate to the American public regarding the integrity of elections in response to Russian efforts to undermine the public faith in democracy, including through information warfare attacks.

The administration has taken steps in this direction, including the President's Executive order regarding election interference from last September, which requires a 45-day report assessing attacks from foreign adversaries. But this won't be fast enough to counter information warfare campaigns in real time. These attacks are moving at the speed of the internet. We don't have 45 days to wait.

As we look to the 2020 Presidential elections, it is imperative that we invest more in election security. While progress has been made since 2016, it has paled in comparison to the magnitude of the challenge.

Last Congress, I was disappointed when an amendment to provide an additional \$250 million in election security grant funding was blocked by my colleagues on the other side. This funding would have built upon the \$380 million that was appropriated for election security grants in the fiscal year 2018 Omnibus Appropriations Act. At the time of the vote last summer, the initial funding was already committed to the States, and 91 percent of those funds had been disbursed. We will need to provide the funding necessary if we are to claim that we are committed to improving election security. In addition, the Kremlin exploits the existence of insecure or outdated systems to promote information warfare operations against us, furthering the narrative that there are so-called cracks in our democracy.

Our government is not the only actor that must play a role in meeting these threats. We must also look to our society and the private sector. As I discussed, the government failed to have

the imagination to fully realize the extent of the coming threat. Unfortunately, the ways in which the social media companies responded to these attacks mirrored the government's failure of imagination. Social media companies were held up as beacons of innovation with a view that technology could bring people together in common cause, but these companies failed to conceive that these same tools could also be used for malign purposes—to misinform as well as to inform.

When originally confronted with the notion that the Kremlin had had an impact on the 2016 election, Facebook founder and CEO Mark Zuckerberg dismissed out of hand any role his company may have played. He said: "To think . . . [Facebook] influenced the election in any way is a pretty crazy idea." Yet we now know that the manipulation of social media is one of the primary lines of effort used by the Kremlin and Kremlin-linked actors to mount their information warfare campaigns against us.

Certain social media companies have made some reforms and worked with law enforcement and DHS to take down fraudulent networks—or what the companies deem as inauthentic accounts. For instance, late last month, Twitter announced that before the 2018 midterms, it removed 418 Russian accounts whose behavior mimicked that of the Kremlin-linked troll organization. However, we just can't assume, going forward, that these companies will act in the best interest of U.S. national security and continue to cooperate without some guidance or, perhaps, even regulation. These are private, for-profit companies, and like any company, they are worried how reputational damage will affect their bottom lines. If they cannot organize themselves effectively to combat warfare campaigns, Congress will have to legislate solutions.

Such an effort is already underway in the European Union, which has worked on several fronts to protect users of social media. The EU has established data privacy rules, known as the General Data Protection Regulation, or GDPR, that seek to strengthen individual rights for the protection of personal data. In addition, the EU has worked with online platforms which are developing voluntary standards to fight disinformation, known as the Code of Practice on Disinformation. As well, EU member nations have also made threats of regulation and fines if social media companies do not do more to address disinformation and fake accounts. It would make sense to look closely at what the EU is implementing to see what might be appropriate for our purposes.

As I discussed in part 1 of this speech, one of the main issues in the 2016 election was that social media companies didn't have the visibility into what had occurred across platforms, including Twitter, Facebook, YouTube, and others, making it harder to detect and combat Russian information warfare operations. As mentioned

previously, two independent reports commissioned by the Senate Intelligence Committee examined a subset of data provided by the social media companies relating to the 2016 election, and they identified significant Russian activity across social media platforms that was not discovered at the time.

As we look at how society must organize to counter this threat, we need greater visibility across platforms so that we can more effectively anticipate these operations coming and defend against future interference. One approach to further that goal could be the establishment of a social media repository to compile data relevant to identifying and countering foreign information operations. This database would be a tool for trusted independent researchers and academics to gain insight into cross-platform trends and provide an analysis of attacks.

To this point, last month, Cyber Commander General Nakasone testified before the Senate Intelligence Committee that the analysis of the independent reports, based on the limited data provided by a few social media companies, was “very effective.” He added:

As we prepared for the 2018 midterms, we took a very, very close look at the information that was provided there. We understood our adversary very well, and we understood where their vulnerabilities also lie.

Imagine how helpful it would be if this repository were ongoing and comprehensive.

America’s intelligence and defensive capabilities are vast and adaptable. To be sure, there is considerable work ahead to restructure, realign, and focus efforts across the government and society, but America will only be best positioned to prevent these attacks in the future once we move from a defensive posture to a strategy that plays to our strengths.

We must come up with our own American playbook to counter Russian information warfare. The Kremlin has resorted to these dirty tricks because it knows it will not win in a fair fight. We should not try to play by their rules or be symmetric in our response. We should counter Russia in the arenas where we have strategic advantages. We should counter Russia in ways that uphold and enhance our democracy and the rule of law. We should counter Russia in ways that show our strength and credibility.

As President Reagan stated: “The ultimate determinate in the struggle now going on for the world will not be bombs and rockets but a test of wills and ideas—a trial of spiritual resolve, the values we hold, the beliefs we cherish and the ideas to which we are dedicated.”

As I have explained, Kremlin and Kremlin-linked propaganda and disinformation seek to amplify fear and mistrust and convince the American public that our democracy is no better than the autocratic regime in Moscow. To push back against this

moral equivalence promoted by Putin and other authoritarian regimes, we must promote and highlight our values. In doing so, we can showcase our adherence to justice and the rule of law by exposing Russian aggression against us, our allies, and our partners.

We must assist and protect journalism, including in countries where criticizing the Kremlin and exposing the truth may put reporters in danger. In concert with allies and partners, we must encourage and support civil society groups here and abroad to protect human rights and enhance rule of law protections. We can use sanctions as a tool to expose Kremlin abuses and raise reputational costs to Putin and his cronies, such as the sanctions provided in the Magnitsky Act.

Our American playbook must also include options for responding to Russian malign activities in cyberspace. The Russians are weaponizing information stolen from our government officials and candidates for public office. We must define and harden our cyber doctrine and clearly understand how to use our military in these new domains. Our responses are likely to be asymmetric rather than employing the same dirty tricks from the Russian playbook. Ultimately, the integrity of our electoral campaigns should lead all U.S. political parties and actors to pledge not to use hacked or stolen materials to attack or smear each other.

The media, too, should contemplate what its responsibilities are to the citizens of this country when covering elections. They should be wary of covering aspects of political campaigns in ways that may aid or abet foreign information operations. While we must always protect the constitutional right of freedom of the press, the media may come to conclude that covering hacked materials without appropriately framing the source of those materials or including comments from Kremlin-linked trolls claiming to be American citizens is no longer appropriate.

Further, as I discussed in part 1 of this speech, a major line of effort for Russia is Kremlin-directed deception operations using social media to penetrate our political and social debates and magnify feelings of fear and mistrust. Our American playbook must also include ways to educate our citizens with knowledge of these plots and provide additional media literacy tools, including teaching our young people how to evaluate what they see online and further make the case to the public for the importance and value of democratic institutions.

In addition, we must strengthen support for one of our greatest strategic advantages—our alliances and partnerships globally. We must take steps to educate the American public about the central role alliances play for our national security. We must also look outward, supporting our alliances and stepping up our diplomatic outreach to help resolve longstanding regional conflicts overseas so that Russia may no

longer use information warfare campaigns to exploit those situations to their advantage.

Our responses to Russian information operations are most effective when we act in concert with allies and partners. The sanctions levied on Russia after their illegal annexation of Crimea were effective because they were implemented together with the EU. We have also witnessed the effects of the more than 25 countries expelling Russian diplomats in solidarity with the United Kingdom in response to the Skripal poisoning. The United States worked closely with Greece to blunt Russia’s attempts to undermine an agreement between Greece and North Macedonia that would open the door for North Macedonia to join NATO. As these examples show, the cost to Russia is greater when they aren’t simply dismissed as a unilateral shunning by the United States.

As the former Estonian Foreign Minister and Ambassador to Russia stated:

Joint initiatives are more likely to deter hackers. If they don’t take seriously one country, they will take seriously 30 countries when they will jointly blame a hacker or foreign nation for an attack.

Last week, the Acting Attorney General and the Secretary of Homeland Security certified that our government “concluded there is no evidence to date that any identified activities of a foreign government or foreign agent had a material impact on the integrity or security of election infrastructure or political/campaign infrastructure used in the 2018 midterm elections.”

However, we should not take that certification as a reason to let down our guard. We seem to be getting better at responding to the types of attacks perpetrated against the United States in 2016, but that is no indicator that we have become better at anticipating future attacks. The Director of the Department of Homeland Security’s Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency warned last November:

The [2018] midterm is . . . just the warm-up or the exhibition game. . . . The big game for adversaries is probably 2020.

This statement was reinforced by DNI Coats, who testified to the Senate Intelligence Committee late last month: “Our adversaries and strategic competitors are probably already looking to the 2020 U.S. elections as an opportunity to advance their interests,” and also “Moscow may employ additional influence toolkits—such as spreading disinformation, conducting hack-and-leak operations or manipulating data—in a more targeted fashion to influence U.S. policy, actions and elections.”

We must think creatively to ensure that we are ahead of this curve. I am confident that this is a challenge that we can meet and conquer with Presidential leadership, a whole of government approach, and the energy and resources necessary. We can and we must do this.

As President John F. Kennedy said: "We are not here to curse the darkness but to light the candle that can guide us through that darkness to a safe and sane future."

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

#### GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I had planned to come to the floor this evening to talk about our national parks and to talk about the lands bill that just passed, but I also want to talk for a moment, if I could, about the legislation we just voted on on this floor. It had to do with border security, and it had to do with six other appropriations bills that include many of our Departments and Agencies. It also had to do with keeping the government from shutting down. If this legislation is now passed by the House tonight, which is expected, and is signed into law by the President, which is expected, we will avoid a government shutdown, which is really important. We don't need to go there again.

I also want to talk, for a second, about the package itself and the most controversial part of it, which has to do with the border. I voted yes this evening, and I did so because the legislation we just signed takes really important steps towards strengthening our southern border. Frankly, I am not hearing much about that on either side of the aisle.

First, let me just say that President Trump had a proposal on the border. His was a comprehensive proposal—yes—of more barriers and fencing but also of more cameras, more remote sensing, more screening at ports of entry, more judges, more Border Patrol, and so on.

That legislation that he asked us to take up included \$22.8 billion—a lot of money, right?

Now, some will say: But Congress didn't follow what President Trump wanted to do because they gave him less money.

The border security funding in this package is actually about \$300 million less than the President asked for. It is \$22.5 billion.

But Congress decided—and I think Congress is right about this—that our southern border is in need of help right now. Some call it a crisis. Some just say it is a big problem. I don't care what you call it. We need more help on the border. We need more barriers, but we also need more cameras, more remote sensing, and more ways to stop the drugs from coming in, most of which come through the ports of entry. Yes, we need more people to be able to respond. Yes, we need more judges to be able to handle this backlog of immigration cases that has built up. Yes, we need more humanitarian assistance.

By the way, the Trump administration and the Democrats from Congress supported both of those things. The place where there was a difference was the amount of funding to put into the

barriers. They gave him less money than he asked for for new barriers and new fencing.

The agreement includes nearly \$1.4 billion for that—for the new barriers and new fencing. By the way, it might also surprise you to learn that that is the most money Congress has ever appropriated for fencing and new barriers in any fiscal year.

Let me repeat that. This is the most money Congress has ever voted for to provide more barriers along the border. And these are new barriers.

Now, again, if you listen to folks—sometimes on both sides of the aisle—on this issue, you might not hear that, but this is the most ever in any one fiscal year. By the way, we are already 4½ months into this fiscal year.

I am glad we provided the funding because I think it is needed. I believe we do have a crisis on the border. I believe it has to do with illegal immigration, but also it has to do with drugs that are devastating my home State of Ohio.

Crystal meth is on the rise—pure crystal meth from Mexico, almost all of it. Ninety percent of the heroin coming into my State comes across that southern border.

We now have fentanyl coming in from across the border in addition to coming straight from China. We now have, of course, cocaine coming across the southern border. We have serious drug problems that need to be addressed.

I have done a lot of work on the issue of human trafficking, and I can just tell you that what we have learned, sadly, is that the amount of trafficking going on along the southern border increases as you have more and more people who are trafficking human beings for work—illegal immigration, which I think is mostly for people coming here to find a better life for work, but they are bringing with them a lot of people who are trafficking women and children.

So the trafficking issue is real. That is what the experts tell us, and that is another reason for us to have a more secure southern border. So I am glad that we are providing the funding.

With regard to the new barriers, what the President had asked for is that his funding go to fund the top priorities of the Border Patrol. Customs and Border Protection has a border security improvement plan. You can check it out online. The border security improvement plan has a number of priorities. The President wanted to fund those priorities. This proposal that we voted on tonight does fund about 55 miles of new barriers—not just fixing up old barriers, but new barriers—which comprise the top two priorities of that border security plan.

Would the President like to do more in terms of barriers? Yes, he would, and he is talking about ways to do that.

But my point tonight is very simple. If you really care about the southern border, then, this was the right vote to

take because, with regard to barriers, this is the most Congress has ever provided for new barriers, new fencing.

I hope this will work to help stop this flow of drugs into our country, to help control the illegal immigration that is happening, to help stop the trafficking of women and children that goes on along the border, but it is going to require more work. We all know that. This is a start, and my hope is that by passing this legislation we can help to start those even more serious efforts to deal with our broader issues here, including our broader immigration issues that have to be dealt with.

So I am hopeful that the House will pass it. I am hopeful that the President will sign it. I think he will. He says he will.

I am also glad that we are not going into a shutdown. Shutdowns make no sense. We have legislation, as some of you know, to try to stop government shutdowns from happening in the future. Why? Because they are bad for taxpayers, who end up paying more, not less, often because workers who are furloughed actually get paid even when they are not working, but also because of the inefficiencies of government during a shutdown. Taxpayer services are reduced—everything from meat inspection to the security lines, to the IRS information line to figure out how to file your doggone taxes. I mean, all of that gets affected.

So shutdowns don't make sense. It really doesn't make sense for the men and women who work for the Federal Government and for their families. During this last shutdown of 35 days, workers who were told they were essential, therefore, had to report for work, and they were not getting paid. So, again, those who weren't working got paid after the fact, and those who were working were not getting paid during the shutdown. That doesn't make a lot of sense to me.

By the way, missing two pay periods is a big deal for a lot of the government workers I know because they live paycheck to paycheck. They had rent payments. They had house payments, in some cases. They had car payments. They had real issues getting through this. Let's not put them through it again. It is not their fault. They shouldn't be pawns in this.

So my hope is that we can pass the "end government shutdown" legislation. It has 33 cosponsors now, which is a lot for around here, and it gets you started. A third of the Senate has said: Yes, let's stop these things. That is a big deal. My hope is that on both sides of the aisle our leadership agrees to take this to the floor. Let's have a vote on it. Let's decide whether people think shutdowns are a good idea or not. I think they are a bad idea.

By the way, it is the fifth Congress in which I have introduced this legislation, and I must say that we have never had this many cosponsors. So I do think more and more people are realizing that this is just not the way we

ought to operate. It is no way to run a railroad or a government.

NATIONAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT ACT

Earlier this week, as I was saying earlier, the Senate passed other legislation called the lands bill, but it is really about land conservation. It is about ensuring that we have the ability to protect treasures around our great country.

There were two provisions that were in this land bill that were very important for Ohio. One had to do with something called the Ohio & Erie Canalway National Heritage Area. You have probably heard of the Erie Canal. It ran through Ohio, New York, Pennsylvania, and other States. The national heritage area is a 110-mile route on that canal from Cleveland to New Philadelphia, OH. It follows the route of the canals that went along the Cuyahoga River. It is a beautiful, beautiful area. It is the 87-mile trail, which is now enjoyed by 2.5 million visitors a year, that we wanted to be sure to protect in this legislation.

I have been there, and my family has been there. It is a great place to hike and great place to bicycle. It is a great place to go bird watching. It is a great place just to enjoy time with your family.

It is our history that we are preserving. The canalway was established as a national heritage area by Congress in 1996, and although Congress has authorized funding for the Ohio & Erie Canalway National Heritage Area through fiscal year 2021, we had reached a funding cap this year, which meant we were at risk of losing about 100,000 bucks. That may not sound like much in the context of the Federal budget, but \$100,000 is a big deal to the canalway. Why? Because we use the Federal money to leverage private money and State and local money, and it is a critical part of making sure that we continue to have this beautiful treasure in our State that brings 2.5 million visitors a year. It adds a lot of economic benefits to our area. So Senator BROWN from Ohio and I have promoted this. We know that this limited Federal funding is going to be critical to leveraging those public-private partnerships, helping to create 4,200 jobs in the region and generating \$408 million in economic benefits.

It is important to have that kind of stable funding in our heritage areas so they can continue to do what they do—to tell our Nation's rich history and to provide the recreational opportunities to the people I represent. So I am glad that that was included in the land package.

There was also another piece of legislation that was passed. It was a bill that Senator CARDIN from Maryland and I had been promoting called the Migratory Birds of the Americas Act, and it reauthorizes the Fish and Wildlife's program that promotes long-term conservation, research, and habitat protection for more than 380 different species of migratory birds.

This is a big deal to our State of Ohio. We are a big bird-watching State.

We have a lot of migratory species, including our State bird, the cardinal.

George Voinovich, whose seat I hold, was a big champion for this program in his time in the Senate, and he used to talk about the importance of this from an economic point of view. It is true that bird watching brings more than 75,000 visitors a year to just one single birding event in Ohio. For the birders who are listening, you probably know it. It is in northwest Ohio at the Maumee Bay State Park. It is called the "Biggest Week in American Birding," and polls have ranked it as the top birding event in the country. We like to think it is.

There is a study out of Bowling Green that indicates that bird watching around Lake Erie has contributed more than \$26 million annually to our local economy—\$26 million a year—and it has created almost 300 jobs.

So passage of this legislation is great news for us. It is about protecting that habitat in Ohio but also the habitat where these birds go in the wintertime. They are snow birds. They go south. We ensure they are going to come back and ensure we can continue to have that economic benefit and enjoy that natural beauty.

So I commend Senators MURKOWSKI, CANTWELL, and MANCHIN for working to get this legislation through the Senate. I look forward to the House's taking it up. It also has a good provision in there for helping our sportsmen and ensuring that we have public access to public lands. So my hope is that can move forward and we can ensure that we begin to deal with the issues that were addressed in that lands package.

One thing that was not addressed in the lands package that I want to be sure we don't lose sight of is the condition of our national parks.

Now, again, if you are going to talk about the treasures of our country, you have to put the national parks right at the top. We have this amazing park system that is the envy of some of the other countries around the world and the reason so many foreign visitors come to our country. The national parks now attract 330 million visitors annually. By the way, that is more visitors in the last few years than in the previous few years. So it is actually going up some.

These 330 million visitors come to see 84 million acres of parks and historical sites. Again, it is a huge economic boon to our country because a lot of people are coming from outside the country but also from the local areas, where people travel to get a beautiful vacation with their family, one they can afford. So we need to do everything we can do to hold our parks up.

Here is the problem. We have, over time, funded the parks' day-to-day operations but not funded their longer term maintenance problems. So think of a building that has a roof that is leaking. Now we are funding the program within that building and the naturalists, but what we are not funding is

the actual reconstruction of that building. It is called a maintenance backlog. That backlog has grown and grown and grown over the years to the point that we now have a \$12 billion maintenance backlog in our parks, and the park funding that we provide every year can't come close to providing that funding. So what some of us have done over the years is tried to bring attention to this and to figure out a way to get funding that was specifically focused on how to ensure that our national parks don't continue to deteriorate.

Again, they are such a beautiful part of our country, our history, and our culture. We have to preserve that legacy.

In Ohio, we have eight national parks, including Cuyahoga Valley National Park. Cuyahoga Valley National Park is one of the top 14 visited parks in the country. We are very proud of that. Whether it is biking, hiking, fishing, or kayaking, 2.7 million visitors a year go to Cuyahoga Valley. I am one of them. I like to do all of that there.

So these parks need to be sure that they can continue to be this treasure for the future. The infrastructure—the water infrastructure, the roads, the buildings, the bridges—is all deteriorating to the point where actually some of it can't be used.

If you go to a national park today, you may see that there is a trail closed or there is a visitors center that can't be visited. You may see that some of the campgrounds are closed or some of the bathrooms are closed because those facilities have not been able to keep up with their deferred maintenance.

So I think we should be putting more money into deferred maintenance and bringing our parks up to speed and addressing this \$12 billion backlog than the idea of expanding parks. We ought to be focused more on the stewardship of the parks we have, and that \$12 billion is impossible to find within the parks' budget that we have.

Think about your own house. If you allow deferred maintenance to build up and you don't take care of the roof, as an example, what happens? Well, you get a leak in the roof and then pretty soon your drywall is ruined, and I am pretty sure you would find out that your floor is ruined, and the costs mount up. That is what is happening in our parks. So we are not fixing the deferred maintenance, and we are creating other costs and other problems, and I have seen it. I have gone to four of our larger parks in Ohio to see, specifically, what their priorities are in terms of deferred maintenance.

One is a leaky roof. Another is a bridge. Another is part of a railroad track that runs through it, a tourism railroad track. Another is a seawall on Lake Erie. If that is not fixed, it then causes other damage.

My hope is that we can, on a bipartisan basis, deal with this because these problems compound. They get worse and worse if you don't deal with

them. We can't wait any longer to address these maintenance needs.

Even though we don't have Yellowstone Grand Teton, or Yosemite in Ohio—we don't have huge parks like those—we have a \$100 million backlog in deferred maintenance in our smaller parks in Ohio—\$100 million.

I toured Cuyahoga Valley National Park with Superintendent Craig Kenkel and Deb Yandala, who is CEO of the Conservancy for Cuyahoga Valley National Park. Deb is also president of the national association of friends groups for our parks. These friends groups are fantastic. They provide a lot of funding for the parks, private sector funding. I think that is an incredibly important part of our overall park funding, but they can't afford these maintenance projects either.

Today, there is more than \$45 million at Cuyahoga Valley alone in unmet maintenance needs—\$875,000 for badly needed renovations for their welcome center. I have been there. I have seen it. They need it. More than \$3 million is needed to renovate parking lots that are crumbling, and more than \$2 million is needed for trail repair for the extensive trail system throughout the park.

I have also been to other parks in Ohio and have seen what some of the deferred maintenance is. At the Perry's Victory & International Peace Memorial up on Lake Erie, \$47.7 million is needed in long-delayed maintenance, which includes millions to repair the cracks in the seawall there to enable the rest of the monument to continue to exist, and the visitor's center has to be made ADA compatible and needs repairs.

Everything we talk about here in terms of the parks is normally very positive. Democrats and Republicans alike love the parks. People in America love our parks. But I think they are surprised to learn that just underneath the surface, our parks are crumbling. We have to do more to ensure they are going to be enjoyed for generations to come.

From 2006 until 2017, annual visitation increased by 58 million people. As these needs are growing, more people are coming, putting more and more pressure on the parks. Keeping up with this aging infrastructure and increased visitation has really stretched the Park Service and required them to focus on just the very immediate maintenance needs and postpone or delay these other projects. We can't continue to use these bandaids. We have to address the underlying issue.

I feel this is a debt unpaid. This is deferred maintenance that has built up over the last couple of decades that we should have addressed and we didn't, and now we need to go back and do it to ensure that it doesn't cause additional costs. So this week, I have reintroduced legislation I have worked on in the last three Congresses. I have reintroduced it with three of my colleagues—Senator MARK WARNER from

Virginia, Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER from Tennessee, and Senator ANGUS KING from Maine. Two Republicans, one Democrat, and one Independent—that makes it tri-partisan. It is called the Restore Our Parks Act—a common-sense solution to deal with this \$12 billion backlog of long-overdue maintenance projects.

I thank my colleagues for stepping up and working on this together, and we have. We have had different proposals out there. Senator WARNER came up with the idea of using offshore and onshore revenue from oil and gas drilling. We combined with the bill that Senator ALEXANDER and Senator KING had put forward. There are others who have great ideas. Senator STEVE DAINES from Montana is one of our strong supporters. He is chair of the National Parks Subcommittee of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. As he said, he grew up in the shadow of Yellowstone Park. We have lots of colleagues on both sides of the aisle who care about this and are involved, and I thank them for their hard work.

Senator ALEXANDER told me that in the 100-year history of our national parks, there has never been a single bill more important than this one. That is saying a lot. Since Teddy Roosevelt decided to acquire this land for our national parks, there have been lots of ways we have tried to help the parks, including, recently, legislation that I drafted on the centennial of the parks that helps us get more public and private money into the parks. That is good, but it is not enough to handle these incredible—\$12 billion—deferred maintenance costs we have now.

The legislation creates what is called a legacy restoration fund, which will get half of all the annual energy revenues over the next 5 years that are not otherwise allocated, and it will be used for priority deferred maintenance projects. These are royalties from onshore and offshore energy development. The Trump administration is doing more of that development, so there is more revenue coming in. The bill caps the deposits into the fund at \$1.3 billion annually, so no matter what, even if there is a lot more money coming in, we will have a cap of \$1.23 billion annually, which will provide a total of \$6.5 billion for deferred maintenance projects over the next 5 years.

I said \$12 billion earlier, and that is the amount, but for the urgent priorities, it is about \$6.5 billion. That is how we came up with that number. So what we are trying to do is—at least let's address the urgent priorities in the next 5 years using the revenues coming into our government from these offshore and onshore energy projects, oil and gas projects. Again, if it is allocated for something else, like the Land and Water Conservation Fund, we don't touch it. It is just funding that is not already allocated somewhere else.

Last year, we had 37 cosponsors here in the Senate for this legislation, Re-

publicans and Democrats alike—more than one-third of this Chamber.

A similar House bill, our House companion bill, had 234 Members cosponsoring it—more than the 218 needed, more than the majority.

The Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee reported this bill out on a bipartisan basis last fall. I was on the committee. We had a good debate on it. We reported it out with a 19-to-4 vote. There is not a lot we do around here that is that bipartisan.

We received overwhelming support from conservation and outdoor recreation groups. This includes the National Parks Conservation Association, the Outdoor Industry Alliance, the Trust for Public Land, the Pew Charitable Trusts, and others. At our hearing we had on the legislation last year, the director of the Pew Charitable Trusts said it well: "Supporting this bipartisan bill is a wise investment for our National Parks System and has overwhelming support from the American public, generates hundreds of thousands of jobs and billions of dollars for the economy each year and provides access to world class recreation opportunities and helps preserve our nation's history."

Yes, the parks do all of that. That is why it is so important that we preserve them and ensure that this long-term problem gets addressed now.

I am proud to introduce legislation in the Senate this week, and I am proud that the House companion bill is being introduced today by Representatives BISHOP and KILMER. I look forward to working with my colleagues to get this bill across the finish line. I thank the Senators who have already signed up as cosponsors. I hope we can continue to build support for this and get this commonsense bill done to help preserve our national treasures.

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

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

#### JOINT REFERRAL OF NOMINATION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that PN175, the nomination of John Lowry III, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans' Employment and Training, sent to the Senate by the President, be referred jointly to the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions and the Veterans' Affairs Committees.

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

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

## MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for 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.

## REMEMBERING JOHN DINGELL

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I arrived in the U.S. Congress in January 1983—a new Congressman from downstate Illinois, the son of an immigrant mother—and I was in awe.

Just listen to this list of House Committee chairmen back then: chairman of the Rules Committee: Claude Pepper; Judiciary chairman: Peter Rodino; Veterans Affairs chairman: Sonny Montgomery; Interior Committee chairman: Mo Udall; Ways and Means Committee chairman: Danny Rostenkowski.

Yet even among these legends, John Dingell, chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, stood out. He was a giant among giants, and not just because he stood 6 foot 3. A 26-year veteran of the House at the time, he was revered as the architect of Medicare and a driving force behind some of the most important civil rights and environmental laws in America's history. He went on to become the longest serving member of Congress in American history. But it is the quality and courage of John Dingell's service, even more than its length, that made John Dingell one of the most influential legislators of all time. He helped write most of the Nation's major environmental and energy laws. He helped save the American auto industry twice: in 1979 and again during the great recession.

His nickname—"Big John"—was a reflection not only of his commanding height but also of his moral stature. Of the more than 25,000 votes he cast in Congress, the one he was most proud of was his vote in support of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. That vote led to a brutal reelection fight later that year. It was the second time John Dingell ever had a cross burned on his lawn and the closest he ever came to losing a race. But John Dingell was unbowed. He went on to champion the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and—many more major civil rights laws.

John David Dingell, Jr. was born in 1926, the eldest of three children. His family, he once said, was as "poor as Job's chicken."

In 1932, when John was 6 years old, his father was elected to Congress, where he became a leading champion of the New Deal. He stood behind FDR as he signed the law creating Social Security.

In 1943, John Senior introduced America's first national health insur-

ance bill—to help seniors and children from poor families. The bill never passed.

In 1955, John Senior died in office from tuberculosis. That same year, at the age of 29, his son was chosen in a special election to finish his father's term.

At the start of every new Congress, John Dingell introduced a bill to create a Medicare Program to provide health insurance for older adults. He never gave up on fulfilling his father's dream. When Medicare finally came up for a vote in 1965, he was given honor of presiding over the House, in memory of his father. He lent the gavel he had used that day to Speaker NANCY PELOSI when the House voted to pass the Affordable Care Act in 2010. John Dingell sat by President Obama's side when he signed the Affordable Care Act into law in 2010. Millions and millions of Americans can afford to see a doctor today and retire with a bit of security and dignity because of John Dingell.

Chairman Dingell's father taught him that public service through politics can be a noble calling. He treated everyone with dignity. He cared about people who struggle, as his own family struggled when he was young. The priest who officiated at his funeral mass in Dearborn yesterday told a story about a woman who approached him recently and told him, "If not for John Dingell, I would not have been able to put food on the table."

Last week, on the day he died, John Dingell dictated some reflections to his wife, Congresswoman DEBBIE DINGELL. She was John's partner and his rock for 40 years, and she now holds the seat that John and his father once held. John's "parting thoughts," as he called them, were published in the Washington Post. They are profoundly moving and wise. One in particular stands out for me. Chairman Dingell said that it always grated on him to hear it said that a person "has" power. "In democratic government," he wrote, "elected officials do not have power. They hold power—in trust for the people who elected them."

I'll close with one last story—one final more bit of wisdom—from my friend John Dingell.

In 1944, when he turned 18, John enlisted in the U.S. Army. The following year, he was supposed to be among the first wave of American soldiers to invade mainland Japan. Only the surrender of Japan saved him from what would have been near-certain death. All of his life, he remained proud of his service and deeply committed to other veterans and to their families.

When President George H. W. Bush died shortly after Thanksgiving, Chairman Dingell wrote a posthumous tribute—the last World War II veteran to serve in Congress, writing to honor the last World War II veteran to occupy the Oval Office. It was published in the Detroit News. This is what John Dingell wrote:

Both of us understood how fragile this American democracy was and the atrocities

that were occurring in the world. Both of us signed up immediately when war was declared and knew our moral responsibility to defend America and fight for the freedom of mankind.

He went on to say:

We were from a political generation that understood delivering for the American people was more important than political wins. The success of government and good public policy is the success of hard-working men and women.

He closed with a plea, almost a prayer:

May the stories of my good friend help us find our way back to a society that promotes dialogues, not demagogues, and that it helps us to remember we, the people, have the ability to restore this great nation to common ground rather than letting it continue its downward spiral into constant chaos.

In closing, Loretta and I send our deepest condolences to John's wife, the love of his life, Congresswoman DEBBIE DINGELL moreover, to John's three surviving children: Chip, Christopher, and Jennifer; and their families, including John's three grandchildren; to his brother and sister; his countless friends and the countless more who thought of him as a friend and mourn his passing.

## BORDER SECURITY

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, in his tortuous attempt to make a case for billions of taxpayer dollars to wall off our southern border, President Trump claimed that a wall would stop human trafficking, which has been touted as a priority of this administration.

On several occasions, the President has depicted human trafficking as women and girls smuggled across the border with their hands and legs tied and duct tape across their mouths. No doubt there are such cases, but the overwhelming majority of trafficking victims in this country are U.S. citizens, and among non-citizen victims, nearly 80 percent cross through legal points of entry. As we have seen time and again, President Trump makes short shrift of the truth and relies on scare tactics, rather than evidence, to garner support for his misguided policies.

Not only would the President's border wall do next to nothing to combat the most common instances of human trafficking in the United States, his administration's policies have actually harmed trafficking victims, especially non-citizen victims.

Last year, the administration announced that applicants who are denied a T visa—an immigrant visa that enables certain victims of sex or labor trafficking to temporarily remain in the United States—may be required to appear in immigration court, the first step in deportation proceedings. This policy has reportedly had a self-censoring effect on victims and victims' advocates who are hesitant to apply or to encourage their clients to apply for a visa that may ultimately land them in immigration court.

The administration also eliminated grant funding for criminal record sealing or expungement for survivors of human trafficking, previously made available by the Department of Justice's Office for Victims of Crime. Survivors may have a criminal record associated with their trafficking, such as an arrest for prostitution or for a charge tangential to their trafficking such as loitering or theft. Helping survivors clear their criminal record is a critical step in their recovery, one that gives survivors a greater chance at securing stable employment, affordable housing, higher education, visas and green cards, and more.

So once again, we are forced to try to reconcile the President's rhetoric with the actions of his administration. They don't align. If this White House were serious about combating human trafficking, it would focus less on creating a false narrative about trafficking across our southern border and instead devote the resources to ensure that trafficking victims can come forward knowing they will be protected and assisted on their path to recovery.

#### THE FREEDOM TO EXPORT TO CUBA ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I want to commend Senator KLOBUCHAR for introducing the Freedom to Export to Cuba Act, of which I and Senator ENZI are cosponsors. I urge other Senators to join us.

This bill is about ending the anachronistic prohibitions in U.S. law that for decades have limited U.S. engagement with Cuba, including preventing American companies from exporting their products to Cuba. The fact that legislation to do so is even necessary is illustrative of the absurdity of the situation in which we find ourselves. Companies from Europe, Russia, China, Mexico, and every other country can sell their products to Cuba, which is just 90 miles from our coast, but American manufacturers and retailers are largely shut out of the Cuban market.

For example, Cuba buys rice from Vietnam and powdered milk from New Zealand, half a world away, not from Alabama, Vermont, or Michigan. That makes no sense. This bill would enable American companies to compete, which every believer in a free market should support.

It is also important for Senators to know that punitive actions by the Trump administration last year to further restrict the right of Americans to travel to Cuba have had devastating consequences for Cuba's fledgling private sector, the very people the White House and supporters of the restrictions profess to want to help. The fact that they have said nothing about the harm they are causing Cuba's struggling entrepreneurs demonstrates that they care more about continuing their failed policy of sanctions, regardless of who they hurt, than about helping the Cuban people or about protecting the right of Americans to travel freely.

The latest ill-conceived attempt by the White House to punish Cuba would permit Title III of the Helms-Burton Act to go into effect. This would allow, among others, individuals who were Cuban citizens when their property in Cuba was expropriated half a century ago to sue in U.S. courts any Cuban, foreign, and even American company whose business in Cuba today uses that property. That could be an airport, port, warehouse, hotel, restaurant, you name it. Virtually every American and foreign company investing in Cuba would suddenly be liable for treble damages.

The purpose, as the law's authors made clear when it was enacted 23 years ago, is to harm Cuba's economy by making it completely inhospitable for foreign investment.

As my friend in the House, Representative JIM MCGOVERN, has pointed out;

"It's no mystery why Presidents Clinton, Bush, Obama, and Trump blocked Title III from going into effect every six months for the past 23 years.

It is hypocritical—it penalizes companies for doing what American companies do all over the world.

It is contrary to international law, which recognizes the right of expropriation and requires compensation.

It is an extraterritorial sanction that guarantees a response from our trading partners, like Canada, Spain and the EU, including complaints at the World Trade Organization.

And if you care about agriculture, be warned: It will open a new front in the trade war, with all the repercussions that can bring.

It will allow Cuba to claim victim status and rally international support.

It will clog our courts with lawsuits.

It will make it impossible to negotiate compensation for U.S. claims in Cuba, and, in the end, hurt the very Americans who seek compensation for the property they lost.

It will divide us from friends and allies who are now working for a peaceful solution in Venezuela.

And it will guarantee that new investment in Cuba will come from the Russians, Chinese and others who are hostile to the United States, and whose state-owned companies can't be sued in U.S. courts."

I agree with my friend in the other body. What the White House is considering would trigger an avalanche of unintended consequences that would bring U.S. commerce with Cuba to a halt, harm relations with our allies in this hemisphere and beyond, and make resolving property claims more difficult. I ask unanimous consent that a piece by William Leogrande on Title III of the Helms-Burton Act published in the February 13, 2019 issue of OnCubaNews be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

Like many issues, Members of Congress have strong feelings pro and con about U.S. relations with Cuba. It is no secret that, after more than half a century of a policy of isolation that has achieved none of its objectives and primarily hurt the Cuban people, I, like Senators KLOBUCHAR and ENZI and many others in this body, favor closer relations.

Conversely, there are those in Congress and the Trump administration who believe strongly that we should ratchet up the pressure on the Cuban Government in an attempt to achieve those elusive goals.

I have often spoken publicly about the lack of political freedom and civil liberties in Cuba, but I also think it is important to try to be objective: to criticize when called for and to acknowledge positive changes when they occur.

I recognize that those who favor maintaining the failed economic embargo have a longstanding, visceral antagonism and resentment toward the Cuban Government. While they rarely, if ever, mention the corrupt and brutal Batista regime that enjoyed unqualified U.S. support until it was overthrown in 1959, they have legitimate reasons to criticize the mistreatment of the Cuban people by the current government and its support for the corrupt and repressive Maduro regime in Venezuela.

But they too should acknowledge that threatening and bullying Cuba has not worked. In fact, it has made the situation worse and provided an excuse for the Cuban Government to blame its own failures on us. They should also acknowledge positive changes in Cuba, but they never do—not ever. It is almost as if they are psychologically, ideologically, or emotionally incapable of saying one positive thing about the Cuban Government, no matter what positive things it does.

Perhaps they are afraid that, if they did, they would alienate their donors in the Cuban-American community. Of course, we know that Cuban-Americans are divided about the U.S. embargo. Some are hardcore believers in the embargo, and they always will be. But at least as many—and increasing numbers—oppose the embargo, especially those who were born after the Cuban revolution.

I wonder what the pro-embargo isolationists would say if the Cuban Government were to stop harassing and abusing dissidents who favor a more democratic system. Would those who oppose the embargo say anything positive?

What if the Cuban Government decided to embrace a free market economy and let private businesses flourish? Would those who oppose the embargo say anything positive?

I doubt it. I doubt it because no matter what positive reforms occur in Cuba, they will continue to defend the embargo until Cuba is a full-fledged democracy and those who currently hold power either die or are voted out of office.

We all want Cuba to become a democracy, where civil and political rights are respected, and the sooner the better, but those same defenders of the embargo support billions of dollars in U.S. aid—and weapons sales—to countries that are led by authoritarian, brutal, and corrupt dictatorships and monarchies, some of which have held power for decades or generations.



How do the pro-embargo diehards reconcile that? They don't, and they can't.

The fact is, Cuba is changing—not nearly as fast as we and the Cuban people would like, but it is changing in ways that few would have predicted not very long ago.

Last year, Raul Castro's hand-picked successor, Miguel Diaz-Canel, became President, and he promised a government more accessible and responsive to the people's needs. How he delivers on that promise remains to be seen.

Since 2010, after the Cuban Government recognized that the internet is essential if Cuba wants to be part of the modern world, internet access has exploded. The government has opened hundreds of public Wi-Fi hot spots and cyber cafes in the past 5 years, and home internet access became legal and available in 2017. Today, almost half of the Cuban people have personal cellphones that were illegal just a decade ago.

As others have pointed out, these changes have encouraged new forms of communication, networking, and organizing via social media.

But change does not come easily in Cuba, as it does not in many countries. Last July, the government announced onerous new regulations on the private sector, covering a wide range of issues: food safety, labor contracts, procurement, taxation, limits on the size of private businesses. The new rules were an attempt by hardliners to crack down on the private sector, which was criticized for black marketeering.

But private entrepreneurs resisted, and they challenged the regulations as contradictory to the government's own plans that recognizes the private sector as important to economic growth and employment. They appealed to government officials and spoke publicly about the harm the new rules would have on their businesses.

When the final regulations were issued, several that had caused the most resentment were dropped. According to the Minister of Labor and Social Security, the decision to revise the rules was due to "the opinion and experiences of those directly involved."

The government also retreated on a new law—Decree 349—requiring artists, musicians, and performers to register with the state and pay a large commission on their earnings from private engagements, and it banned work with objectionable content and empowered inspectors to shut down any offensive exhibition or performance. Clearly, an attempt to further limit free expression.

Since the 1980s, Cuban artists have had more freedom to be critical of the government than other social sectors, and so it was not surprising that Decree 349 ignited widespread protests. After social media was used to mobilize opposition within the Cuban arts community and among artists abroad, the government agreed not to enforce the law until implementing regulations are

drafted in consultation with the arts community.

According to one observer, "during [the latter half of last year], nearly 8.9 million Cubans debated the draft of a new constitution in their workplaces, neighborhoods and schools. Communist Party members were told not to argue with even the most radical proposals for amendments, and the ensuing debates were freewheeling, often lasting past their scheduled time. Among the main topics: whether the president and state governors should be directly elected by voters; whether the concentration of wealth and property should be allowed; whether term limits and age limits for leaders were a good idea; and whether the Communist Party should be subordinated to the constitution and hence the law." Not long ago it would have been unthinkable to openly debate these issues, especially as part of a constitutional reform process.

One article that attracted intense debate recognized same-sex marriage and was promoted by Raul Castro's daughter, a long-time activist for LGBTQ rights. The proposal sparked strong opposition from evangelical churches supported by the Catholic Church. Gay rights advocates countered with campaigns of their own. The chance of a significant "no" vote on the entire constitutional reform led the government to drop the provision from the final draft of the constitution with a pledge to consider it later.

This surge in mobilization by well-organized constituencies utilizing social media to resist government policy, from burdensome private sector regulations to gay marriage, is unprecedented in Cuba. The government's willingness to not only tolerate these organized challenges but to change policies in response to them is significant.

As has been noted, none of these issues dealt with the rigid structure of the Cuban system. Cuba remains a one-party state, in which those who challenge the system are treated as criminals, but the precedent of organized interest groups mounting successful campaigns to challenge and change government policy is now established, which is positive.

None of the longstanding critics of the Cuban Government in the U.S. Congress or the Cuban-American community have acknowledged any of this, nor are they likely to. For them, anything less than a wholesale change of government in Cuba is unworthy of mention, even though they apply a very different standard—a double standard—to other authoritarian governments. In fact, they would ridicule anyone who regards such changes as positive or worthy of recognition.

As we know from our own experience, political reform is difficult. Our own Electoral College, an anachronism designed to protect a slave-holding minority, remains in effect more than two centuries later. Five times, in the world's oldest democracy, it has pre-

vented the winner of the most popular votes from being elected President.

The Cuban people want to live better and they want a lot less government control over their lives. Armed with cellphones and the internet, they are going to make increasing demands of their government. This is happening at a time when Venezuela's economy is collapsing and the survival of the Maduro regime, Cuba's closest ally in the hemisphere, is in question. Not surprisingly, the Cuban Government is trying to limit the pace of change and to secure other benefactors. It is turning increasingly to Russia, Algeria, Iran, and other countries that welcome the chance to challenge U.S. influence in this hemisphere.

This is a time for the United States to be actively and visibly engaged in Cuba, for Americans to be traveling to Cuba, for expanding educational, cultural, and professional exchanges between the U.S. and Cuba, and for American companies to be competing in Cuba. It is not a time to return to a failed policy of threats and ultimatums, driven by domestic politics rather than by what is in our national interests.

That is why I am cosponsoring the Freedom to Export to Cuba Act, and it is why I intend to support other bipartisan legislation to replace our failed Cuba policy with one that serves America's interests, not the interests of a shrinking minority, and not the interests of Russia and other countries that are reaping the economic benefits of our self-defeating policy of isolation.

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

[From OnCubaNews, Feb. 13, 2019]  
PRESIDENT TRUMP RISKS ALIENATING ALLIES  
OVER CUBAN AMERICAN PROPERTY CLAIMS  
(By William M. LeoGrande)

The Trump administration is seriously considering whether to allow Title III of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act (Helms-Burton) to go into effect in March, according to National Security Adviser John Bolton. On January 16, Secretary of State Mike Pompeo announced that he was suspending Title III for just 45 days instead of the usual six months while the administration reviews whether its implementation would promote democracy in Cuba. He warned foreign companies doing business on the island that they had better "reconsider whether they are trafficking in confiscated property and abetting this dictatorship."

Title III allows U.S. nationals to file suit in U.S. courts against anyone "trafficking" in their confiscated property in Cuba—that is, anyone profiting from it. If President Trump allows Title III to go fully into effect, he will open the door to as many as 200,000 law suits by U.S. nationals, most of them Cuban Americans, whose property was taken by the Cuban government after 1959. U.S. courts would be swamped, the ability of U.S. companies to do business on the island would be crippled, and allies abroad might retaliate for U.S. suits brought against their companies in Cuba. Once the suits have been filed, there will be no way to undo the resulting legal chaos and the tangle of resulting litigation could take years to unwind.

The U.S. Foreign Claims Settlement Commission has certified 5,913 claims of U.S. nationals whose property was seized. These are

the claims that Cuba recognizes and that the United States and Cuba had begun to discuss during the Obama administration. But Title III takes the unusual position of allowing naturalized Cuban Americans who lost property to also file suit against alleged traffickers. Normally, international law recognizes the sovereign right of governments to dispose of the property of their own citizens. According to the Department of State, by including Cuban Americans who were not U.S. citizens when their property was taken, Title III creates the potential for an estimated 75,000–200,000 claims worth “tens of billions of dollars.”

Back in 1996, when the law was being debated in Congress, angry opposition from U.S. allies Canada, Mexico, and the European Union, whose companies doing business in Cuba would be the targets of Title III law suits, led President Bill Clinton to insist on a presidential waiver provision in Title III. As a result, the president has the authority to suspend for six months the right to file Title III law suits, and he can renew that suspension indefinitely. Every six months since the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act was passed, successive presidents, Democrat and Republican alike, have continued the suspension of Title III.

U.S. allies have denounced Title III’s extraterritorial reach. Mexico, Canada, the United Kingdom, and the European Union all passed laws prohibiting compliance with it. The European Union also filed a complaint with the World Trade Organization, which it did not pursue after President Clinton suspended Title III. In fact, the principal justification both President Clinton and President George W. Bush offered for continuing the suspension was the need to maintain cooperation with European allies.

If President Trump does not renew the suspension, all these old wounds with allies will be reopened as U.S. claimants try to haul foreign companies into U.S. courts for doing business in Cuba. We already have enough tough issues on our agenda with Mexico, Canada, and Europe without adding another one. At this very moment, Washington is trying to muster their support in dealing with the Venezuelan crisis, support that could be endangered if the administration picks a fight with them over Title III.

U.S. businesses would not be exempt from potential liability. A Cuban American family in Miami claims to have owned the land on which José Martí International Airport was built, so any U.S. carrier using the air field

could conceivably be sued under Title III. Another family that owned the Port of Santiago could file suit against U.S. cruise ships docking there.

Moreover, it would be almost impossible for a U.S. or foreign company to know in advance whether a proposed business opportunity in Cuba might become the subject of Title III litigation. “This will effectively end for decades any attempt to restore trade between the U.S. and Cuba,” attorney Robert Muse told the Tampa Bay Times.

When President Trump announced new sanctions on Cuba back in June 2017, senior administration officials said they were designed “to not disrupt existing business” that U.S. companies were doing in Cuba. If the president fails to continue the suspension of Title III, business relations will be disrupted far more severely and irreparably than they would be by any regulatory change.

**BUDGET ENFORCEMENT LEVELS**

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, BBEDCA, establishes statutory limits on discretionary spending and allows for various adjustments to those limits. In addition, sections 302 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 allow the chairman of the Budget Committee to establish and make revisions to allocations, aggregates, and levels consistent with those adjustments.

The Senate will soon consider the conference report for H.J. Res. 31, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019. This measure provides full-year appropriations for Federal Government agencies and contains spending that qualifies for cap adjustments under current statute.

This measure includes \$8,165 million in budget authority that is designated as being for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of BBEDCA. Of that amount, \$165 million is for spending in the security category and \$8,000 million is for nonsecurity spending. CBO estimates that this

budget authority will result in \$2,980 million in outlays in Fiscal Year 2019.

This measure also includes \$12,000 million in nonsecurity discretionary budget authority designated for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of BBEDCA. This designation makes the spending associated with this provision and its associated outlays of \$600 million eligible for an adjustment.

This legislation repurposes nonsecurity discretionary budget authority for emergency efforts. This funding is designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of BBEDCA. CBO estimates that this repurposing of funds will result in \$10 million in outlays this fiscal year.

As a result of the aforementioned designations, I am revising the budget authority and outlay allocations to the Committee on Appropriations by increasing revised security budget authority by \$165 million, revised nonsecurity budget authority by \$20,000 million, and outlays by \$3,590 million in Fiscal Year 2019. Further, I am increasing the budgetary aggregate for Fiscal Year 2019 by \$20,165 million in budget authority and \$3,590 million in outlays.

I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying tables, which provide details about the adjustment, be printed in the RECORD.

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

**REVISION TO BUDGETARY AGGREGATES**  
(Pursuant to Sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)

	\$s in millions	2019
Current Spending Aggregates:		
Budget Authority .....		3,619,159
Outlays .....		3,546,419
Adjustments:		
Budget Authority .....	20,165	
Outlays .....	3,590	
Revised Spending Aggregates:		
Budget Authority .....	3,639,324	
Outlays .....	3,550,009	

**REVISION TO SPENDING ALLOCATION TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019**

(Pursuant to Sections 302 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)

	\$s in millions	2019
Current Allocation:		
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority .....		715,835
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority .....		600,577
General Purpose Outlays .....		1,352,810
Adjustments:		
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority .....	165	
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority .....	20,000	
General Purpose Outlays .....	3,590	
Revised Allocation:		
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority .....	716,000	
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority .....	620,577	
General Purpose Outlays .....	1,356,400	

Memorandum: Detail of Adjustments Made Above	Regular	OCO	Program Integrity	Disaster Relief	Emergency	Total
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority .....	0	165	0	0	0	165
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority .....	0	8,000	0	12,000	0	20,000
General Purpose Outlays .....	0	2,980	0	600	10	3,590

**RECOGNIZING IDAHO NATIONAL LABORATORY**

Mr. RISCH. Madam President, along with my colleagues Senator MIKE CRAPO and Representative MIKE SIMP-

SON, I recognize an important anniversary being celebrated at the U.S. Department of Energy’s, DOE, 890–square-mile site in eastern Idaho.

On February 18, 1949, the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission decided to build

the National Reactor Testing Station in Idaho.

For 70 years, work done by the scientists, engineers, technicians, and support staff at Idaho’s lab has helped

promote American prosperity and contributed to our national security.

Since 1967, research conducted at Idaho National Laboratory's, INL, Advanced Test Reactor has powered and modernized the U.S. Nuclear Navy.

Fifty years ago, the Navy had to refuel its nuclear fleet frequently, an expensive and time-consuming process.

Today, as a result of experiments conducted at the Advanced Test Reactor, ATR, the Navy's nuclear fleet can run the lifetime of the ship—more than three decades—without refueling. That saves American taxpayers millions of dollars and ensures that our fleet is actively defending U.S. national security instead of sitting in port waiting to be refueled.

Roughly a decade and a half ago, Congress designated INL as the Nation's lead nuclear energy research and development laboratory. This is fitting because on December 20, 1951, INL first demonstrated nuclear fission could be used to generate power to light our homes and cities. Throughout its history, INL has built and operated 52 original nuclear reactors and helped establish an American industry that today produces approximately 19 percent of our Nation's electricity and more than half of our carbon-free electricity. INL has become a world leader in cyber security research and works actively with government and industry to protect and make the Nation's most critical infrastructure more resilient. INL has advanced broader clean energy research, informing electric vehicle deployment and developing bioenergy solutions that benefit the environment and our Nation's farmers. Even as we celebrate INL's 70 years, the lab's leadership and staff are looking ahead. Those seven decades of service provide a foundation upon which today's INL will help this Nation build a brighter future. INL leads the effort to maintain and extend the lives of America's nuclear reactor fleet, while helping industry develop advanced reactor designs, including small modular reactors and microreactors. INL's vital national and homeland security work grows more important every day as our systems become increasingly automated and interdependent.

As we eye the energy systems that will power U.S. prosperity into the future, INL's clean energy research is developing breakthroughs that will help integrate renewables into the power grid and allow our manufacturing and transportation systems to operate more efficiently and with less environmental impact.

It is our great honor to congratulate INL and DOE on this important anniversary, and to wish its employees well as they work to resolve our nation's pressing clean energy and national security challenges.

#### TRIBUTE TO BRENDAN MACKIE

Mr. COONS, Madam President, I rise to recognize with gratitude the dedi-

cated service of Jeffrey Brendan Mackie to Delawareans as a member of my constituent services staff. Brendan is smart, funny, kind, and creative, with a deep respect for our Nation's history and institution and a genuine, intense passion for public service.

Over the past 5½ years, Brendan has put the needs and challenges of people from across Delaware first. Brendan worked on my constituent outreach and communication teams, serving as veterans advocate, staff photographer, and press assistant. In total, Brendan resolved more than 1,500 cases for constituents and in his last year alone produced more than 350 documents and postings for our communications team.

Brendan has also served with distinction in the U.S. Army, Delaware National Guard, Hawaii National Guard, twice overseas in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom, as a first responder following Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Maria, and served as an AmeriCorps volunteer with the Corporation for National and Community Service.

Brendan's ability to balance his workload while focusing on his own professional development was equally admirable. While on my team, he graduated from Wilmington University in 2014, Officer Candidate School in 2015, Military Intelligence School in 2016, and Air Assault School in 2017. These milestones have strengthened Brendan's capacity as a leader and have increased his knowledge of defense and intelligence matters.

Tomorrow, Brendan will finish his service with my Senate office and soon after will join the staff of the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, where I know he will be a zealous advocate for members of the military and veteran community. His colleagues—now friends—who enjoy his wit and wisdom will miss him. While we will miss his regular anecdotes laced with historical references, we know we will continue to enjoy his “on this day” Facebook posts and updates as he continues to read biographies on every American president.

In sum, Brendan stood out amongst my staff and demonstrated a level of intelligence, analytical ability, character, and a devotion that will serve him well in the future. I will miss his insights and his constant focus on making things better for the constituents we serve, and I look forward to hearing about his successes to come.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### TRIBUTE TO BLONDELL REYNOLDS BROWN

• Mr. CASEY, Madam President, today I wish to honor Councilwoman Blondell Reynolds Brown, a notable public servant in Pennsylvania, as she concludes 20 years of service within the Philadelphia City Council. Throughout her career, Councilwoman Reynolds Brown

has worked to improve the lives of Philadelphians as an educator, community activist, and political leader.

The oldest of seven children, Blondell Reynolds Brown was born in Sumter, SC, to Sadie Reynolds, a schoolteacher, and the late Whittimore Reynolds, who worked in construction. At the age 5, Reynolds Brown and her family moved to Philadelphia, where she would go on to graduate from the Philadelphia High School for Girls.

Councilwoman Reynolds Brown demonstrated an early proclivity for public service. Following her graduation from Pennsylvania State University, she was on track to join the Peace Corps, but instead decided to start her service in Philadelphia and teach in the city's public schools.

In 1999, Reynolds Brown was elected to one of seven at-large city council seats. It was her time as a legislative aide for a State senator that inspired her initial decision to run for city council. During this time, Reynolds Brown noticed a lack of Black women in leadership roles and led her own efforts to promote equity and diversity in public office.

During her time in office, Reynolds Brown has championed meaningful legislation in service of children, women, arts and culture, education, small business development, and the environment and sustainability. Councilwoman Reynolds Brown's major legislative accomplishments include the creation of the Fund for Children, the establishment of requirements for menu labeling within Philadelphia, the implementation of sexual harassment training for city of Philadelphia employees, the overhaul of the parks and recreation system, and the expansion of domestic partner benefits within city contractors. She also did a great deal to advocate for the appointment of woman to board positions and helped leverage funding for mentorship, early childhood education, the arts, and Philadelphia tourism.

Beyond her work on city council, Reynolds Brown is an active member of the Philadelphia community. She is a board member of the Philadelphia Convention and Visitor's Bureau, the Marian Anderson Award, Philadelphia Young Playwrights, the Greater Philadelphia Cultural Alliance, and Wynnefield Residents Association. Reynolds Brown is also an ex-officio member of the board of the Philadelphia Dance Company, and a general member of the Philadelphia Alumnae Chapter of the Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Incorporated.

I wish to thank Councilwoman Blondell Reynolds Brown for her long service to Philadelphia on its city council. I wish her success in all her future endeavors to serve the people of Pennsylvania.●

##### TRIBUTE TO SETH BEAL

• Mr. CRAPO, Madam President, along with my colleague Senator JAMES E. RISCH, I congratulate Seth Beal, who is

retiring after more than 30 years of serving as a commissioner for Butte County, ID.

Seth Beal has dedicated so much of his time and talents to serving others throughout his communities. He was appointed to the Butte County Commission on June 6, 1988. Seth has said that efforts that established far-reaching benefits for his communities have been the most satisfying parts about his job. This includes the establishment of the rural addressing of Butte and South Custer Counties. He also assisted with Federal legislation providing for small community and arid landfill design. He was involved with ensuring that local counties could access Payment in Lieu of Taxes, PILT, payments because of the local presence of U.S. Department of Energy facilities. Another highlight of his work on the Butte County Commission is the commission's establishment of the Butte County Elected Scholarship, which awards three scholarships per year to Butte County High School seniors.

Through his work and public service, Seth has helped improve his local communities and supported area youth. In addition to his service on the county commission, Seth has served as an assistant football coach for 8 years at Butte County High School. He has served as bishop and stake president in the Idaho Falls Temple Presidency. He has also been involved with the purchase and renovation of buildings that provide improved facilities for the county.

In addition to his extensive service on the Butte County Commission, he has served in numerous other leadership positions that include service on several boards, including the Idaho County Risk Management Program for 20 years; GEM PLAN, the county's insurance plan, for 14 years; East Central Idaho Development Association for 12 years; founding member of the Regional Development Alliance and 21 years of service; 7th Judicial District Commissioner for 24 years; District 6 elected officials chairman for 5 years; Idaho National Lab Citizens Advisory Board member for 7 years; founding member of the 3-B Juvenile Detention Center; and founding member of the Energy Communities Alliance.

Seth Beal, congratulations on your retirement after more than three decades of serving on the Butte County Commission and in many other leadership positions. Your thoughtful and committed leadership all these years is a prime example of what makes our communities so great. Thank you for your dedication and extensive service on behalf of our fellow Idahoans.●

#### TRIBUTE TO RUSSELL JAMES

● Mr. DAINES. Madam President, this week I have the honor of recognizing Russell James of Missoula County for his impact on the Whitewater community.

A third generation Montanan, Russell was born and raised in Ovando, MT. Mr. James graduated high school from Thompson Falls, where he went to the University of Montana. Directly after graduation in 1980, Russell dove into the workforce, taking a job as a professional truck driver.

Russell has been a professional truck driver for 38 years and has accumulated over 1 million accident-free miles. He has won numerous awards during his tenure as a driver, including the 2008 YRC employee of the Year Award and the 2018 YRC Road to Excellence Award. He has represented YRC every year at the Montana Truck Driving Championships since 2005, as well as the National Truck Driving Championships in 2011 and 2014. Russell is active in the community, volunteering with the Blackfoot River Preservation Group and environmental quality improvement and wildlife habitat. He is also an avid outdoorsman and enjoys tending to his small family farm.

I congratulate Russell on his lifetime of outstanding achievements and willingness to give back to his community. A tried and true Montanan, I look forward to seeing his success in his future endeavors.●

#### TRIBUTE TO OFFICER MILOS GRUBNIC

● Ms. DUCKWORTH. Madam President, today I wish to honor supervisory Transportation Security Officer Milos Grubnic for going above and beyond his duties while serving with the U.S. Department of Homeland Security's Transportation Security Administration, TSA, at O'Hare International Airport in Chicago, IL.

On November 26, 2018, Officer Grubnic was featured in TSA Today after he and a fellow Transportation Security officer, John Kozcur, helped a passenger recover his stolen cell phone. Not only did they handle the situation in a thorough and professional manner by reviewing security footage, tracking the individual down and returning the item, but they were able to do so before the passenger boarded his flight. Many times, the hard work of our Transportation Security officers goes unnoticed and unreported, and I am thankful for all they do to keep us safe.

Officer Grubnic's actions in November displayed his steadfast dedication and passion for public service. Throughout his time at O'Hare International Airport, Officer Grubnic has worked to support all aspects of TSA's mission, including assisting my family and me at security checkpoints as we travel.

I commend Officer Grubnic's hard work, passion, and commitment to safeguarding the public and achieving TSA's mission to protect our Nation's transportation systems. May his continued dedication serve as an inspiration to us all.●

#### REMEMBERING BISHOP MCKINLEY YOUNG

● Ms. HARRIS. Madam President, our Nation mourns the loss of one of the country's greatest servant-leaders, The Right Reverend, Senior Bishop McKinley Young, whose life work ministering to countless individuals and whole communities in search of both hope and democracy exemplifies faith in action.

Senior Bishop McKinley Young was born on November 10, 1944, in Atlanta, GA; the eldest son of Reverend Lonnie C. Young and Mrs. Nellie Cummings Young. He attended Morris Brown College, where he earned his bachelor's degree and later received two master's degrees from Andover Newton Theological School and the University of Chicago Divinity School respectively.

Early in his ministry, Bishop Young pastored churches in the first, fourth, and sixth Episcopal Districts, including the historic Big Bethel A.M.E Church in Atlanta, GA. After being elected and consecrated the 109th Bishop of the African Methodist Episcopal Church in 1992, his first episcopal assignment was to the 15th District of Angola, South Africa, and Namibia where he led the Centennial Celebration of African Methodism. Bishop Young would later serve as presiding prelate in Texas, Florida, and the Bahamas. His final episcopal assignment was with the third District, which includes Ohio, West Virginia, and Western Pennsylvania, where he served until his transition to the church triumphant on Wednesday, January 16, 2019.

Bishop Young's commitment to the church community was as strong as his commitment to voter education, voter registration, and getting people from the pews to the polls. This passion came from his lifelong belief that "a vote-less people is a hopeless people." For decades, Bishop Young organized voter registration drives across the United States, empowering those who were historically voiceless in the voting process. His commitment to democratic values led him to South Africa, where he worked on voter registration efforts during the first free democratic election of the President of South Africa.

Throughout his journey and in addition to his ministerial and civic work, Bishop Young worked diligently to increase educational opportunities for African-American students, especially those attending historically black colleges and universities. He served on the board of trustees for Payne Theological Seminary, led the church in financially stabilizing Paul Quinn College, helped raise \$2 million to secure Edward Walters College's accreditation, and would later serve as chancellor of Wilberforce University.

Bishop Young has served the ecumenical community faithfully for over 40 years. He was a devoted leader of the African Methodist Episcopal Church Service and Development Agency, Inc., SADA for over 20 years and served as

chair of the board. Bishop Young's leadership among other faith councils only amplified the effectiveness of his advocacy across the faith community, including as a member of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches, the National Council of Churches, the World Methodist Council, and the Conference of National Black Churches.

Bishop Young was a courageous servant leader, activist, and champion for civil and human rights whose service and dedication to countless communities will continue to inspire others for generations to come.

We wish every member of the African Methodist Episcopal Church that he served and those whose lives were touched by Bishop Young peace during this difficult time, especially his wife Dr. Dorothy Jackson Young, his children, Karyn, Deana, Andrea, and Stephanie, and eight grandchildren:●

#### TRIBUTE TO HEATHER MCGLAUFLIN

● Ms. HASSAN. Madam President, I am proud to recognize Heather McGlaulin of New Boston, NH as the February Granite Stater of the Month for her remarkable work to help prevent substance misuse. Now a high school senior, Heather has worked with a number of organizations since her sophomore year to help prevent substance misuse among her peers and to fight for young people to have a seat at the table in efforts to combat this devastating epidemic.

Heather's advocacy on this issue began after a guidance counselor encouraged her to attend a weekend training with CADCA, Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America. At the end of the weekend, Heather participated on a panel of students proposing solutions to government officials and advocates on how to strengthen the response to this crisis that was broadcast live on New Hampshire's WMUR.

The CADCA training inspired Heather's continued activism, and in the years since, she has gotten involved in a variety of initiatives such as training younger students on over-the-counter medication safety, presenting on the importance of youth advocacy to DEA agents from across New England and the country, and participating in a public service announcement training with the Mark Wahlberg Youth Foundation. As a result of her work with the Mark Wahlberg foundation, Heather created several PSA's which were selected for further production and participated in an Emmy-winning PSA with WMUR. Heather also helped found Empower Youth 603—a youth coalition focused on substance misuse in New Hampshire—and she recently presented at CADCA's national conference in Washington, DC, where I met Heather and heard more about her work.

Heather says she is driven by the stories of her friends and peers, too many

of whom have been impacted by New Hampshire's devastating opioid crisis. She believes that it is critical to stop substance misuse before it happens and that the best messenger for young people is often someone their own age.

For her continued efforts in preventing substance misuse, I am proud to recognize Heather McGlaulin as February's Granite Stater of the Month.●

#### TRIBUTE TO JENNIE CYRAN

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, today I recognize Jennie Cyran, the Polk County Teacher of the Year from Horizons Elementary School in Davenport, FL.

In receiving this award, Jennie credited her colleagues and students for her success, believing she would not be in this position if it were not for them. She considers successful teachers to be those that devote their time to building trust and relationships with their students and their families.

Jennie considers the classroom to be a student's second home, free from judgement and a place where they can embrace their mistakes as learning opportunities. She tutors her students on weekends at school or at their homes and offers parents the resources to help their children succeed in school and later in life.

Jennie has been a teacher for 13 years and enjoys working with new teachers so that they are not overwhelmed with their new jobs. She also mentors female students through the Girls of Integrity program and volunteers as a Special Olympics coach and unified partner for several sports.

I would like to thank Jennie for all her hard work to provide students with a successful learning environment. I extend my best wishes to her and look forward to hearing of her continued success in the coming years.●

#### TRIBUTE TO HOLLY MICKLER

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, today I honor Holly Mickler, the Pasco County Teacher of the Year from Pasco Middle School in Dade City, FL.

Holly is an Advancement Via Individual Determination teacher. She focuses on preparing her students for college level writing, reading, and critical thinking skills. She also teaches them the non-academic skills, such as perseverance, time management, curiosity, manners, and character building, that are so important for students success in the classroom and in life.

While she develops a general lesson plan for her students, she also individualizes these plans and shifts her end goals based on their needs. Holly believes having an intentionally flexible lesson plan is what turns good teachers into great teachers because it allows them to adapt their student's needs.

Holly has taught at Pasco Middle School for 14 years. She earned her bachelor's degree in special education

from Appalachian State University. Outside of the classroom, she works with her husband in their prison ministry, Hostage of Hope Ministries. They provide inmates with personal items and transcribe sermons from the Tampa Bay Presbyterian Church.

I extend my sincere thanks and gratitude to Holly for her dedication to her students and look forward to hearing of her continued success in the years to come.●

#### RECOGNIZING THE CHURCH OF ST. MICHAEL THE ARCHANGEL

● Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, this year marks the 160th year that the Church of St. Michael the Archangel has served the people of South Providence and the larger Rhode Island community. Rhode Island's earliest values are of inclusion, acceptance, and respect for difference. The founder of our State, Roger Williams, went off into an unknown wilderness and established a land in which tolerance and religious openness were the new standard. In keeping with these founding principles, the community of St. Michael's has been a place of welcome since its inception.

Generations of immigrants built this country; yet too often, those who come seeking the American dream are met with discrimination. Originally serving Irish and Western European immigrant populations often pushed to the margins of society, St. Michael's has expanded to incorporate the Providence of today, a multicultural, multilingual community.

Faith compels work toward fairness and justice for all living beings, regardless of nationality or social status. St. Michael's has fostered a vibrant community of people who are answering that call. The people of St. Michael's have partnered with nonprofit groups and other faith organizations to carry out meaningful advocacy work and provide direct services to those in need. It has been a privilege to know and work alongside church leaders like Sister Mary Reilly, Father Ray Malm, and the late Sister Ann Keefe. Their tireless advocacy and spirit of service have been manifested through the good works of numerous community organizations including Sophia Academy, Providence CityArts, AIDS Care Ocean State, and the Institute for the Study and Practice of Nonviolence. These groups have made rich and diverse contributions to the character of Rhode Island.

The immigrant spirit of perseverance is shared in the moral fiber of this country. In Rhode Island, St. Michael's church has been a symbol of refuge and hope for 160 years. They have made our State and the city of Providence better through their dedication to public life. I applaud the work of St. Michael's and its pastor, Father Robert Perron, and I congratulate the venerated parish on 160 years of service.●

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:31 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 995. An act to amend chapter 3 of title 5, United States Code, to require the publication of settlement agreements, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 37. Joint resolution directing the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress.

## MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 995. An act to amend chapter 3 of title 5, United States Code, to require the publication of settlement agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.J. Res. 37. Joint resolution directing the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

## MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill and joint resolution were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 483. A bill to enact into law a bill by reference.

S.J. Res. 8. Joint resolution recognizing the duty of the Federal Government to create a Green New Deal.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SHELBY, from the Committee on Appropriations:

Special Report entitled "Further Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals for Fiscal Year 2019" (Rept. No. 116-1).

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. LEAHY, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 485. A bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 and other laws to clarify appropriate standards for Federal employment discrimination and retaliation claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 486. A bill to waive the penalty for withdrawals from retirement plans for certain Federal employees and contractors affected by a lapse in appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. KING):

S. 487. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a natural gas demand response pilot program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. JONES, Mr. REED, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. KING, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. COONS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. WARNER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. SMITH, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. BENNET, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Ms. ERNST, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. PORTMAN, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 488. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to specify lynching as a deprivation of civil rights, and for other purposes; considered and passed.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. UDALL, Ms. SMITH, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BROWN, Mr. REED, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 489. A bill to establish a State public option through Medicaid to provide Americans with the choice of a high-quality, low-cost health insurance plan; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 490. A bill to designate a mountain ridge in the State of Montana as "B-47 Ridge"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. UDALL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 491. A bill to reaffirm the policy of the United States with respect to management authority over public land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

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

S. 492. A bill to amend the FAST Act to improve contracting opportunities for service-connected disabled veteran-owned small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 493. A bill to require Federal agencies not performing security functions to relocate throughout the United States by the beginning of fiscal year 2030; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. WARREN, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 494. A bill to establish the American Fisheries Advisory Committee to assist in the awarding of fisheries research and development grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. JONES, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 495. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to reauthorize and expand the

National Threat Assessment Center of the Department of Homeland Security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. CANTWELL, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 496. A bill to preserve United States fishing heritage through a national program dedicated to training and assisting the next generation of commercial fishermen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. COONS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. REED):

S. 497. A bill to improve diversity and inclusion in the workforce of national security agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. ROUNDS:

S. 498. A bill to provide for an independent outside audit of the Indian Health Service; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. 499. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to apply to territories of the United States, to establish offshore wind lease sale requirements, to provide dedicated funding for coral reef conservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. GARDNER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CASEY, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 500. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish, fund, and provide for the use of amounts in a National Park Service Legacy Restoration Fund to address the maintenance backlog of the National Park Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 501. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the increase in unrelated business taxable income by amount of certain fringe benefit expenses; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 502. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require disclosure to States of the basis of determinations under such Act, to ensure use of information provided by State, Tribal, and county governments in decision-making under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 503. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide the opportunity for responsible health savings to all American families; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 504. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to authorize The American Legion to determine the requirements for membership in The American Legion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. SMITH, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 505. A bill to ensure due process protections of individuals in the United States against unlawful detention based solely on a protected characteristic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KING, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CARDIN, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 506. A bill to support State, Tribal, and local efforts to remove access to firearms from individuals who are a danger to themselves or others pursuant to court orders for this purpose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. JONES, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 507. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to clarify that a State may not use an individual's failure to vote as the basis for initiating the procedures provided under such Act for the removal of the individual from the official list of registered voters in the State on the grounds that the individual has changed residence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Ms. WARREN):

S. 508. A bill to extend the authorization for the Cape Cod National Seashore Advisory Commission; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 509. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the United States Coast Guard; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WYDEN, and Ms. SMITH):

S. 510. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for certain requirements relating to charges for internet, television, and voice services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. COTTON):

S. 511. A bill to promote and protect from discrimination living organ donors; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 512. A bill to establish an advisory office within the Bureau of Consumer Protection of the Federal Trade Commission to prevent fraud targeting seniors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 513. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to civil forfeitures relating to certain seized animals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. REED, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. VAN

HOLLEN, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. PETERS, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 514. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the benefits and services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to women veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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

S. 515. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that all provisions shall apply to legally married same-sex couples in the same manner as other married couples, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. KING, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 516. A bill to require the use of prescription drug monitoring programs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 517. A bill to establish a tiered hiring preference for members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WICKER, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. KING, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. COONS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. COTTON, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. DAINES, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. JONES, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 518. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items as items of durable medical equipment; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 519. A bill to amend certain appropriations Acts to repeal the requirement directing the Administrator of General Services to sell Federal property and assets that support the operations of the Plum Island Animal Disease Center in Plum Island, New York; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

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

S. 520. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an energy efficiency materials pilot program; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 521. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 522. A bill to establish the African Burial Ground International Memorial Museum and Educational Center in New York, New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 523. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop a national strategic action plan and program to assist health professionals and systems in preparing for and responding to the public health effects of climate change, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 524. A bill to establish the Department of Veterans Affairs Advisory Committee on Tribal and Indian Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. RISCHE, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. CRUZ, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. ENZI, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 525. A bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 526. A bill to withdraw certain Bureau of Land Management land from mineral development; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 527. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the earned income tax credit to account for the amount by which economic growth has outpaced income growth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. COONS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 528. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to provide a lactation room in public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 529. A bill to establish a national program to identify and reduce losses from landslide hazards, to establish a national 3D Elevation Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 530. A bill to establish the Federal Labor-Management Partnership Council; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 531. A bill to permit disabled law enforcement officers, customs and border protection officers, firefighters, air traffic controllers, nuclear materials couriers, members of the Capitol Police, members of the

Supreme Court Police, employees of the Central Intelligence Agency performing intelligence activities abroad or having specialized security requirements, and diplomatic security special agents of the Department of State to receive retirement benefits in the same manner as if they had not been disabled; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. JONES):

S. 532. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide that an individual may remain eligible to participate in the teacher loan forgiveness program under title IV of such Act if the individual's period of consecutive years of employment as a full-time teacher is interrupted because the individual is the spouse of a member of the Armed Forces who is relocated during the school year pursuant to military orders for a permanent change of duty station, or the individual works in a school of the defense dependents' education system under the Defense Dependents' Education Act of 1978 due to such a relocation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 533. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to consider certain transactions related to precious metals for purposes of identifying jurisdictions of primary money laundering concern, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 534. A bill to prohibit certain funds from being transferred or reprogrammed to plan, develop, or construct a new physical barrier along the southwest border, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 535. A bill to enable Federal employees and contractors to correct their credit reports to remove adverse items of information reported as a result of a shutdown, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban 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. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. Res. 71. A resolution honoring the memory of the victims of the senseless attack at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School 1 year ago; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. PERDUE (for himself, Mr. JONES, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. Res. 72. A resolution honoring the 100th anniversary of Fort Benning in Columbus, Georgia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SASSE, Mr. KAINE, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. Res. 73. A resolution calling on the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to immediately release Saudi Women's Rights activists and respect the fundamental rights of all Saudi citizens; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. ERNST, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. JONES):

S. Res. 74. A resolution marking the fifth anniversary of Ukraine's Revolution of Dignity by honoring the bravery, determination, and sacrifice of the people of Ukraine during and since the Revolution, and condemning continued Russian aggression against Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARPER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. BURR):

S. Res. 75. A resolution honoring the life, achievements, and distinguished public service of John David Dingell, Jr., and expressing condolences to his family on his passing; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. COONS, Ms. WARREN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. DURBIN, and Ms. ERNST):

S. Res. 76. A resolution designating March 1, 2019, as "National Speech and Debate Education Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. KING, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. JONES, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BRAUN, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ENZI, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. ROMNEY):

S. Res. 77. A resolution designating the week of February 16 through 23, 2019, as "National FFA Week," recognizing the important role of the National FFA Organization in developing young leaders, and celebrating 50 years of female membership in the National FFA Organization; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SHELBY:

S. Con. Res. 4. A concurrent resolution providing for a correction in the enrollment of H.J. Res. 31; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. UDALL):

S. Con. Res. 5. A concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 80

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) 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. 130

At the request of Mr. SASSE, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) 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. 208

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 208, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain retired members of the uniformed services who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or Combat-Related Special Compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 283

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 283, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to, and utilization of, bone mass measurement benefits under part B of the Medicare program by establishing a minimum payment amount under such part for bone mass measurement.

S. 285

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S. 286

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 286, supra.

S. 311

At the request of Mr. SASSE, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) was added as a cosponsor of 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 an abortion or attempted abortion.

S. 317

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 317, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide States with the option of providing coordinated care for children with complex medical conditions through a health home.



S. 336

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 336, a bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report on the response of law enforcement agencies to reports of missing or murdered Indians.

S. 362

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) were added as cosponsors of S. 362, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

S. 380

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 380, a bill to increase access to agency guidance documents.

S. 426

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 426, a bill to increase the rates of pay under the General Schedule and other statutory pay systems and for prevailing rate employees by 3.6 percent, and for other purposes.

S. 455

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 455, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide for Federal Exchange outreach and educational activities.

S. 465

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 465, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to make reforms to the benefits for Public Service Officers, and for other purposes.

S. 479

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 479, a bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. JONES, Mr. REED, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. KING, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. COONS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. WARNER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. MUR-

PHY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. SMITH, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. BENNET, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Ms. ERNST, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. PORTMAN, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 488. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to specify lynching as a deprivation of civil rights, and for other purposes; considered and passed.

S. 488

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Justice for Victims of Lynching Act of 2019”.

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The crime of lynching succeeded slavery as the ultimate expression of racism in the United States following Reconstruction.

(2) Lynching was a widely acknowledged practice in the United States until the middle of the 20th century.

(3) Lynching was a crime that occurred throughout the United States, with documented incidents in all but 4 States.

(4) At least 4,742 people, predominantly African Americans, were reported lynched in the United States between 1882 and 1968.

(5) Ninety-nine percent of all perpetrators of lynching escaped from punishment by State or local officials.

(6) Lynching prompted African Americans to form the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (referred to in this section as the “NAACP”) and prompted members of B’nai B’rith to found the Anti-Defamation League.

(7) Mr. Walter White, as a member of the NAACP and later as the executive secretary of the NAACP from 1931 to 1955, meticulously investigated lynchings in the United States and worked tirelessly to end segregation and racialized terror.

(8) Nearly 200 anti-lynching bills were introduced in Congress during the first half of the 20th century.

(9) Between 1890 and 1952, 7 Presidents petitioned Congress to end lynching.

(10) Between 1920 and 1940, the House of Representatives passed 3 strong anti-lynching measures.

(11) Protection against lynching was the minimum and most basic of Federal responsibilities, and the Senate considered but failed to enact anti-lynching legislation despite repeated requests by civil rights groups, Presidents, and the House of Representatives to do so.

(12) The publication of “Without Sanctuary: Lynching Photography in America” helped bring greater awareness and proper recognition of the victims of lynching.

(13) Only by coming to terms with history can the United States effectively champion human rights abroad.

(14) An apology offered in the spirit of true repentance moves the United States toward reconciliation and may become central to a new understanding, on which improved racial relations can be forged.

(15) Having concluded that a reckoning with our own history is the only way the country can effectively champion human rights abroad, 90 Members of the United States Senate agreed to Senate Resolution 39, 109th Congress, on June 13, 2005, to apologize to the victims of lynching and the de-

scendants of those victims for the failure of the Senate to enact anti-lynching legislation.

(16) The National Memorial for Peace and Justice, which opened to the public in Montgomery, Alabama, on April 26, 2018, is the Nation’s first memorial dedicated to the legacy of enslaved Black people, people terrorized by lynching, African Americans humiliated by racial segregation and Jim Crow, and people of color burdened with contemporary presumptions of guilt and police violence.

(17) Notwithstanding the Senate’s apology and the heightened awareness and education about the Nation’s legacy with lynching, it is wholly necessary and appropriate for the Congress to enact legislation, after 100 years of unsuccessful legislative efforts, finally to make lynching a Federal crime.

(18) Further, it is the sense of Congress that criminal action by a group increases the likelihood that the criminal object of that group will be successfully attained and decreases the probability that the individuals involved will depart from their path of criminality. Therefore, it is appropriate to specify criminal penalties for the crime of lynching, or any attempt or conspiracy to commit lynching.

(19) The United States Senate agreed to unanimously Senate Resolution 118, 115th Congress, on April 5, 2017, “[c]ondemning hate crime and any other form of racism, religious or ethnic bias, discrimination, incitement to violence, or animus targeting a minority in the United States” and taking notice specifically of Federal Bureau of Investigation statistics demonstrating that “among single-bias hate crime incidents in the United States, 59.2 percent of victims were targeted due to racial, ethnic, or ancestral bias, and among those victims, 52.2 percent were victims of crimes motivated by the offenders’ anti-Black or anti-African American bias”.

(20) On September 14, 2017, President Donald J. Trump signed into law Senate Joint Resolution 49 (Public Law 115–58; 131 Stat. 1149), wherein Congress “condemn[ed] the racist violence and domestic terrorist attack that took place between August 11 and August 12, 2017, in Charlottesville, Virginia” and “urg[ed] the President and his administration to speak out against hate groups that espouse racism, extremism, xenophobia, anti-Semitism, and White supremacy; and use all resources available to the President and the President’s Cabinet to address the growing prevalence of those hate groups in the United States”.

(21) Senate Joint Resolution 49 (Public Law 115–58; 131 Stat. 1149) specifically took notice of “hundreds of torch-bearing White nationalists, White supremacists, Klansmen, and neo-Nazis [who] chanted racist, anti-Semitic, and anti-immigrant slogans and violently engaged with counter-demonstrators on and around the grounds of the University of Virginia in Charlottesville” and that these groups “reportedly are organizing similar events in other cities in the United States and communities everywhere are concerned about the growing and open display of hate and violence being perpetrated by those groups”.

(22) Lynching was a pernicious and pervasive tool that was used to interfere with multiple aspects of life—including the exercise of Federally protected rights, as enumerated in section 245 of title 18, United States Code, housing rights, as enumerated in section 901 of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3631), and the free exercise of religion, as enumerated in section 247 of title 18, United States Code. Interference with these rights was often effectuated by multiple offenders and groups, rather than isolated individuals. Therefore, prohibiting conspiracies

to violate each of these rights recognizes the history of lynching in the United States and serves to prohibit its use in the future.

### SEC. 3. LYNCHING.

(a) OFFENSE.—Chapter 13 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

#### “§ 250. Lynching

“Whoever conspires with another person to violate section 245, 247, or 249 of this title or section 901 of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3631) shall be punished in the same manner as a completed violation of such section, except that if the maximum term of imprisonment for such completed violation is less than 10 years, the person may be imprisoned for not more than 10 years.”.

(b) TABLE OF SECTIONS AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 13 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 249 the following:

“250. Lynching.”.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. JONES, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 495. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to reauthorize and expand the National Threat Assessment Center of the Department of Homeland Security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### EAGLES ACT

Mr. President, I come to the floor today to take a moment and remember the tragedy that occurred a year ago at the Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida.

One year ago today, on Valentine's Day, 17 innocent lives were lost at the hands of a troubled, evil young man who entered a high school and opened fire.

The tragedy in Parkland cannot be forgotten.

We in the Senate cannot afford to forget such senseless acts of violence, and instead must continue to fight to prevent dangerous attacks in our country and our schools.

I remain dedicated to keeping weapons out of the hands of those who seek to harm others.

That is why I am proud to reintroduce the EAGLES Act of 2019.

Along with Senators RUBIO, SCOTT from Florida, JONES, MANCHIN, and GARDNER, I am reintroducing a piece of legislation today that proactively works to mitigate threats of violence on school campuses.

The EAGLES Act is named after the Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School Mascot, the Eagles.

It reauthorizes and expands the U.S. Secret Service's National Threat Assessment Center which is used to study targeted violence and develop best practices and training to identify and manage threats before they result in violence.

This legislation also allows the Secret Service to focus a significant portion of its efforts directly on school safety by equipping communities and schools with training and best practices on recognizing and preventing school violence.

In the wake of the Parkland shooting, there has been a flurry of activism, opinions, and action on the issue of gun safety, gun violence, and rights guaranteed to law abiding citizens under the Second Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

It's our obligation as members of Congress to discuss issues, shortcomings, and room for advancement.

The EAGLES Act is part of the solution to prevent future violence in our communities.

This past year in the Senate, we took important steps to address gun violence and solutions to prevent future attacks.

Through investigations, hearings, oversight of federal agencies, and legislation, I worked with my colleagues to shed light on the issue and seek solutions.

For example, last Congress, two instrumental pieces of legislation to help protect Americans from future acts of violence were signed into law.

The first was the Students, Teachers, and Officers Preventing School Violence Act, which provides funding to schools to strengthen their infrastructure to make it more difficult for shooters to enter schools.

The other bill signed into law was the Fix NICS Act.

This law penalizes Federal agencies who fail to comply with the requirements in current law to report dangerous individuals and violent criminals to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

These laws enjoyed bipartisan support and will help keep our communities safe.

As former Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I also held a number of hearings on gun violence, one which specifically addressed the government's role and failures in preventing the Parkland shooting.

It was because of the lack of government coordination, successful identification of threats, and mitigation of dangers that I introduced the EAGLES Act last Congress.

As we learned in the hearing following the Parkland shooting and through subsequent investigations, there was much more that should have been done to prevent the Parkland shooting from happening.

There's still more to do to address the issue of targeted violence.

I expect my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will continue to propose solutions.

It's a conversation worth having. We should find more ways to keep weapons out of the hands of dangerous individuals while still protecting important constitutional rights.

It's in that spirit that I am reintroducing the EAGLES Act.

By passing this Act, we can do more to assess threats, train communities and schools, and prevent violence.

We cannot undo the tragedies of the past, but together we can do a better job to prevent future tragedies.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on this important priority.

I yield the floor.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. JONES):

S. 532. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide that an individual may remain eligible to participate in the teacher loan forgiveness program under title IV of such Act if the individual's period of consecutive years of employment as a full-time teacher is interrupted because the individual is the spouse of a member of the Armed Forces who is relocated during the school year pursuant to military orders for a permanent change of duty station, or the individual works in a school of the defense dependents' education system under the Defense Dependents' Education Act of 1978 due to such a relocation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I would like to bring the Senate's attention to the bipartisan Preserving Teacher Loan Forgiveness for Military Spouses Act of 2018, which I am introducing today with Senators CORNYN and JONES. This legislation eliminates a barrier for teachers in military families to earn federal student loan forgiveness for their years of public service.

The Department of Education's Teacher Loan Forgiveness program rightfully incentivizes teachers to commit to students in our lowest income school districts in exchange for up to \$17,500 in Federal student loan forgiveness. Teachers qualify for the Federal student loan forgiveness once they have taught full-time for at least five consecutive years at a low income school or educational service agency. Teachers who are forced to move in the middle of the school year to follow their spouse's relocation or reassignment to another installation in the United States or abroad lose their accrued eligibility for the program and must restart their five years of service under current law.

Last Congress, a Maryland constituent brought to my attention the barriers her daughter faced when seeking Federal student loan forgiveness despite her commitment to public service. Her daughter, a teacher married to a member of the military, was in the middle of her fifth consecutive year teaching at one of Maryland's lower income schools. As any military spouse knows, relocation or reassignment orders can come at any time, upending the lives of the service member and their family. Rather than being able to complete a fifth year of teaching in a Maryland school, this family had to relocate with three months left in the school year. Despite this family's double commitment to service for our military and our schoolchildren, this military spouse missed the opportunity to have a portion of her Federal student loans forgiven. No military spouse

should be punished for following his or her spouse's relocation or reassignment.

The legislation that Senators CORNYN, JONES and I have introduced is a common sense proposal to allow military spouses to earn the benefits that they have dutifully worked towards and continue to incentivize individuals to teach our hardest to educate children. Our legislation provides a waiver from the Department of Education's Teacher Loan Forgiveness program's five consecutive years of service requirement for qualified military spouses if their spouse is relocated during the school year pursuant to military orders from the Armed Forces. This waiver will allow individuals to remain eligible for the Teacher Loan Forgiveness program should they resume teaching full-time at a qualifying low-income school district within one year of their relocation. In addition, this legislation requires the Department of Education to provide a report to Congress every two years on the number of military spouses who remained eligible for Teacher Loan Forgiveness due to this legislation. In addition, it would allow military spouses that follow their service member overseas to accrue periods of service towards the Teacher Loan Forgiveness program if they teach in one of the Department of Defense Education Activities operated schools.

I urge my colleagues to join in this effort to help families who are wholly committed to public service by supporting the Preserving Teacher Loan Forgiveness for Military Spouses Act. No family committed to service of our country should lose out on earned benefits due to a technicality.

#### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 71—HONORING THE MEMORY OF THE VICTIMS OF THE SENSELESS ATTACK AT MARJORY STONEMAN DOUGLAS HIGH SCHOOL 1 YEAR AGO

Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 71

Whereas, on February 14, 2018, a mass shooting that took the lives of 17 teachers and students took place at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida;

Whereas the people of the United States continue to pray for those who were affected by this tragedy;

Whereas President Donald Trump stated: "No child, no teacher, should ever be in danger in an American school. No parent should ever have to fear for their sons and daughters when they kiss them goodbye in the morning.";

Whereas the Parkland community has shown strength, compassion, and unity in the past year; and

Whereas February 14, 2019, marks 1 year since the horrific attack: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates the victims killed in the attack and offers heartfelt condolences and deepest sympathies to the families, loved ones, and friends of the victims;

(2) honors the survivors and pledges continued support for their recovery;

(3) recognizes the strength and resilience of the Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School community; and

(4) expresses gratitude to the emergency medical and health care professionals of the Parkland community for their efforts in responding to the attack and caring for the victims and survivors.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 72—HONORING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF FORT BENNING IN COLUMBUS, GEORGIA

Mr. PERDUE (for himself, Mr. JONES, and Mr. ISAKSON) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. RES. 72

Whereas 2018 was the 100th anniversary of Fort Benning, a military installation operating in Columbus, Georgia;

Whereas Fort Benning is named after Brigadier General Henry Lewis Benning, a resident of Columbus, Georgia;

Whereas Fort Benning resides on land originally belonging to the Creek Tribe of the Muskogee Nation;

Whereas, on April 4, 1917, the day after President Woodrow Wilson asked Congress for a declaration of war against Germany, the citizens of Columbus began advocating for an Army camp to be constructed near Columbus, Georgia;

Whereas the War Department decided to move the Infantry School of Arms at Fort Sill, Oklahoma, to a more spacious site to train soldiers on infantry skills and tactics;

Whereas, on August 27, 1918, with the help of the Columbus Chamber of Commerce, an 84-acre farm on Macon Road in Columbus, Georgia, was selected as the site for the infantry camp;

Whereas, on September 18, 1918, the Adjutant General ordered troops from Fort Sill to report to the newly selected site by October 1, 1918;

Whereas, on October 19, 1918, Columbus native Anna Caroline Benning, daughter of the brigadier general, raised the United States flag over the United States Infantry School of Arms and the site was formally christened Camp Benning;

Whereas, after the end of World War I, the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate ordered construction on Camp Benning to be halted on January 9, 1919;

Whereas Senator Hoke Smith of Georgia strongly advocated for congressional hearings to receive testimony on resuming construction of the post, allowing for Columbus-area supporters, as well as infantry commanders who fought in World War I, to testify about the need for the post;

Whereas, on March 8, 1919, the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate voted to resume building Camp Benning;

Whereas the post quickly outgrew the Macon Road location and, on June 17, 1919, Camp Benning was moved to its present site, which included the 1,800-acre plantation of local businessman Arthur Bussey;

Whereas, on January 9, 1922, the War Department issued General Order No. 1, making Camp Benning a permanent military installation and appropriating more than \$1,000,000 of additional building funds for the Infantry School of Arms, which later became the Infantry School;

Whereas, on May 12, 1920, 10 Army aircraft were assigned to Camp Benning as the air detachment of the post, marking the first use of aviation at Camp Benning;

Whereas, on February 8, 1922, Camp Benning was redesignated as Fort Benning;

Whereas, on June 17, 1932, the tank school of the United States Army officially moved from Fort Meade, Maryland, to Fort Benning;

Whereas Fort Benning played a critical role in World War II, training thousands of soldiers for the European, African, and Pacific theaters of war;

Whereas, on June 25, 1940, the commandant of the Infantry School was directed by the Adjutant General to provide a platoon of volunteers for parachute test duty, leading to the formation of the Parachute Test Platoon;

Whereas, on September 16, 1940, the War Department approved the formation of the first Parachute Battalion at Fort Benning;

Whereas, on October 1, 1940, the 501st Parachute Battalion was activated;

Whereas, in July 1941, the modern Officer Candidate School for Infantry was established at Fort Benning to provide a rigorous training venue for new officers;

Whereas, in December 1943, the 555th Parachute Infantry Company, later redesignated as Company A, 555th Parachute Infantry Battalion, the first African-American parachute unit, which was known as "Triple Nickles", was activated at Fort Benning;

Whereas, after World War II, Fort Benning continued to play a vital role in training soldiers for every conflict involving the United States;

Whereas the Ranger Training Center was established on October 12, 1950, which trained personnel for the Korean War;

Whereas, during the Korean War, Fort Benning opened the Officer Candidate School on February 18, 1951, which has trained—

(1) thousands of infantry officers to serve as leaders in the Army; and

(2) since 1973, officers of all branches to serve as leaders in the Armed Forces;

Whereas the 11th Air Assault Division was activated at Fort Benning on February 7, 1963, to test and develop the air mobile concept;

Whereas the 11th Air Assault Division was inactivated on July 1, 1965, and replaced by the 1st Cavalry Division (Airmobile) and deployed to Vietnam on September 11, 1965, specializing in flying troops in and out of combat zones via helicopter;

Whereas Fort Benning served as a major staging ground for troops sent to the Middle East during Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm, and later during Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom;

Whereas, in 2009, tanks from the Armor School at Fort Knox arrived at Fort Benning, combining infantry and armor at 1 post and forming the Maneuver Center of Excellence;

Whereas, on August 16, 2017, the 1st Security Force Assistance Brigade was activated at Fort Benning and subsequently deployed to Afghanistan to assist forces of the Government of Afghanistan;

Whereas the Maneuver Center of Excellence consists of—

(1) the Capabilities Development and Integration Directorate;

(2) the United States Army Infantry School;

(3) the United States Army Armor School;

(4) the 194th Armored Brigade, 316th Cavalry Brigade, and 198th and 199th Infantry Brigades;

(5) the Directorate of Training and Doctrine; and

(6) additional tenant units;

Whereas some of the most respected United States military leaders in the 20th century were stationed at Fort Benning, including—

- (1) General Omar Bradley;
- (2) General Dwight Eisenhower;
- (3) General George Marshall;
- (4) General George Patton;
- (5) General William Livsey; and
- (6) General Colin Powell;

Whereas Fort Benning has helped foster changes in the role of women in the military;

Whereas, on December, 14, 1973, Privates Joyce Kutsch and Rita Johnson became the first women to graduate the Basic Airborne Course, and later, the United States Army Quartermaster School Parachute Rigger Course;

Whereas, on August 21, 2015, Captain Kristen Griest and 1st Lieutenant Shaye Haver became the first 2 women to graduate from the Army Ranger School at Fort Benning;

Whereas, on December 1, 2016, 13 women became the first ever to graduate from the Army Armor Basic Officer Leader Course at Fort Benning;

Whereas, on May 19, 2017, Company A, 1st Battalion, 19th Infantry Regiment, 198th Infantry Brigade, graduated 137 new Infantry soldiers, including 18 women who completed the first inter-gender Infantry One Station Unit Training at Fort Benning;

Whereas, on June 22, 2017, 4 women became the first ever to graduate from the Cavalry School of the Army at Fort Benning;

Whereas Fort Benning is the sixth largest military installation in the United States covering approximately 182,000 acres, with a \$5,500,000,000 economic impact to the “Tri-Community” and approximately 120,000 military and civilian personnel;

Whereas the Columbus Chamber of Commerce, the Rotary Club of Columbus, Columbus 2025, and other partnering groups fought to establish and have continued to support Fort Benning from its inception;

Whereas the people of the Tri-Community fought to establish and have continued to support Fort Benning from its inception; and

Whereas the following visionary citizens displayed the foresight, vision, and leadership to fight to establish Camp Benning near Columbus, Georgia:

- (1) Mr. John Betjeman.
- (2) Mr. Rhodes Browne.
- (3) Mr. John Ralston Cargill.
- (4) Mr. Lucius H. Chappell.
- (5) Mr. Henry B. Crawford.
- (6) Mr. J. Homer Dimon.
- (7) Mr. Robert Ernest Dismukes.
- (8) Mr. W. J. Fielder.
- (9) Mr. Reynolds Flournoy.
- (10) Mr. Frank U. Garrard.
- (11) Mr. Ralph Curtis Jordan.
- (12) Mr. Albert Kirven.
- (13) Mr. A. F. Kunze.
- (14) Mr. Frank G. Lumpkin.
- (15) Mr. Leighton W. MacPherson.
- (16) Mr. H. R. McClatchey.
- (17) Mr. T. T. Miller.
- (18) Mr. Marshall Morton.
- (19) Mr. Roger M. Page.
- (20) Mr. T. G. Reeves.
- (21) Mr. Walter A. Richards.
- (22) Mr. H. C. Smith: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) honors Fort Benning in Columbus, Georgia, on its 100th anniversary;

(2) commends the thousands of men and women who have worked and trained at Fort Benning;

(3) honors the people of the “Tri-Community” including those in Columbus, Georgia, and Phenix City, Alabama, for their continued support of Fort Benning; and

(4) encourages Fort Benning to continue its instrumental role in preparing the brave men and women of the United States for the battlefield.

SENATE RESOLUTION 73—CALLING ON THE KINGDOM OF SAUDI ARABIA TO IMMEDIATELY RELEASE SAUDI WOMEN’S RIGHTS ACTIVISTS AND RESPECT THE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS OF ALL SAUDI CITIZENS

Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SASSE, Mr. KAINE, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. MARKEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 73

Whereas the United States Government and the Government of Saudi Arabia share an important security partnership;

Whereas Saudi Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman said during an April 2018 interview with *The Atlantic* magazine, “I support women . . . In our religion there is no difference between men and women . . . We don’t want divided treatment for different people”;

Whereas Saudi authorities, since Mohammed bin Salman became Crown Prince, have relaxed some repressive restrictions on women, including by allowing women to drive, attend certain sporting events, and enter some professions which were previously closed to them;

Whereas, in May 2018, Saudi authorities began arresting women’s rights activists and their supporters, including those who had campaigned for the right to drive ahead of the government’s announcement granting women the right to drive effective June 24, 2018;

Whereas those detained included—

- (1) Samar Badawi, who petitioned Saudi authorities to allow women the right to drive, vote, and run in municipal elections;
- (2) Nouf Abdelaziz, who expressed solidarity with arrested women’s rights activists;
- (3) Mayaa al-Zahrani, an activist and friend of Abdelaziz;
- (4) Nassima al-Sadah, who campaigned for the right to drive and against the government’s male guardianship laws;
- (5) Hatoun al-Fassi, a professor of women’s history who was one of the first Saudi women to acquire a driver’s license; and
- (6) Loujain al-Hathloul who spent 73 days in detention for defying the driving ban in 2014–15;

Whereas one of the detained women, Aziza al-Youssef, is a United States permanent resident who maintains a residence in Virginia;

Whereas Saudi authorities, on June 2, 2018, announced that they would provisionally release eight individuals and refer nine individuals to trial, where they could face the following serious charges that carry penalties of up to 20 years in prison “cooperating with entities hostile to the kingdom,” “recruiting persons in a sensitive government agency to obtain confidential information to harm the interests of the kingdom,” and “providing financial and moral support to hostile elements abroad”;

Whereas, in 2012, Samar Badawi, one of the activists detained by the Saudi authorities, received the International Women of Courage Award from the United States Department of State;

Whereas Samar Badawi’s brother, Raif Badawi, has remained imprisoned in Saudi Arabia since 2012 and was publically flogged for his work calling for free speech on his website “Free Saudi Liberals” and his lawyer, Waleed Abu al-Khair, is serving a 15-

year sentence for his work defending human rights;

Whereas, according to a 2018 Human Rights Watch report, “Saudi interrogators tortured at least three of the Saudi women activists’ detained beginning in May 2018”;

Whereas the reports of torture include electric shocks, whippings, beatings, and sexual harassment and assault;

Whereas, according to news reports, a top adviser of Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman, Saud al-Qahtani, has been present during interrogation sessions with the women’s rights activists;

Whereas, on January 16, 2019, more than 200 academics from around the world sent a letter to the Saudi King calling on the Government of Saudi Arabia to release “Dr Hatoun Aiwad-al-Fassi and other women’s rights advocates who remain in detention”;

Whereas the United States Senate resolved on International Women’s Day on March 8, 2018, that the empowerment of women is inextricably linked to the potential of a country to generate economic growth, sustainable democracy, and inclusive security;

Whereas the Department of State’s 2017 report on human rights practices in Saudi Arabia stated that the Government of Saudi Arabia’s review of guardianship laws had not yet been completed, that the Government of Saudi Arabia restricts the foreign travel of women, and that the Government of Saudi Arabia continues to discriminate against women;

Whereas the arrests of women’s rights activists and their supporters since May 2018 are contrary to the Government of Saudi Arabia’s stated reform goals; and

Whereas the detention and reported abuse of women’s rights activists and the murder of Jamal Khashoggi, a Washington Post journalist and United States resident, demonstrate a blatant disregard for human rights and the freedom of expression: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) calls on the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to immediately release and drop any politically motivated charges against the detained Saudi women’s rights activists related to peaceful activities to advance human rights in Saudi Arabia, which are protected under international law;

(2) expresses concern over the reported use of torture by the Government of Saudi Arabia against the women’s activists, and urges investigation into such allegations and the holding accountable of perpetrators;

(3) recognizes that the strategic relationship with Saudi Arabia is in the national interest of the United States;

(4) reaffirms that the global recognition and protection of basic human rights, including women’s rights, is in the national security interest of the United States;

(5) urges the Government of Saudi Arabia to reform its laws that restrict basic human rights, including women’s rights, such as by abolishing the male guardianship system;

(6) urges the President and the Secretary of State to affirm the support of the United States for the right of activists to peacefully advocate for the protection of universal human rights;

(7) calls on the President to press the Government of Saudi Arabia to immediately release all political prisoners, human rights defenders, journalists, and bloggers, including Raif Badawi, Waleed Abu al-Khair, and others who support religious freedom, and the women’s rights activists detained after May 2018; and

(8) calls on the President to comply with the request submitted under subsection (d) of section 1263 of the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114-328; 22 U.S.C. 2656

note) for a determination under subsection (a) of that section with respect to the persons responsible for the murder of Saudi journalist Jamal Khashoggi.

**SENATE RESOLUTION 74—MARKING THE FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINE'S REVOLUTION OF DIGNITY BY HONORING THE BRAVERY, DETERMINATION, AND SACRIFICE OF THE PEOPLE OF UKRAINE DURING AND SINCE THE REVOLUTION, AND CONDEMNING CONTINUED RUSSIAN AGGRESSION AGAINST UKRAINE**

Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. ERNST, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. JONES) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

**S. RES. 74**

Whereas, on November 21, 2013, peaceful protests began on Independence Square (Maidan) in Kyiv against the decision by the government of then-President Viktor Yanukovich to suspend signing the Ukraine-European Union (EU) Association Agreement and instead pursue closer ties with the Russian Federation;

Whereas the Maidan protests, initially referred to as the Euromaidan, quickly drew thousands of people and broadened to become a general demonstration in support of Ukraine's integration with the European Union and against the corrupt Yanukovich regime;

Whereas, on the night of November 30, 2013, Ukrainian police forces surrounded and violently dispersed peaceful protestors on the Maidan;

Whereas the next day, thousands of Euromaidan demonstrators regrouped and resumed the protests for three months, despite facing continuing and increasing violence from the police;

Whereas, on January 16, 2014, anti-protest laws, known as the "dictatorship laws", were adopted by the Government of Ukraine, which sought to restrict the actions of the Euromaidan protestors;

Whereas these laws were condemned by Euromaidan protestors as well as Western officials, including then-Secretary of State John Kerry, who called them "anti-democratic";

Whereas many of these laws were repealed just 11 days after being signed into law;

Whereas, on the night of February 18, 2014, police assaulted and burned down the Trade Union Building in Kyiv, which had been used as a headquarters for the Euromaidan movement;

Whereas Yanukovich's government forces began using live ammunition against the Euromaidan movement, leading to the deaths of more than a hundred protestors who are now remembered in Ukraine as the "Heavenly Hundred";

Whereas, on February 21, 2014, in the face of the ongoing Euromaidan protests demanding his resignation, then-President Viktor Yanukovich fled Kyiv, and then fled Ukraine the next day;

Whereas, on February 22, 2014, the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine recognized that Yanukovich had ceased his functions as president, voted him from office, and scheduled early presidential elections for May 25, 2014;

Whereas, on February 25, 2014, fulfilling demands of the Maidan, Ukraine's special police force known as the Berkut was dissolved, as it had been heavily involved in the violence against the Euromaidan protestors;

Whereas the Ukrainian government's use of force against activists throughout the Euromaidan protests, including the use of live bullets, was widely condemned by Western governments, including the United States, and ultimately failed to discourage the Euromaidan movement;

Whereas, on September 1, 2017, the Ukraine-EU Association Agreement came into force after its signing by the Government of Ukraine and the EU;

Whereas, in response to Ukraine's Revolution of Dignity, the Russian Federation launched military aggression against Ukraine, illegally occupied Ukraine's Crimean Peninsula, and instigated a war in eastern Ukraine, which is still ongoing and has killed more than 10,000 Ukrainians;

Whereas the Russian Federation's attempted invasion and annexation of Crimea has been widely seen as an effort to stifle pro-democracy developments across Ukraine in 2014 in the wake of the Revolution of Dignity;

Whereas 2019 marks the 25th anniversary of the signing of the Budapest Memorandum, which committed the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Russian Federation to refrain from the threat or use of force against Ukraine's territorial integrity in exchange for Ukraine giving up its nuclear weapons;

Whereas the Russian Federation is a signatory to the 1994 Budapest Memorandum and thus committed to respect the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of Ukraine;

Whereas the Government of the Russian Federation is further obligated to respect the sovereignty of Ukraine pursuant to its commitments as a signatory to the Helsinki Final Act and the Charter of the United Nations;

Whereas, on March 27, 2014, the United Nations General Assembly adopted Resolution 68/262 calling on states and international organizations not to recognize any change in Crimea's status and affirmed the commitment of the United Nations to recognize Crimea as part of Ukraine;

Whereas the United States and European Union have imposed sanctions on individuals and entities who have enabled the attempted invasion, annexation, and occupation of Crimea;

Whereas, pursuant to the Revolution of Dignity's goal of fighting corruption in Ukraine, the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine adopted the Law on the National Anti-Corruption Bureau (NABU) of Ukraine on October 14, 2014;

Whereas, on June 26, 2017, the Law of Ukraine On the Establishment of the High Anti-Corruption Court was signed into law;

Whereas, on July 5, 2018, the Law on National Security was adopted, which has strengthened civilian control over the Ukrainian military, increased transparency in the security sector, and more clearly delineated the powers of law enforcement agencies;

Whereas, on January 6, 2019, the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople granted autocephaly to the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, thus establishing the first independent Ukrainian Orthodox Church in over 300 years;

Whereas despite requests by the Government of Ukraine, the Government of the Russian Federation has repeatedly refused to extradite former President of Ukraine Viktor Yanukovich to stand trial in Ukraine;

Whereas, on January 24, 2019, a Ukrainian court found Yanukovich guilty in absentia of high treason and complicity in conducting an aggressive war against Ukraine, and sentenced him to 13 years in prison;

Whereas, in order to help Ukraine preserve its sovereignty in the face of Russian aggression, the United States Government has provided Ukraine with over \$1,000,000,000 in security assistance, including critical defensive items such as Javelin anti-tank missiles and Island-class cutters; and

Whereas, in the 115th Congress, both the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives passed resolutions commemorating the 85th anniversary of the Holodomor, the Soviet Union's manmade famine that it committed against the people of Ukraine in 1932 and 1933: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) remembers the courage and resolve shown by the Ukrainian people in the Revolution of Dignity;

(2) solemnly honors the "Heavenly Hundred" who were killed during the Revolution of Dignity while fighting for the causes of freedom and democracy in Ukraine;

(3) applauds the progress that the Government of Ukraine has made since the Revolution of Dignity in strengthening the rule of law, aligning itself with Euro-Atlantic norms and standards, and improving military combat readiness and interoperability with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO);

(4) encourages the Government of Ukraine to continue implementing crucial reforms to fight corruption, build strong and free markets, and strengthen democracy and the rule of law;

(5) affirms the United States Government's unwavering commitment to supporting the continuing efforts of the Government of Ukraine to implement democratic and free market reforms, restoring Ukraine's territorial integrity, as well as providing additional lethal and non-lethal security assistance to strengthen Ukraine's defense capabilities on land, sea, and in the air in order to improve deterrence against Russian aggression;

(6) condemns the Russian Federation's ongoing malign activities against Ukraine and renews its call on the Government of the Russian Federation to immediately cease all activity that seeks to undermine Ukraine and destabilize the European continent;

(7) reiterates its strong condemnation of the provocative actions and unjustified use of military force by the Government of the Russian Federation in the Kerch Strait against the Ukrainian Navy on November 25, 2018, as a blatant violation of the Russian Federation's commitments under international law and the 2003 Treaty Between the Russian Federation and Ukraine on Cooperation in the Use of the Sea of Azov and the Kerch Strait;

(8) expresses its support to all Ukrainian political prisoners convicted on fabricated charges and incarcerated by Russian or Russian-controlled authorities, including the Ukrainian sailors seized in the November 25, 2018, attack near the Kerch Strait who are due treatment under the 1949 Geneva Conventions and have been illegally kept in detention in the territory of the Russian Federation, while renewing its strong call on the Kremlin to immediately release these Ukrainian citizens;

(9) affirms the Department of State's Crimea Declaration, announced on July 25, 2018, that rejects Russia's attempted annexation of Crimea and pledges to maintain this policy until Ukraine's territorial integrity is restored;

(10) believes that the Nord Stream 2 pipeline poses a major threat to European security, seeks to further undermine Ukraine's economic stability, and threatens to increase the country's vulnerability to further Russian military incursions;

(11) calls upon the United States Government, as well as its international allies and partners, to maintain a strong sanctions regime against the Russian Federation until it upholds its international obligations towards Ukraine, including the Budapest Memorandum on Security Assurances and the Minsk Agreements; and

(12) congratulates the people of Ukraine on the announcement on January 6, 2019, of autocephaly for an independent Orthodox Church of Ukraine, which has marked an important milestone in Ukraine's pursuit of its own future free from Russian influence.

SENATE RESOLUTION 75—HONORING THE LIFE, ACHIEVEMENTS, AND DISTINGUISHED PUBLIC SERVICE OF JOHN DAVID DINGELL, JR., AND EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES TO HIS FAMILY ON HIS PASSING

Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARPER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. BURR) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 75

Whereas, on February 8, 2019, the death of Representative John David Dingell, Jr. (referred to in this preamble as "John Dingell"), former Chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, brought a sense of deep personal loss—

(1) to his family, including his wife, Representative Deborah "Debbie" Dingell of the 12th congressional district of Michigan, and his children and grandchildren;

(2) to his many former colleagues and friends;

(3) to Members of Congress; and  
(4) to the people of the United States;

Whereas John Dingell represented the people of southeastern Michigan with distinction in the House of Representatives for 59 years, from December 13, 1955, to January 3, 2015, making John Dingell the longest serving Member of either chamber of Congress in the history of the United States;

Whereas the father of John Dingell, the late John David Dingell, Sr., preceded John Dingell in service as a Member of the House of Representatives from March 4, 1933, to September 19, 1955;

Whereas the wife of John Dingell, Deborah Dingell, succeeded John Dingell on January 3, 2015, and continues to serve as a Member of the House of Representatives;

Whereas the people of southeastern Michigan have entrusted John David Dingell, Sr., John Dingell, and Deborah Dingell together to serve as their voice in Congress for the past 86 years;

Whereas John Dingell was raised from the age of 6 in southeast Michigan, the home State of the parents of John Dingell, and the State that John David Dingell, Sr., was elected to serve in the 73rd Congress;

Whereas John Dingell was fiercely proud of his Polish-American roots and throughout his life shared the joys of his heritage with others, including by delivering paczki pas-

tries to colleagues, staff of the House of Representatives, and visitors to the Capitol;

Whereas John Dingell had his first taste of public service and participation in government as a page for the House of Representatives;

Whereas John Dingell, while serving as a page for the House of Representatives, in the Hall of the House of Representatives on December 8, 1941, witnessed President Franklin Roosevelt deliver the iconic address asking for a declaration of war against Japan following the bombing of Pearl Harbor;

Whereas John Dingell was drafted into the United States Army at the age of 18 and served honorably;

Whereas John Dingell received a Bachelor of Science degree and a Juris Doctor degree from Georgetown University;

Whereas, prior to being elected to the House of Representatives, John Dingell worked—

(1) in private law practice;

(2) as a park ranger with the National Park Service; and

(3) as an assistant prosecutor;

Whereas John Dingell was elected to the House of Representatives following the death of John David Dingell, Sr., in 1955 and was reelected 29 times;

Whereas John Dingell—

(1) advocated for affordable health insurance coverage for seniors in the United States, a cause championed by John David Dingell, Sr.; and

(2) worked to secure the enactment of the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) in 1965, presiding over the passage of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 (Public Law 89-97; 79 Stat. 286) in the House of Representatives;

Whereas John Dingell witnessed President Lyndon B. Johnson sign into law the Social Security Amendments of 1965 (Public Law 89-97; 79 Stat. 286), which enacted the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.);

Whereas John Dingell was a crusader for the environment, helping to author and shepherd to passage—

(1) the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.);

(2) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);

(3) the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 (Public Law 92-500; 86 Stat. 816), which formed the basis of the modern Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.);

(4) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); and

(5) the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.);

Whereas John Dingell fought to make civil rights a part of the platform of the Democratic Party in 1960, standing up to people who believed it would alienate certain voters and declaring that making civil rights a platform issue was the right thing to do;

Whereas John Dingell was a strong supporter in the House of Representatives of—

(1) the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (Public Law 85-315; 71 Stat. 634);

(2) the Civil Rights Act of 1960 (Public Law 86-449; 74 Stat. 86);

(3) the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000a et seq.); and

(4) the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.);

Whereas John Dingell served as chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives from January 3, 1981, to January 3, 1995, and again from January 3, 2007, to January 3, 2009, and served as the ranking minority member during the years in between, making John Dingell the senior Democratic member on that Committee for 26 years;

Whereas, during every Congress in which he served, John Dingell introduced legislation to provide universal access to health care;

Whereas, in 2010, John Dingell invited Speaker Nancy Pelosi to use the gavel with which he presided over passage of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 (Public Law 89-97; 79 Stat. 286), which included the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.), to preside over passage of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18001 et seq.) in the House of Representatives;

Whereas John Dingell, over the course of his tenure in the House of Representatives, served with the following 11 Presidents: Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, Richard Nixon, Gerald Ford, Jimmy Carter, Ronald Reagan, George H.W. Bush, Bill Clinton, George W. Bush, and Barack Obama;

Whereas John Dingell served as Dean of the House of Representatives from January 3, 1995, to January 3, 2015;

Whereas John Dingell retired from the House of Representatives in 2015 and was succeeded by his beloved wife, Deborah, whom he referred to as his "lovely Deborah";

Whereas Deborah Dingell carries on the legacy of John Dingell and now serves as co-chair of the Democratic Policy and Communications Committee in the Democratic Caucus;

Whereas, in 2014, President Barack Obama awarded John Dingell the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the highest civilian honor of the United States;

Whereas John Dingell, both before and after retirement, gathered a large following on Twitter, where he demonstrated wit, wisdom, and clever commentary on politics in the United States while promoting greater civility, patriotism, tolerance, justice, and inclusion; and

Whereas John Dingell was held in the highest esteem by Members of Congress from both parties because of his record tenure in office, sharp intellect, good humor, congeniality, and belief in working together to achieve consensus through trust and camaraderie: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) honors the life, achievements, and distinguished public service of John David Dingell, Jr.; and

(2) expresses condolences to the family of John David Dingell, Jr., on his passing.

SENATE RESOLUTION 76—DESIGNATING MARCH 1, 2019, AS "NATIONAL SPEECH AND DEBATE EDUCATION DAY"

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. COONS, Ms. WARREN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. DURBIN, and Ms. ERNST) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 76

Whereas it is essential for youth to learn and practice the art of communicating with and without technology;

Whereas speech and debate education offers students myriad forms of public speaking through which students may develop talent and exercise unique voice and character;

Whereas speech and debate education gives students the 21st-century skills of communication, critical thinking, creativity, and collaboration;

Whereas critical analysis and effective communication allow important ideas, texts, and philosophies the opportunity to flourish;

Whereas personal, professional, and civic interactions are enhanced by the ability of

the participants in those interactions to listen, concur, question, and dissent with reason and compassion;

Whereas students who participate in speech and debate have chosen a challenging activity that requires regular practice, dedication, and hard work;

Whereas teachers and coaches of speech and debate devote in-school, afterschool, and weekend hours to equip students with life-changing skills and opportunities;

Whereas National Speech and Debate Education Day emphasizes the lifelong impact of providing people of the United States with the confidence and preparation to both discern and share views;

Whereas National Speech and Debate Education Day acknowledges that most achievements, celebrations, commemorations, and pivotal moments in modern history begin, end, or are crystallized with public address;

Whereas National Speech and Debate Education Day recognizes that learning to research, construct, and present an argument is integral to personal advocacy, social movements, and the making of public policy;

Whereas the National Speech & Debate Association, in conjunction with national and local partners, honors and celebrates the importance of speech and debate through National Speech and Debate Education Day; and

Whereas National Speech and Debate Education Day emphasizes the importance of speech and debate education and the integration of speech and debate education across grade levels and disciplines: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) designates March 1, 2019, as “National Speech and Debate Education Day”;

(2) strongly affirms the purposes of National Speech and Debate Education Day; and

(3) encourages educational institutions, businesses, community and civic associations, and all people of the United States to celebrate and promote National Speech and Debate Education Day.

**SENATE RESOLUTION 77—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF FEBRUARY 16 THROUGH 23, 2019, AS “NATIONAL FFA WEEK,” RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANT ROLE OF THE NATIONAL FFA ORGANIZATION IN DEVELOPING YOUNG LEADERS, AND CELEBRATING 50 YEARS OF FEMALE MEMBERSHIP IN THE NATIONAL FFA ORGANIZATION**

Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. KING, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. JONES, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BRAUN, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ENZI, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. ROMNEY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 77

Whereas Future Farmers of America (FFA) was established in 1928 and is now known as the National FFA Organization;

Whereas the National FFA Organization is comprised of more than 8,500 chapters in all 50 States, Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, and Washington, D.C.;

Whereas more than 650,000 students in secondary schools, community and technical colleges, and universities are members of the National FFA Organization;

Whereas 2019 marks 50 years of female membership in the National FFA Organization;

Whereas the National FFA Organization welcomes students with diverse backgrounds;

Whereas the mission of the National FFA Organization is to develop the potential of students for premier leadership, personal growth, and career success through agricultural education;

Whereas, through classroom education and hands-on work experience, the National FFA Organization prepares students for college and a broad range of careers, including more than 255 careers in agriculture;

Whereas members of the National FFA Organization strengthen their communities through service and by preparing the next generation of leaders to meet agricultural challenges; and

Whereas members of the National FFA Organization will celebrate National FFA Week during the week of February 16 through 23, 2019: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) designates February 16 through 23, 2019, as “National FFA Week”;

(2) recognizes the important role of the National FFA Organization in developing young leaders and providing educational and career opportunities to students; and

(3) celebrates 50 years of female membership in the National FFA Organization.

**SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 4—PROVIDING FOR A CORRECTION IN THE ENROLLMENT OF H.J. RES. 31**

Mr. SHELBY submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 4

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That, in the enrollment of the joint resolution H.J. Res. 31, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall amend the long title so as to read: “Making consolidated appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.”.

**SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 5—SUPPORTING THE LOCAL RADIO FREEDOM ACT**

Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. UDALL) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. CON. RES. 5

Whereas the United States enjoys broadcasting and sound recording industries that are the envy of the world due to the symbiotic relationship that has existed among these industries for many decades;

Whereas, for nearly a century, Congress has rejected repeated calls by the recording industry to impose a performance fee on local radio stations for simply playing music on the radio, as such a fee would upset the mutually beneficial relationship between local radio and the recording industry;

Whereas local radio stations provide free publicity and promotion to the recording industry and performers of music in the form of radio airplay, interviews with performers, introduction of new performers, concert promotions, and publicity that promotes the sale of music, concert tickets, ring tones, music videos, and associated merchandise;

Whereas committees in the Senate and the House of Representatives have previously reported that “the sale of many sound recordings and the careers of many performers have benefitted considerably from airplay and other promotional activities provided by both noncommercial and advertiser-supported, free over-the-air broadcasting”;

Whereas local radio broadcasters provide tens of thousands of hours of essential local news and weather information during times of national emergencies and natural disasters, as well as public affairs programming, sports, and hundreds of millions of dollars worth of time for public service announcements and local fund raising efforts for worthy charitable causes, all of which are jeopardized if local radio stations are forced to divert revenues to pay for a new performance fee;

Whereas there are many thousands of local radio stations that will suffer severe economic hardship if any new performance fee is imposed, as will many other small businesses that play music, including bars, restaurants, retail establishments, sports and other entertainment venues, shopping centers, and transportation facilities; and

Whereas the hardship that would result from a new performance fee would hurt businesses in the United States and ultimately the consumers in the United States who rely on local radio for news, weather, and entertainment, and such a performance fee is not justified when the current system has produced the most prolific and innovative broadcasting, music, and sound recording industries in the world: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That Congress should not impose any new performance fee, tax, royalty, or other charge—

(1) relating to the public performance of sound recordings on a local radio station for broadcasting sound recordings over the air; or

(2) on any business for the public performance of sound recordings on a local radio station broadcast over the air.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 190. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. RISCH)) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 1, calling for credible, transparent, and safe elections in Nigeria, and for other purposes.

SA 191. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. RISCH)) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 1, *supra*.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

**SA 190.** Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. RISCH)) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 1, calling for credible, transparent, and safe elections in Nigeria, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following: “That Congress—

(1) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to supporting peace and democracy in Nigeria;

(2) calls on the Government of Nigeria and all Nigerian political parties and actors to—

(A) take actions to facilitate credible, transparent, and peaceful elections that reflect the will of the people and advance the consolidation of democracy and the stability of the broader region;

(B) condemn in the strongest terms the use of speech that incites violence, and refrain from efforts to demonize or delegitimize opponents, sow division among Nigerians, or otherwise inflame tensions;

(C) seek to resolve any disputes over results peacefully, including through judicial processes as necessary;

(D) respect the impartiality of the Independent National Electoral Commission; and

(E) take measures to combat vote buying;

(3) calls on the Government of Nigeria to—

(A) refrain from deploying security forces in a partisan manner;

(B) ensure that security services maintain the highest level of professionalism and impartiality in facilitating the electoral process, enable accredited observers and journalists to perform their work, and protect the right of citizens to exercise their votes freely; and

(C) enforce laws against election malfeasance, including vote buying, and ensure equal and robust application of such laws through appropriate mechanisms, including through the establishment of an Electoral Offenses Commission and Tribunal;

(4) urges all Nigerians to fully and peacefully engage in the electoral process, insist on full enfranchisement, reject inflammatory or divisive rhetoric or actions, and seek to resolve any disputes over results through the legal system;

(5) calls upon the Independent National Electoral Commission to sustain confidence and trust in its management of the electoral process by taking effective measures to—

(A) combat vote buying through voter education campaigns;

(B) institute a nationwide ban on cell phones in the voting cubicle;

(C) ensure the participation in the election of internally displaced persons (IDPs); and

(D) clean the voter rolls and ensure timely production and distribution of the Permanent Voter Card to new voters;

(6) encourages political parties in Nigeria to adhere to and enforce existing codes of conduct that commit parties to democratic electoral standards regarding campaign use of resources, engagement of voters, peaceful resolution of disputes, and acceptance of verified and credible results;

(7) condemns any efforts on the part of any politicians or political parties in Nigeria to politicize the security and law enforcement agencies;

(8) encourages civil society organizations in Nigeria to—

(A) promote the peaceful participation of citizens in the electoral process and draw on existing inter-religious and peacebuilding bodies to enhance their efforts;

(B) disseminate information about citizen-based observation findings and analysis to increase public knowledge and understanding about the conduct of the elections; and

(C) continue leading important early warning and response activities to mitigate election-related violence, including monitoring efforts to incite violence or further inflame tensions;

(9) supports efforts by the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to assist elections preparations in Nigeria, including through programs focused on conflict mitigation; and

(10) calls on the United States Government and other international partners, especially

election-focused nongovernmental organizations, to—

(A) continue to support efforts by the Government of Nigeria to address the remaining electoral preparation challenges and identify gaps in which additional resources or diplomatic engagement could make important contributions to the conduct of credible, transparent elections; and

(B) support civil society organizations and media organizations working to enhance transparency and accountability in the use of state resources around the election period.

**SA 191.** Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. RISCH)) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 1, calling for credible, transparent, and safe elections in Nigeria, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas it is in the national interest of the United States to maintain a strong bilateral relationship with a politically stable, democratic, and economically sound Nigeria that can play a leadership role in the region and the continent more broadly;

Whereas Nigeria has presidential and National Assembly elections scheduled for February 16, 2019, and gubernatorial and state-level elections scheduled for March 2, 2019;

Whereas credible, transparent, and peaceful elections could further consolidate democratic gains achieved in Nigeria since the transition from military to civilian democratic rule;

Whereas a 2017 survey conducted by Afrobarometer found that the overwhelming majority of Nigerians agreed that democratic elections are the best means of choosing their country's leaders, thus indicating that the country's citizens are deeply committed to democracy;

Whereas collaboration between civil society actors and the international community was a key factor that contributed to successful elections in 2015;

Whereas successive elections in Nigeria have featured varying degrees of violence;

Whereas both the ruling coalition and opposition parties have incited ethnic violence in an apparent effort to gain electoral advantage, intimidate electoral rivals, and suppress voter turnout;

Whereas, during the Ekiti and Osun gubernatorial elections in July 2018 and September 2018, respectively, there were concerning incidents in which some elements of Nigeria's security agencies displayed partisanship and a lack of objectivity, which risks escalating tensions within the country;

Whereas Nigeria's Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) has taken important steps to improve electoral processes, notably through the introduction of continuous voter registration, the adoption of simultaneous accreditation and voting, improvements to the secrecy of the ballot, and the advancement of smart card reader technology;

Whereas remaining challenges to the conduct of credible, transparent, and peaceful elections in Nigeria include the failure to enact additional, critical reforms to the legal framework for elections, instances of vote buying, reported security threats in the Middle Belt and North East, incitement, and disinformation; and

Whereas ensuring transparency in electoral preparations and building public confidence in the electoral process is vital to the success of the upcoming elections in Nigeria: Now, therefore, be it

#### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I have 4 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

##### COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 14, 2019, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

##### COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 14, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Bimal Patel, of Georgia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Todd M. Harper, of Virginia, and Rodney Hood, of North Carolina, both to be a Member of the National Credit Union Administration Board, and Mark Anthony Calabria, of Virginia, to be Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency.

##### COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 14, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

##### SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 14, 2019, at 2 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

#### SIGNING AUTHORITY

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Nebraska and the senior Senator from Arkansas be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions on February 15.

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

#### RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 75, S. Res. 76, and S. Res. 77.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measures en bloc?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the



motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

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

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

#### CALLING FOR CREDIBLE, TRANSPARENT, AND SAFE ELECTIONS IN NIGERIA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from further consideration of S. Con. Res. 1, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 1) calling for credible, transparent, and safe elections in Nigeria, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I further ask unanimous consent that the Menendez-Risch substitute amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to; that the concurrent resolution, as amended, be agreed to; that the Menendez-Risch amendment to the preamble, at the desk, be considered and agreed to; that the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The amendment (No. 190) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: To provide a complete substitute)

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following: "That Congress—

(1) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to supporting peace and democracy in Nigeria;

(2) calls on the Government of Nigeria and all Nigerian political parties and actors to—

(A) take actions to facilitate credible, transparent, and peaceful elections that reflect the will of the people and advance the consolidation of democracy and the stability of the broader region;

(B) condemn in the strongest terms the use of speech that incites violence, and refrain from efforts to demonize or delegitimize opponents, sow division among Nigerians, or otherwise inflame tensions;

(C) seek to resolve any disputes over results peacefully, including through judicial processes as necessary;

(D) respect the impartiality of the Independent National Electoral Commission; and

(E) take measures to combat vote buying;

(3) calls on the Government of Nigeria to—

(A) refrain from deploying security forces in a partisan manner;

(B) ensure that security services maintain the highest level of professionalism and impartiality in facilitating the electoral process, enable accredited observers and journal-

ists to perform their work, and protect the right of citizens to exercise their votes freely; and

(C) enforce laws against election malfeasance, including vote buying, and ensure equal and robust application of such laws through appropriate mechanisms, including through the establishment of an Electoral Offenses Commission and Tribunal;

(4) urges all Nigerians to fully and peacefully engage in the electoral process, insist on full enfranchisement, reject inflammatory or divisive rhetoric or actions, and seek to resolve any disputes over results through the legal system;

(5) calls upon the Independent National Electoral Commission to sustain confidence and trust in its management of the electoral process by taking effective measures to—

(A) combat vote buying through voter education campaigns;

(B) institute a nationwide ban on cell phones in the voting cubicle;

(C) ensure the participation in the election of internally displaced persons (IDPs); and

(D) clean the voter rolls and ensure timely production and distribution of the Permanent Voter Card to new voters;

(6) encourages political parties in Nigeria to adhere to and enforce existing codes of conduct that commit parties to democratic electoral standards regarding campaign use of resources, engagement of voters, peaceful resolution of disputes, and acceptance of verified and credible results;

(7) condemns any efforts on the part of any politicians or political parties in Nigeria to politicize the security and law enforcement agencies;

(8) encourages civil society organizations in Nigeria to—

(A) promote the peaceful participation of citizens in the electoral process and draw on existing inter-religious and peacebuilding bodies to enhance their efforts;

(B) disseminate information about citizen-based observation findings and analysis to increase public knowledge and understanding about the conduct of the elections; and

(C) continue leading important early warning and response activities to mitigate election-related violence, including monitoring efforts to incite violence or further inflame tensions;

(9) supports efforts by the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to assist elections preparations in Nigeria, including through programs focused on conflict mitigation; and

(10) calls on the United States Government and other international partners, especially election-focused nongovernmental organizations, to—

(A) continue to support efforts by the Government of Nigeria to address the remaining electoral preparation challenges and identify gaps in which additional resources or diplomatic engagement could make important contributions to the conduct of credible, transparent elections; and

(B) support civil society organizations and media organizations working to enhance transparency and accountability in the use of state resources around the election period.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 191) in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the preamble)

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas it is in the national interest of the United States to maintain a strong bilat-

eral relationship with a politically stable, democratic, and economically sound Nigeria that can play a leadership role in the region and the continent more broadly;

Whereas Nigeria has presidential and National Assembly elections scheduled for February 16, 2019, and gubernatorial and state-level elections scheduled for March 2, 2019;

Whereas credible, transparent, and peaceful elections could further consolidate democratic gains achieved in Nigeria since the transition from military to civilian democratic rule;

Whereas a 2017 survey conducted by Afrobarometer found that the overwhelming majority of Nigerians agreed that democratic elections are the best means of choosing their country's leaders, thus indicating that the country's citizens are deeply committed to democracy;

Whereas collaboration between civil society actors and the international community was a key factor that contributed to successful elections in 2015;

Whereas successive elections in Nigeria have featured varying degrees of violence;

Whereas both the ruling coalition and opposition parties have incited ethnic violence in an apparent effort to gain electoral advantage, intimidate electoral rivals, and suppress voter turnout;

Whereas, during the Ekiti and Osun gubernatorial elections in July 2018 and September 2018, respectively, there were concerning incidents in which some elements of Nigeria's security agencies displayed partisanship and a lack of objectivity, which risks escalating tensions within the country;

Whereas Nigeria's Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) has taken important steps to improve electoral processes, notably through the introduction of continuous voter registration, the adoption of simultaneous accreditation and voting, improvements to the secrecy of the ballot, and the advancement of smart card reader technology;

Whereas remaining challenges to the conduct of credible, transparent, and peaceful elections in Nigeria include the failure to enact additional, critical reforms to the legal framework for elections, instances of vote buying, reported security threats in the Middle Belt and North East, incitement, and disinformation; and

Whereas ensuring transparency in electoral preparations and building public confidence in the electoral process is vital to the success of the upcoming elections in Nigeria: Now, therefore, be it

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, with its preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

S. CON. RES. 1

Whereas it is in the national interest of the United States to maintain a strong bilateral relationship with a politically stable, democratic, and economically sound Nigeria that can play a leadership role in the region and the continent more broadly;

Whereas Nigeria has presidential and National Assembly elections scheduled for February 16, 2019, and gubernatorial and state-level elections scheduled for March 2, 2019;

Whereas credible, transparent, and peaceful elections could further consolidate democratic gains achieved in Nigeria since the transition from military to civilian democratic rule;

Whereas a 2017 survey conducted by Afrobarometer found that the overwhelming majority of Nigerians agreed that democratic elections are the best means of choosing their country's leaders, thus indicating

that the country's citizens are deeply committed to democracy;

Whereas collaboration between civil society actors and the international community was a key factor that contributed to successful elections in 2015;

Whereas successive elections in Nigeria have featured varying degrees of violence;

Whereas both the ruling coalition and opposition parties have incited ethnic violence in an apparent effort to gain electoral advantage, intimidate electoral rivals, and suppress voter turnout;

Whereas, during the Ekiti and Osun gubernatorial elections in July 2018 and September 2018, respectively, there were concerning incidents in which some elements of Nigeria's security agencies displayed partisanship and a lack of objectivity, which risks escalating tensions within the country;

Whereas Nigeria's Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) has taken important steps to improve electoral processes, notably through the introduction of continuous voter registration, the adoption of simultaneous accreditation and voting, improvements to the secrecy of the ballot, and the advancement of smart card reader technology;

Whereas remaining challenges to the conduct of credible, transparent, and peaceful elections in Nigeria include the failure to enact additional, critical reforms to the legal framework for elections, instances of vote buying, reported security threats in the Middle Belt and North East, incitement, and disinformation; and

Whereas ensuring transparency in electoral preparations and building public confidence in the electoral process is vital to the success of the upcoming elections in Nigeria: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—*

(1) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to supporting peace and democracy in Nigeria;

(2) calls on the Government of Nigeria and all Nigerian political parties and actors to—

(A) take actions to facilitate credible, transparent, and peaceful elections that reflect the will of the people and advance the consolidation of democracy and the stability of the broader region;

(B) condemn in the strongest terms the use of speech that incites violence, and refrain from efforts to demonize or delegitimize opponents, sow division among Nigerians, or otherwise inflame tensions;

(C) seek to resolve any disputes over results peacefully, including through judicial processes as necessary;

(D) respect the impartiality of the Independent National Electoral Commission; and

(E) take measures to combat vote buying;

(3) calls on the Government of Nigeria to—

(A) refrain from deploying security forces in a partisan manner;

(B) ensure that security services maintain the highest level of professionalism and impartiality in facilitating the electoral process, enable accredited observers and journalists to perform their work, and protect the right of citizens to exercise their votes freely; and

(C) enforce laws against election malfeasance, including vote buying, and ensure equal and robust application of such laws through appropriate mechanisms, including through the establishment of an Electoral Offenses Commission and Tribunal;

(4) urges all Nigerians to fully and peacefully engage in the electoral process, insist on full enfranchisement, reject inflammatory or divisive rhetoric or actions, and seek to resolve any disputes over results through the legal system;

(5) calls upon the Independent National Electoral Commission to sustain confidence and trust in its management of the electoral process by taking effective measures to—

(A) combat vote buying through voter education campaigns;

(B) institute a nationwide ban on cell phones in the voting cubicle;

(C) ensure the participation in the election of internally displaced persons (IDPs); and

(D) clean the voter rolls and ensure timely production and distribution of the Permanent Voter Card to new voters;

(6) encourages political parties in Nigeria to adhere to and enforce existing codes of conduct that commit parties to democratic electoral standards regarding campaign use of resources, engagement of voters, peaceful resolution of disputes, and acceptance of verified and credible results;

(7) condemns any efforts on the part of any politicians or political parties in Nigeria to politicize the security and law enforcement agencies;

(8) encourages civil society organizations in Nigeria to—

(A) promote the peaceful participation of citizens in the electoral process and draw on existing inter-religious and peacebuilding bodies to enhance their efforts;

(B) disseminate information about citizen-based observation findings and analysis to increase public knowledge and understanding about the conduct of the elections; and

(C) continue leading important early warning and response activities to mitigate election-related violence, including monitoring efforts to incite violence or further inflame tensions;

(9) supports efforts by the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to assist elections preparations in Nigeria, including through programs focused on conflict mitigation; and

(10) calls on the United States Government and other international partners, especially election-focused nongovernmental organizations, to—

(A) continue to support efforts by the Government of Nigeria to address the remaining electoral preparation challenges and identify gaps in which additional resources or diplomatic engagement could make important contributions to the conduct of credible, transparent elections; and

(B) support civil society organizations and media organizations working to enhance transparency and accountability in the use of state resources around the election period.

#### ENACTING INTO LAW A BILL BY REFERENCE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 26, S. 483.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 483) to enact into law a bill by reference.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. McCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 483) passed, as follows:

S. 483

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

SEC. \_\_\_\_ (a) H.R. 1029 of the 115th Congress, as passed by the Senate on June 28, 2018, is enacted into law.

(b) In publishing this Act in slip form and in the United States Statutes at Large pursuant to section 112 of title 1, United States Code, the Archivist of the United States shall include after the date of approval at the end an appendix setting forth the text of the bill referred to in subsection (a).

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

#### ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2019, THROUGH MONDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2019

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn to then convene for pro forma sessions only, with no business being conducted, on the following dates and times, and that following each pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Friday, February 15, at 7 a.m.; Tuesday, February 19, at 10 a.m.; and Thursday, February 21, at 10 a.m.

I further ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, February 21, it next convene at 3 p.m., Monday, February 25; and 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 the closing of morning business, Senator FISCHER be recognized to deliver Washington's Farewell Address; further, that following the address, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 311; finally, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture motions filed during today's session ripen at 5:30 p.m., Monday, February 25.

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

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator CARPER.

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

The Senator from Delaware.

## HAPPY VALENTINE'S DAY

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I just want to start off with this. This is Valentine's Day, and there are different days of the year that are more special to us than others—other than Thanksgiving and Christmas. I even like Halloween. But I think Valentine's Day is very special.

For our loved ones, our spouses or significant others, and our children, we love them, and I hope they know that. But to the people who work here day in and day out, the folks who are here when it is a weekend, when other folks are maybe heading out for the holidays to visit their families across the country, we don't say thanks enough. So to all of them, from my heart and from my staff, and, I think, from all of us—Democrats and Republicans in the Senate—we want to say thank you and happy Valentine's Day.

## GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I want to talk a little bit about John Dingell this evening, but before I do that, I just want to comment on the fact that we passed spending bills to fund our government for the balance of this fiscal year. That is a good thing—a good, good thing. I wish we had done it last year. In fact, we did—months ago. Democrats and Republicans joined together here almost unanimously to pass a spending plan for the balance of the fiscal year—all 13 appropriations bills, and they looked a whole lot like what we passed here today. Yet we went through a shutdown which created a lot of havoc and turmoil, not just for Federal employees but for the people whom they serve and we serve.

I have apologized for that, and I know other colleagues have as well. Hopefully, in the months ahead, we can make it up to the people who were inconvenienced. In many cases they were not just disadvantaged but treated very badly.

The President apparently is going to sign the spending bills we passed with broad bipartisan support, and I understand he is going to declare a state of emergency to be able to do additional things down at the border with Mexico.

Tomorrow morning at 6 a.m., I will lead a bipartisan delegation, with House and Senate Members, and we will not be going to the border. I have been there any number of times as chairman of the Homeland Security Committee. We are not going to go to the border this time.

The President was down there a couple of weeks ago, and standing at the border he said: There is a human catastrophe or tragedy going on at the border.

I thought to myself: Well, what is going on at the border is very unfortunate, but the real human tragedy is what is going on in three countries: Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador. The illegal immigration, to my sur-

prise a couple of years ago, is not just coming from Mexico. In fact, today there are more Mexicans going back into Mexico from the United States than there are going the other way. I was surprised to learn that, but that is the case today.

Illegal immigration in our country is down about 80 percent from the year 2000, and the folks coming across the border illegally are coming from three countries—Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador. Each year in the last decade or so, they have vied for the title "Murder Capital of the World."

Their lives are made miserable because of our addiction to drugs. So having been complicit in their misery, the thought occurred to a number of us, including the last administration's President and Vice President and some of us in the House and the Senate, that maybe we should see why all of those people are coming out of Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador and trying to come into the United States.

I will tell a true story. Some of them come to Delaware. We have three counties in my State. The southernmost county, Sussex County, is a big county that raises a lot of corn, soybeans, and raise a lot of chickens. We process a lot of chickens. Over the years, a lot of folks come up from Guatemala to work in the agriculture and poultry industry.

About 2 or 3 years ago, we had an increase—a blip in migration—especially from Guatemala. I was in Sussex County, in Georgetown, the county seat, right in the middle of all of this poultry business. There are three chickens for every person in Delaware, to give you some idea of the extent of it.

I met with the folks at La Esperanza. That is Spanish for hope. It is a nonprofit. Their job is to try to help people who do make it across the border into our country and who have families, and they try to do some reconnection with their families.

But, anyway, I heard this story. There was a young man in Guatemala, a teenager, who was recruited by a gang there. He said he had to talk to his parents. He went to talk to his parents, and they said: We don't want you to join any gangs.

He went back, and the gang found him and approached him a couple of days later and said: Well, what do you think? Do you want to join our gang? He said: I talked to my parents, and they don't think it is the right thing for me to do now.

They said: Well, think about it some more.

A week or so later, they found him again and said: Well, what do you think? Are you ready to join our gang?

He said: No, I don't think I am going to do that now.

They said: If you don't join our gang, somebody in your family is going to die. Somebody in your family is going to die.

He went home, and he told his parents. They talked it over, and he joined the gang.

One of the things they do in these gangs—they have to go through an initiation. Part of his initiation was a requirement that he rape his 13-year-old sister. The son was like 15 years old, and one of the rites of passage is he had to rape his 13-year-old sister. He went home and told his parents what was expected of him. Within a week or two, the sister and the brother were on their way out of their country to try to be reunited with other relatives in the United States, and they ended up in Delaware. That is a human tragedy. I think if they had stayed there, it would have been probably an even greater human tragedy.

I am a big believer in root causes. Don't just address the symptoms of the problem. The symptom of the problem is people trying to get into our country and cross our borders illegally. That is a problem. That is a challenge. We need secure borders, but the root cause is what is going on in the countries that they are fleeing from—lack of rule of law, impunity, police who don't police, prosecutors who don't prosecute, judges who don't really administer the law, prisons that don't—correctional institutions that don't really correct behavior. Instead of turning out better people, they turn out better criminals. That has been a problem, and it has been a problem for some time.

Whenever we face a situation like this where an issue is really hard to deal with, what I like to say is, let's find out what works.

I am an old Governor. I used to be chairman of the National Governors Association. My last year as Governor, I chaired something in the NGA. In addition to being the Governor of Delaware, I chaired something called the Center for Best Practices. The idea was, how do we share solutions among Governors and among States for all the problems we face—some of the problems we face?

In trying to figure out how we help Guatemala and El Salvador sort of become less violent places, places with hope and opportunity—how can we help in that? So we looked around the world. We don't have to look too far, but if we look south of Central America, we find Colombia.

Colombia is a place where about 20 years ago, there were leftist guerillas trying to bring down the government, and there were drug lords trying to bring down the government. One day 20 years or so ago, a bunch of thugs rounded up the supreme court of the country—rounded them up, took them into a room, shot them all to death, killed them all.

Colombia was teetering, and it was not clear whether it was going to really make it as a nation. Some very brave people stood up and some of the leaders of Columbia stood up and said: We are not going to let these guys—whether it is the FARC, the leftist guerillas, or the drug lords—take over our country and take it down. We are going to fight back.

The United States, led by then-President Bill Clinton and by a guy who was serving as the chairman, I think, of the Foreign Relations Committee, Joe Biden, sort of made common calls with the President of Colombia, who was a very brave person, and said to the Colombians: You can do this. Stabilize your country. Make it a more livable, decent place to live. We can help because we are complicit in their misery, too, given our addiction to drugs.

Well, guess what. They started something called Plan Colombia, and for 20 years it has worked slowly. Slowly. An example of what we did is we provided Apache helicopters. Why did we do that? So that the Colombian police and the Colombian military would have the mobility they need to go across the country and go after the bad guys and take them on. That was just one of the many things that was happening in Plan Colombia.

But again, it is like Home Depot. You have Home Depot, Madam President, in your State, and we have them in mine. What is their saying? "You can do it, and we can help." So we said: Colombia, you can do it, and we can help. We are complicit in your misery, and we can help. And we have.

About a year or so ago, the President of Colombia won a Nobel Peace Prize. The leftist guerillas are—it is not perfect, but they are part of the government. Are drugs still a problem there? Yes, they are, but not like before. It is a country with a relatively bright future and one that we can be proud to call our friend and ally.

When we looked for a way to help in Central America—the Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador—we went to Colombia, and we said: Maybe it is possible to have a Central American version of Plan Colombia. And now we have that.

What we have done over the last 3, maybe 4 years, we funded those three countries in efforts to address some of the deficiencies that I just described—police who don't police, prosecutors who don't prosecute, judges who don't administer justice, and correctional institutions that don't really correct behavior. We have been doing this now for about 3 years, and our congressional delegation is going to go down there tomorrow and do a little bit of oversight and find out what is working in those three countries and what is not, whether they are meeting their responsibilities, and whether we are meeting our responsibilities.

You know, we can build a wall from sea to shining sea and from the Pacific Ocean to the Gulf of Mexico. It can be 30 feet tall. But unless somehow the root causes of that migration—and it ain't coming from Mexico—some but not much. Again, more Mexicans are going back into Mexico than are coming the other way.

We really want to help the people of the Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador address those root causes. You know, they are going to keep coming

up here, and if we lived there, we would want to come too.

You know, for what it is worth, we have had about 80 Presidential declarations of emergencies, I guess, in maybe the last century, and they were for Pearl Harbor, Katrina, 9/11, other disasters, some of them natural disasters, others. Since 2000, there has been an 80 percent reduction in illegal migration at the borders. Most of it is coming from these three countries, not Mexico. So we will see what happens with the declaration of emergency that the President is going to declare.

I think you have to be careful. To my Republican friends, I say this lovingly to you on Valentine's Day: The idea of a President invoking his powers, using his powers in this way, I am frankly not convinced that—while there certainly are challenges at the border, I have explained where I think the real challenges are, the real causes.

Someday, we will have a Democratic President, and he or she will be considering a range of options of what to do, and somebody is going to suggest: Well, in the earlier administration, the Trump administration, they declared it. So they will say: Well, I will just declare a national emergency and do what I want to do. That is a slippery slope, and I think that is one we need to be very careful about going on.

#### REMEMBERING JOHN DINGELL

Mr. CARPER. The last thing I would like to do, if I could, is I want to talk a little bit about John Dingell. I don't know if our Presiding Officer ever had a chance to meet him or know him. She says no—nods no.

I had the pleasure of knowing him I guess since 1982, 1983, when I was elected to the House. I was a Representative, and he was already there. I was the new guy, and I had been a treasurer of Delaware and a naval flight officer before that, and I finally retired from the Navy as a captain a few years ago.

He was so nice to me. He was a big guy, a giant of a man and kind of gruff. He was kind of gruff, and I can't imagine how the pages would have reacted to him if he yelled at them or frowned at them or growled at them. But for reasons that aren't all clear, he was really kind to me. I think in his heart that is what he was.

I like to work out. I like to run. I like to work out in gyms. They have a gym over at the House in the basement of the Rayburn Building. It is a pretty nice gym. We have one here. It is small by comparison. It is modest. I usually go home at night, but occasionally I would spend the night in DC when I was in the House, and the next morning I would go to the gym, and I would either go run out on the Mall, or I would lift weights or ride the bike or something in the gym. When I finished up, before I took a shower and got dressed, I would go in the steam room—the gym had a steam room in it—and a lot of times, John Dingell was in there.

I remember sitting there with him repeatedly over the years—not hundreds of times but many times. Sometimes there were several people there. We talked. Sometimes it was just the two of us. He gave me really good advice. He was like a mentor.

The day I was sworn in as a Congressman from Delaware, I was the dean of our delegation because we only had one, so I didn't really have like a big brother or a big sister in my delegation to look up to in the House. There was nobody else but me. I was brand new. John Dingell was nice, along with a bunch of other folks too. They kind of stepped up and gave me some of the guidance that I needed.

He was an interesting fellow because he chaired the Energy and Commerce Committee the whole time I was in the House and a long time after that, and he always looked out for his bread and butter. In Michigan, that is automobiles. This was a big deal. It was then, and it still is. So he always wanted to make sure that they had the predictability that they wanted and needed and that they could be successful. If I were the Senator or Representative from Michigan, I would want that too. But he also was really good on clean air issues, clean water issues, natural resource issues, open space issues, and agricultural issues.

I remember once on one of those mornings, we were talking about whether it is possible to be a good steward of the environment, mindful of air, water, open space, public health—is it possible to do all those things and also look out for job creation and job preservation, whether it is in Michigan or some other place?

My staff has heard me say this, I am tempted to say, a million times. Folks on the Environment and Public Works Committee, where I am a senior Democrat now, have heard me say this more often than they want to. I have always said it is possible to have clean air, clean water, better public health, do good things for our planet, and create jobs. They go hand-in-glove.

One of the first people who reminded me of that a long time ago was John Dingell. He supported the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act. He supported the Clean Air Amendments in 1990, on which he was nice enough to let me offer a provision that was incorporated into the law. He did a lot to help preserve the auto industry not just in his State but in this country. He was an amazing guy.

Either the day he passed away or before he passed away, with his wife Debbie by his side—she is now a Congresswoman in his old seat—he shared with her some thoughts that he wanted to leave as part of his legacy at 92, and those words—I am not going to read them here today. I think they probably have already been read on the floor or introduced into the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent that those words be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 8, 2019]

JOHN DINGELL: MY LAST WORDS FOR AMERICA

(By John D. Dingell)

John D. Dingell, a Michigan Democrat who served in the U.S. House from 1955 to 2015, was the longest-serving member of Congress in American history. He dictated these reflections to his wife, Rep. Debbie Dingell (D-Mich.), at their home in Dearborn, on Feb. 7, the day he died.

One of the advantages to knowing that your demise is imminent, and that reports of it will not be greatly exaggerated, is that you have a few moments to compose some parting thoughts.

In our modern political age, the presidential bully pulpit seems dedicated to sowing division and denigrating, often in the most irrelevant and infantile personal terms, the political opposition.

And much as I have found Twitter to be a useful means of expression, some occasions merit more than 280 characters.

My personal and political character was formed in a different era that was kinder, if not necessarily gentler. We observed modicum of respect even as we fought, often bitterly and savagely, over issues that were literally life and death to a degree that—fortunately—we see much less of today.

Think about it:

Impoverishment of the elderly because of medical expenses was a common and often accepted occurrence. Opponents of the Medicare program that saved the elderly from that cruel fate called it “socialized medicine.” Remember that slander if there’s a sustained revival of silly red-baiting today.

Not five decades ago, much of the largest group of freshwater lakes on Earth—our own Great Lakes—were closed to swimming and fishing and other recreational pursuits because of chemical and bacteriological contamination from untreated industrial and wastewater disposal. Today, the Great Lakes are so hospitable to marine life that one of our biggest challenges is controlling the invasive species that have made them their new home.

We regularly used and consumed foods, drugs, chemicals and other things (cigarettes) that were legal, promoted and actively harmful. Hazardous wastes were dumped on empty plots in the dead of night. There were few if any restrictions on industrial emissions. We had only the barest scientific knowledge of the long-term consequences of any of this.

And there was a great stain on America, in the form of our legacy of racial discrimination. There were good people of all colors who banded together, risking and even losing their lives to erase the legal and other barriers that held Americans down. In their time, they were often demonized and tar-

geted, much like other vulnerable men and women today.

Please note: All of these challenges were addressed by Congress. Maybe not as fast as we wanted, or as perfectly as hoped. The work is certainly not finished. But we’ve made progress—and in every case, from the passage of Medicare through the passage of civil rights, we did it with the support of Democrats and Republicans who considered themselves first and foremost to be Americans.

I’m immensely proud, and eternally grateful, for having had the opportunity to play a part in all of these efforts during my service in Congress. And it’s simply not possible for me to adequately repay the love that my friends, neighbors and family have given me and shown me during my public service and retirement.

But I would be remiss in not acknowledging the forgiveness and sweetness of the woman who has essentially supported me for almost 40 years: my wife, Deborah. And it is a source of great satisfaction to know that she is among the largest group of women to have ever served in the Congress (as she busily recruits more).

In my life and career, I have often heard it said that so-and-so has real power—as in, “the powerful Wile E. Coyote, chairman of the Capture the Road Runner Committee.”

It’s an expression that has always grated on me. In democratic government, elected officials do not have power. They hold power—in trust for the people who elected them. If they misuse or abuse that public trust, it is quite properly revoked (the quicker the better).

I never forgot the people who gave me the privilege of representing them. It was a lesson learned at home from my father and mother, and one I have tried to impart to the people I’ve served with and employed over the years.

As I prepare to leave this all behind, I now leave you in control of the greatest nation of mankind and pray God gives you the wisdom to understand the responsibility you hold in your hands.

May God bless you all, and may God bless America.

Mr. CARPER. I will close with this. I went to the funeral. I couldn’t stay the whole time. It was here in DC. I missed STENY HOYER, the Democratic majority leader, and his comments. I was told he was terrific, as were others, as well. But I did get to hear just about everything Bill Clinton said. I was inspired and amused by that. He was funny. He really caught the character of John and his foibles, his strengths, and brilliance.

Before I went to the funeral, I went to a breakfast. A friend at the breakfast was kind enough to share his words with the rest of us. He actually

worked for John Dingell at one time. In an off-the-cuff riff about John Dingell, he shared some of the things he worked on. Later on, I said: Would you share that with me? He was kind enough to do that.

I wish I could say these are my words, but that would be plagiarism. I give him the credit, at least in a left-handed sort of way. This is what my friend gave to me. I just want to close with these words from my friend about John Dingell:

This morning as I was reading the obituaries detailing Congressman DINGELL’s life and accomplishments, I started thinking of all the aspects of daily life that he had a direct and meaningful impact on for almost 60 years.

He went on to say what some of them were.

The air we breathe, the water we drink. The health of rivers and lakes. The wildlife that exists and depends upon those spaces. The food we eat. The pills we take. The products we use. The electricity that powers our economy. The efficiency of almost every product that uses electricity. The phones we use. The health insurance we count on in a medical crisis. The regulation and cleanup of hazardous waste. The cars we drive, of course! And a host of other things.

On this Valentine’s Day—when we give thanks for our loved ones, our families, and those who are special in our lives—I also give thanks for John and the many blessings that he has left us and this country.

With that, I will say I appreciate the opportunity to share these words.

God bless.

Thank you.

---

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 7 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 7 a.m. tomorrow morning.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:29 p.m., adjourned until Friday, February 15, 2019, at 7 a.m.

---

#### CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 14, 2019:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

WILLIAM PELHAM BARR, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE ATTORNEY GENERAL.