United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 14, 2019 No. 46

Senate

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

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Our Father in Heaven, we praise You for the greatness of Your faithfulness. Faithfully guide our lawmakers along the path that leads away from pride, providing them with the humility that comes with wisdom. Lord, help them to remember that in the multitude of counselors, there is safety. May this knowledge prompt them to be quick to listen, slow to speak, and slow to anger. Open their hearts to Your love, their minds to Your truth, and their desires to Your guidance. Replenish them daily with Your grace and power.

We pray in Your sovereign Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 1 AND H.R. 1617

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the second time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1) to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, and strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 1617) to direct the Director of National Intelligence to submit intelligence assessments of the intentions of the political leadership of the Russian Federation, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. In order to place the bills on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will be placed on the calendar.

DECLARATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, later today, the Senate will vote on a resolution related to the state of emergency the President has declared on our southern border. Let me first say, I support the President's decision. So I will vote today to uphold it and reject this resolution of disapproval.

I want to begin where this whole discussion should begin—beyond all the partisan rhetoric and denials of reality we see from our friends across the aisle, just the facts of the matter, and the facts are not at all ambiguous. There is a clear border security and humanitarian crisis on the southern border of the United States of America.

It was only last week that the President's top officials in the matter—Secretary Nielsen and CBP Commissioner McAleenan—each came before Congress to once again lay all this out.

The man charged with protecting our Nation's borders didn't mince words ahead of last week's hearing. This is what he had to say: ''The system is well beyond capacity, and remains at the breaking point.''

The system is well beyond capacity and remains at the breaking point. The Commissioner pointed out to our colleagues on the Judiciary Committee that the 76,000 attempted illegal crossings documented in February marked an 11-year high for that month, and, based on CBP projections, by the middle of this month—tomorrow—apprehensions for fiscal year 2019 will already be twice what they were in all of fiscal year 2017.

In front of the House Homeland Security Committee, the Secretary of Homeland Security elaborated by saying the following: ''Our capacity is already severely strained, but these increases will overwhelm the system completely.''

This is one of the President's senior advisers—a Cabinet Secretary—and she is telling Members of Congress that the current situation is very much a crisis, one that requires immediate action.

Over the past 5 years, CBP has recorded a 620-percent increase in apprehensions of family units at the U.S.-Mexico border. Last year's figure marked an alltime high.

Research suggests upward of 30 percent of women apprehended at the border report experiencing sexual assault during the journeys. Lately, a daily average of 56 individuals taken into CBP custody have required emergency medical care.

The men and women of the Border Patrol are great. They are well trained, they are highly skilled, and they volunteered for a very challenging job, but today they are facing challenges they are not fully equipped to overcome.

It is no secret I take the Senate as an institution extremely seriously. I take the separation of powers extremely seriously. I take Congress's prerogative over appropriations extremely seriously, but—as I argued yesterday in the context of the Yemen resolution—the Senate should not be in the business of misusing specific resolutions to express opinions on more general matters.

President Trump has not invoked some vague article II authority or simply swept aside existing law, as President Obama did to establish his DACA

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

Printed on recycled paper.

policy. He has simply operated within existing law—the National Emergencies Act of 1976—to invoke a narrow set of authorities to reprogram a narrow set of funds.

If Congress has grown uneasy with this new law, as many have, then we should amend it. If the 116th Congress regrets the degree of flexibility the 94th Congress gave the Executive, the 116th Congress has the ability to do something about it. I have suggested to the chair of the Homeland Security Committee that they examine how the law can be updated to reflect these concerns. I hope they can report bipartisan solutions through the regular order that the full Senate can actually take up.

Let's not lose sight of the particular question that is before us later today, whether the facts tell us there is truly a humanitarian and security crisis on our southern border and whether the Senate, for some reason, feels this particular emergency on our own border does not rise to the level of the 31 other national emergencies which are currently in effect.

In my own view, these narrow questions are not especially difficult ones to answer. The President is operating within existing law, and the crisis on our border is all too real. So I will vote to support the President's decision later today, and I encourage our colleagues to do the same.

TRIBUTE TO ''STEW''

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, on a completely different matter, few of us can aspire to the fame and fortune that are signified when a celebrity is known by just one name.

There is Cher; there was Prince; there is Madonna; and there is ''Stew.'' Everybody knows Stew—not Don Stewart, certainly not Don, just Stew.

For more than 12 years, Stew has been the larger-than-life personality patrolling the Ohio Clock corridor, camping out in the Press Gallery, and prowling the hallways of the Capitol complex—the guy who knows everything about policy, procedure, and communications with the office just off the Senate floor.

Stew is one of the best known staff members in all of Congress. It has been my great fortune to lean heavily on him every single day for more than a decade as my communications director and deputy chief of staff.

So, you can imagine, it is proving difficult to grasp that today is the very last workday I will have Stew by my side. After serving so well for so long, he is taking a leave—shall we say—for greener pastures.

So, this morning, I am exacting a little revenge. I am doing the one thing I suspect will make my deputy chief of staff's stomach churn more than anything else. I am actually turning the spotlight on him.

Now, the complete ''Legend of Stew'' is somewhat of a winding tale. This scrappy son of Riverside, CA, did not stroll a typical path to the corridors of power.

What came after high school was work, including what I understand was a spell as a bouncer. I am certain that position offered no useful preparation at all for wrangling our distinguished friends in the press corps. Then came Army service, then back to school in Georgia, and then politics.

Our late colleague Senator Coverdell hired Stew to represent him with his constituents down in Georgia. Not long after, he asked him to relocate to Washington.

The way I understand it, the ink was barely dry on Stew's lease, and the unpacking had just started when his boss tragically passed away, but Stew landed on his feet. He found his way to a pair of tough Texans, handling press for Senator Phil Gramm and then Senator CORNYN. He became famous as the communications director who could outsmart everybody and outwork everybody in a town where it is very hard to do either.

That is where Stew caught my eye. As I prepared, in 2006, for the possibility of becoming Republican leader, I knew we would need the most sophisticated communications shop a Senate leader had ever constructed, and it was clear Stew was the guy to build it.

Something else quickly became clear too. Stew was not quite like anybody else any of us had ever met before. One former colleague recalls that Stew would end a phone call with a plan already formed in his mind, then push off his desk with both hands, sending his rolling chair rocketing backward and slamming into the wall behind him. That high-octane crash was the official notification that Stew was about to make something happen. ''It was really endearing,'' this colleague explained, ''in retrospect.''

Restless energy has always been Stew's calling card. Every news story, every request from reporters, every shift in public sentiment, Stew was literally on top of it all. Seven days a week, almost literally 24 hours a day.

I was recently reminded that, in Stew's early days with me, some around the Capitol questioned whether he was an actual person or some kind of automated email system our office had built to blast out memos and bulletins literally around the clock.

The instant mobile devices started to provide email alerts, Stew's bat-like sleeping habits and inexhaustible work ethic probably rendered half the alarm clocks in Washington completely obsolete.

Questions, answers, press clippings, battle plans, they would pour into inboxes until after midnight, pause for a couple of hours, and resume before anyone else had even woken up, but circadian rhythms weren't the only thing Stew's presence reprogrammed. His energy, his careful foresight, his patriotism, all these things were just as infectious.

As our chief spokesman, key strategist, close adviser, team leader, morale-builder, resident dog lover, heavy metal music aficionado, and happy warrior, Stew helped me in my office through the Iraq war, the financial crisis, seismic policy battles, nomination debates, three different Presidents, and two reelection campaigns.

No matter what the day brought, I always knew what my deputy chief of staff would bring—razor-sharp instincts, a level head, a steady hand, and a boatload of integrity. For more than 12 years, I entrusted Stew with my words, my goals, and my reputation, and he has never let me down. He never flagged. He never slowed. Our watchdog never lost a step. He is totally trustworthy, completely reliable, and unbelievably competent—the greatest luxury a leader could have.

With these characteristics, you might think the person I am describing could be a little stiff, a little stern. Maybe that energy would occasionally boil over into harsh words or heated moments. But, remember, Stew is a bit of an unusual guy. That intensity doesn't overflow into frustration or unkindness or sharp words; instead, it overflows into generosity, goodheartedness, and compassion.

Stew is famous around Washington for his encyclopedic memory of birthdays, kids' birthdays, and anniversaries. Like clockwork, notes and greeting cards arrive, and texts and emails roll in. What I am saying is that work challenges aren't the only thing Stew is good at keeping in perspective. I was reminded of that fact a few months back when Stew brought his mother, Nancy, to visit here in the Senate. For all the history Stew has helped make, for every victory when he has allowed himself a brief smile, his colleagues aren't sure they have ever seen him happier than when he was ushering his mom around the corridors and showing her all he has built.

For all Stew's own accomplishments, we aren't sure we have ever seen him prouder than when he brags on his daughter Kylie. Lately, that has meant her career in software engineering and the apps she has created. Stew loves his family. He is loyal to his family. It is just our good luck that he came to see the Senate as part of that family as well.

My former chief of staff reminded me of the day he brought his boys to work. Stew loves kids, so he made a beeline, but one son felt a little shy. Instead of shrugging and walking away, it somehow occurred to Stew to say this: ''Did you know I could do a standing jump right onto that table right there?'' One more time for good measure—he is kind of a unique individual. The boy was understandably perplexed, but then this friendly stranger crouched down and leapt right up onto the table, with tie, dress shoes, and everything—a total spectacle, just to put that young man at ease and coax a smile. That is not your typical Senate moment, but that is the thing—for me and

for all of Stew's colleagues, that level of good cheer and concern for others really has been typical for a dozen years.

That is why his departure has triggered an avalanche of tributes from people all over Washington and beyond, people—many of them junior people—whom he wrote back with advice, met for coffee, shared some wisdom; this sprawling family tree of men and women who all feel that, one way or another, they owe a significant part of their success and careers to him. On that note, I have to say I know exactly how they feel.

So today I have to say goodbye to an all-star staff leader who took his job about as seriously as anybody you will ever meet but who took himself far less seriously than most people you will ever meet in the process. Professional excellence and personal humility are rare virtues. Having a heavy dose of either is impressive, but only the combination can explain Stew. There are plenty of people in this town who haven't tackled nearly the challenges or rubbed nearly the elbows he has, but you better believe their egos dwarf his. His resume looks like he belongs in fancy cocktail parties in tony neighborhoods, but I am not positive Stew would even be allowed into a fancy cocktail party. Regardless, I doubt he would find much time for the elite guests; he would be too engrossed in conversation with the security guards, valet parking attendants, hospitality staff, talking Nationals baseball and everything else under the Sun with the people who actually made the thing go.

Never before yesterday had I seen a large number of Capitol police officers gather to surprise a departing Senate staffer and send him off as if he were one of their own. That is the admiration and love that Stew has for the men and women who keep us safe—and vice versa. I know nothing I say today will really compete with that tribute. The only kind of man who would earn that sort of salute is the kind of man who would prize it above and beyond any fancy praise offered in a place like this. Don't get me wrong. Stew reveres this institution, but he never once seemed to covet the trappings or the power for its own sake; he just seemed honored to serve.

My colleagues and I are sad to bid farewell to the Senate staffer who made himself thoroughly famous by trying not to make himself famous. We are sorry to part with our tough-talking workaholic who can't bypass a cute puppy without stopping for a good scratch and a photo shoot. We will sorely miss our true-blue patriot who so loves this country where a kid can grow up from working odd jobs to counseling Senators and statesmen and not lose an ounce of his character along the way.

Stew, we can't quite imagine a place without you, but we are so grateful for what you have made it while you were here.

Happy trails, buddy.

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.

RELATING TO A NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED BY THE PRESIDENT ON FEBRUARY 15, 2019

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Committee on Armed Services is discharged from further consideration of H.J. Res. 46, and the Senate will proceed to its immediate consideration.

The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 46) relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO ''STEW''

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I thank my colleague and friend from Tennessee for deferring.

First, on Donald Stewart, I know Leader MCCONNELL talked about him. Everyone is going to miss him here in the Senate. He was truly somebody whom everyone liked. He always had a great sense of humor and a big smile. He served his boss, MITCH MCCONNELL, extremely well, but he never let that get in the way of being friendly and working with the other side. He is somebody we will all miss. I enjoyed my interactions with him a great deal. I think that is probably true of just about every Member here.

We wish Stew the best and thank him for serving this body so long and so well.

H.J. RES. 46

Today, Madam President, the Senate will vote on the resolution to terminate the President's declaration of a national emergency. This is not a normal vote. What we are doing here today—this is not a normal day. It is not your typical vote on an appropriations or authorization bill. It doesn't concern a nomination or an appointment. This will be a vote about the very nature of our Constitution, the separation of powers, and how this government functions henceforth.

The Framers gave Congress the power of the purse in article I of the Constitution. It is probably our greatest power. Now the President is claiming that power for himself under a guise of an emergency declaration to get around a Congress that repeatedly would not authorize his demand for a border wall.

The President has not justified the emergency declaration. You would think in a moment like this, when there is not a war, when there is not an immediate disease, or when there is not a disaster—that is when we had other declarations. They don't need an elaboration, but this one would. But the President hasn't done that. He simply said he ''didn't need to do this.'' That is amazing, folks, my colleagues. The President said he didn't need to do this, and yet he is declaring an emergency. It is a direct contradiction of his own words.

Everyone here knows the truth. Democrats and Republicans know the sad truth. The President did not declare an emergency because there is one; he declared an emergency because he lost in Congress and wants to get around it. He is obsessed with showing strength. He couldn't just abandon his pursuit of the border wall, so he had to trample on the Constitution to continue his fight. That is not how this democracy is supposed to function. That is not how this democracy has functioned. I have never seen it, where, out of anger and out of a desire to win the fight regardless of the consequences, a President would do this.

The President has not laid out where he plans to divert funds from, though we know it is going to be from our military—from the men and women serving us and from the things they need.

Senators who vote against this resolution this afternoon may be voting to gut funding for a military installation in their State or for a cut to military pay and military pensions. How could they do that?

Most importantly, President Trump has shown zero understanding of what his emergency portends for the separation of powers in our democracy. The President seems to regard the government, not just the Justice Department, as his own personal tool to do whatever he wants, whether it is in the private sector or the public sector. We have never had a President like this.

We have had lots of Presidents with lots of foibles, but none of them seem to equate their own ego with the entire functioning of the government of the United States, except this one.

We can't succumb to that. It is our job here, in Congress, to limit executive overreach, to defend our core powers, to prevent a President—any President—from ignoring the will of Congress every time it fails to align with the will of the President. That is what the balance of powers is. That is what checks and balances is. That is what every one of us learned in second grade civics class.

All that teaching in the second grade civics class seems to be lost on so many of my Republican colleagues in blind obeisance to this President, no matter what the consequences.

This is not an issue of the wall. It goes way beyond that. We have had our fights and disputes on the wall for several years here. However you feel about our policy on the southern border and however you feel about the President, Senators should vote yes on the resolution to terminate the emergency declaration.

This resolution is about more than this President. It is about the Presidency now and on into the future.

It should not be difficult for any of my Republican colleagues to take this vote. Conservative principles would demand it, and some of the true conservatives, like Mr. LEE, yesterday, understood that logic. Conservatives have always feared an agglomeration of power in any branch of government, but particularly in the executive branch. The conservative movement has been designed to reduce the powers of the Federal Government. That is why they are for lowering taxes so much.

All of a sudden, again, because President Trump simply wants it, they say: Let's abandon those principles and vote to change, fundamentally, the way the balance of power works—shame.

If conservatism today is to mean anything, self-branded conservatives should vote to terminate the resolution. Deep-seated principles like that shouldn't take a back seat to the politics of the moment. They should not be abandoned just because the President shares the same party.

Now, let me speak from the heart to my Republican colleagues. I know that President Trump is extremely popular among Republicans for many reasons. I know he commands the vast majority of the Republican Party, and I know that the President never shies away from threatening, bullying, or publicly castigating members of his own party if they refuse to do what he wants.

So, I realize this. It is a much more difficult vote for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to take than for those of us who are Democrats. I would say to them, and I would say to every Republican: There are times when loyalty to America, to our Constitution, to our principles, and to what has made this country great should lead Members to rise above and rise to the occasion.

I hope and I pray that this moment is one of those times when Members choose country over party and when Members rise above politics for the sake of fidelity to our constitutional principles and to this great United States of America.

In conclusion, on this issue, this is not an everyday moment. This is not just about going along with this President or that one. This is a red-letter day in the history of how the U.S. Government functions. The judgment of our Founding Fathers and the judgment of history weighs upon this vote.

TARIFFS

Madam President, the trade negotiations with China are moving forward, and I continue to have concerns that President Trump will accept a weak deal for the sake of a headline. Apparently, I am not alone. President Trump's former top economic adviser, Gary Cohn, told a podcast that the President is ''desperate'' to reach a trade deal. He also expressed deep skepticism that the administration would be able to stop the Chinese from stealing intellectual property and hold the Chinese accountable.

I hope Gary Cohn is wrong. The President, to his credit, was not desperate for a deal in North Korea and stood up to Kim Jong Un and looked strong for that. I hope he realizes that, as he negotiates with someone with even more consequences at stake for the long run of America—President Xi—and with a country that can do far more harm to our country, ultimately, in the long run.

Ambassador Lighthizer has said that there are still major issues left to be resolved. If that is the case, President Trump should not be pressing for a quick solution. The Chinese are more desperate for a solution than we are, although, obviously, some harm has been created to bring the Chinese to the table with tariffs.

The Chinese are desperate, and it is like they are ahead in the seventh inning, and then you say: I quit the ball game; I lose.

Don't do that, Mr. President. The tariffs you have imposed, at some political cost, have brought China to the table and given us the first opportunity in decades—in decades—to make the Chinese reform so they don't take total advantage of American workers and know-how. Soybean purchases and promises to import more American goods are not sufficient if we don't win concrete concessions on major issues.

If President Trump caves to China for the sake of soybean purchases, he would be trading America's future, literally, for a hill of beans. We want to help the soybean farmers. We want to help everybody else, but not at the expense of the future viability of jobs and wealth in America.

My message to President Trump is the same one I mentioned to him and I gave to him before he met with Kim Jong Un: Don't back down.

The President should be proud that he stood up to North Korea and walked away. He will be proud if he does the same with China, unless President Xi makes enduring, verifiable reforms of China's economic and trade policies, because the odds are high that if the President walks away from a weak deal, he will be able to get a much better deal down the road.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

H.J. RES. 46

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, Tennesseans have asked me: Is there really a crisis on the southern border? Do you support President Trump's border wall?

And my answer to both questions is yes, I do.

I have urged the President to build the 234 miles of border wall that he asked for in his January 6 letter to the Senate and to do that in the fastest possible way, with a minimum delay and legal challenge, by using the $5.7 billion already approved by Congress.

But the President's emergency declaration to take an additional $3.6 billion that Congress has appropriated for military hospitals, for barracks, and for schools—including one in Fort Campbell—is inconsistent with the U.S. Constitution that I took an oath to support and to defend.

Never before has a President asked for funding, the Congress has not provided it, and then the President has used the National Emergencies Act of 1976 to spend the money anyway. The problem with this is that after a Revolutionary War against a King, our Nation's Founders gave to Congress—a Congress elected by the people—the power to approve all spending so that the President would not have too much power. This check on the executive is a source of our freedom.

In addition, this declaration is a dangerous precedent. Already, Democrat Presidential candidates are saying they would declare emergencies to tear down the existing border wall, to take away guns, to stop oil exports, to shut down offshore drilling, and for other leftwing enterprises—all without the approval of Congress.

I believe the crisis on our southern border is real. U.S. Customs and Border Patrol arrested more than 66,000 illegal aliens in February of 2019—the highest total in a single month since March 2009. In the last 2 years alone, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement officers have arrested 266,000 illegal aliens in the United States with criminal records. Each week, approximately 300 Americans die from heroin overdoses, of which nearly 90 percent come across the southern border.

During the last 25 years, Congress approved and President Obama, President Clinton, President George W. Bush, and President George H. W. Bush built 654 miles of barrier along the 1,954-mile southern border. In 2013, the comprehensive immigration bill that received 68 Senate votes, including mine, included $40 billion for border security, including physical barrier, and enforcement. Last year, I voted with nearly

every Democrat for a bill that included $25 billion for border security, including physical barrier.

So one might ask: Why is President Trump the only President not allowed to build more wall on the southern border?

But in this case, as the Wall Street Journal said on March 12, ''The President doesn't need to invoke a national emergency to build his wall along the southern border.'' He has the money immediately available in other accounts already approved by Congress. Any appreciation for our structure of government means that no President should be able to use the National Emergencies Act to spend money that Congress refuses to provide.

The late Justice Antonin Scalia, who is revered by constitutional conservatives, put it this way for us. Justice Scalia said:

''Every tin horn dictator in the world today, every President for life has a Bill of Rights. That's not what makes us free. What has made us free is our Constitution. Think of the word ''constitution,'' it means structure. That's why America's framers debated not the Bill of Rights, but rather the structure of the federal government.''

Justice Scalia wrote:

The genius of the American constitutional system is the dispersal of power. Once power is centralized in one person, or one part of government, a Bill of Rights is just words on paper.

That was Justice Scalia.

I fault Democrats for not supporting President Trump's reasonable request for more wall on the border after 25 years of approving physical barriers and border wall for four other Presidents. That is not an excuse to ignore the constitutional separation of powers, especially when the faster way to build the 234 more miles of border wall that the President has asked for is to use $5.7 billion already approved by Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Wall Street Journal dated March 12, 2019, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 12, 2019]

TRUMP'S EMERGENCY EXIT

HOW HE CAN DECLARE VICTORY ON WALL MONEY WITHOUT LOSING A VOTE

(By The Editorial Board)

The Senate will vote on a resolution to override President Trump's emergency declaration as early as Thursday, and rarely has there been a clearer case of needless self-harm. Mr. Trump should listen to the Senate Republicans offering him a safe emergency exit.

On Tuesday Vice President Mike Pence met with several GOP Senators ahead of a vote on the override resolution that passed the House with ease. As many as 10 to 15 GOP Senators may vote to override.

Republican Senators up for re-election in tough states are in an impossible position. Susan Collins of Maine and Thom Tillis of North Carolina are both up in 2020, and they're voting to rebuke the President. Martha McSally has to fight for her seat in Arizona in 2020, and to win she'll need a coalition of Trump voters and the President's skeptics. No matter how she votes she isolates potential supporters. Ditto for Cory Gardner of Colorado.

And for what? The President doesn't need to invoke a national emergency to build his wall along the southern border. Sen. Lamar Alexander of Tennessee has pointed out that the White House already has funds at its disposal without declaring an emergency.

Consider: The President wants $5.7 billion for the wall. Congress provided $1.375 billion in appropriations. The President plans to tap $601 million from a forfeiture fund at the Treasury Department that can be used for general law enforcement purposes. Mr. Trump also plans to use $2.5 billion from Defense Department accounts that deal with drug smuggling, though Sen. Alexander notes that the law allows him to tap up to $4 billion.

In other words, if the President moved $3.7 from the Pentagon drug account, he'd reach his $5.7 billion goal without needing to pilfer $3.6 billion from military construction. The White House noted this in a fact sheet last month but declared an emergency anyway. The irony is that the President can't possibly spend all this money on wall construction before the fall's budget negotiations for fiscal 2020, when he can work on winning more funding.

Mr. Trump could rescind the order and say he'll spend the money available under the law first, and reconsider if facts warrant. This would keep the money out of the courts. The President would also be better positioned to win the 2020 defense spending he wants if he isn't raiding the military to pay for the wall. In his budget proposal this week, Mr. Trump asked Congress to backfill the money he is taking from military construction. House Democrats have no incentive to cooperate.

The alternative is a divisive vote that Mr. Trump is sure to lose and a bipartisan resolution he'll have to veto. And that's for starters. The National Emergencies Act allows a vote in Congress every six months until an emergency is terminated. Democrats have found a gift that will keep on giving.

Some Republicans are proposing fixes to the National Emergencies Act, which would be welcome. A proposal from Mike Lee of Utah would let the President declare an emergency as he can now, but after 30 days Congress would have to vote to continue it.

Republican Senators don't want a pointless showdown with Mr. Trump, but they can't avoid one if the White House won't change course. Mr. Trump should declare victory on wall funding for this year and live to fight next year.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Thank you, Madam President, for the recognition. It is great to be joined on the floor by Senator COLLINS, who is going to speak after me to stand up for the Constitution, and I very much appreciate Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER's comments also. He is a real student of the Constitution, and I respect very much the conclusion he has come up with here today.

When each Senator is sworn into office, we take a fundamental pledge to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. That vow that we support the Constitution dates back to the very first Congress in 1789. Defending the Constitution is our first and foremost sacred duty.

The Founders built a system of checks and balances into our Constitution. They made sure that the three branches of government exercised their own separate powers, and they made sure that no one branch, no one person, could exercise too much power, especially over the use of taxpayer money. The Founders gave to Congress the power of the purse, one of our most fundamental powers. Article I, section 9 of the Constitution could not be more clear: ''No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law.''

Congress holds the power to spend taxpayer money, not the President. It is our job to make sure that spending decisions have widespread public support and are not the product of an extreme minority, much less one man or one woman.

We all know that the President wants a wall. We just had a major debate about border security funding. The President shut down the government for 35 days because Congress refused his wall request.

Eventually he relented, but now he has declared an ''emergency'' to simply try and take the money that he couldn't get from the appropriations process. He said: ''I didn't need to do this.'' He flaunted the fact that this is not a real emergency.

The President is testing the limits of Executive power. The questions before the Senate today are these: Are we going to let this happen or are we going to open Pandora's box? What about article I of the Constitution? What about the 35-day government shutdown? What about Presidential budget requests? What about the Appropriations Committee? Are we really going to let a President raid taxpayer money after Congress denies the request?

The opposition to this power grab is bipartisan, as it should be. Among the American people the numbers are overwhelming. Almost 70 percent of the American people oppose the President's emergency declaration to raid taxpayer money for the wall. That is almost 70 percent.

My fellow Senators, it is time for the Senate to do its job. It is time for us to assert our authority over the purse. It is time for us to honor our oath of office. Every Senator should vote yes on the resolution to terminate the President's emergency declaration.

I want to thank my cosponsors in this effort. Earlier I mentioned Senator COLLINS, who is on the floor with me and will speak after me—Senator MURKOWSKI, Senator SHAHEEN. Again, I know that Senator COLLINS is on the floor to urge us to do the right thing, to stand up for Congress's authority.

This vote is historic. The Constitution's principle of separation of powers is at stake. If the Senate enables the President to hijack our power to appropriate, history will not remember us fondly.

This vote is not about the wisdom of building a wall along the border. This vote is not about party. This vote is about whether we will let any President trample on the Constitution, whether we will sit by and let the President take away our constitutional authority to appropriate.

I rise today, hopeful that my Republican colleagues will speak up. In addition to Senator COLLINS and Senator MURKOWSKI, Senator TILLIS stated firmly in a recent opinion piece:

> I support Trump's vision on border security. But I would vote against the emergency.

Why does he say he would vote against the emergency declaration? Because, he said, ''[a]s a U.S. Senator, I cannot justify providing the executive with more ways to bypass Congress.''

Former Governor Kasich authored an opinion piece recently titled ''It's time for Republicans in Congress to put country over party.'' He states:

> Let's be clear. This vote is not about the situation at the border; it's about an executive power grab and, above all, congressional respect for the democratic process.

I couldn't agree more with Governor Kasich.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the full pieces by Senator TILLIS and Governor Kasich.

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

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 25, 2019]

I SUPPORT TRUMP'S VISION ON BORDER SECURITY. BUT I WOULD VOTE AGAINST THE EMERGENCY

(By Thom Tillis)

Thom Tillis, a Republican, is a U.S. senator from North Carolina.

President Trump has few bigger allies than me when it comes to supporting his vision of 21st-century border security, encompassing a major investment in technology, personnel and infrastructure, including new physical barriers where they will be effective. It is a vision that will take many years and tens of billions of dollars to fully realize, and the president can count on me to help.

The president is rightfully frustrated with Congress's inaction regarding the humanitarian and security crisis at the nation's southern border. Even though Republicans and Democrats spent the past several decades in the halls of Congress and on the campaign trail promising the American people that they would work to secure U.S. borders, some of my colleagues seemingly made a politically calculated decision to block the president's good-faith efforts to finally get it done. They have regressed to the point where a Democratic presidential contender such as Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand (N.Y.) and a possible candidate, former congressman Beto O'Rourke of Texas, are even entertaining the possibility of tearing down existing physical barriers. Although Trump certainly has legitimate grievances over congressional Democrats' obstruction of border-security funding, his national emergency declaration on Feb. 15 was not the right answer.

From the perspective of the chief executive, I can understand why the president would assert his powers with the emergency declaration to implement his policy agenda. After all, nearly every president in the modern era has similarly pushed the boundaries of presidential power, many with the helping hand of Congress.

In fact, if I were the leader of the Constitution's Article II branch, I would probably declare an emergency and use all the tools at my disposal as well. But I am not. I am a member of the Senate, and I have grave concerns when our institution looks the other way at the expense of weakening Congress's power.

It is my responsibility to be a steward of the Article I branch, to preserve the separation of powers and to curb the kind of executive overreach that Congress has allowed to fester for the better part of the past century. I stood by that principle during the Obama administration, and I stand by it now.

Conservatives rightfully cried foul when President Barack Obama used executive action to completely bypass Congress and unilaterally provide deferred action to undocumented adults who had knowingly violated the nation's immigration laws. Some prominent Republicans went so far as to proclaim that Obama was acting more like an ''emperor'' or ''king'' than a president.

There is no intellectual honesty in now turning around and arguing that there's an imaginary asterisk attached to executive overreach—that it's acceptable for my party but not thy party.

Republicans need to realize that this will lead inevitably to regret when a Democrat once again controls the White House, cites the precedent set by Trump, and declares his or her own national emergency to advance a policy that couldn't gain congressional approval.

This isn't just conjecture. House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D–Calif.) and other prominent Democratic elected officials have already hinted that emergency declarations will be part of the playbook for the left, with Pelosi musing, ''just think about what a president with different values can present to the American people.''

Conservatives should take these warnings seriously. They should be thinking about whether they would accept the prospect of a President Bernie Sanders declaring a national emergency to implement parts of the radical Green New Deal; a President Elizabeth Warren declaring a national emergency to shut down banks and take over the nation's financial institutions; or a President Cory Booker declaring a national emergency to restrict Second Amendment rights.

Those on the left and the right who are making Trump's emergency declaration a simple political litmus test of whether one supports or opposes the president and his policies are missing the mark. This is about the separation of powers and whether Congress will support or oppose a new precedent of executive power that will have major consequences.

As a U.S. senator, I cannot justify providing the executive with more ways to bypass Congress. As a conservative, I cannot endorse a precedent that I know future left-wing presidents will exploit to advance radical policies that will erode economic and individual freedoms.

These are the reasons I would vote in favor of the resolution disapproving of the president's national-emergency declaration, if and when it comes before the Senate.

[From CNN, Mar. 12, 2019]

JOHN KASICH: IT'S TIME FOR REPUBLICANS IN CONGRESS TO PUT COUNTRY OVER PARTY

(By John R. Kasich)

John R. Kasich is the former governor of Ohio, serving from 2011 to 2019. A Republican, he was previously a member of the House of Representatives. He is the author of ''Two Paths: America Divided or United.'' The opinions expressed in this commentary are his. View more opinion articles on CNN.

During my 18 years as a member of Congress—not so long ago—my colleagues and I didn't robotically toe the line with the President. Republicans didn't vote in lockstep with Republican presidents, not even Ronald Reagan. And Democrats departed from their party's president when they thought it was the right thing to do. We took party loyalty seriously, but we gave even greater weight to principle.

In recent decades, of course, partisanship in the House and Senate has become far more intense, and the nation is worse as a result. But even now, in this hyper-partisan era, there comes a time when our elected leaders must put country over party.

One such moment: the ongoing debate over President Donald Trump's national emergency declaration to fund construction of a wall on the US-Mexico border. Sometime soon, Republican senators will have the opportunity to demonstrate—as 13 Republicans did in the House—their love of country and their commitment to constitutional values by voting for the resolution to disapprove the President's emergency declaration. Instead of acting like they're afraid of their own shadows, Senate Republicans must use this vote to—at long last—stand up and defend the Constitution.

THE REAL NATIONAL EMERGENCY IS NOT AT THE BORDER

Let's be clear. This vote is not about the situation at the border; it's about an executive power grab and, above all, congressional respect for the democratic process. Whatever their views on the border situation—which I agree is serious—Republicans should oppose the President's declaration. Standing against the President on this issue is important not just for today, but for our future.

For years, Republicans decried executive overreach by President Barack Obama. If we are serious about our constitutional values, we can't complain only about actions by the other party. We have to apply consistent principles whenever we have a president from our own party as well.

We should be especially concerned about President Trump's effort to circumvent Congress simply by invoking the magic word ''emergency.'' If presidents can do end runs around Congress merely by claiming ''emergency,'' then there's almost no limit to executive authority. This would create a gravely dangerous situation, not only for this president but for all future presidents as well.

Legal scholars are debating what the word ''emergency'' means as it's used in the National Emergencies Act, and the courts will resolve that question if Congress fails to override an expected presidential veto of their resolution of disapproval. But there's no real doubt about what the word is supposed to mean. A president's emergency powers are intended to be used for addressing sudden or unexpected events, not just serious problems. Indeed, the National Emergencies Act, passed in 1976, aimed to curtail—not expand—presidential discretion to declare emergencies.

What's also clear is how emergency declarations should be used: To address problems in ways for which there is not only a general consensus, but also where the pressing nature of the challenge requires speedy action without the formal and oftentimes slow process of congressional action. Nothing about the current situation matches up to that standard.

President Trump's emergency declaration for border wall funding is almost the antithesis of that model. The problems at our border may indeed be severe, but they are chronic. Even more significantly, there is

not a consensus to pursue the President's approach. To the contrary, Republicans and Democrats in Congress did negotiate a compromise—and the President signed it into law. But then he proceeded to turn his back on the negotiation, the process and the agreement by declaring a national emergency.

That kind of unilateralism not only conflicts with our Constitution, it amplifies the worst of our present-day politics. President Trump is playing to his base, focused on politics not policy. The result of his approach is more bitterness and alienation, less trust between parties and a continued loss of public confidence in our government. It leaves both parties—our government—far less able to do the things the American people need and desire. I am proud to have joined with three dozen former Republican members of Congress to urge those Republicans currently serving there to stand for our values and by standing up to the President against his emergency declaration. President Trump remains popular within our party, but so is a deeply ingrained commitment to constitutional conservativism. Opposing your party's president is never easy, but I am hopeful that Republicans will vote to uphold the constitutional principles I know they hold dear.

Mr. UDALL. Madam President, to get this wall money, the President caused the longest government shutdown in our Nation. The shutdown caused hardship for millions of Federal employees and lasting pain for thousands of Federal contractors, not to mention the millions of Americans who were denied services for 35 days—services they paid for with their tax dollars.

I visited with New Mexicans hurt by the shutdown and it was very, very painful to hear their stories.

In the end, Congress decided on a bipartisan basis not to spend the $5.7 billion the President demanded for his wall. He got $1.3 billion. I didn't want to see that much, and I wanted to see more restrictions as to specifically what it was going to be spent for, but it was a hard-fought compromise, and a deal is a deal.

Congress's determination should have ended the debate for this fiscal year, the year that we are in.

Now the President is asking Congress for $8.6 billion for the border wall next year. That is his prerogative, but make no mistake, it is not only Congress's prerogative, it is Congress's constitutional responsibility to decide if he gets that money. As the old saying goes, the President proposes and Congress disposes. President Trump is being treated no differently than all previous Presidents. That is how our constitutional system works—or at least how it is supposed to work.

The President's emergency declaration is an end run around Congress, plain and simple. If any Democratic President issued an emergency declaration like this, say for climate change or gun safety funding, Republicans in this body would scream bloody murder and vote to disapprove.

I am on record that climate change is one of the most pressing issues on our planet, and I am on record that gun violence is a national crisis. I have voted for and proposed actual legislation on these topics, as our system is supposed to work. No previous President has used the National Emergency Act to bypass the appropriations process like this. Our Constitution, the rule of law, separation of powers—all of these rise far above the day-to-day controversies like the President's border wall.

On a practical note, the President wants to take real money away from real military construction projects, which will have a real impact on national security. These military construction projects have been vetted through years of scrutiny, through the military, through numerous congressional committees in Congress, and they are projects deemed essential to national security—projects all across the Nation, in our States, that are now at risk.

We have a long list of military construction projects by the President. Yet he has not bothered to tell us which projects would be cut to build his wall. Will he raid $793 million to rebuild Camp Lejeune, NC, after the devastation from Hurricane Florence?

Will he steal up to $800 million for Navy ship maintenance to make sure that accidents like what happened to the USS *McCain* and USS *Fitzgerald* never happen again?

Will he raid $125 million from my State of New Mexico for Holloman Air Force Base to develop unmanned aerial vehicles to track terrorists and for White Sands Missile Range to build a badly needed information systems facility?

The answer is that we don't know, but these critical projects in all of our States are at risk.

We each need to think about our States and the people we were sent here to represent. I am from one of the four States that border Mexico, one of the four States that would be the most directly impacted by any border wall, and I am here to state there is no national security emergency along my State's border with Mexico. What is happening at our border does not justify the use of this authority.

New Mexico's border communities are flourishing with economic, cultural, and educational activity. Border communities are as safe as or safer than others in the interior.

This is not a partisan view along the border. Republican WILLIAM HURD represents more than 500 miles of the Texas border with Mexico. He not only believes the President's emergency declaration is unconstitutional, but he also thinks the President's wall is ''the most expensive and least effective way to do border security.''

Again, whether you support or oppose the border wall is not an issue. What is at issue is our oath to support and defend the Constitution, whether any President can toss Congress aside and raid critical funds at will.

We have an opportunity to stand up to an unconstitutional power grab. I urge everyone in this Chamber to seize that opportunity.

With this, I yield to Senator COLLINS, who, from the beginning, has worked with me as we have our resolution in, and we are working hard to make sure that we stand up for the Constitution.

I yield the floor.

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

Ms. COLLINS. Thank you.

Mr. President, later today, the Senate will make a significant decision with implications for our constitutional system of government.

We will vote on a resolution to reverse the President's ill-advised national emergency declaration that funds the construction of a border wall using money that Congress has appropriated and the President has signed into law for other purposes, such as military construction.

I want to thank Senator UDALL, the Senator from New Mexico, for working together with me. We introduced a companion resolution to overturn the President's declaration, and I commend Senator UDALL for his leadership.

By declaring a national emergency, the President's action comes into direct conflict with Congress's authority to determine the appropriation of funds, a power vested in Congress by the Framers of our Constitution in article I, section 9. That is why this issue is not about strengthening our border security, a goal that I support and have voted to advance. Rather, it is a solemn occasion involving whether this body will stand up for its institutional prerogatives and will support the separation of powers enshrined in our Constitution.

Throughout our history the courts have consistently held that ''only Congress is empowered by the Constitution to adopt laws directing monies to be spent from the U.S. treasury.''

For the past 65 years, the courts have determined the boundary of Presidential authority vis-a-vis Congress under the doctrine of Youngstown Sheet & Tube, the 1952 Supreme Court case that reversed President Truman's seizure of U.S. steel companies during the Korean war.

As Justice Robert Jackson explained in his profoundly influential concurrence in that case, the question of whether a President's actions are constitutionally valid should be determined by examining the source of the President's authority. In this concurrence, the Justice goes through three scenarios in which he assesses the President's power.

According to Justice Jackson, when acts taken by the President are against the express or implied will of Congress, the President's power is at its lowest ebb. President Trump's declaration clearly falls in that category.

The President rests his declaration on the National Emergencies Act, and that act fails to define precisely what constitutes an emergency. There is a commonsense rule we can apply. It is a five-part test that was used by the Office of Management and Budget under

former President George Herbert Walker Bush to determine whether requested funding merited an emergency designation under our budget rules. Under that test, a spending request was designated as an emergency only if the need for spending met a five-part test. It had to be necessary, sudden, urgent, unforeseen, and not permanent.

Whether one agrees with President Trump that more should be done to secure our southern border—and I do agree with him on that goal—his decision to fund a border wall through a national emergency declaration would never pass all of this five-part test.

Another concern I have with the President's declaration is, it shifts funding away from critical military construction projects. We don't know which ones. We have not been able to get a list, but this could have very real national security implications. Again, I would note that the Military Construction appropriations bill incorporated projects recommended by the President and his Department of Defense, was passed by both bodies, and signed into law by the President.

Let me emphasize, once again, that the question presented by this resolution is not whether you are for a border wall or against a border wall; it is not whether you believe that border security should be strengthened or whether it is sufficient; it is not whether we support or oppose President Trump; rather, the question is a far more fundamental and significant one. The question is this: Do we want the executive branch, now or in the future, to hold the power of the purse, a power the Framers deliberately entrusted to Congress?

We must stand up and defend Congress's institutional powers as the Framers intended we would, even when doing so is inconvenient or goes against the outcome we might prefer.

I urge my colleagues to support the rulings of disapproval and our Constitution.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this is a debate worth happening. I appreciate the comments from my New England neighbor. It is an important matter for us to consider.

President Trump declared a national emergency, citing a ''crisis'' at the southern border, but it has become more and more evident he did it for one reason, to do an end run around Congress and the Appropriations Committee, and use taxpayer money to build a wall on the southern border that Congress has refused to fund.

For 3 years, he failed to convince Congress—a Republican-controlled Senate and a Republican-controlled House—that his wall was a good idea. For 3 years, he requested that Congress fund his cynical campaign promise to build a ''big beautiful'' wall on the southern border, and for 3 years, the Republican-controlled Congress refused. Even when his own party controlled both Chambers of Congress, he could not convince enough Members that it was a good idea. Certainly, nobody accepted his pledge that Mexico would pay for the wall. We all knew the U.S. taxpayers would have to pay for it.

So instead of accepting that we are in a democracy, and he is not a monarch, instead of accepting that we are in a democracy and there are two other coequal branches of government that could constrain his actions, the President has decided to ignore the Constitution and the will of Congress and go it alone. Actually, Congress alone has the power of the purse. Congress having exclusive power over our government spending priorities is one of the most critical checks and balances in our constitutional system.

Anybody who goes back and reads the history of the founding of this country knows that the reason we are the oldest existing democracy currently in the world, is that we believed in checks and balances.

The President, of course, could propose funding for whatever projects he wants, but it is the job of Congress to decide where to invest the American people's hard-earned tax dollars. In a democracy, every President from George Washington to now is supposed to respect those decisions. After not getting what he wanted, this President has invoked the National Emergencies Act. He is stretching the powers given to him in that act beyond all recognition. He has declared a national emergency on the southern border.

We are not responding to a national emergency. There is no crisis on our southern border requiring such extreme action. What kind of national emergency is declared only after you lose a 3-year funding fight with Members of your own party? What kind of national emergency is resolved by a vaguely defined, multiyear construction project? The truth is clear. He is trying to use this authority as a means to a political end.

When Congress enacted the National Emergencies Act in 1976, it conveyed certain powers to the President to use in the event of a true emergency that required quick action. I remember. I was here during the debate. There was a Republican President. It assumed that whoever sat in the Oval Office would have enough respect for the office and the power being conveyed not to abuse it. Those of us in the Senate, at that time, felt that whether it was a Republican or Democratic President, they would not abuse the power. President Trump has failed that test.

Presidential emergency powers should only be invoked in a true time of crisis. It is an abuse of power to invoke these authorities just because he couldn't do what he wanted in any other way. We are now seeing what he would do if he had these powers.

The President wants to raid money meant for military housing and military base improvements to pay for his wall. This comes almost in the same week we see in the news that so much of military housing is infested by mold, by rats, by asbestos, and by all these other problems. Is he going to take the money that would make this housing safe for the men and women in our military to pay for his wall? Is he going to take money from Camp Lejeune that was hit by Hurricane Florence and badly damaged? I know Camp Lejeune. When my son was in the Marines, he spent time there. Is he going to take money from Tyndall Air Force base, which was flattened by Hurricane Michael? What about money for schools for military families, like the school at Fort Campbell, KY, or a child development center at Joint Base Andrews in Maryland? What about essential training facilities that would ensure military readiness, like a special operations training facility at Fort Bragg, NC—which I have visited. Congress chose to fund these projects over an ineffective, wasteful wall. Congress had to say, where does the money go? We felt these things to help our military and military families made far more sense than the wall. Congress used its constitutional power—let me emphasize that—Congress used its constitutional power of the purse to set priorities for how to invest the American people's hard-earned tax dollars.

The President is trying to label opponents of his action as weak on border security or weak on crime. That is nonsense. I don't know any Member of the Senate, of either party, who doesn't believe in border security or is in favor of crime.

Let's see what he asked for. Instead of border security, he wanted $5.7 billion for the wall. Congress approved a border security package—money for fencing along with technology added between the ports of entry, and additional personnel. That is real border security, not a political stunt. Now the President is saying: Thank you for your views; thank you for following your constitutional power, but I am still going to do it my way. Where is he going to stop?

The fact that it is a political game was shown when this Congress passed, overwhelmingly, $1.6 billion for border security. The President threatened to veto that. Then after closing the government for 35 days—costing the taxpayers billions and billions of dollars for nothing—he signed the bill that did not give him the $1.6 billion that he threatened to veto but that gave him $1.3 billion, and that he signed. If anybody thinks this is just playing games, that states it.

Over the past 2 years, we have seen the erosion of our institutional checks and balances in the face of creeping authoritarianism. The time has come for Congress and Members of the President's own party to take a stand. Congress simply cannot afford to remain silent in the face of such an unprecedented violation of the separation of powers.

I understand Senator LEE has introduced a bill to reform the National Emergencies Act. I appreciate the thought he has put into this issue. I am certainly going to review his legislation with an open mind, but make no mistake, legislation to fix future abuses of this law does not address the abuses we have that are happening right now. His bill does not address the fact that this President is trying to do an end run around Congress—an end run around Democrats and Republicans alike—and is cynically using an emergency declaration to fund a request on which we had voted but of which we did not approve. We must send a message to the President that this is unacceptable. This is not something we never voted on. We have voted on this matter, and under the Constitution, that is what is supposed to carry the day.

I hope my Republican friends will take a moment to take stock of where we are. President Trump is going to be but a moment in our Nation's history. The Constitution controls our history no matter who is President. For the sake of appeasing a man who made a foolish campaign promise that was never grounded in reality, will they not stand up for the institution in which they serve? For the sake of appeasing a President who detests any limits or checks on his authority, will they forever diminish the role of Congress as a coequal branch of government?

Now is the time for country over party. I will vote aye on the joint resolution of disapproval, and I urge all Senators to do the same.

I do not see any Senator who seeks the floor.

Mr. President, is this under controlled time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is controlled equally between the proponents and opponents.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time consumed by the quorum be equally divided between both sides.

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

Mr. LEAHY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COTTON. 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. COTTON. Mr. President, the Senate will soon vote on the President's declaration of a national emergency. We have reached a moment of crisis, but it is not a constitutional crisis; it is a crisis on the border, a crisis of American sovereignty. When hundreds of thousands of foreigners arrive at the southern border and demand entry, that is not migration; that is an emergency and a threat to our sovereignty. The stories speak for themselves.

Last Thursday, an American citizen named Rocio Alderete was shot to death on a bridge over the Mexican border near McAllen, TX. Early reports suggest Rocio was caught in a shootout between cartel gunmen and the Mexican police, but whatever the case turns out to be, Rocio has perished—the latest American victim of lawlessness at our southern border.

Since last October, Border Patrol agents have apprehended more than 260,000 illegal aliens at the border, which is a surge of 90 percent—almost double from the previous year. For the most part, these aren't young men who are coming for work, as has been so often the case in the past; rather, they are Central Americans who are gaming our generous asylum laws. Instead of running away from the Border Patrol, these illegal aliens run to it so they can be captured and released into the country, with notice to appear in court, which they hardly ever do. Thanks to stupid laws and activist judges, illegal aliens are even using little kids as legal force fields because being detained with minors increases their odds of being held in America rather than to be turned around and sent home.

As a result, we see all of the horrors of the human smuggling trade at the border today. Women and girls are sexually assaulted at horrific rates. Hundreds die in the desert each year of thirst and exhaustion. Infectious diseases we had all but eradicated with vaccines are appearing again in border communities. ICE health officials have found 236 confirmed or probable cases of mumps among detainees in the past year after having reported zero cases for the previous 2 years.

This surge of illegal aliens is swamping law enforcement's ability to do its job. ''Overwhelmed'' is the word we hear so often from agents. Border Patrol Commissioner Kevin McAleenan says: ''This is clearly both a border security and humanitarian crisis.''

The consequences of this crisis stretch far beyond the border. Sometimes it stretches thousands of miles away. An American—1 of 192 every day—dies of a drug overdose. The poison in his veins flows across the Mexican border. A brave police officer and father, Corporal Ronil Singh, of California, was shot dead the day after Christmas after his killer snuck into the country illegally. We have failed to protect our border, as any sovereign nation must, and our people are dying because of it.

The President has declared a national emergency because of this crisis. Yet the administration's sensible, long overdue efforts to secure the border have been met only by howls of outrage from the Democratic Party and its media wing. Judging from their reaction, you would think the real emergency was not our lawless border but any genuine effort to secure it. The minority leader called the President's emergency declaration a ''lawless act'' that showed ''naked contempt for the rule of law.'' Other members of the self-styled resistance have compared the President to Hitler.

These are curious, overheated claims, I have to say. To be lawless, after all, one must act outside the law. Yet the President's critics don't even bother making that case, probably because they don't have much of one to make.

The President isn't purporting to invoke his inherent Executive powers under article II of our Constitution. He does not even claim to defend his constitutional prerogatives from legislative encroachment. On the contrary, he is only exercising the statutory authority that has been delegated to him by us, by this very body—the U.S. Congress. More than half of the $8.1 billion the President is using to build the wall and secure the border comes from nonemergency statutes that have been passed by Congress. The remainder comes from an explicit delegation of various powers to the President in the event of a national emergency, just like the one the President has declared, which we also delegated him the authority to do. I should add, the National Emergencies Act passed nearly unanimously, with only five ''no'' votes in the House.

I am sympathetic to arguments that the National Emergencies Act is too broad and gives the executive branch too much power. That is a reasonable debate to have. Believe me, Congress has ceded too much power to the Executive for more than a century and has expanded an administrative state that increasingly deprives our people of having a meaningful say in their government, so I invite my Democratic colleagues to reconsider the wisdom of this path.

Maybe we can also reform the EPA. Perhaps we can require up-or-down votes in Congress in order to approve big regulations so politicians around here can show some accountability for once. I am ready to have those debates. Believe me, I am ready. In the meantime, don't pretend we didn't delegate all of these powers or that it is lawless for the Executive to use the laws we have passed just because you deplore him.

If you want to see lawless Executive action, by the way, you can look, instead, to the last administration. President Obama purportedly gave millions of illegal aliens legal status and work permits, which was in clear violation of statutes that had been passed by this Congress. He also expressly defied our ban on bailout payments from the ObamaCare slush fund to big health insurance companies. It is strange how I don't recall the self-styled resistance manning the ramparts and rushing to the Ninth Circuit back then. In fact, I only recall a lot of congressional fanboys of the President's using the pen and phone to encroach on our constitutional prerogatives.

I have also heard from some Senators who admit the President is acting lawfully but who worry about the slippery slope of Executive power. I respect this

view. Our system of separated powers calls on each branch to jealously protect its own powers, but one can ski to the bottom of a slippery slope pretty fast. A Republican declares a national emergency today on the border. A Democrat—or who knows these days, maybe a socialist—will tomorrow declare a gun violence emergency to confiscate guns or will declare a climate change emergency to shut down coal-fired powerplants.

I acknowledge it doesn't take much to imagine such abuses by a future liberal President, especially with the gang they have running today, but that is precisely what such actions would be—abuses. What the law says matters here. We have delegated to the Executive the power to enforce the Nation's immigration laws, including by an emergency declaration. We have not delegated to the Executive the power to confiscate guns, to close powerplants or any of the other common entrants in the parade of horribles on the slippery slope. That is the difference between lawful and lawless government, and that is the case here.

Still, others claim the crisis on the border isn't bad enough to call a national emergency. Some have gone so far as to deride it as a fake emergency. If killings, caravans, and cartels at the border are fake emergencies, I would really hate to see a genuine emergency.

Let's suppose we take their claim seriously. We at least ought to compare the crisis at the border to past national emergencies to see how they all stack up. Right now, there are 32 national emergencies in effect—32 national emergencies. Among them is a national emergency related to election fraud in Belarus. Another is in response to the breakdown of the rule of law in Lebanon. A third is in response to a failed coup in Burundi.

I don't deny that those are all genuine problems or that an American response may well be warranted—far from it. Yet I doubt many Americans would put them ahead of a serial violation of our sovereign border by millions of foreigners. If the Belarusians warrant an emergency declaration, then surely Americans do, too, when we face a crisis at our southern border.

The Democrats used to take border security seriously, but in elite society these days, ''border security'' are bad words, and ''wall'' is practically a four-letter word unless they are the walls that protect the rich and the powerful and the politically connected from a dangerous world. Look in the news. The Democrats' newest Presidential aspirant, Robert Francis O'Rourke—a former Congressman and failed Senate candidate—has gone so far as to suggest the tearing down of existing barriers at the southern border, which I am sure has thrilled all of the good people in El Paso who don't live in a world of private planes and security details.

Regrettably, the Democrats' hostility to border security couldn't come at a worse time for our country because there is, indeed, a crisis at the border, and we ought to be addressing it.

We could be spending this valuable legislative time tightening up our asylum laws or cracking down on employers who exploit illegal aliens instead of hiring American workers or ramping up drug enforcement. Instead, we are debating whether a crisis at our southern border can be called an emergency. Instead of solving a problem, we are trying to spin it.

So I have a simple suggestion for my colleagues: If you are genuinely alarmed by the President's invocation of the very emergency powers we delegated to him, instead of furrowing your brows and tugging your chins and gravely citing Youngstown Sheet, let's tackle this emergency declaration by making it unnecessary. Let's get to the root of the problem and secure our border once and for all. No more border crisis, no more emergency—it is as simple as that.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, last month, I launched a new series of floor speeches to recognize what is going on with prescription drug pricing across America.

When you ask the American people about the economic things that are on their minds, it is No. 1—the cost of prescription drugs. No. 2 is, have I saved enough money for my retirement? It really gets to the heart of the concerns families have every day. Each one of us knows that the cost of prescription drugs is going up, and we also realize how vulnerable we may be as individuals if one of those drugs is a matter of life and death.

I came to the floor 2 weeks ago to talk about the cost of insulin. Seven and a half million diabetics across America have seen dramatic increases in the cost of insulin—increases that can't be justified because the same American companies selling the same drugs in Canada do it for a fraction of the cost. Americans pay outrageous prices.

Humalog, which is one of the most popular forms of insulin, costs $329 a dosage in the United States. Twenty years ago, it was about $29. It has gone up in price 35 times in that 20-year period of time. How much does the exact same drug that costs $329 in the United States cost in Canada? It is made by the same company. Thirty-eight dollars. You look at that and you think there is something wrong here. The pharmaceutical industry is not focusing on giving American consumers a break.

What I want to talk about today goes to an issue that is hard to believe but true. A few years ago, the New York Times reported that nearly $3 billion worth of drugs was wasted each year. These are not ordinary drugs; these are cancer drugs used in chemotherapy. Medicare, Medicaid, and private health insurers spend billions of dollars on medications. Many of them are literally thrown in the trash. How could that possibly be?

You see, for many of the most expensive drugs, like new cancer treatments, the pharmaceutical industry produces them in a one-size-fits-all container, a single-use vial that a physician has to draw from to give a treatment to a patient. The dosage for the patient in the cancer therapy is based on the patient's size and weight. The problem is that the pharmaceutical industry insists on selling these drugs in excessively large vials that contain dramatically more medicine than the average patient would need, so doctors administer the proper dosage and throw away the rest.

Here is a graphic to illustrate what I am talking about. Here is why we are wasting billions of dollars each year on cancer drugs. One size does not fit all.

This drug, Velcade—the vial size available is 3.5 milligrams. The patient dose is 2.2. The amount that is left over is 1.3. Oh, you are going to recycle that? You can't do it. That is the end of it, and it is thrown away. In 2016, $300 million was wasted in this way.

This vial, the first one here that is produced, is a vial that would apply to a person who is 6 feet 6 inches tall and weighs 250 pounds, which means our linebacker Khalil Mack on the Chicago Bears—God forbid he would ever need it—that would be his dosage size. Most people are not as big as Chicago linebackers.

Why is Pharma sending us one vial, take it or leave it? Because they make money. They make money when we buy it and have to throw it away.

Takeda Pharmaceutical sells this drug for those who are suffering from multiple myeloma and lymphoma. As I mentioned, it is for a person who is 6 feet 6 inches and weighs 250 pounds. Takeda made $310 million in the year 2016 off of unused Velcade that got thrown in the trash—$310 million.

What makes this even more appalling is that the pharmaceutical industry titans actually sell the same drug in smaller containers in other countries but not in the United States. Here, we are forced to buy the largest container and throw away the difference.

This chart shows that the same company—Takeda—that makes Velcade sells this drug not in 3.5-milligram vials, as in the United States, but, in Europe, in 1-milligram vials. It seems like a simple thing, doesn't it, that you would dispense this drug in a manner so that it is not wasted? Sadly, wasting and throwing away the drug is part of their marketing strategy.

Another Japanese company, Eisai, sells its chemotherapy drug Halaven only in 1-milligram vials in the United States but sells smaller vials—0.88 milligram—in Europe.

Merck's immunotherapy drug KEYTRUDA, which is truly a breakthrough, an amazing drug—research was done by taxpayers at the National Institutes of Health, which led to the development of this drug—they sell this drug, KEYTRUDA, only in 100-milligram vials in the United States but in 50-milligram vials in Europe. In 2016, Merck made $200 million on KEYTRUDA—this lifesaving drug—that was thrown away.

In 2016, I asked the inspector general of Health and Human Services about this waste of taxpayers' money. The inspector general uncovered that Medicare spent $195 million in just 1 year on 20 identified drugs for medication that was thrown away. That year, Takeda received $47 million in taxpayer funding for amounts of Velcade thrown in the trash. It wasn't alone. Genentech's Rituxan, one of the most common cancer medications, only comes in vials that are 100 milligrams or 500 milligrams. In 2013, Medicare wasted $10 million on Rituxan that was thrown away.

It is for this reason that I am presenting my second Pharma Fleece Award to Takeda, Eisai, Merck, and Genentech. Patients in America should not face higher drug costs because these Pharma fleecers choose to sell their expensive cancer drugs in excessively large drug vials that are necessarily going to be wasted.

Two weeks ago, I teamed up with Republican Senator ROB PORTMAN of Ohio to introduce the REFUND Act—a simple bill that Senator PORTMAN and I have introduced, and I hope others will join us. It says that taxpayers will only pay for the drug that is given to a patient, not for the part that is thrown away. Medicare already tracks how much of this medication is being discarded, so the REFUND Act simply requires Medicare to determine how much was wasted and to recoup the money from the drug companies. We then provide a portion of that money back to seniors for the 20-percent coinsurance they have to pay for the drugs.

An important point: When Medicare is paying for these drugs, and a lot are being thrown away, the seniors are still paying their 20 percent, even for the drug portion that is being thrown away. So ROB PORTMAN's bill—the one I have introduced with him—says that the money recouped from the drug companies will go back to the benefit of these seniors. Under our new bill, this pharma fleecing for drug vial waste will soon come to an end so that not just the patients but our government will save money.

Remember the bottom line. When you ask the major health insurers today: What is driving the cost of health insurance premiums, they say: Senator, prescription drug pricing is No. 1.

Blue Cross Blue Shield, based out of Chicago, when I sit down with them, say: We spend more money on prescription drugs than we do on inpatient hospital care.

To give you an idea, it is out of sight. You can't turn on a television set, particularly if you are over the age of 50, without being bombarded with all these drug ads, right? You have heard them over and over again.

The No. 1 drug being sold on television today is HUMIRA. What is it for? psoriatic arthritis. It is serious. If you have that arthritis, that may be a lifesaver for you, but it is now being sold for that little red patch on your elbow called psoriasis. Interesting. Do you know how much HUMIRA costs each month? Five thousand dollars.

I have legislation that would require these drug companies to advertise the cost of their drugs on television. They tell us everything else; don't they? They tell us, if you are allergic to HUMIRA, don't take HUMIRA. I have never understood that warning. They tell us everything under the Sun, but they never mention the price. So what I want to do is get the price out in front of the public, and let them know what being perfect in a swimsuit is going to cost you per month.

From my point of view, there are people who need these drugs desperately, and we ought to try to get the prices within their reach. For those who are overusing and abusing the airwaves of America to advertise drugs—to try to push doctors into writing the scripts even when it is not necessary—we have to come to grips with this. If we don't, we are not going to have a serious effort to reduce the cost of health insurance and the healthcare costs that face our Nation.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

H.J. RES. 46

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I want to congratulate the Presiding Officer on being in the Senate and presiding over the Senate.

I come to the floor to remind us how we got here. President Trump told us over and over and over again during his campaign that Mexico would pay for the wall. He said it at the beginning of the campaign. He said it in the middle of the campaign. He said it at the end of the campaign.

He made that promise over and over again. The U.S. Congress didn't make that promise. There is no way for Congress to force Mexico to pay for the wall. We cannot force Mexico to pay for the wall. It is not Congress's fault. It is the President's fault, and it is his promise he has broken.

Instead of going to Mexico to get them to pay for the wall, as he said he would do over and over again, he has now asked Congress to pay for it. He has now asked the American taxpayer to fulfill his broken promise.

By the way, that is after 2 years of having a Republican majority in the Senate and a Republican majority in the House who said: We don't want to build your wall. We are not going to help you keep your promise. In fact, you promised Mexico would pay for the wall. Go get Mexico to pay for the wall is what the Republican Senate and the Republican House said.

So he was frustrated. He said how frustrated he was. He went out to the American people during the 2018 election, and the people rewarded him by electing Democrats to be the majority in the House of Representatives.

Then, last December, those Democrats offered the President $1.3 billion for border security. It wasn't for his medieval wall. It is for what he now calls steel slats.

Instead of accepting that fact—the fact that nobody here wants to fund the wall he said Mexico would pay for—he shut down the government for 35 days. Then, after all the misery he inflicted, after the billions of dollars he cost our economy, to say nothing of what he did to the Federal workers, he basically got exactly the same deal as he got before he shut down the government, making the shutdown pointless, making the billions of dollars of lost wages and economic activity in America pointless, all a casualty of his inability to keep his promise that Mexico would pay for the wall and his inability to get Republican majorities in the House and the Senate to build his wall.

So having failed to get Mexico to pay for the wall, having failed to get a Republican Congress to pay for the wall, he now says he is going to declare a national emergency to pay for the wall.

We should ask ourselves—we must ask ourselves—whether this is an appropriate use of emergency power. By the way, if it was an appropriate use of emergency power, why didn't he just declare an emergency before he shut the government down for 35 days? Why cost the economy billions and billions of dollars if you can just do this by declaring an emergency? The easy answer for that is that it is not an emergency.

He is only doing this now because he lost the negotiation. He lost his leverage. He embarrassed himself by having the longest shutdown in American history.

This is not a national emergency. This is just plan B. The President has admitted as much as he was signing the declaration itself—the declaration of emergency. He said:

> I didn't need to do this, but I'd rather do it much faster. . . . I just want to get it done faster, that's all.

It is not an emergency. He just wants to get it done faster, which is astonishing coming from a guy who has not spent the money that Congress has already appropriated for the wall. He

hasn't even spent that money, and now he is saying he wants to go faster, and he has to declare a national emergency to do it.

By the way, America, you may have noticed that the President is also now saying that ''much of the wall has already been fully renovated or built.'' ''Much of the wall has already been fully renovated or built.'' That is what your President is saying to you at the exact same time he is saying that he needs a national emergency to build the wall. It is preposterous. It is a joke.

On top of everything else, he is not telling the truth about that. He has not built a mile of this wall since he has been President of the United States, even though Congress has appropriated more than $1 billion—I think about $1.7 billion—to do it.

When he signed the emergency declaration, he said that national emergencies have ''been signed many times before. It's been signed by other presidents from 1977 or so; it gave the presidents the power.''

''There's rarely been a problem'' the President said. ''They sign it. Nobody cares.'' That is what he said.

Nobody cared because those were real emergencies, not fake emergencies. They weren't emergencies being declared by Presidents who had promised that Mexico would do something, and then it didn't happen, and now they had to declare an emergency. They certainly were not cases where the President came to the Congress, including a Congress of their own party, and said, I want to do something, and they said no. Then, they said: Well, we are going to declare an emergency.

That has never happened before in American history.

By the way, if we go down this road, this will not be the last time this happens. This will happen time and again, which is why every Member of the Senate should vote for this measure of disapproval.

Since 1976, when Congress passed the National Emergencies Act, Presidents have declared national emergencies 58 times. Fifty-three of those times have been to do things like block the sale of weapons to foreign countries or to sanction governments, like Iran and North Korea. The four remaining cases were after two U.S. planes were shot down by Cuba, after we invaded Iraq and desperately needed to protect critical infrastructure, after the outbreak of swine flu, and after 9/11.

Failing to fulfill his promise that Mexico would pay for the wall is not a national emergency, and if he thinks it is, he should sanction himself for failing to keep his promise.

As I said earlier—and this should bother everybody who believes in our system of checks and balances and who believes in the Constitution—never has a President sought to enact a national emergency like this after Congress has said no. In our Constitution, Congress has the power of the purse. Every single Senator should be voting to protect that.

Over the months and now stretching into years, I have been shocked at how the people around here who declare that they are constitutional conservatives have put up with a President who obviously doesn't care about the rule of law, doesn't care about the separation of powers—as you see here—isn't concerned about having an independent judiciary, and wants to threaten the leading journalists of this country, calling them fake news.

I would think this step would be one step too far, even for anybody in this Chamber who supported this craziness up until this point.

Let's add it all up. What has it gotten us? The President couldn't get Mexico to pay for the wall. He couldn't get a Republican House and a Republican Senate to pay for the wall. So now he is violating the Constitution to steal money that has been appropriated by this branch—by Congress. He is stealing that money from the Department of Defense, from our warfighters, and from the U.S. military to expropriate private land held by American farmers and ranchers—many of whom I assume are Republicans—through eminent domain.

As I have said on this floor before, if any President tried to do that in Colorado, there is not a person in our delegation who would support that—stealing our farms and ranches.

It must be said that, for a politician, he has a very unusual view about eminent domain. Here are some quotes of his: ''I think eminent domain is wonderful.''

For those of you who don't know what eminent domain is, it is when a government decides it wants a project, and your house is in the middle of where that project is going to go. Then, the government can use this thing called eminent domain to take your house and pay you for it. That is what it is. It is rarely used because most people don't want the government deciding whether they can live in their house or on their farm or on their ranch, which—in the case of people on the border of the United States—has been in their family for generations. That is why the local Congressman down there doesn't want this wall built. I think he is a Republican.

But the President said: ''I think eminent domain is wonderful''—not sometimes essential, not a tool that is useful from time to time. He said it is ''wonderful.''

He said: ''Eminent domain is something that has to be used, usually you would say for anything that's long, like a road, like a pipeline, or like a wall, or a fence.''

He didn't say steel slats, but I am sure the same thing applies.

Here is another quote. This is fascinating. I have not met a single person in Colorado who would agree with this—not one—and I bet you there is not a person in Mississippi or Texas or Alabama who would agree with this sentiment either. This is what the President of the United States said:

> Most of the time, they just want money. It's very rarely they say, ''I love my house, I love my house, it's the greatest thing ever.''

Here is another quote—and just for everybody who is watching this because people are going to come out on this floor and say: Oh, no, the money will not be used for it in this case—not for a wall, not for eminent domain.

Donald Trump says:

> We are going to need a little eminent domain to get that wall built, just so you understand. . . . You need eminent domain, you have to take certain areas, okay?

That is the kind of language you would expect out of some autocrat someplace, not in a democracy.

I say to my Republican friends here who are going to vote with the President on this bill, that is what you are supporting when you are voting with him on this bill.

I don't know how anybody goes home and defends that. For anyone who wants to go home and defend misappropriating money that has been dedicated to the Department of Defense and to our military and to take that money extra-constitutionally and use it to take the property of law-abiding citizens, I don't understand how you defend it.

I am not making any of this up. These are his words. By the way, it is no wonder he can't get it through the people's Representatives in Congress because there is not a single person here who would ever admit to doing what he is about to do and what he says he wants to do. What a betrayal of conservative principles this is.

As I said, this whole exercise itself is an admission that he has broken his promise to the American people.

We didn't break it, Republicans in the Senate. We didn't break it, and we should not help him keep it if it is going to break the Constitution. In fact, we can't help him keep it unless somebody around here has a way of persuading Mexico to build the wall or pay for the wall, which I don't think there is a single person here who has that kind of influence, as influential as all of us think we are.

I don't understand it, but it is amazing to me why people would cash in their conservative principles so cheaply—$3.6 billion.

The idea that you would be willing to give up your principles in such a tawdry exchange should be infuriating to the real conservatives who I know are in this country. Many of them live in my State of Colorado, which is a third Republican, a third Independent, and a third Democratic. Don't come to our State and tell us you are taking away our houses because we don't care about them—that we will just take the money instead for a broken promise that you didn't keep. That would not sell in Colorado. I don't know why it sells in Texas. I can't imagine that it does. I don't know how anybody could support that.

By the way, that is not even the most important point. The most important

point is that we have ground ourselves up for a 35-day government shutdown, for 3 months of media cycles on this fight by the President on a wall that he now says is almost fully built, while he is declaring an emergency to build a wall that hasn't been built.

While we are screwing around here to keep a broken promise that Mexico is going to pay for the wall, this is what was going on in China. By the way, I know somebody is going to say: Hey, they have a wall. They do have a wall. They built it 500 years ago. That is not what they are working on today. They took care of that medieval wall 500 years ago.

Today, what they are doing is they are spending $125 billion on high-speed rail this year alone. That is $125 billion on high-speed rail. You get on one of those trains and you could hear a pin drop. If you go on Amtrak, which I take all the time—I feel grateful that we have it—it is less than half the speed, and you can't put your Coca-Cola on the table in front of you without it falling over or falling on your neighbor.

China has spent $300 billion on new roads, bridges, and ports across the globe through their Belt and Road Initiative. They have bought stakes in 16 different ports across Europe and the Mediterranean, some of which have fallen into their hands because—and this is part of the plan—the debt that the countries have put on to build the ports is so onerous that China gets to own the ports. They have built the longest sea bridge in the world. They have laid over 3,700 miles of fiber optic cable to connect Africa to Latin America and, ultimately, to China. On that Belt and Road Initiative, they have laid their technology over that with fiber optic cables so they could extend the surveillance society that they are building inside of China right now, while we screw around with this wall.

By the way, on the $3.6 billion for the wall, here is an interesting chart. Here is how much cement China used over a 3-year period, from 2011 to 2013. This is what they used in 3 years, 2011 to 2013. I was in the Congress then. We were in the depths of the great recession during that period of time. It was 6.6 gigatons of concrete. Here is how much we have built in concrete in 100 years: 4.5 gigatons.

They used 4.5 gigatons in 3 years. They have used dramatically more than we have used in 100 years, and we can't even get an infrastructure bill off this floor. The White House can't even write an infrastructure bill.

All night, every night, on the cable, all we hear is $3.6 billion for the wall, the wall, the wall—the wall that the President says has already been mostly built, that he is now declaring a national emergency to build.

The world is racing ahead of us, as I have said on this floor over and over again, while we are getting run around by one inane distraction after another. It has been said that the President is somebody who is mostly concerned with winning the politics of any given day. That is what he tries to do, and he is often very effective at it. We spend a lot of time talking about him and his priorities, unlike figuring out a plan to counteract what China is doing or others are doing.

I bet they have a great strategy in China and Iran. Russia is not so obviously good at that strategy. Actually, come to think of it, they are pretty good, too. If you can stay off FOX News, the President will not pay any attention to what you are doing, so go do whatever it is you want to do while we fritter away one day after another of the American people's time over a broken promise that he never could keep.

Unless we are prepared to be the first generation of Americans to leave less opportunity, not more, to the people coming after us, we need to do a lot better than what we are doing, and part of that is to ensure that we preserve the institutions that built this country, like the one we are standing in right now.

I know that among some people there is an effort to divide the government from the American people and that there are people here who think they have been sent here for one purpose, which is to discredit the Federal Government.

I have a lot of problems with the Federal Government—lots of them. I was a school superintendent before I came here. I have a lot of problems with what is happening to poor children who are going to schools in our public system of education across the country, so I am not here to defend government or the way it works right now. In fact, I don't think Democrats should be the party defending bad government. We should fix it where it needs to be fixed.

We are talking here about our institutions. We are talking here about the rule of law. We are talking here about the Constitution that generation after generation after generation of Americans has preserved—not always perfectly, often very imperfectly.

Every generation of Americans has seen it as their obligation, their responsibility, to at least try to live up to the pages in our founding documents, and where we failed, we got up and we tried again. This whole country is founded on the idea that we will have disagreements because we live in a Republic, and in a Republic, you have disagreements. There is no King or tyrant to tell you what to think. That is the reason we live in a democratic Republic.

This place here and the Chamber down the hall are part of the mechanisms that were drafted into our founding documents for us to resolve our disagreements. The Founders believed something. They had no good example in the past, but here is what they believed. They believed that out of that vigorous disagreement, we would create more imaginative and durable solutions than any tyrant could ever come up with on their own. That is why they designed the institutions the way they did, and that is why they created the checks and balances that they did. There is a reason no President has ever done what this President is trying to do.

They exercise self-restraint because of what is in the Constitution and because nobody on this floor would have supported him. There are many ways this generation of politicians—and I accept my share of the blame. There are many ways in which we have degraded these institutions in our time. We have destroyed the Senate's responsibility to advise and consent on judicial nominations and Supreme Court nominations. That has been turned into a purely partisan exercise by this generation of American politicians. I am ashamed of that. I am ashamed to have been here when we did that, and I take my share of the responsibility.

What I say to my colleagues is that we cannot continue to degrade these institutions and expect that the next generation of Americans is going to look back on us with anything except contempt. Generation after generation after generation of Americans has preserved these institutions so the next generation could have the opportunity to resolve their disagreements in these Chambers. We will regret it. We will regret it if we go down this road.

As the majority leader said in another time: Things have a way of changing around here sooner than you think, and someday the shoe will be on the other foot. If this Republican sets this precedent and some Democratic President follows it, that is one more step away from living in the Republic that we all claim we cherish, from the democracy we all claim we cherish, to put power in the hands of a tyrant who may or may not represent the will of the American people.

We may never get another vote like this around here. This is going to be the time that each of us is going to decide whether we are going to act to preserve these institutions for the next generation or whether we are going to continue to degrade them in our mindless partisanship and, in this case, to somehow fulfill a promise the President never could keep. That would be a shameful day in the U.S. Senate.

I yield the floor.

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

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, when President Trump declared a national emergency over the crisis along our southern border, it was immediately met with expressions of concern—some, in my view, illegitimate; others, quite legitimate.

As I have said in the past, I will repeat again that this—what we are doing here today—is no one's first choice, but it is useful to recall how we find ourselves at this point today.

Of course, when it comes to funding, when it comes to appropriations, Congress holds the purse. That is why,

each year, the Congress receives the President's budget request for the upcoming fiscal year, just as we did earlier this week.

Even though, in the President's budget, he outlines his priorities, my experience in the Senate is that most Presidential budgets, while they are an expression of the President's priorities, are dead on arrival. It then falls to us, in the Senate and the House, to look at his request and to work on a compromise budget and appropriations process and fund the operations of the Federal Government.

This process is arduous, it is time-consuming, and it is often frustrating, but it is the way the system is supposed to work. As all Americans can attest, what we have seen over the last few months looks like something very different. The refusal of Democrats in the House and the Senate to engage in negotiations on border security funding led us to a 35-day government shutdown.

Despite the clear message from border security experts, despite seeing the humanitarian crisis at the border, described by President Obama in 2014, get many times worse, our Democratic colleagues decided to play politics instead of dealing with the problem.

We heard the Speaker of the House call border barriers immoral. The minority leader here in the Senate said that there would be no additional money for physical barriers along the border. They know, just as I know, that back in 2006 and 2008, the Secure Fence Act was passed with broad bipartisan support, including support from then-Senator Barack Obama, then-Senator Hillary Clinton, and Senator CHUCK SCHUMER, currently the Democratic leader in the Senate, who now feels that this President should not get any additional money to fund border security measures that the President believes are an important response to the crisis we see at the border.

My preference would be for the normal appropriations process to be used, but when your negotiating partners refuse to take a seat at the table, normal goes out the window. Our colleagues across the aisle left the President with few options to fund what he believed was so important for the Nation's security, and that is what led us to this situation.

Enter the 1976 legislation, the National Emergencies Act. What the President did is ask his lawyers to look at what other authority, under congressionally passed laws signed by previous Presidents, might he have to access additional funds, and his lawyers pointed to the 1976 National Emergencies Act, which has granted Presidents, since that time, broad powers to reprogram funding previously appropriated by Congress.

This idea that somehow this is an unconstitutional act by this President is simply wrong. Congress has given the President this authority. They may regret it today or they may disagree that this is an emergency or they may disagree with the way the President wants to spend the money to secure the border, but, clearly, the President is using authorities the Congress has previously granted, not just to him but to all Presidents since 1976.

My father liked to remind me growing up—one of the things he always told me is that hindsight is always 20–20. Our predecessors did not anticipate the fights we would be having today, which are largely contrived and unnecessary. We should be working together to solve these problems, not engaged in a zero-sum game of political brinkmanship. That is what brought us to where we are today.

I think it is appropriate to look at what Congress did in 1976, and in a prospective sort of way, ask ourselves: Have we delegated too much authority to Presidents since that time? There are literally 123 statutory authorizations that could be invoked under the National Emergencies Act—123 times that Congress has said a President, upon the declaration of a national emergency, can reprogram money that Congress has appropriated—123 times. That was a shock not only to me but, I dare say, to virtually all of our colleagues here in the Senate.

Many of these statutory grants of authority are exceedingly broad. They cover everything from the military to public health to Federal pay schedules. With these broad authorities already part of the law, the emergency powers provision could be viewed as a fail-safe for an agenda that the administration—an administration alone—is pushing. Let's say, hypothetically, that a future President decides there is a need to declare a national emergency over climate change. Maybe they decide this is a way to enact the Green New Deal being pushed by some of our colleagues across the aisle.

Considering the potential scope and scale in which these powers could be abused in the future and this overdelegation of authority that Congress has done 123 times, I believe we should take a look at the National Emergencies Act, once we vote today, and have a fulsome debate and discussion about whether this is really the sort of delegation of powers that the Founding Fathers intended when they said that distinct separated power should be given to each branch of the government: the legislative, the judicial, and the executive branch.

It is clear that the President is operating within the authority Congress has given to him. You don't have to like it. You don't have to agree with it, but it is clear the President is operating within the authority Congress delegated to him. Rather than talking in circles and debating that fact, I think our discussion should focus on the structure of emergency powers moving forward.

I believe there is a need to rein back in some of the authority that Congress has delegated to presidents just as a constitutional concern, as a constitutional matter, which is why I am cosponsoring a bill which has been introduced by our colleague Senator LEE which gives Congress a stronger voice in processes under the National Emergencies Act.

That bill will now be referred to the Homeland Security Committee. Chairman JOHNSON has said he will give that bill a hearing and then a markup. Then I would expect, at some point, that legislation will make its way to the Senate floor where we will have a debate and a vote.

The proposal would allow the President to maintain his statutory powers to declare an emergency, but that declaration would end after 30 days unless Congress affirmatively votes to extend it. This would maintain a President's ability to provide funding during national emergencies while restoring Congress's proper authority under article I of the Constitution. I think this is an honest and important effort to hopefully prevent us from ending up in this predicament in the future.

The real cause of where we are today is just politics—Ms. PELOSI's deciding that building any border barrier was immoral, after Democrats and Republicans had not made that a particularly political decision in the past. In fact, it had been bipartisan that we did support it as one tool in the toolbox for Border Patrol, in addition to technology and personnel, some physical barriers.

Rather than scolding the President of the United States for exercising statutory authority that Congress has already given, we should try to work together to solve these problems rather than engaging in the kind of political brinksmanship that brings us here today. We should fix—should it be the will of Congress—this massive delegation of authority not just to this President but to any President since 1976.

I have to disagree with our colleague from Colorado and others who suggest that what is happening at the border is not serious. By the way, I haven't heard any of them suggest any alternative solutions. Perhaps instead of Border Patrol securing the border we ought to have police officers at the border directing traffic, waving people through to their chosen destination. I think that would be a terrible mistake, but that seems to be the only alternative our friends across the aisle are offering to this humanitarian crisis and emergency at the border.

Last month, 76,000 people illegally crossed the border and were apprehended by U.S. Customs and Border Protection, making this an 11-year high. So rather than 76,000 people in 1 month, which our Democratic colleagues don't seem to think is a problem, let's say next month it is 150,000 or 300,000 or 600,000. As long as we have this attraction for people from other countries to come to the United States, and if they pay the fee to the criminal organizations that transport them

here, they will successfully make their way into the United States. They are going to keep coming.

It is clear this problem isn't going away, and it is overwhelming the communities along the border as well as the Federal Government's ability to deal with it.

I remember what the Director of Customs and Border Protection said. He said: When the Border Patrol is handing out diapers and juice boxes to children coming across the border, the drug cartels will exploit that and move their poison into the United States. I will just remind my colleagues that more than 70,000 Americans died of drug overdoses last year alone. A substantial amount of it was synthetic opioids in the form of fentanyl, but a lot of it had to do with heroin that had made its way from Mexico into the United States because 90 percent of the heroin that comes into the United States comes from Mexico. So while the Border Patrol is handing out diapers and juice boxes, the drug cartels are moving in heroin, fentanyl, and methamphetamine across the border into our Nation and getting rich in the process.

We know border security is complicated, and that it is not just about security, it is about facilitating legitimate trade, travel, and commerce. Last year alone, there was $300 billion worth of commerce that took place just at Texas ports of entry with Mexico—$300 billion. That supports an awful lot of American jobs.

The terrain in the 1,200-mile border between Texas and Mexico varies significantly. What works well in one sector does not work well in another. What I continue to hear from my constituents, including elected officials at the border, is that if this is the Border Patrol telling us what they need in order to succeed to do the job we have asked them to do, we are all in, but if this is just politics and elected officials in Washington trying to micromanage the solution along the border, we are skeptical. This is what they tell me, and I don't blame them.

I think we need to take action to adequately fund our border security missions, and I hope our discussions in the coming months will be more productive than they will be this year.

I will vote against the resolution of disapproval today and encourage my colleagues to instead ask my colleagues to focus their energy on reforming the legislation that got us into this situation to begin with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I am here this afternoon to support the resolution that would terminate the President's unconstitutional emergency declaration. It is a declaration that would take money away from critical military construction projects to fund a costly and ineffective border wall.

Congress did not provide these funds for a border wall that President Trump promised Mexico would pay for; rather, we specifically allocated these resources that are being talked about to be used by the President for the wall to ensure that our military is ready and capable and that our servicemembers receive the support they deserve.

The President's attempt to circumvent Congress by making the military pay for his border wall jeopardizes our national security and does a disservice to our men and women in uniform. That is why the House passed the legislation on the Senate floor today and why I introduced legislation with my colleagues in the Senate to terminate the emergency declaration.

The resources Congress has provided support military construction projects in New Hampshire and across the country. Those projects often provide necessary infrastructure improvements that enable our servicemembers to accomplish their mission.

Several of those projects that, I think, are potentially being reviewed for being added to the list of projects to have money taken from are at the Portsmouth Naval shipyard. It is one of the many installations that faces potential cuts in funding if this emergency declaration is executed. Congress has already approved funding for several projects at the shipyard and at our public shipyards around the country that support critical submarine maintenance, and any disruption to funding of those projects could lead to costly delays and to a reduction in military readiness because they would derail carefully laid plans to upgrade aging infrastructure. Delays in projects that support the shipyard's mission threaten to exacerbate the Navy's already high demand for submarine maintenance and the projected submarine shortfall in the coming years.

I recently sent a letter to President Trump and spoke with the leaders at DOD urging them to protect these important projects at the shipyard, but the only way to ensure that these projects move forward is to terminate the emergency declaration.

In addition to projects at the shipyard, the emergency declaration could also impact New Hampshire's National Guard readiness centers, which are in desperate need of modernization. A 2014 report from the Army National Guard ranked the condition of New Hampshire's National Guard facilities 51 out of 54 States and territories.

Our National Guard has been forced to shoulder an enormous burden since the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Servicemembers have often faced multiple deployments, and they still had to respond to national disasters at home and to other personal crises. The New Hampshire National Guard can't afford further delays to the readiness center improvements because of President Trump's emergency declaration.

These military construction projects in New Hampshire are at risk because President Trump wants to score political points by building a wall rather than focusing on the border security proposals that actually work. I was disappointed to hear my colleague from Texas accusing Democrats of not supporting border security because, in fact, virtually everyone here has supported significant border security proposals in the past, including targeted fencing in vulnerable areas where we know fencing or barriers can make a difference. We have supported more Border Patrol agents, better surveillance and screening technologies, and increased security at the ports of entry.

Coming from a State where we have a huge challenge with the opioid epidemic, where we understand the impact of having cocaine and fentanyl and other drugs come across our border, I also know the best way to interdict those drugs is through the ports of entry. That is where most of them are coming from.

In a recent bipartisan budget agreement Congress provided, I supported, along with the majority of this Senate, nearly $15 billion for Customs and Border Protection, including $1.3 billion for physical infrastructure in vulnerable areas along the southern border. The reality at our borders is, the vast majority of drugs and contraband come through the ports of entry. They don't come through the areas between the ports of entry.

In the past 2 months alone, law enforcement officials have made the largest cocaine seizure in the past 25 years at Newark, NJ, and the largest fentanyl seizure ever at any port of entry in the U.S. in Arizona. Despite this reality, President Trump insists on having our military bear the burden to fulfill his campaign promise.

His insistence that the situation at the border requires the military to pay for his wall runs counter to what I have heard in the Senate Armed Services Committee from our military leaders. In a recent Senate Armed Services Committee hearing, General O'Shaughnessy, Commander of U.S. Northern Command, testified that the threats to our Nation on our southern border are not military in nature, and he has never advised the President that a border wall is necessary to support his mission. Just this morning, we heard testimony at our SASC hearing with Secretary Shanahan and Joint Chiefs Chairman Dunford that we have more troops on our southern border with Mexico than we have in all of Europe, on Europe's eastern border with Russia, and we have almost as many on our southern border, and one-quarter as many as we have on the DMZ on the border with North Korea. By any measure, North Korea and Russia pose a greater threat to our national security than Mexico. It is a policy that does not make sense. Yet we have more troops on the southern border now than we do in Eastern Europe and in Syria.

The fact is, the men and women at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard and at the New Hampshire National Guard

and men and women serving in our military across this country should not be forced to sacrifice readiness for an unnecessary border wall that takes funding away from projects that this Congress has already approved that are going forward.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to protect Congress's constitutional authority and defend our national security by supporting the resolution to terminate President Trump's emergency declaration.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there be 90 minutes of debate, equally divided, remaining on the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

LIBERIAN-AMERICANS

Mr. REED. Madam President, I come to the floor today to plead on behalf of Liberians who face the immediate threat of deportation from the only home many of them have known.

I have come to the floor many times over the last two decades to highlight the plight of Liberians, who, after fleeing civil wars, political turmoil, economic instability, and deadly disease, were given the ability to stay in the United States and work, pay taxes, and contribute to our country and local communities by successive Republican and Democratic administrations—that is, until last year, when this President terminated deferred enforced departures, DED, the most recent status offered to Liberians. I urge the President to reconsider his decision and reinstate DED by March 31 to save Liberians from being forced to leave their jobs, their families, and their homes.

Moreover, the Liberian community deserves a long-term solution. That is why I also urge my colleagues to take up S. 456, the Liberian Refugee Immigration Fairness Act, to end the perpetual limbo for Liberians here in the United States and ensure our national security interest in fostering Liberia's recovery. This bill provides legal status and a pathway to citizenship for qualifying Liberians. I have introduced similar legislation continuously since coming to the Senate and have worked to include its key objectives in comprehensive immigration reform bills that passed the Senate in years gone by, only to die in the House of Representatives.

I have been joined in this mission by countless advocates and many colleagues, including my Rhode Island colleague, Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, as well as Senators KLOBUCHAR, SMITH, DURBIN, CARDIN, VAN HOLLEN, and others. I thank them for their support and urge the rest of our colleagues to join us in supporting the Liberians who are hard at work enriching our communities.

Today, I met with several Liberians from Rhode Island. I hope my colleagues similarly meet with Liberians from their States so they can hear firsthand about what would be lost if these members of our communities are deported.

Beginning with its founding in the early 19th century by freed American slaves, our country has had deep ties with Liberia. It goes without saying that when Liberians faced tragedy, with their country engulfed by a civil war that would last from 1989 to 1997, claiming the lives of thousands, displacing more than half the country's population, halting food production, collapsing the economy, and destroying its infrastructure, that our country would open its arms.

By 1991, an estimated 14,000 Liberians had fled to the United States. In March of that year, the Attorney General under President Bush granted them the opportunity to register for temporary protected status, TPS.

Before the prospects for a safe return could be realized, Liberia plunged into a second civil war from 1999 to 2003. This horrific conflict ended with the departure from power of former President Charles Taylor, who is currently serving a 50-year prison sentence by the Special Court for Sierra Leone for war crimes.

In 2014, still poverty-stricken and struggling to recover, Liberia found itself plunged into an extensive outbreak of the Ebola virus. Ebola killed an estimated nearly 5,000 of the over 10,000 persons in Liberia who contracted the disease. The outbreak overwhelmed the country's already fragile healthcare system, infrastructure, and economy while exacerbating social tensions.

Throughout these tragic conflicts and challenges, Liberians who fled to the United States have been granted the ability to stay here either under TPS or DED while conditions remain unstable in Liberia. In order to participate, these Liberians had to submit to vigorous vetting, pay hefty fees, and stay out of trouble with the law.

While unable to access earned benefits available to American citizens, these statuses at least allowed Liberians to apply for work authorizations so they could join the workforce or start their own businesses, pay taxes, and raise families. Once again, they work, but they do not earn any of the benefits other Americans earn.

They have found themselves and their communities have found them to be some of the most responsible, hardworking, and decent people we see throughout our communities. Many of these individuals have American citizen children who attend American schools and serve in our military. These children have known no home other than America. They are Americans, and it would be a tragedy if their parents and grandparents were suddenly taken away, physically taken away and sent back to Liberia, because for all of them, since the early 1990s, America has been their home.

In the years since 1989, Liberians have become our neighbors and friends, pastors, soldiers, police officers, health workers, and many more professions. They are an important community that contributes a great deal of diversity and prosperity in States like Rhode Island, Minnesota, Idaho, and other places around the country. It would do our country no good and would be simply cruel to uproot these Liberians from their families, employers, and communities.

Moreover, deporting these Liberians would be contrary to the national interest of the United States and destabilizing to the already fragile West African region. We must pursue all possible efforts to ensure regional stability by fostering Liberia's continuous post-war and post-Ebola crisis recovery. We must also continue to build on our country's substantial foreign policy investments over the past years, including U.S. bilateral assistance and peacekeeping investments in the region.

Given Liberia's precarious condition and lack of resources, the sudden deportation of as many as 4,500 affected people to Liberia would overburden the country's limited infrastructure and ability to maintain peace and deliver essential services, all the while sabotaging the hopes for progress following the country's first democratic transition of power in years that occurred last year. Deporting this population would also cause Liberia economic harm by curtailing crucial private sector investment and socioeconomic assistance that Liberians in America have long provided in the form of remittances to their relatives in Liberia.

I again plead with the Trump administration to reinstate DED. Please don't separate and uproot hundreds of Liberian-American families from their jobs and homes and force them to return to a country that is unrecognizable for many of them. These Liberians are Americans in every sense of the word except for a piece of paper.

While discussions continue about the best path forward for Dreamers and TPS, Liberians cannot wait another month or another year. They have just over 2 weeks before their time may be up.

In my view, with each year that has passed since the first of these Liberians arrived, the case has grown stronger that they should have the option to adjust their status and remain in the communities where they have made their homes and raised their families.

We have long since reached the point where simple justice requires that Congress extend this option to these Liberians. So in addition to urging President Trump to reinstate DED, I also urge my colleagues to take up and pass the Liberian Refugee Immigration

Fairness Act and put an end to uncertainty for this population after decades of displacement.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

H.J. RES. 46

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I rise, as colleagues of mine have earlier today, to talk about the President's emergency declaration. Before I do, I will just say that this declaration deals with budgetary matters at the end of the day, whether the President should be able to take $6.1 billion this year and possibly more in future years from the Pentagon's budget to deal with a nonbudgetary emergency.

I want to acknowledge that today is the last day of my budget staffer, my right hand on all Federal budget matters for the last 6½ years, Ron Storhaug. I am going to miss him. I will start there. I will miss Ron. He has done such a good job. My only good feeling is that he is staying right here in the Senate and moving to work with the senior Senator from Maryland.

I want to talk about the declaration and urge my colleagues to vote to reject what I believe is the President's unwise use of his power to raid the Pentagon's budget.

Is there an emergency at the border? There is a serious issue at the border—a whole series of serious issues, negative but also positive. Trade happens across all the borders of the country. But all the testimony before the Armed Services Committee, where I sit, says there is no military emergency at the border. We heard testimony from General O'Shaughnessy, who is the commander of what we call NORTHCOM—everything in the Americas north of Mexico's southern border. General O'Shaughnessy said there is no military emergency at the border between the United States and Mexico. We heard the same testimony this morning from Defense Secretary Shanahan and the head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Dunford. So there is no military emergency at the border.

Compared to other significant challenges we deal with—70,000 drug overdose deaths a year, climate change, 40,000 deaths a year from gun violence, including both homicides and suicides, homelessness, lack of medical care, military housing—it is hard to see why the border issue would be an emergency that would rise to the top of any list. I can certainly assert this: There are much higher priorities for Virginians.

While we could argue about whether it is an emergency, one thing I think is pretty clear—it is inarguably a Presidential power grab. The President is unhappy with congressional appropriations for the border, so he is declaring an emergency to take $6.1 billion this year and possibly more in future years from the Pentagon's budget. This will establish a very dangerous precedent.

First, let's focus on the President's being unhappy. For all of this President's tenure up until January 3, he had two Republican Houses. There were two Republican Houses and a Republican President. Why should he be unhappy with the budget? He would have had the ability to convince Republican majorities to do what he wanted, but he could not. So he is unhappy with what Congress, the appropriating branch, has put on the table. We put billions of dollars on the table for the border, but he is unhappy with it, and so now he is going to declare an emergency.

It raises two important questions. Can a President just declare an emergency every time he is unhappy that Congress doesn't accept his budgetary proposals? Second, can the President use the declaration of a nonmilitary emergency to just tap a spigot into the Pentagon's budget? That is exactly what President Trump is trying to do in this case.

The President has declared an emergency that all agree is a nonmilitary emergency. The President said: I want to take $6.1 billion from the Pentagon's budget to deal with this emergency.

He wants to take $3.6 billion from military construction. Military construction are the funds we use to build facilities on our military bases across the United States and across the world or to rebuild facilities, like the airbase at Tyndall or the big sections of Camp Lejeune that were hit in hurricanes last year. That is what the MILCON budget is supposed to do.

This morning, I toured Fort Belvoir to visit with Army families living at Fort Belvoir in Fairfax County, VA. They shared with me atrocious stories about the condition of the housing they are living in. These are atrocious stories of rodent infestation, black mold, lead, and asbestos. I drove by one military house at Fort Belvoir that had a big warning sign on the door: ''Poison.'' You could not enter it because of efforts at asbestos and lead remediation.

The families told me about the poor physical conditions of their properties. They told me about the fact that they couldn't get a response when they were trying to get help. Then they told me, tragically, about the illnesses of their children, hospitalizations, and having to move out of their homes and apartments. One mother of a 10-year-old talked about the fact that her 10-year-old daughter, because of mold in her military housing unit, missed 45 days of school in the last school year. Her daughter had to be absent for a quarter of the school year because of the poor physical conditions of military housing.

The MILCON budget is there to deal with issues like these. Yet the President wants to take $3.6 billion out of the MILCON budget. The President wants to take $2.5 billion out of the drug-interdiction budget within the Department of Defense. Press reports suggest that account only has about $85 million available, so what they would need to do is cannibalize other accounts to fill up that account to $2.5 billion to then take out. Those are the important funds—military construction and drug interdiction—the President is proposing to raid.

I think it is important to notice this: The President's emergency declaration is not just about tapping the budget this year for $6.1 billion. Earlier today, in an Armed Services hearing, I asked Secretary Shanahan: Doesn't this emergency declaration last until the President declares it is over? If we don't rebut the emergency, it will not just be fiscal year 2019; it will be fiscal year 2020 or 2021 and beyond. It will enable the President to tap a spigot into the MILCON budget and draw out moneys this year, next year, and in future years. So it is $6.1 billion that he is asking for this year, but unless Congress asserts its article I power to say, no, we are the appropriators, we will basically be allowing the President to tap into this fund in perpetuity, thereby affecting important military construction priorities that would be good for the military families and our Nation's defense.

Which military construction projects might be compromised by the President's use of this $6.1 billion?

When the President declared the emergency, I wrote a letter to Secretary Shanahan on February 15 and asked: Can you give us a list of the projects that will be compromised by this $6.1 billion raid on the Pentagon's budget? I have not received a response. That was 27 days ago.

This morning, before the committee, Secretary Shanahan was asked: Why haven't we received a list? If the President wants to take $6.1 billion out of the Pentagon's budget, give us a list of the potential projects that could be affected.

I wrote a letter on the 15th, and staffers have been reaching out to the Pentagon. If you do not know precisely the projects, give us the universe—all unobligated MILCON projects on your priority list that could possibly be affected. Today, after not responding to the requests, Secretary Shanahan said that he will send us a list at the end of the day: I will send you a list, basically, after you vote this afternoon.

The vote that we will be casting this afternoon is about whether the President should be able to raid the Pentagon's budget for $6.1 billion. For a month, we have been asking what projects might be affected, and they are now proposing to give us an answer to the question after the vote. They have had the list since the very day we asked them. They keep a list every day about unobligated MILCON projects, but the service secretaries are not allowed to share those lists with Congress until the Secretary of Defense allows them to, and he is going to allow us to see it today.

Everybody is voting to cannibalize the Pentagon's budget to the tune of $6.1 billion. All of the Senators should

be interested in what projects might be affected in their own States that are necessary to the Nation's defense before they vote to give the President this power.

In conclusion, I hope, today, we will stand up against the President's power grab. We shouldn't let the President tap a spigot into the Pentagon's budget to deal with an emergency that all have agreed is a nonmilitary emergency. We shouldn't let him tap a spigot that is not just for this budgetary year but for future fiscal years, as well, which is the effect of the vote today.

We are the article I branch, and under that section of the Constitution, we set the spending priorities. Because he is unhappy with our work product, the President should not be able to overturn the spending priorities that we have established in our appropriations bills and raid the Pentagon's budget without telling us where the moneys will come from.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I rise to talk a little bit about the emergency declaration by the President. It is a bad idea. I think everybody in this body knows it is a bad idea, and we will see how many people will vote to override that bad idea. It is a bad idea for a number of reasons.

The President says it is for this country's safety, but he is robbing from our military to build a wall on the southern border. Yet, I might add, most of the money that we allocated in the last fiscal year is still there—$1.3 billion—plus the $1.375 billion that was authorized by the conference committee, made up of a group of Democrats and Republicans from the House and the Senate, which means it was passed by both bodies. It was money that he received but to which he said ''I don't like it'' and declared an emergency declaration.

Look, Montana is no stranger to military service. We are home to the second-most veterans per capita of any State in the country. Every time our Nation is in need, Montanans step up to the plate and answer the call to serve. That is why, today, I rise to fight back against the President's declaration, for it will be shortchanging our troops in favor of a campaign promise to build a wall that he said Mexico would pay for.

The President's plan to raid our military resources would directly hurt Montana's military community and its men and women in uniform. The heart of the Air Force's Global Strike Command is located in Great Falls, MT, at Malmstrom Air Force Base. The 341st Missile Wing at Malmstrom is a critical component of our Nation's nuclear triad. It is our great deterrent against adversaries who would do us harm. As President Kennedy said, it is our ace in the hole.

Over the past few years, I have been fighting to secure the military construction dollars on the Appropriations Committee to meet the needs of the Malmstrom Air Force Base. I led a bipartisan effort to deliver more than $19 million to construct a new Tactical Response Force Alert Facility. That facility was a top priority for Malmstrom because the current facility is old, laden with asbestos and lead-based paint, and this has complicated efforts to secure the base's missile sites.

I also helped to secure some $14.6 million for the construction of a missile maintenance dispatch facility. This facility will allow the base to more properly and efficiently store critical components and equipment for the missile field and to retrofit its hangar so we can ultimately house the replacement fleet for its Vietnam-era Hueys, which should be replaced in the next couple of years. Unfortunately, the construction of these facilities and of many others around the country is at risk because of the President's decision.

More alarmingly, Malmstrom is in critical need of a weapons generation facility, and I have been fighting for years to ensure that this project is included among the Air Force's top military construction priorities. Just yesterday, the Secretary of the Air Force confirmed that the funding for the facility has been included in the fiscal year 2020 Air Force budget request. This investment represents a significant step forward for Malmstrom Air Force Base, for the Air Force, and for our national security. It is important because this is where ICBM warheads are maintained and stored.

As a result of the deterioration of this facility, airmen and missileers must confront numerous safety and security challenges while carrying out their missions every day. Yet now we have to tell them that this critical project, which the Air Force has said it desperately needs and which it does desperately need, could very well get kicked down the road and down the list of priorities because the President would rather spend billions of the military construction money on the construction of his wall.

The same is true for other critical infrastructure investments at Malmstrom, including a new security forces compound, but the President doesn't care. He is more interested in robbing taxpayer funds to build an unnecessary wall on the southern border, but Congress has rejected the President's request on a bipartisan basis. His defiance of that rejection comes at the expense of my State's defense installations.

Great Falls is also home to the Montana Air National Guard. My older brother was in the Air Guard for 35 years, and I have seen their work up close. Since we entered the Middle East conflict 17 years ago, this country has used the Guard like never before. They have asked a lot of our citizen soldiers and airmen, and they have always delivered whether that be when they were deploying to war, fighting against wildfires, or saving families from natural disasters.

In Montana, they have asked for little in return. They have asked for the construction of a new aircraft apron to park and store the Guard's C–130 fleet. Once again, we got to work, and we secured the money—$9 million—to make sure that our C–130s would stay in good shape for years to come. Max Baucus and I fought hard to bring those C–130s to Montana, which is why I am so outraged that the President's emergency declaration puts this funding at risk. I know that nobody in this body takes the decision of sending young men and women to war lightly, but when those difficult decisions are made, we had better deploy them with the best and the safest equipment.

The debate today is clear: A vote against the President's disaster declaration is a vote to protect our coequal branches of government, our system of checks and balances, and our Constitution. A vote for the President's power grab is a vote for Federal overreach and is a violation of our oath of office.

I hope my colleagues who vote for this plan are on the first plane back home to explain to their constituents why they are shirking their basic duties. I hope they explain to their communities—and there are many like Great Falls, MT—why they are ripping those investments out of their towns and out of our military. I hope they explain to our future leaders why it is OK to follow the Constitution only when it is expedient.

This disaster declaration undermines the bipartisan work that the Republicans and Democrats have done to rebuild our military. It sets a dangerous precedent that, no doubt, will be abused by future Presidents, and everybody in this body knows that.

We have an option here. We have the ability to stand with our troops and to stand with the Constitution and reject this declaration. It is critically important if we are going to have a strong military. I think we decided in the last Congress to make investments into our military that were much needed, and now the President is pulling those dollars out. It is nothing short of ridiculous.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

GM CLOSURES

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I concur with the comments of my friend from Montana. I know what this President wants to potentially do to the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base and to the air bases in Springfield, in my hometown of Mansfield, in Youngstown, and in Toledo in my State and so much more.

Last week, we got yet another clear illustration of whose side President Trump is on. All week, we got news of favor after favor from the Trump administration in what it is doing for Wall Street. The White House looks

like a retreat for Wall Street executives except on the days it looks like a retreat for drug company executives.

Wall Street banks have complained to the President about the Volcker rule. That is the rule that stops the big banks from taking big risks with American families' money. Wall Street didn't like it, but it had passed this Congress a decade ago. The rules were being written far too slowly because of Wall Street's influence even during the Obama years, but because Wall Street didn't like it, the Trump administration agreed to rewrite them. The Wall Street banks complained that even the rewrite was not weak enough, so the administration reportedly is going to water it down even further.

Secretary Mnuchin, the Secretary of the Treasury—another Wall Street guy who was appointed by this President—announced he is going to go easier on shadow banks, and the Fed announced it would make it easier for big banks to pass the annual stress test. It is like this body and Senator MCCONNELL, who is down the hall, have forgotten what happened 10 years ago. It is this collective amnesia that has worked its virus through this body and through the administration so that people forget what happened 10 years ago with regard to our economy.

My wife and I live in Cleveland, OH—ZIP Code 44105. In the first half of 2007, that ZIP Code had more foreclosures than any ZIP Code in the United States. I see what happens when people lose their homes. I think about what happens to families who have to explain it to their children, who have to give away their pets, who have to move to new school districts—all the things that happen to families when their homes are foreclosed on or when they are evicted from their apartments. Yet none of these executives seem to mind. None of these executives have to have those conversations. Nobody in the Trump administration has to have those conversations with one's kids.

The Trump administration is weakening the stress test. It is weakening some of the capital. It is simply doing Wall Street's bidding over and over—and that was just last week. Of course, we know that comes after 2 years of this President's and this Congress's doing Wall Street's bidding.

To me, the one what was even more personal was how this administration decided to weaken the overtime rule. Here is how it works. If somebody is making $40,000 a year and is working as a night manager at a restaurant, say, or at any kind of job in which one may manage a few people and is making $35,000 or $40,000 or $45,000 a year, if the top people of the company give this gentleman or gentlewoman who is doing this job the title of management, then they don't have to pay him or her overtime.

They can work them 45, they can work them 50, they can work them 60 hours a week and pay them not a dime of overtime—nothing. They get a salary for 40 hours.

So you take a worker, you pay that worker $45,000 a year, $40,000 a year, the owners of the company classify them as management, and they can refuse to pay them for the extra 10 or 15 hours. That is 10 or 15 hours without pay or it is 10 or 15 hours away from family, away from raising your kids, and the administration, of course, sided with the companies. Of course, they sided with Wall Street. Of course, they betrayed workers. They never ever side with workers.

Look at Youngstown, OH, right now. This President stood by while General Motors closed the Chevy Cruze plant. It had been there 53 years—Lordstown, OH, a valley of about 400,000 people. This is 5,000 jobs. There are probably another 4,000 to 5,000 jobs for people who worked in the supply chain and made components that go into the Chevy Cruze. I asked the President personally—first, he didn't even know about the plant closing when I talked to him, even though by that time they had laid off about half of the workers. Then I asked him face-to-face, and I asked him on the phone to actually call the CEO of GM to make an appeal to say: Instead of using your huge tax cut that you got from the White House to build more jobs overseas and to do stock buybacks so the executives are getting richer, how about investing in this General Motors plant, how about retooling, which this company has done many times in the past?

I remember one of the best days, other than the birth of six of my grandchildren during my last term in the Senate, during that several years—I remember the best day of that last term was when President Obama, Secretary of Labor Perez, and I stood together in Columbus, OH, at Jeni's ice cream, and we announced that the Obama administration was going to update that salary threshold on the overtime rule. If you work extra hours, you get extra pay, you get time and a half under the law—under the law the way that President Obama did it.

The Obama rule would have meant that more than 4 million Americans—130,000 people just in my State, 130,000 people, if they work 10 hours, they get hundreds of dollars in overtime pay. If they are working 50 hours instead of 40, they literally would get—depending on their wage, of course—at least another $100 in their pay.

Now, because of Trump and the Secretary of Labor in this administration—first because of some judges and now the President—those workers never got that raise.

Attorneys general around the country, Republican, far-right attorneys general, including one in the Presiding Officer's State, are always glad to do the bidding of their corporate sponsors. They are always glad to do the bidding of billionaires. They are always glad to do the bidding of the richest 1 percent in this country. They blocked it.

Now President Trump has come up with a new rule that leaves most of those workers behind.

Again, these aren't rich executives who are working. I am sure the Presiding Officer, the Senator from Texas, most of us work well over 40 hours in these jobs. We get paid a salary; it is a good salary. We shouldn't get paid overtime; neither should a corporate lawyer who is working more than 40 hours overtime, and neither should an executive nor should a doctor who works more than 40 hours get overtime. But these are workers who are making $30,000 and $35,000 and $40,000 a year, and you classify them as management, so you refuse to pay them overtime. That is what this rule is about. It means that millions of ordinary workers are not getting the pay they have earned.

As if the richest 1 percent aren't doing well enough without this rule, President Trump again—President Trump again—betrayed workers. Again he stood with the billionaires. Again he stood with the largest corporations that ship jobs overseas.

It comes down to whose side you are on. Are you on Wall Street's side? Are you on the side of Senator MCCONNELL, who responds to every special interest in this country that wants something from this Senate? Are you on their side or are you going to be on the side of the American workers?

This President came to Youngstown. He promised to fight for American workers. He breaks that promise damn near every single day. He breaks it over and over and over.

If you love this country, you fight for the people who make it work. I wish President Trump would understand that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

H.J. RES. 46

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I am here to talk about the vote that we will take later today on this floor regarding the President's national emergency declaration.

From the outset of this process, I have had two objectives. One is to support the President on the crisis at the border. I believe his plan to address that crisis is a good one, and we should support it. But, second is to do it in the right way, without setting a dangerous new precedent counter to a fundamental constitutional principle, without tying up the needed funds for the border in the courts, and without taking funds away from important military construction projects for our troops.

Unfortunately, despite a sincere effort by the administration as recently as this morning to try to work with me and other colleagues, including the Presiding Officer, we were not able to agree on a path forward that addresses those concerns that I just outlined.

I am going to lay out in a minute how I think we can better achieve the President's goals of strengthening our border security without invoking the national emergency and the funding he

seeks through that national emergency.

First, let me repeat what I have said on this floor many times and said consistently: I do believe we have a crisis at the border—a humanitarian crisis, a trafficking crisis, a drug crisis. According to Customs and Border Protection, in February—last month—76,000 illegal immigrants arrived at our southern border. That is an average of about 2,000 every day. Since October of last year, we have apprehended more than 268,000 people at the border. That is about a 100-percent increase over the same period last year. We have also seen a 300-percent increase in families arriving at the border compared to this time last year. By the way, the vast majority of those are from three countries in Central America.

This is a humanitarian crisis. The journey to the United States from these so-called Northern Triangle countries is incredibly dangerous, especially for women and for children. They face violence from gangs and traffickers and hunger and dehydration in the rough terrain. Many of them arrive at our border traumatized, hurt, sick, and often we don't have the resources to provide for those needs.

There is also a growing human trafficking crisis. Our lack of border security allows these smugglers—human smugglers—to move across the border unchecked. Increasingly, they are taking advantage of these flows of individuals to traffic women and children.

In particular, I will say the Border Patrol resources are spread thin trying to monitor these areas that do not have barriers.

Third, this is a drug crisis. The Drug Enforcement Agency has said that the southwest border ''remains the primary entry point for heroin into the United States.'' That is not a debatable point. I am told that with regard to Ohio, where we have been devastated by the opioid epidemic, over 90 percent of the heroin is coming across the southern border.

Fentanyl, the deadliest drug of all, which comes primarily from China and primarily through the U.S. mail system—50 times more powerful than heroin—is increasingly coming across the southern border too. Yesterday I learned from Customs and Border Protection that fentanyl seizures along the border between the ports of entry have increased by 400 percent between 2016 and 2018.

As we are finally beginning to make progress on the opioid crisis in my home State of Ohio and around the country, finally reducing the number of heroin and other opioid overdose deaths for the first time in 8 years, we are seeing a reduction in those deaths, but crystal meth and the devastation it causes is coming back—coming back with a vengeance. It is more pure than ever, more powerful than ever, and it is coming from Mexico.

Some of you may remember in your own communities the issue of crystal meth labs being in people's houses and the environmental damage it caused and the crystal meth being cooked. That is not happening much anymore. Why? Because the pure crystal meth from Mexico is so much more powerful and less expensive; it is cheap.

Law enforcement tells me that on the streets of Columbus, OH, pure crystal meth is now plentiful and less expensive than marijuana—and far more dangerous. Where is this coming from? It is coming from Mexico.

Even with limited resources, in fiscal year 2018, Customs and Border Protection seized almost a half million pounds of marijuana and 11,000 pounds of methamphetamine between ports of entry. At the ports of entry, they seized over 1,700 pounds of fentanyl—by the way, that is enough to kill about 3 billion people—1,700 pounds of fentanyl, three flecks of which can kill you, 56,000 pounds of meth, and nearly 52,000 pounds of cocaine.

Frankly, that is the tip of the iceberg. Most of it is getting through. They are checking only a small percentage of shipments, meaning the vast majority of drugs are coming across our borders undetected. We need to do more.

There is no question we need stronger border security. Again, I support the plan the President has outlined, including the $5.7 billion the President has requested for walls and other barriers.

That $5.7 billion number, by the way, wasn't just picked out of thin air. It funds the top 10 priorities of the Customs and Border Protection Border Security Improvement Plan. The experts have given us a plan, and the President's $5.7 billion simply funds what the experts have said.

This plan, by the way, the expert's border security plan, has been embraced by this Congress in the last two appropriations bills. They pointed to that plan and said: This is the path forward. These are the experts. It is not controversial.

By the way, the experts have recommended not that we build a wall from sea to shining sea—it has been mischaracterized as that—but 234 miles of barriers, walls, and other fencing at places where people cross the border most frequently, primarily in the State of Texas, primarily in the urban areas—places where it will make the most difference.

Funding for these types of barriers has been included in the budget requests from previous administrations, of course. Previous administrations have built hundreds of miles of fencing—over 500 miles.

It has also been included in appropriations bills passed by Congress during the last two appropriation cycles by both Republicans and Democrats. Why is it that this administration can't build the barriers that other administrations have and that Congress in the past has supported?

Of course it is not just about more physical barriers, and the President's plan also recognizes that. It calls for more Border Patrol agents, more technology, more surveillance, more drones, more cameras, more screening at our ports of entry, more technology to stop this illegal flow of drugs. That is also a significant part of the plan.

But erecting more barriers and fencing in key areas along the border will help stem the tide. It will ease the burden on our Border Security personnel and allow them to focus their resources more effectively.

It is time to listen to the experts and give them what they need to carry out their important mission, but we have to do that in the right way.

As we all learned in high school, our government has a system of checks and balances. It gives some powers to the President; it gives some powers to Congress. Our Constitution explicitly gives the U.S. Congress what is called the power of the purse.

Congress, not the President, has the sole authority to determine how to spend taxpayer money, and that is appropriate. After all, we are here to represent the people. We are most accountable to the taxpayers. Once we appropriate the money for a specific purpose, then it is the President and the executive branch that are responsible for administering those programs.

We had our spending fight here in Congress. I thought we should give the President the full amount of money he requested for barriers, and I voted that way. At the end of the day, Congress decided to give him only some, not all, of the funds he requested.

Under current law and current congressional approval and authorities, without declaring a national emergency, President Trump can actually access additional funds that get him to the $5.7 billion he requested. As the Wall Street Journal said in a recent editorial opposing a national emergency, ''The President doesn't need to invoke a national emergency to build his wall along the southern border.''

Declaring a national emergency to access different funds sets a dangerous new precedent. The use of national emergency powers to circumvent Congress's explicit decision on funding is unprecedented. No President has ever used what is called the National Emergencies Act in this way. As a result, it opens the door for future Presidents to implement just about any policy they want and to take funding from other areas Congress has already decided on without Congress's approval.

Once a President declares an emergency, he or she has access to a lot of power. Some would say nearly unlimited power. A future President could seize industries or could control means of communication. Think of the internet. A future President may well say that climate change is a national emergency and use emergency authorities to implement the Green New Deal. By the way, according to a new study by Douglas Holtz-Eakin at the American Action Forum, the proposed policies in the Green New Deal would cost

between $51 trillion and $93 trillion over the next 10 years when added up together. Obviously, that is not sustainable. It is an astounding price tag. In fact, as Senator ALEXANDER said on the floor earlier today, future Presidents could actually use this emergency authority to tear down the very wall we are now constructing, and some Democrats running for President have said that is what they intend to do. That is what they want to do.

The President is using the National Emergencies Act to take funds away from a particular area of spending. It is called military construction funds. Only twice before have Presidents declared a national emergency in order to transfer military construction funds away from congressionally designated projects into other priorities. In both of those situations, we were at war, and the Secretary of Defense transferred the funds to support the war effort, and Congress did not object. Although there is a crisis at our southern border, we are not in wartime, and there are funds available to address border security.

The President wants to do more to address the crisis at the border, and I do, too, and he can do more. The President has available to him enough funds, right now, to begin building all the barriers he has requested without resorting to national emergency funds. I support his using those funds to get to the full $5.7 billion he requested for barriers on the southern border.

Here is how we could access it without using the national emergency. First would be the $1.375 billion appropriated by this Congress for the barriers. By the way, that is the most that has ever been appropriated in a fiscal year, ever, for the purpose of barriers. Second, he can access, as he intends to do, $601 million from the Treasury Forfeiture Fund. He could do that without a national emergency. Third, he could access funding through the DOD counter-drug account. He has said that he would like to access about $2.5 billion from that account, but he could actually access, under our laws that we have passed here—and we have given him authority to access—up to $4 billion. This adds up, as we can see, to over $5.7 billion—almost $6 billion—which is at the President's disposal without moving to the national emergency that he has invoked. My hope is that the President will take this approach.

I think using those funds is a better way to accomplish our border security goals. Precisely because the President does not need to declare a national emergency, these funds are far more certain. The $3.6 billion the President takes from the military construction projects is uncertain because these funds are likely to be tied up in constitutional litigation for months, probably years. By the way, the President has rightly acknowledged that.

Under the National Emergencies Act, Congress has given the President flexibility to address significant threats to our Nation's well-being, and we want him to have that flexibility. It was critical for President Bush to act quickly and decisively in the days after the 9/11 attacks. But short of that type of situation, it is imperative for the President to honor Congress's constitutional role to make policy and appropriate money. A national emergency declaration is a tool to be used cautiously and sparingly. That is why I cosponsored legislation, authored by Senator MIKE LEE, to amend the National Emergencies Act to ensure that Congress does have more control over these decisions in the future.

So in my view, the best resolution here is for the President to use that nearly $6 billion in funding that he has at his disposal to implement his plan, and, then, ask Congress for additional funding during the next appropriations cycle, which, by the way, begins on October 1 of this year.

This approach, again, has three distinct advantages. One, it would not set the dangerous precedent we discussed today. Second, the funds could actually get to the border because they will not be tied up in litigation. Third, it would fully protect important military construction projects in Ohio and around the country—including, by the way, funding for the National Air and Space Intelligence Center, or NASIC, at the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base; an automated, multipurpose machine gun range at Camp James A. Garfield; a fire station replacement at Mansfield Lahm Airport; a small arms range at Rickenbacker International Airport, and a main gate relocation project at Youngstown Air Reserve Station. All of those are things in the current fiscal year Military Construction appropriations bill that benefit Ohio. I am a strong supporter and advocate for Ohio's military facilities and our research institutions, and I will continue to work to ensure that our key military construction projects at these strategic facilities can continue to move forward.

I have worked on both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue. I have had the honor of being a Senator and a Congressman on this side, and I have worked for two White Houses. In fact, I was Associate Counsel to President Bush 41 in his White House Counsel's office. I know how hard it can be for the executive branch, the President, and Congress to find the balance that our Founders intended between the executive branch and the legislative branch, but our Founders drew a clear line on at least one thing: Congress, closest to the people, would have the power of the purse.

When President Obama bypassed Congress and took executive action to create new immigration policy back in 2012, I spoke out. I criticized him because of the constitutionality issue. I said I agreed with President Obama that our immigration system was—and, by the way, still is—broken. I agreed we needed to work together to fix it, but, I said that it doesn't mean that a President can ignore Congress, substitute his own judgment for the will of the people, and make up new laws on his own. That is what I said President Obama did. I believed it was wrong then.

I believe the President's use of the national emergency declaration to access already approved military construction project funding is wrong now. I support his goals. President Trump is right that we have a crisis, and I support his plans to secure the border, and he can fully fund it in a more reliable way. By the way, anyone who cares about getting that money to the border to build walls ought to want that certainty.

Each one of us in this body has sworn an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. So today I will vote to support the disapproval resolution that is before us.

I know the President has the votes to pursue his approach. Even if the disapproval resolution passes, he can veto it, and his veto will be sustained. I know that, but I continue to hope that the President uses the funds he has available to him without creating a bad precedent, having some of the needed funds tied up in the courts, and taking money from important military projects.

President Trump is right about the crisis at the border, and the approach I outlined today would enable him to accomplish his policy objectives on the border and honor our Constitution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise in strong opposition to President Trump's so-called emergency declaration of a crisis and invasion on our southern border, an attempt to misappropriate funds to build the President's border wall. The President's actions here are an affront to the constitutional separation of powers, our checks and balances, and the congressional power of the purse to set appropriation levels.

The very nature of how President Trump decided, finally, to declare a so-called emergency at our southern border shows that he, too, knows that there is no real national emergency at our southern border. President Trump himself admitted, in announcing this so-called emergency in the Rose Garden:

> I could do the wall over a longer period of time. I didn't need to do this, but I'd rather do it much faster.

It doesn't sound like a national emergency. We know that a medieval border wall would be a tremendously wasteful expenditure of resources, as opposed to smarter border security technology that would enhance screening at our ports of entry and specifically target transnational criminal operations smuggling contraband into the United States.

The Constitution gives Congress, not the President, the power of the purse.

Article I, section 9, clause 7 provides that ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law.''

Article I, section 8, clause 1 provides that ''the Congress shall have Power To . . . provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.''

Additionally, the presentment clause of the Constitution requires that the President either approve or veto a bill, and it does not give him the power to change the text of a law or appropriation levels or to cast a line item veto for certain provisions.

The Supreme Court held in the line-item veto case of ''Clinton v. City of New York'' in 1998:

> There is no provision in the Constitution that authorizes the President to enact, to amend or to repeal statutes. . . . Our first President understood the text of the Presentment Clause as requiring that he either ''approve all the parts of a bill, or reject it in toto.''

The courts have regularly upheld the authority of Congress by statute—and not the President by fiat—to set funding levels. As the Supreme Court said in Hooe v. United States, in 1910, ''it is for Congress, proceeding under the Constitution, to say what amount may be drawn from the Treasury in pursuit of appropriations.''

The Ninth Circuit held in United States v. McIntosh, in 2016, that if the executive branch spends money in violation of appropriations law, ''it would be drawing funds from the Treasury without authorization by statute, and thus violating the Appropriations Clause.''

The Supreme Court held in the Office of Personnel Management v. Richmond, in 1990, that ''any exercise of a power granted by the Constitution to one or the other branches of Government is limited by the valid reservation of congressional control over funds in the Treasury.''

Beyond the legal challenges in court to the President's emergency declaration, Congress has a responsibility to act, as well, and rein in the President's abuse of power in order to maintain the proper separation of powers and checks and balances under our Constitution.

Former Republican Members of Congress recently wrote a powerful open letter to the current Republican Members of Congress on this issue. Signatories include former Members John Danforth, Mickey Edwards, Chuck Hagel, Jim Kolbe, Olympia Snowe, and Richard Lugar. Let me quote:

> Our oath is to put the country and its Constitution above everything, including party politics or loyalty to a president. . . . That is why we are coming together to urge those of you who are now charged with upholding the authority of the first branch of government to resist efforts to surrender those powers to a president.
>
> We offer two arguments against allowing a president—any president, regardless of party—to circumvent congressional authority. One is the constitutional placing of all lawmaking power in the hands of the people's representatives. . . . The power of the purse rests with Congress. . . . If you allow a president to ignore Congress, it will be not your authority but that of your constituents that is deprived of the protections of true representative government.

Let me just add that, in addition to what was said in that letter, we have made appropriations here. We expect those appropriations to be carried out. We are the representatives of the people. In my own State of Maryland, we have many military construction contracts on many of the military installations that could be put at jeopardy. Maryland is the proud home of major military installations, including Pax River, Indian Head, Andrews, Fort Detrick, Fort Meade, and the APG, or the Aberdeen Proving Ground. It is our responsibility to make those appropriations. If you let this emergency power go, that action could be compromised by the President of the United States, denying the people of this country their representative government.

Let me continue the letter from our former Republican colleagues. The letter continues:

> The second argument goes directly to the question each of you must face: how much are you willing to undermine both the Constitution and the Congress in order to advance a policy outcome that by all legitimate means is not achievable? The current issue—a wall on our southern border—has gone through the process put in place by the Constitution. It has been proposed by the President, it has been debated by Congress, and the representatives of the people allocated funding at a level deemed appropriate by Congress. We understand that there are many Members of Congress who disagree with the final funding compromise reached by a bipartisan group of legislators.

And it was approved overwhelmingly by Congress.

> To you, we ask this question: what will you do when a president of another party uses the precedent you are establishing to impose policies to which you are unalterably opposed? There is no way around this difficulty: what powers are ceded to a president whose policies you support may also be used by presidents whose policies you abhor.

The letter then concludes:

> We who have served where you serve now call on you to honor your oath of office and to protect the Constitution and the responsibilities it vested in Congress. We ask that you pass a joint resolution terminating the emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019.

Congress should therefore take all necessary action to overturn this unlawful Presidential declaration on border security under the National Emergencies Act or other authorities. Instead of trying to raid funds that have been designated for critical military construction and environmental projects, the President should work with Congress to enact comprehensive reform.

The Senate should vote to uphold the Constitution and its legislative prerogatives, including the power of the purse, and to cancel the President's emergency declaration.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, during the recent government shutdown, there were a lot of budget issues that were negotiated. It was a wide-ranging bill of over 1,000 pages, when it was all said and done, but the most contentious number in all of the negotiations circled around a barrier on our southern border in the highest drug trafficking corridor in the country.

The President requested $5.7 billion to build a barrier fence in 10 locations that the Customs and Border Patrol had identified as the top 10 points of illegal drugs entering our country. That study had been requested by Congress before they fulfilled that study of identifying the highest profiled drug trafficking corridors. They brought that back to Congress. The President then requested funding to build fencing in those areas of the highest trafficking areas.

His request was not for a 2,000-mile-long wall. It was only to replace some of the sections of the 650-mile-long barrier that already exists—areas that were old and ineffective—or to put new fencing in high drug trafficking areas.

In a highly partisan debate, Congress eventually appropriated $1.375 billion to DHS for the construction of additional barriers. It is not even close to what the President and what Customs and Border Patrol said they needed to protect the Nation and members of law enforcement.

During those negotiations, the President announced he would declare a national emergency if he didn't get the funds needed to secure the Nation. At that point, there were two options for people who don't want the President to secure our border. One was to include language in that appropriations bill before it was passed to prevent the President from declaring an emergency action and using any of the funds for that. The second one was to wait until after the bill was passed and declare a disapproval resolution to stop the President after the bill had already passed.

Those who oppose border security chose the second option—to fight the President after passage, which brings us to today.

After signing the funding bill to reopen the government, to deal with the humanitarian crisis, and the flow of illegal narcotics coming into our country, the President declared a national emergency in two areas. He has over 100 authorities; he declared it in two.

One was this. He wanted to replace some of the National Guard members with members of the Reserve. You have to declare a national emergency to call up the Reserve members. So his first request was to call up some of the Reserves to swap out some of the Guard members who were already serving at the border.

The second one was that in one of the accounts that deal with military construction, if needed, he wanted to tap into some of those funds. He was also very clear. There are four accounts

they would have access to. Three of them don't need an emergency declaration. Let me run through those.

The first is the $1.375 billion Congress allocated in the government shutdown, ending debate. There is no question that $1.375 billion has been approved by Congress.

There is a second fund where there is $600 million. It is in the Treasury Asset Forfeiture Fund. That fund specifically notes that those funds can be used for any reason for Federal law enforcement. It is very clear. It has wide discretion—any use for Federal law enforcement. There is no legal question that it can be used by Customs and Border Patrol or to do construction of any kind of barrier.

There is a third fund that already exists within the Department of Defense. There are $4 billion set aside in this fund, and it can be used for wide-ranging issues dealing with counternarcotics. There is no question the President can act on anything dealing with counternarcotics with that fund.

In fact, in that fund itself, there is specific language already included in that—and this is up to $4 billion—saying it can be used for construction of roads, fences, and installation of lighting to block drug smuggling corridors across international boundaries of the United States.

Let me run through this. There is up to $4 billion the President can ask for that he doesn't have to ask for emergency authority at all on. That is counternarcotics, counterdrug smuggling. There are $600 million that have been allocated that the President can use because it deals with law enforcement. There is $1.375 billion that Congress also allocated. There is no legal question on any of those.

At the tail end of that, the White House has also said, after all three of those funds are expended—which, by the way, those three funds exceed the $5.7 billion the President says he needs—the President's request is, if we go through all of those, and we are not able to close that section down, at some future point, he wants to be able to access this other fund.

They have also made it very clear it would be past October. That would not even be in this fiscal year. So really the debate about funding is next year's issue, what is called the 2808 funding on military construction.

That leads us again to this. An emergency declaration really has two questions in it. Is it an emergency, and does the President have statutory authority to take this action? Those are the only two questions on the table.

Is it an emergency is in dispute. There are some folks who would say: I don't think what is going on at the border is an emergency. There are some folks—some in this Chamber and some in the other Chamber—who want to abolish ICE, dismantle a wall, and open the borders. Thankfully, that is a small group of people who do not see our national security as important.

For the vast majority of people, they do see an importance in Congress working on national security and securing our borders. Then we have the argument about how serious is this.

I have had folks who have said to me: It is really not that bad because we have individuals coming but not as high of a number as what it used to be. Twenty years ago, we even had more people crossing the border illegally.

That is not the question that is in front of us. The request from Customs and Border Patrol is specifically for the 10 areas with the highest drug trafficking along all of our southern border. That is the request.

The question is, Do we have an emergency dealing with illegal drugs crossing our border after the Customs and Border Patrol has said to us that we need barriers to slow down the flow of illegal drugs? Are they right or are they wrong?

Among those areas, right now the Rio Grande Valley sector is the highest area for movement of illegal drugs crossing into our country. It is 16 percent of the border miles, but it is 40 percent of the illegal border and illegal drug trafficking coming in.

Last year, just in that one sector, 550 pounds of methamphetamine were seized. This is not at the port of entry. This is between ports of entry, in that open area that doesn't have a fence. There were 550 pounds of methamphetamine seized. There were 1,500 pounds of cocaine and 64,000 pounds of marijuana that were seized in that one section without a fence.

The question is, Is that an emergency?

Last year, 70,000 Americans died from overdoses from drugs that came from and through Mexico—70,000. If we had any—any—issue in America where 70,000 people died, I can assure you this Congress would stand up and say we have an emergency, but, for some reason, there is a dispute on whether it is important we stop the flow of illegal drugs coming from Mexico into the United States. I don't think that should be in dispute.

To give an example of how fast this is changing and how much of an emergency this is, people would say: This has been going on for years. Why is it different now? Just in the last 2 years, between ports of entry—again, not at the ports of entry but in that open area where there is no barrier. Last year, our Customs and Border Patrol seized 388 pounds of fentanyl. That may not sound like much, but only a couple of grains of it—as in a couple of grains of sand—is enough to kill a person.

Fentanyl is highly addictive and an exceptionally powerful drug. It is 100 times more powerful than morphine. It is being laced into heroin and laced into cocaine. It is a mass killer.

Last year, almost 25,000 people in the country died from an overdose of fentanyl. Knowing it only takes two or three grains to be too much to kill a person, 388 pounds of it were seized between ports of entry along our border.

To tell you how it has accelerated, in 2 years, that is a 269-percent increase of fentanyl being captured between ports of entry.

Yes, we have an emergency. Yes, we have people dying in this country due to overdoses from fentanyl, heroin, cocaine, and methamphetamine, and the problem is not static. The problem is accelerating.

Last year, we had one of the highest—highest—rates of cocaine being picked up between ports of entry that has ever existed in our country.

Last year, U.S. Customs and Border Patrol seized a total of 11,000 pounds of methamphetamine coming across that border. That is the highest year ever of that drug coming across our border.

Undeniably, there is an emergency. The question is, Do we agree or disagree that when the statute says a President has the ability to do a construction, it means he can also construct a barrier? I believe it does.

We have those two questions. Is it an emergency, and does the statutory authority exist?

Interestingly enough, there are some of my friends who are adding a third question. Should the President have that authority?

That is a different question, and I understand that question. Interestingly enough, just a few hours ago, the President of the United States tweeted out—as he is infamous for doing—if Congress wants to discuss should a President have this authority in the future, I am open to discussing that, but that is not pertaining to today.

I think that is an interesting question we should address as a nation—what and how broad should an Executive authority be for a President—but the debate we have today is plain and simple. Is it an emergency, and, under current law, does the President have statutory authority?

My answer to both of those questions is yes.

I hope we continue to do drug interdiction, continue to work through the issues that need to be addressed, continue to do recovery, and continue to help people who are fighting through addiction because we need a healthy nation and also a secure Nation.

For those 10 areas that are the highest drug trafficking areas in the entire country, I hope we close those doors, and I hope we protect lives in the days ahead.

I am going to choose to oppose a resolution of disapproval today that says the President doesn't have the authority to protect the American people.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

If no one yields time, time will be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, significant, the very first clause of the very first section of the very first article of the Constitution consists of the words ''all

legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and the House of Representatives.''

The Founding Fathers wasted no time in getting right to the heart of the matter, which is to say that the legislative powers within the Federal Government—that is, the power to make law within that Federal system—would themselves be exercised only by the branch of that government most accountable to the people at the most regular routine intervals.

This system of government, of course, involved three branches—one that would make the law, one that would enforce the law, and one that would interpret the law. That system of government relied, necessarily, and quite appropriately, on the fact that each branch of government would operate within its domain and would jealously guard the powers reserved to it, neither exceeding the powers granted it, nor accepting a diminution of those powers.

It is with that topic in mind that I rise today, reluctantly, in support of the resolution before us. When I speak—and some of my colleagues might even say nag—about our constitutional framework, when I insist that every word, every clause, and every principle does, in fact, matter, that we take oaths to support and defend the Constitution of the United States—we do so, in fact, right here on these very steps in this very Chamber when we start each term of office—we are dutybound to adhere both to the letter and to the spirit of that document, and we should do everything we can to avoid straying from it.

When I say some of these things, I am sometimes accused by some of naivete. I am told the old ''Schoolhouse Rock'' version of how a bill becomes a law works in theory, sounds nice in theory, but it is somehow passe in a vast, diverse, continental nation including about 230 million people today. I am told that given the responsibilities of the United States as now a vast, global, and economic power and Congress's inability to get things done, we have no choice but to accept and even encourage a system of government in which we are relegated to the backseat, to the backseat of the very things we were supposed to be doing in the first place, which is passing law, which is setting policy within the Federal Government.

This faux sophisticated analysis gets things exactly backward. It is the advocates of Executive overreach and judicial supremacy who are naive. They believe that given our Nation's size and diversity, only centralized government can rise above partisan, ideological, regional, practical differences, and unite us behind one policy, but this function now strangling this city and strangling this body, toxifying our political discourse, is directly related to this relentless march toward centralization. We think, somehow, that by pulling power into Washington and within Washington to the less-accountable branches of the government—that is, to the other two branches that are not this branch—we are governing. No, that is not governing. It is ruling.

With centralization, we empower and enrich the political and corporate classes at the expense of the working and middle classes. Centralization is not unity. It is surrender—surrender to exactly the kind of monarchical and abusive sort of government our Founding Fathers were trying to protect us from.

Political elites often reassure us and reassure each other that these deviations from constitutional norms are somehow victimless endeavors. No one cares about the process, they insist, but the Constitution is all process. That is the whole point is process. The Constitution doesn't resolve our political differences. It lays out the processes by which we are to resolve them. Brushing that process aside does not override our disagreement. It intensifies them. It escalates them—ratcheting up our politics into an all-consuming war of outrage and contempt.

My Democratic colleagues, some of them, at least, would have us believe this vote is about President Trump and President Trump alone. It is not. It is about much more than him. It is about much more than them. It is liberal elites' cult-like zeal for centralized power and their furious entitlement to wielding it that has led us to this very vote.

Now, I am not sure the Democratic Party cares immensely, as an institution, about Presidential overreach. I will leave that to them to decide and to exhibit. Some simply believe that abuse of constitutional power should be a one-way street.

In many instances, we have had Members of this body support previous Presidents of both political parties in engaging in acts of overreach. The real source of outrage here is not constitutionally mandated procedure but simply that we, as an institution, have voluntarily surrendered—we have relinquished our legislative power.

In this instance, this happens to be an exercise of power in an area in which many on the other side of the political aisle happen to disagree. To make clear, a border fence—a border barrier is a policy I support wholeheartedly and unequivocally. I agree with the need to secure our border. I agree with the President that there is a crisis unfolding on our border endangering men and women and children and endangering many of those who were most affected by the communities who are themselves in the direct path of these caravans. I support a border wall, and I encourage full congressional funding for it.

I think it is a tragedy and really something of an outrage that we haven't done that as a Congress. I support workplace enforcement of immigration laws. I support a biometric entry-exit system. I support the President's new ''Remain in Mexico'' policy that would keep asylum seekers south of the border while they await processing if they come from a noncontiguous country. I support the President's calling up military Reservists to support border agents in their dangerous and underappreciated work.

I support the President's invocation of 10 USC section 284(b)(7), which unequivocally authorizes him, in certain instances, relevant here and present here, to authorize funding for the construction of a fence along international boundaries as a means of combating the illegal international drug trade.

I support the President's use of up to $601 million from the Treasury Forfeiture Fund and $2.5 billion from the 284 fund I mentioned a minute ago, and I support the administration's work, on a diplomatic level, with Mexico to reduce the flow of migrants to the United States. I have supported all of these things in this administration, and I have for years—during this administration and prior to that—and I will continue to support these policies.

An emergency declaration, in accordance with the National Emergencies Act, in this instance, is different. The White House is asserting authority to spend money on projects and priorities in a manner not themselves directly authorized by Congress. Congress directly refused a request to appropriate the specific amount of funds we are dealing with.

At the end of the day, it is not the White House, it is not this President, it is not other Presidents who are at fault for this; it is, in fact, Congress. Congress was the institution that chose voluntarily to relinquish this power. Congress, as an institution, adopted and enacted legislation that was so broad as to take basically all the guardrails off the legislative process.

Congress, as an institution, in 1976, adopted the National Emergencies Act and said the President may declare an emergency with almost no standards, and then, once a President declares an emergency, there are some estimated 128 different provisions of law that can be looped in and made effective as a result of the declaration of that emergency.

At the time Congress did this, Congress left its foot in the door, saying that Congress unilaterally could veto the President's actions by passing a concurrent resolution not itself subject to Presidential veto. For reasons having to do with a subsequent Supreme Court ruling that occurred 7 years after the enactment of the National Emergencies Act in 1983, a case called INS v. Chadha—a case, coincidentally, argued by my late father. If he were here today, perhaps I would half-jokingly acknowledge that maybe he is in some ways to blame for this.

After the Supreme Court concluded in INS v. Chadha that the legislative veto was unconstitutional, Congress

went through and systematically removed, from about 450 statutes, the legislative veto provisions, replaced them with resolutions of disapproval, replaced them with a procedural mechanism whereby Congress may signal its disapproval, but that disapproval is still subject to signature or veto by the President.

This is where we have a problem because that converts, effectively, legislative power by handing it over to the Executive and then leaves the Congress without an opportunity to signal how it feels about this beyond adopting a resolution of disapproval, which is itself subject to a Presidential veto.

That is why I am concerned about this. I have concerns about this legal framework. This is not about the President. This is not about my disagreement with or disapproval of the President or his approach to border security or his desire to build a barrier along our southern border. I think all those things need to happen.

This law is wrong. It is not President Trump's fault. It is Congress's. We need to change it. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reform the National Emergencies Act. We need to get this done. This is an issue that is neither Republican nor Democratic, neither liberal nor conservative. It is simply an American issue.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I have up to 5 minutes to make comments on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, a few weeks ago, I was talking with my staff, in advance of the President issuing the emergency order, and I told them I wanted to put together an op-ed to really express two things; one, my concern with the manner in which funds were being appropriated but also that there is a real crisis we have to address. In fact, I am very sympathetic to what the President did, and the only question is how he went about doing it.

I received a lot of feedback over the past few weeks, but what it allowed me to do was to engage in a discussion with some of my colleagues here and with the White House over the past couple of weeks that have been very productive.

My main concern with this Executive action is future potential abuses. I have a concern with the Executive action the President took, the emergency order, and that is why I voiced it, but I am sympathetic to what he was trying to do.

I think we can view this as an opportunity—I thought we could view this as an opportunity where maybe we could have a discussion about the National Emergencies Act and potentially make a real difference.

So today, I come to the floor to say that I do not intend to vote for the resolution of disapproval, and here is why. A lot has changed over the last 3 weeks—a discussion with the Vice President and a number of senior administration officials, a lot of collaboration with my colleague from Utah. There is serious discussion about changing the National Emergencies Act in a way that will have Congress speak on emergency actions in the future.

The White House has been very gracious and I should say very patient, given my initial position, in working with us and as late as today having the President make a statement that he is willing to work with us. I suspect that we will hear more from the President.

We also heard today from Leader MCCONNELL. I was trying to remember—I don't know whether it has been done before—Leader MCCONNELL took to the floor this morning and said that he encourages this discussion through the regular order and working on a bipartisan basis to move a measure forward through the Homeland Security Committee and to this floor for a vote. I, for one, am going to work on that and hopefully get consensus on a bipartisan basis after the temperatures have cooled and we can move on.

In the meantime, I think we have to recognize that we have a crisis at the border, with 76,000 people crossing illegally in February alone. We have narcotics flooding our country, poisoning our children and adults of all ages. A lot of it has to do with the porous border and the seemingly unending and spiraling-out-of-control crossings.

One of the challenges that I have to communicate to my constituents, and I am sure everyone does, is how do I reconcile—first, I should say that my colleagues on this side of the aisle who will vote for the resolution of disapproval I think to a person also recognize that there is a crisis. I respect them for their decision; it is just not a decision that I can take.

Over the course of the next few months, I look forward to working with the administration to talk about boundaries that we are very close to getting agreement on and making changes to the National Emergencies Act that will make sense.

The fact that this President is prepared to transfer power back to the article I branch—by his statements, either publicly or through his administration—is extraordinary. That we have a leader, with a Republican down the street, willing to move this through the regular order is extraordinary.

For those reasons, I will be voting against the resolution of disapproval, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Thank you.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today, I am voting against the resolution to end the national emergency. Make no mistake: Our Nation is facing a prolonged and worsening security and humanitarian crisis on our southern border. Lethal drugs are flooding across the border at an alarming rate. Just last year, enough fentanyl to kill 88 million Americans was seized by border patrol agents between our ports of entry. We are also witnessing unprecedented levels of illegal immigration and are on track for the highest level of illegal immigration in more than a decade. That means more human trafficking, more forced labor, and more exploitation of people along the dangerous journey to the United States. Failures by Congress to adequately address our immigration and border security issues have only exacerbated this crisis.

Here is just a sample of the data from our Federal authorities. The total volume of illegal immigration is increasing. Illegal immigration is on pace to exceed the highest level in more than 10 years. There has been a 338 percent increase in family units from the Northern Triangle apprehended thus far in fiscal year 2019 compared with same period in fiscal year 2018. There was 54 percent increase in unaccompanied minors apprehended thus far in fiscal year 2019 compared with same period in fiscal year 2018.

Additionally, drug seizures are increasing between ports of entry. In fiscal year 2018, U.S. Border Patrol intercepted 388 pounds of fentanyl between our ports of entry. That is enough to kill 88 million Americans; that is right, 88 million Americans. Fentanyl seizures increased 73 percent between fiscal year 2017 and fiscal year 2018. Heroin seizures also increased 22 percent between fiscal year 2017 and fiscal year 2018. Methamphetamine seizures increased 38 percent between fiscal year 2017 and fiscal year 2018.

As I have said repeatedly, even though the President is using the authority given to him by Congress, I share my colleagues' concerns that too much authority has been delegated to the executive branch. In 1976, Congress gave the President the authority to declare national emergencies, so we shouldn't be surprised when he seeks to use it, just as others have done. For this reason, I will continue working to pass meaningful legislation, like the ARTICLE ONE Act, to reclaim congressional power from the executive branch and improve congressional oversight of the National Emergency Act. I encourage my colleagues to join in this effort, which takes real action, as opposed to symbolic show votes that don't address the root of the problem.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the President often claims that he knows how to make deals, but when it comes to the border, he seems uninterested in a good deal, a deal to provide effective border security, and he is hurting our military in the process. This week's vote to repeal the President's national emergency is a vote to restore sanity to our border security debate and restore Congress's constitutional power of the purse.

We all remember Donald Trump's idea that we need a 2,000-mile concrete wall from sea to shining sea and his claim that Mexico would pay for it. He said it some 200 times on the campaign trail and in the Oval Office. In December, after asking and failing to receive funding from Congress for this wall, the President said, ''I am proud to shut down the government for border security.''

What followed was the 35-day Trump shutdown, the longest government shutdown in U.S. history. It cost our country $11 billion, according to the Congressional Budget Office. After the President finally agreed to reopen the government, Congress provided funding to the Department of Homeland Security for smart and effective border security measures, including technology and additional Customs personnel. We did this because the President's own administration has stated that the vast majority of lethal narcotics that cross our southern border come through legal ports of entry.

But within hours of signing this bill, President Donald Trump announced that it wasn't enough. The President went on television to announce that he was declaring a national emergency over the border, and he announced that he was taking $6.5 billion from our military to build it.

Presidents of both parties have declared national emergencies. Each time, it was done in response to a specific crisis, in order to unlock certain statutory authorities. President George W. Bush declared a national emergency after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. In the 1970s, President Carter declared a national emergency as it pertained to Iran. Presidents of both parties have declared and updated emergencies relating to instability in Syria.

What Presidents did in those situations varied—sometimes levying sanctions, sometimes seizing assets—but each time, it was accepted on a bipartisan basis as necessary, legitimate, and in defense of our national interests. What President Trump did was different. For the last 2 years, he has struggled to fulfill a campaign promise, so when he didn't get his way, he created a fake crisis and declared a phony emergency.

The good news is that the American people aren't buying it. A poll conducted earlier this month by Quinnipiac University found that 66 percent of voters oppose the President's end-run around Congress and oppose his fake emergency declaration.

Newspapers around the country have concluded the same thing. The Tampa Bay Times editorial board said it clearly a few days after the President's announcement, ''Border wall is no emergency.'' In their words, ''It is not a national emergency just because President Donald Trump didn't get his way.''

West Virginia's Herald Dispatch newspaper concludes much the same, urging the President to ''take a realistic look at whether the wall is needed or if it's simply an unnecessary quest to satisfy his ego.'' That is common sense, but then common sense seems to be in short supply in this White House.

Not only is the President declaring a fake emergency, but he is using that crisis to take money. The President has told us that he will take $6.5 billion that Congress gave to our troops and spend it instead on a wall on the southern border. He is proposing to delay or cancel $3.6 billion in military construction projects—projects that our military told Congress it needed less than a year ago—and divert it to his wall.

Last Friday, Senator SCHATZ and I sent a letter to Acting Secretary of Defense Patrick Shanahan demanding to know which projects have been deemed, due to political interference, as less important than the President's wall. There are almost 400 military projects at risk. They cover 43 States, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and more than a dozen foreign countries, including strong U.S. allies like Japan and the United Kingdom.

The President will have to cancel or postpone approximately 20 percent of these projects for his wall. What are we talking about?—$800 million for essential training facilities like National Guard Readiness Centers, simulators, and firing ranges in Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, and Montana, to name a few; $1.4 billion worth of maintenance-related projects, such as aircraft hangars, and vehicle maintenance shops in Arkansas, Indiana, Missouri, Oklahoma, and elsewhere; $1 billion worth of projects for medical and dental care facilities, schools for military families, military barracks and dining facilities in Arizona, Missouri, Texas, and beyond.

For instance, the Marine Corps needs a new rifle range at Parris Island, SC. This base trains 20,000 new Marine recruits every year. Also on the list is new training center at Fort Bragg, NC, to provide top-notch training and prevent injuries among our special operations forces. They are using old warehouse right now. Are we really going to tell our military that their needs are being put on hold so the President can fulfill his campaign promise to build a wall? I hope those aren't our priorities.

In addition, the President also announced that he would take $2.5 billion in other military funds for his wall. The Pentagon tells me that they may take some of this money from excess military pay and pensions. Meanwhile, each of the military services—Army, Air Force, Navy, and Marines—have met with me to discuss a long list of urgent, last-minute needs, but with $2.5 billion being diverted for the wall, none of those leaders were able to say whether or not they would get the funding they need.

Last year, Hurricane Florence damaged 800 buildings at Camp Lejeune, New River, and Cherry Point, causing $3.6 billion in damage from wind and flood waters. A similar hurricane leveled Tyndall Air Force Base, in Florida. Both of them could use billions right now for repairs.

I am also told that the Navy needs hundreds of millions of additional dollars for unexpected ship maintenance. We can't afford not to make sure our sailors are safe on deployment. The National Guard has 2,100 personnel on the border, but it is starting to run low on its pay account. Unless DOD finds $150–300 million this year, the Guard will have to cut short its summer trainings in all 50 States to pay for this.

My subcommittee has identified almost $5 billion in military priorities that need attention now, but after the President takes $2.5 billion to pay for his border wall, which priorities will get cut?

This week, Republicans and Democrats in the Senate should join the House in rejecting the President's phony emergency declaration, and the Senate should reject any effort by the President to take money from our troops to build the wall.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on the resolution of disapproval before us that would terminate President Trump's phony national emergency.

President Trump's national emergency declaration, which he attempts to justify using falsehoods about immigration and the Southern border, presents a serious threat to the separation of powers and the rule of law.

First I would like to speak about how there really isn't an emergency at the border, then I would like to get into the constitutional problems with the President's actions.

While illegal border crossings do occur, all of the numbers refute President Trump's claim that there is a crisis at the border. Those claims simply don't hold up.

Unauthorized border crossings have been at their lowest levels in years.

In 2000, border agencies reported more than 1.6 million apprehensions.

In 2017, the agency reported just 303,916 apprehensions, one-fifth of the level just two decades ago.

It is clear that investments in border security have worked. Those include additional border patrol agents, fencing in urban areas, ground sensors, drones, and increased use of E-Verify.

In addition, since 2014, two-thirds of undocumented immigrants have come to the United States legally but then overstayed their visas, more than 500,000 per year. A border wall would do nothing to curb visa overstays.

Dangerous criminals aren't overrunning our country.

Immigrants commit fewer crimes than native-born citizens. Data collected in Texas show the arrest rate for undocumented immigrants in 2015 was 40 percent lower than for the native-born population.

Additionally, many immigrants are actually legally seeking asylum through the process already in place. There are often families with young

children fleeing persecution and violence in Central America who have a legal right to petition our government for asylum.

Under current law, they can apply for asylum by presenting themselves at a U.S. port of entry. Unfortunately, by focusing on a border wall instead of investing in modernizing entry points, President Trump's policies force many of these families to turn themselves into Border Patrol in between ports and ask for asylum or wait for long periods in Mexico in dangerous conditions.

The timing of the President's declaration also undercuts his claim that this is an emergency.

President Trump kicked off his Presidential campaign nearly 4 years ago by claiming that immigrants were bringing drugs and crime to the United States. Despite this, he decided to wait until more than halfway through his term to declare his emergency and only then after Congress refused to give him the money he wanted.

If there were truly an emergency, the President should have declared it on day 1. He did not.

Trump also emphatically rejected a bill that would have given him $25 billion for a border wall in exchange for providing Dreamers a path to citizenship. Clearly, there was no emergency then either.

But the most clear statement that there is no emergency came from President Trump himself, who after declaring the emergency, said this in a Rose Garden speech: ''I didn't need to do this, but I'd rather do it much faster.''

We shouldn't judge the President's attempt to divert appropriated funds to his border wall through a partisan lens, but rather view it as a radical departure from our constitutional separation of powers.

Through its appropriations clause, the Constitution provides Congress, not the President, with the power of the purse. Congress decides how to spend taxpayer dollars.

By providing Congress with this power, our Founding Fathers imposed a key check on the President, a check that President Trump is trying to do away with.

Congress exercised its power of the purse last month in a spending bill to keep the government open by including $1.35 billion for border barriers, rather than the $6 billion the President sought for a border wall.

The Constitution gave the President two options at that point: sign the bill or veto it. President Trump tried to create a third path, saying he would sign the bill but still divert additional Federal dollars to the wall, his so-called emergency.

In essence, the President decided to violate the Constitution so he could more quickly fulfill a campaign promise to build his border wall.

One of the ironies of President Trump's decision to divert funds to a border wall that won't stop drugs or crossings is the pots of money from which he is drawing.

First, the White House said it would pull $2.5 billion from a counter-narcotics program that is used to support international law enforcement interdiction and apprehension efforts, as well as to fund National Guard support for State drug law enforcement operations, including in California.

Second, the White House said it would take another $3.5 billion from military construction projects.

These are programs that actually help improve our national security, and the President wants to take billions of dollars from them to build a wall—incredible.

The long-term danger here is that President Trump will set a precedent that a Commander in Chief can interpret the Nation's laws and the Constitution any way he wants. This can't be allowed to stand.

The National Emergencies Act of 1976 does allow the President to reprogram funds appropriated by Congress in case of a national emergency, like a hurricane or earthquake, but it is clear that the law was never intended to be used to explicitly overrule the will of Congress, which is how President Trump wants to use it.

During the Korean war, the Supreme Court struck down a similar attempt by President Truman to use emergency powers to seize privately owned steel mills, an action inconsistent with laws passed by Congress.

Even if there were an emergency—which there isn't—President Trump still wouldn't have the authority to reprogram Federal funds in this context.

Specifically, the statute that President Trump relies on, 10 U.S.C. §2808, allows the President, in a national emergency that ''requires the use of the armed forces,'' to spend unobligated military construction funds for military construction projects ''that are necessary to support . . . use of the armed forces.''

The situation at the border does not ''require the use of the armed forces,'' and it is unclear how the wall would be ''necessary to support'' them.

If anything, the President's use of the military at the border to enforce the law raises additional questions under the Posse Comitatus Act, which has prohibited the use of the Armed Forces for domestic law enforcement for well over a century.

In sum, President Trump is relying on an incredibly frail legal argument to justify this blatant power grab. It is incumbent upon Congress to hold this President accountable as he attempts to seize one of our most important powers.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution of disapproval and cancel President Trump's phony emergency.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. We have 1 minute remaining, I think. I ask unanimous consent to speak in leader time.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Thank you, Mr. President.

Today, the Senate will vote on the resolution to terminate the President's declaration of a national emergency.

Let me begin with a quotation.

> Revelations of how power has been abused by high government officials must give rise to concern about the potential exercise, unchecked by the Congress or the American people, of this extraordinary power. The National Emergencies Act would end this threat and ensure that the powers now in the hands of the Executive will be utilized only in a time of genuine emergency and then only under safeguards providing for congressional review.

Let me repeat that. ''[T]he powers now in the hands of the Executive will be utilized only in a time of genuine emergency.'' That is from the special committee report on the National Emergencies Act, which was passed decades ago.

The bottom line is very simple. We all know the other arguments—that this is not an emergency. The President himself said so. He said he didn't have to do this if he didn't want to. In previous emergencies, it was either apparent, like 9/11, or it was a disease or some other immediate disaster, and there was a long explanation as to why. We have gotten no explanation as to why this is an emergency.

The second reason, of course, is the money that might be taken away from the military—our brave men and women in uniform not getting the dollars they need—for this wall.

The third, of course, is that the President couldn't get his way through Congress even when we had 2 years of Republican leadership in the House, Senate, and White House, couldn't get his way this time, and is now simply going around Congress to declare an emergency.

But those reasons pale for the most important reason. This is a momentous day. The balance of power that the Founding Fathers put in place, so exquisitely designed, has served this Nation extremely well for over two centuries. That balance of power was in large part motivated by the fear of an overreaching Executive. The patriots had just fought King George. They knew what it was like to have an Executive who would go too far, and they put in precautions to make sure that didn't happen.

Today, we are being asked, in a way that we haven't been asked in decades, maybe even longer, to change that balance of power. And make no mistake about it—it will set an awful precedent for the future, no matter who is President. It will change it. If a President can invoke an emergency because he didn't get his way or she didn't get her way, without real cause, without a real emergency, woe is our Republic in many ways—the ways the Founding Fathers feared.

I know this is a very difficult vote for my friends on the other side of the

aisle—much more difficult than ours. We all know that the President is extremely popular in the Republican Party for maybe a few good reasons—I would say mostly bad, but he is. We know that he has been vindictive, contemptuous, calling out people who oppose him. So it is not an easy vote. I take my hat off to those Members on the other side of the aisle who have let principle rise above party, who understand what the Constitution requires this afternoon and have agreed to vote against this emergency.

I would plead with those others who haven't made up their minds to look at this moment in history. This is not an immediate moment. You can be for the wall or against the wall, you can think that what we are doing at the southern border is inadequate, but that issue pales before the issue before us; that is, how far an Executive can reach when Congress does not want to do what that Executive wants.

This is a crucial moment. This is a moment historians will look back on. This could be a moment that changes the fundamental balance of power in our government. So I would ask my colleagues—I would really plead with my colleagues. I understand the politics are difficult—much harder for you than for me—but our Nation, our Constitution, the beauty of this government demands that we rise to the occasion this afternoon. Please join us in rejecting this emergency and keeping our government with the same balance of power that has served us so well for two centuries.

I yield the floor.

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

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 49 Leg.]

YEAS—59

Alexander	Feinstein	Moran
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Bennet	Harris	Murphy
Blumenthal	Hassan	Murray
Blunt	Heinrich	Paul
Booker	Hirono	Peters
Brown	Jones	Portman
Cantwell	Kaine	Reed
Cardin	King	Romney
Carper	Klobuchar	Rosen
Casey	Leahy	Rubio
Collins	Lee	Sanders
Coons	Manchin	Schatz
Cortez Masto	Markey	Schumer
Duckworth	Menendez	Shaheen
Durbin	Merkley	Sinema
Smith	Udall	Whitehouse
Stabenow	Van Hollen	Wicker
Tester	Warner	Wyden
Toomey	Warren	

NAYS—41

Barrasso	Ernst	McSally
Blackburn	Fischer	Perdue
Boozman	Gardner	Risch
Braun	Graham	Roberts
Burr	Grassley	Rounds
Capito	Hawley	Sasse
Cassidy	Hoeven	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Hyde-Smith	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Inhofe	Shelby
Cramer	Isakson	Sullivan
Crapo	Johnson	Thune
Cruz	Kennedy	Tillis
Daines	Lankford	Young
Enzi	McConnell	

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 46) was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 20.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Bridget S. Bade, of Arizona, 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 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 Bridget S. Bade, of Arizona, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, David Perdue, Roy Blunt, John Cornyn, Joni Ernst, Lindsey Graham, John Boozman, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Steve Daines, James E. Risch, John Hoeven, Mike Crapo, Shelley Moore Capito, John Thune, Pat Roberts, Jerry Moran.

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.

RECOGNIZING THE DUTY OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO CREATE A GREEN NEW DEAL—Motion to Proceed

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 27, S.J. Res. 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 27, S.J. Res. 8, a joint resolution recognizing the duty of the Federal Government to create a Green New Deal.

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 legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 27, S.J. Res. 8, a joint resolution recognizing the duty of the Federal Government to create a Green New Deal.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. I withdraw the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019—Motion to Proceed

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 15, H.R. 268.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 15, H.R. 268, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

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 legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 15, H.R. 268, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, David Perdue, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, John Cornyn, Pat Roberts, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, John Thune, Richard Burr, Steve Daines, John Hoeven, James E. Risch, Roy Blunt, Susan M. Collins, Lisa Murkowski.

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 Senator from Nebraska.

NEBRASKA'S BOMB CYCLONE

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I would first like to address the harsh

and very inclement weather that is sweeping across the State of Nebraska.

My prayers are with the Nebraskans who have been affected by the damaging storm.

This massive storm they are calling a bomb cyclone has brought blizzard conditions, hurricane force winds, and dangerous floods to Nebraska. Some people have had to evacuate their homes. Others have been working tirelessly for the safety of their livestock.

I thank our emergency responders, the State, and local officials who are helping the citizens of our State during this time.

I want all Nebraskans to know that my office stands ready to assist you in any possible way.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SERGEANT CORY RYAN MRACEK

Mr. President, I rise to continue my tributes to the current generation of men and women who have lost their lives in Iraq and in Afghanistan while defending our freedom. Each of these Nebraska heroes has a special story to tell.

I recall today the life and service of SGT Cory Mracek, who was a native of Hay Springs, NE.

Though Cory spent most of his life in Hay Springs, he was born in Chadron, NE. Both of his parents, Pat and Jim, were born and raised in Nebraska as well.

As a young child, Cory was always trying to have a good time. He was often found either laughing or trying to make others laugh. Cory talked a lot, starting at age 1. Pat, his mother, fondly remembers that Cory was a curious child, and when they would go into stores, Cory would always touch different items because he wanted to know more about them. He was an easygoing kid, and he loved watching Sesame Street on a regular basis.

Cory was close to his grandfather, and they would often go places together and spend time together. Both of Cory's younger sisters, Stacy and Heather, came into the world when he was a young child, and he had a very close relationship with both of them. As is often the case with siblings, though, they sometimes quarreled.

Like many kids his age, Cory was fascinated by ''Star Wars'' and ''The Simpsons.'' The original ''Star Wars'' movies came out when Cory was young, and he had all kinds of ''Star Wars'' figurines and action figures around the house.

Cory attended several small schools in northwest Nebraska before enrolling in Hay Springs High School. Around the time Cory started high school, Michael Jordan was changing the sport of basketball all over the world. The Chicago Bulls' legend became Cory's sports hero. His bedroom was covered with Michael Jordan posters, basketball cards, and memorabilia.

During his high school years, Cory became involved in many extracurricular activities. Fishing was one of his favorites, and he would often go to nearby Walgren Lake, southwest of Hay Springs.

In high school, Cory was also involved in basketball and football, where he played fullback.

Pat vividly remembers when she worked in the eastern part of Nebraska one week so that Cory could attend Tom Osborne's Big Red Football School for 3 days. This was a popular football camp that many teenage boys in Nebraska participated in over the years.

At Hay Springs High, Cory wasn't too fond of actually going to school, but he was more than capable. He scored a 30 on his ACT, and his armed services vocational aptitude battery score was also exceptionally high.

After graduating from Hay Springs High School, Cory attended Chadron State College, just down the road from where he grew up. While at Chadron State, Cory had a hard time finding a good job. With his high marks on the test, Cory decided to enlist in the Nebraska Army National Guard. He graduated from basic training at Fort Sill, OK, in 1996.

After 1 year, Cory transferred to the Active Army because it provided him with a year-round job. Cory's military occupation specialty was 13-bravo or cannon crewmember for artillery, and he was stationed at Fort Campbell in Kentucky.

Immediately after joining the Active Army, Cory was deployed to South Korea for 1 year. He enjoyed his time in Korea, and he participated in the tradition of the Manchu Mile, a daunting, 24-mile march in full combat gear across Korea's mountainous terrain.

Cory was also involved in the honor guard.

In January of 2001, Cory returned home to Nebraska and transitioned back to the National Guard. Months later, the September 11 terrorist attacks changed our Nation and the world. The events of that fateful day ignited deep patriotism within Cory. While he and his parents were outside their home holding up candles in memory of the lives lost in the 9/11 attacks, Cory told his mom that he was going to transition back to the Active Army to serve his country.

In early 2002, Cory transitioned back to the Active Army from the Nebraska National Guard. Cory then deployed to Korea for a second time—this time for 15 months, serving near the demilitarized zone between North and South Korea.

When he returned from Korea, Cory was assigned to the 82nd Airborne Division at Fort Bragg and completed airborne school in November of 2003. Shortly after, Cory received notice that he was deploying to Iraq. Cory arrived in Iraq for his deployment in January of 2004. Pat had already sent care packages over for Cory so they would be there when he arrived.

On the morning of January 27, 2004, Pat instant-messaged with Cory to catch up and see how things were going. Later that same day, Cory and his reconnaissance platoon were performing a mission near Iskandariyah, Iraq. This particular area of Iraq saw major combat activity and sectarian violence from 2003 to 2007. During Cory's reconnaissance mission that day, his platoon came across an IED. Cory and two other U.S. servicemembers were killed by that explosion.

On Wednesday, February 4, 2004, at the Chadron State College gymnasium, more than 600 family members, friends, and military officials gathered to celebrate and honor the life, service, and sacrifice of SGT Cory Mracek. He was eulogized by many, including his two sisters, Stacy and Heather.

He was laid to rest at the Gordon City Cemetery next to his grandfather. The funeral procession from Chadron to Gordon was a short drive by western Nebraska standards—46 miles. From Chadron to Hay Springs to Rushville, people lined the streets to pay their respects, wave American flags, and salute Cory.

For quite some time, Cory's parents thought about the best way to memorialize him. Eventually, Pat came up with the perfect tribute: renaming the local Chadron, NE, post office after Cory. Pat had previously worked at the post office for 10 years, and she asked GEN Roger Lempke, Retired, who is now a member of my staff, how we could make this happen.

I had the privilege of working alongside former U.S. Senator Mike Johanns on legislation to rename the Chadron Post Office the ''Sergeant Cory Mracek Memorial Post Office.'' The bill was passed by Congress, and it was signed into law on November 2014.

To this day, Cory's mother, Pat, remains heavily involved in many veteran and military organizations. She is the president of Nebraska Gold Star Mothers and the cochair of the Honor and Remember Nebraska Chapter.

Both Pat and Cory's father, Jim, would like our Nation to remember how happy Cory was. He liked to laugh, have fun, and enjoy life.

I join Nebraskans and Americans across our country in saluting Cory's willingness to serve and the sacrifices he and his family made to keep us free, and I am honored to tell his story.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H. CON. RES. 24

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, this morning, something rather amazing and wonderful happened in the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives this morning passed a resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the full report by Special

Counsel Robert Mueller should be made available to the public and to Congress. The vote was 420 to 0. Not a single Member of the House, Democratic or Republican, voted no.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the record of the vote, including all 190 Republicans who voted yes, be printed in the RECORD.

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

FINAL VOTE RESULTS FOR ROLL CALL 125

(Democrats in roman; Republicans in italic; Independents underlined)

H. Con. Res. 24: Yea-and-Nay, 14-Mar-2019, 10:30 AM.

Question: On Agreeing to the Resolution.

Bill Title: Expressing the sense of Congress that the report of Special Counsel Mueller should be made available to the public and to Congress.

	Yeas	Nays	Pres	NV
Democratic	230			4
Republican	190		4	3
Independent				
Totals	420		4	7

YEAS 420

Abraham	Golden	Ocasio-Cortez
Adams	Gomez	*Olson*
Aderholt	*Gonzalez (OH)*	Omar
Aguilar	Gonzalez (TX)	*Palazzo*
Allen	*Gooden*	Pallone
Allred	Gottheimer	*Palmer*
Amodei	*Granger*	Panetta
Armstrong	*Graves (GA)*	Pappas
Arrington	*Graves (LA)*	Pascrell
Axne	*Graves (MO)*	Payne
Babin	*Green (TN)*	*Pence*
Bacon	Green (TX)	Perlmutter
Baird	*Griffith*	*Perry*
Balderson	Grijalva	Peters
Banks	*Grothman*	Peterson
Barr	*Guest*	Phillips
Barragán	*Guthrie*	Pingree
Bass	Haaland	Pocan
Beatty	*Hagedorn*	Porter
Bera	Harder (CA)	*Posey*
Bergman	*Harris*	Pressley
Beyer	*Hartzler*	Price (NC)
Biggs	Hayes	Quigley
Bilirakis	Heck	Raskin
Bishop (GA)	*Hern, Kevin*	*Reed*
Bishop (UT)	*Herrera Beutler*	*Reschenthaler*
Blumenauer	*Hice (GA)*	Rice (NY)
Blunt Rochester	*Higgins (LA)*	*Rice (SC)*
Bonamici	Higgins (NY)	Richmond
Bost	*Hill (AR)*	*Riggleman*
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hill (CA)	*Roby*
Brady	Himes	*Rodgers (WA)*
Brindisi	*Holding*	*Roe, David P.*
Brooks (AL)	*Hollingsworth*	*Rogers (AL)*
Brooks (IN)	Horn, Kendra S.	*Rogers (KY)*
Brown (MD)	Horsford	*Rooney (FL)*
Brownley (CA)	Houlahan	Rose (NY)
Buchanan	Hoyer	*Rose, John W.*
Buck	*Hudson*	Rouda
Bucshon	Huffman	*Rouzer*
Budd	*Huizenga*	*Roy*
Burchett	*Hunter*	Roybal-Allard
Burgess	*Hurd (TX)*	Ruiz
Bustos	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberger
Butterfield	Jayapal	Rush
Byrne	Jeffries	*Rutherford*
Calvert	Johnson (GA)	Ryan
Carbajal	*Johnson (LA)*	Sánchez
Cárdenas	*Johnson (OH)*	Sarbanes
Carson (IN)	*Johnson (SD)*	*Scalise*
Carter (GA)	Johnson (TX)	Scanlon
Carter (TX)	*Jordan*	Schakowsky
Cartwright	*Joyce (OH)*	Schiff
Case	*Joyce (PA)*	Schneider
Casten (IL)	Kaptur	Schrader
Castor (FL)	*Katko*	Schrier
Castro (TX)	Keating	Scott (VA)
Chabot	Kelly (IL)	*Scott, Austin*
Cheney	*Kelly (MS)*	Scott, David
Chu, Judy	*Kelly (PA)*	*Sensenbrenner*
Cicilline	Kennedy	Serrano
Cisneros	Khanna	Sewell (AL)

YEAS 420—Continued

Clark (MA)	Kildee	Shalala
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Sherman
Clay	Kim	Sherrill
Cline	Kind	*Shimkus*
Cloud	*King (IA)*	*Simpson*
Clyburn	*King (NY)*	Sires
Cohen	*Kinzinger*	Slotkin
Cole	Kirkpatrick	*Smith (MO)*
Collins (GA)	Krishnamoorthi	*Smith (NE)*
Collins (NY)	Kuster (NH)	*Smith (NJ)*
Comer	*Kustoff (TN)*	Smith (WA)
Conaway	*LaHood*	*Smucker*
Connolly	*LaMalfa*	Soto
Cook	Lamb	Spanberger
Cooper	*Lamborn*	*Spano*
Correa	Langevin	Speier
Costa	Larsen (WA)	Stanton
Courtney	Larson (CT)	*Stauber*
Cox (CA)	*Latta*	*Stefanik*
Craig	Lawrence	*Steil*
Crawford	Lawson (FL)	*Steube*
Crenshaw	Lee (CA)	Stevens
Crist	Lee (NV)	*Stewart*
Crow	*Lesko*	*Stivers*
Cuellar	Levin (CA)	Suozzi
Cummings	Levin (MI)	Swalwell (CA)
Cunningham	Lewis	Takano
Curtis	Lieu, Ted	*Taylor*
Davids (KS)	Lipinski	Thompson (CA)
Davidson (OH)	Loebsack	Thompson (MS)
Davis (CA)	*Long*	*Thompson (PA)*
Davis, Danny K.	*Loudermilk*	*Thornberry*
Davis, Rodney	Lowenthal	*Timmons*
Dean	Lowey	*Tipton*
DeFazio	*Lucas*	Titus
DeGette	*Luetkemeyer*	Tlaib
DeLauro	Luján	Tonko
DelBene	Luria	Torres (CA)
Delgado	Lynch	Torres Small (NM)
Demings	Malinowski	Trahan
DeSaulnier	Maloney, Carolyn B.	Trone
DesJarlais	Maloney, Sean	*Turner*
Deutch	*Marchant*	Underwood
Diaz-Balart	*Mast*	*Upton*
Dingell	Matsui	Van Drew
Doggett	McAdams	Vargas
Doyle, Michael F.	McBath	Veasey
Duffy	*McCarthy*	Vela
Duncan	*McCaul*	Velázquez
Dunn	*McClintock*	Visclosky
Emmer	McCollum	*Wagner*
Engel	McGovern	*Walberg*
Escobar	*McHenry*	*Walden*
Eshoo	*McKinley*	*Walker*
Espaillat	McNerney	*Walorski*
Estes	*Meadows*	*Waltz*
Evans	Meeks	Wasserman Schultz
Ferguson	Meng	Waters
Finkenauer	*Meuser*	*Watkins*
Fitzpatrick	*Miller*	Watson Coleman
Fleischmann	*Mitchell*	*Weber (TX)*
Fletcher	*Moolenaar*	*Webster (FL)*
Flores	*Mooney (WV)*	Welch
Fortenberry	Moore	*Wenstrup*
Foster	Morelle	*Westerman*
Foxx (NC)	Moulton	Wexton
Frankel	Mucarsel-Powell	Wild
Fudge	*Mullin*	*Williams*
Fulcher	Murphy	Wilson (FL)
Gabbard	Nadler	*Wilson (SC)*
Gallagher	Napolitano	*Wittman*
Gallego	Neal	*Womack*
Garamendi	Neguse	*Woodall*
Garcia (IL.)	*Newhouse*	*Wright*
Garcia (TX)	Norcross	Yarmuth
Gianforte	*Norman*	*Yoho*
Gibbs	*Nunes*	*Young*
Gohmert	O'Halleran	*Zeldin*

ANSWERED "PRESENT" 4

Amash	*Gosar*
Gaetz	*Massie*

NOT VOTING 7

Cleaver	*Marshall*	*Schweikert*
Hastings	McEachin	
Lofgren	*Ratcliffe*	

Mr. SCHUMER. Now, why did every Republican vote for this? That is because there is no good reason that the special counsel's report should not be made public. The American people are overwhelmingly for making the report public. They have a right to see it. No one should stand in the way of that. In fact, in the House, no one did. The only reason to not make this report public would be to cover up what is in it. What a shame that would be.

The Senate should pass this resolution with the same unanimity that the House did. The special counsel has been investigating one of the greatest affronts to our democracy—the deliberate interference by a foreign power in our elections. The American people have an undeniable right to see the results of that investigation for themselves, and so this resolution should pass.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 24, expressing the sense of Congress that the report of Special Counsel Robert Mueller be made available to the public and to Congress, which is at the desk; further, that the concurrent 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. Is there objection?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I will try to be very brief as far as where I am coming from here.

We were told that Mueller may be imminently fired. The President said some things that were at times disturbing about the investigation. I was asked many times, let's make sure we protect Mueller and let him do his job. So I first introduced the Special Counsel Independence Protection Act on August 3, 2017, with Republicans and Democrats.

To my good friend from New York, I think Mueller is just about done.

To all those who are worried about Mueller not being able to do his job, he has. He is about to tell us what he found.

There is a regulation that determines what is disclosed and how it is disclosed. I have all the confidence that Mr. BARR will be as transparent as possible. That regulation is specific. You can look at it for yourself. I would like to know as much as possible and share it with the public. However, I have also been consistent in trying to find balance here.

In February of 2018, I called for a special counsel to look at the abuses, potentially, by the Department of Justice and the FBI regarding the Clinton email investigation and the handling of the FISA warrant process against Mr. CARTER Page, someone associated with the Trump campaign.

So since 2018, I have asked a simple thing. If this stuff about Page and Strzok and Ohr doesn't bother you, then that bothers me. Were there two

systems of justice in 2016—one for the Democratic candidate and one for the Republican candidate, where the Republican candidate's campaign had a FISA warrant issued against somebody associated with it based on a document that was known to be unreliable, politically charged, on four different occasions? That should bother every American.

Rather than my telling you whether it happened or not, why don't we appoint a Mueller-like figure to look at how the Clinton email investigation ended up the way it did, what the tarmac meeting was all about between Loretta Lynch and Bill Clinton?

I can quickly say to my colleagues, if the shoe were on the other foot, if the Republican Party hired a foreign agent to go to Russia to investigate dirt on Hillary Clinton, gave it to the Justice Department, and it was used on four separate occasions to get a warrant against somebody working with or associated with the Clinton campaign, all hell would pay.

If a member of the Justice Department told the investigators: Before you get the warrant, the person who is involved in collecting this information hates Clinton; if there were exchanges between an FBI agent and a Department of Justice lawyer talking about getting an insurance policy to make sure that Hillary Clinton is never elected and how much they hated Trump, it would be front-page news all over the world.

I don't know what happened between Trump and Russia, but we are about to find out, and we will see if there is something there, and we will use a process to disclose it to the public.

But I ask the Democratic leader to modify his request and allow my amendment at the desk to make a simple change—and every Republican will be with me, if you wonder about how Republicans vote in the House—that this resolution be modified calling for the Attorney General to appoint a special counsel to investigate Department of Justice misconduct in the handling of the Clinton email investigation and in the handling of the FISA warrant process as it relates to warrants obtained on Carter Page and to publicly release the results of those investigations—be agreed to consistent with law. I ask that the resolution to be modified in accordance with this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. SCHUMER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I am deeply disappointed in my good friend from South Carolina. This amendment appears to be a pretext for blocking this very simple, noncontroversial resolution. Four hundred-twenty Members of the House voted for it. Congressman JIM JORDAN, a friend of the President's, voted for it. Congressman DEVIN NUNES, a friend of the President's, voted for it.

This resolution should pass the Senate in the blink of an eye. I have absolutely no idea why a Member of this body would object to this basic level of transparency, whatever their concern on other issues.

My friend from South Carolina says the report ought to be made public. Let's not stand in the way for other issues. He is chairman of the Judiciary Committee. He can deal with that separately but not block this resolution.

So let the American people know that the Republican majority in the Senate—at least for now—is blocking a resolution that the Mueller report should be made public. I hope my friend from South Carolina and all of my Republican colleagues take time over the recess to thinks about this. We are going to be back here asking for consent again when the Senate is back in session, and my Republican colleagues ought to think long and hard before they block this resolution again.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there an objection to the original request?

Mr. GRAHAM. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I thank Senator SCHUMER. I appreciate getting this done quickly.

I will just say, there are a lot of Americans, including JIM JORDAN, who believe that what happened in 2016 with the Clinton email investigation and the FISA warrant against Carter Page showed corruption at the highest level of the government. I agree that there are more than smoking guns here. There is overwhelming evidence that somebody outside the political system should look into. I can't find anybody much on the other side who seems to give a damn about that.

Mueller, I get. Mueller has been allowed to do his job. We are going to find out what he found pretty soon, as much as we can, consistent with the law. But I am not going to give up on the idea that we are just going to look at one problem of 2016. I have been talking to myself for the most part; now I have a forum.

I will introduce a resolution asking you to do a simple thing. Ask somebody outside of politics—a special counsel—to look into how in the world the system got so off track, to use a document prepared by foreign agent, paid for by the Democratic Party, collected in Russia, to obtain a warrant against an American citizen that is garbage to this day? How in the world could the investigation get so off track that the two people in charge of it openly talked about making sure that there was an insurance policy against Trump if he won and openly espoused support for Clinton. How do you interview Clinton the way she was interviewed? Any American out there who did what Secretary Clinton did you would see in jail now.

The question I want to know is, Does anybody other than me believe that? I don't ask you to believe me. We let Mueller look at all things Trump related to collusion and otherwise. Somebody needs to look at what happened on the other side and find out if the FBI and the DOJ had two systems—one supporting the person they wanted to win and one out to get the person they wanted to lose.

Some of these people have been fired for lying, and it is now time to have a special counsel look at all things 2016, not just Trump.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

2019 IDITAROD

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I am here on the Senate floor today to talk about a sporting event—an event that captures the attention of people not only in my State of Alaska but around the country and around the globe. I am talking about the ''Last Great Race on Earth.'' It is a pretty fancy, big, and impressive title for what really happens—the ultimate challenge with man, woman, and dogs—a 1,100-mile sled dog race from Anchorage to Nome, up north.

I will share with you all a picture that was taken at 3:39 a.m. on Wednesday morning, March 13. Obviously, it is the middle of the night. I know everybody thinks that it is always dark in Alaska this time of year, but it is not. This is at 3:39 a.m. on Wednesday, March 13. It is pitch dark. You can't really see it in this picture, but the snow is coming down. The wind is blowing. It is pretty dang cold. Temperatures are down in the teens, but you have some wind blowing. So it gets your attention.

What you are seeing here is Front Street in Nome, AK. At 3:30 in the morning, the street is packed. It is lined with hundreds of people who are cheering loudly. These are people from all over the country—fans, friends, and family who have come from across Alaska and flown into Nome. Some of them chartered an aircraft coming out of the YK Delta. They flew into Nome, a community of about 4,000 people, to witness this moment—to witness the moment that Pete Kaiser, born and raised in Bethel, AK, came into town with eight dogs in harness and came down the street to cross the finish line and claim victory as the 2019 Iditarod champion. He was just 12 minutes ahead of the defending champion, Joar Leifseth Ulsom, who is originally from Norway but who now lives with us in Alaska. This is probably one of the closest Iditarod races we have in some time.

Jessie Royer, of Fairbanks, a friend of my family and a great lady, came in at third place.

When you talk about the ''Last Great Race'' of 1,100 miles across extraordinary terrain, Pete Kaiser took 9 days, 12 hours, and 38 minutes to complete this—9 days, 12 hours, and 38 minutes.

Think about how you cover 1,100 miles on the back of a dog sled. Typically, with dogs, when you are moving

really fast, you are moving along at about 10 miles an hour, but you are going over some incredible terrain, and you are doing this not just between 8 and 5, but you are running the trail over the course of days and weeks.

Here is Pete Kaiser. He has just crossed the finish line. He has his hands thrown up in the air in celebration. He hugged his family. He wiped the tears from his face. It is one of those moments that he will always, always remember. The feeling is probably hard to fathom, but for Pete, a young man who grew up in Western Alaska, somebody who is often referred to as an encyclopedia of racing knowledge, somebody who is known in his community for his hard work and dedication, somebody who has now won the Kuskokwim 300 four times in a row—a race qualifier for the Iditarod—and for his family and his extended family who supported him, who cheered him along the way, and for so many in the community of Bethel who joined together, who chartered an aircraft to get there in time to see him finish and celebrate this achievement, this truly is a victory that is an accomplishment and an extraordinary highlight to a remarkable career.

So the excitement that comes when you are finishing a grueling race like this and when you and your team come across the line is something that you really have to experience to understand. There is fatigue, but there is great excitement with the accomplishment.

It is not just the accomplishment of the musher, because the musher would still be sitting back in Willow were it not for these extraordinary animals, which truly, truly live to run. They live to do this race and others like it.

Nothing beats the finish here. I don't have very many opportunities where I can actually be at the finish because you never quite know when it will be. Usually, race winners come in between 8, 9, or 10 days. So if you are starting on a Sunday, usually we finish during the week when we are back here working. So I haven't had the opportunity to be on that end, but I have had multiple opportunities—in fact, this is an opportunity that I do not miss—to be at the front end and to be at the start of the Iditarod.

So just 9 days prior, this is me and Pete Kaiser at the start of the Iditarod. He is looking pretty fresh in this picture. He probably didn't look quite so fresh after 9 days on the trail.

We gathered in downtown Anchorage with 52 mushers—that is how many mushers ran this year—and all of their teams. With the rules change this year, there were 14 dogs to a team at the start. But you are in downtown Anchorage, and you not only have your teams who are going to be moving you through the first day of the ceremonial start but you have your other dogs. So you have dogs, you have mushers, you have people, and you have kids. It is like a carnival atmosphere.

This year I had an opportunity to do something I have never done before, and that was to drive the tag sled of one of our four-time champions, Jeff King.

During the ceremonial start, you go from Anchorage to Campbell Creek Airstrip. It is an 11-mile portion of the trail. I can say that I did 1 percent of the Iditarod by driving on the back of this tag sled. I didn't have the dogs directly in front of me, but I still had to operate the brake on the sled. I still had to lean into the curves and still had the opportunity to experience just the majesty of the dogs in front of you and the way the mushers communicate with their team.

The Iditarod is a race like none other, and it is perhaps made so because of the challenge of the terrain that this race goes through. The journey that led the mushers through these valleys and across these mountain ranges is hard. It is challenging. The weather is not unlike the terrain. It was up, and it was down. We had areas along the trail where it was raining, and then we had areas where we had freezing temperatures. You had wind. You had snow. You had ice. So when you think about how much work it is to get through the burled arch, it is really a tremendous accomplishment to be able to say that you have completed this race.

As we speak, there are still dozens more mushers and their teams that are out along that trail working to complete it.

You might think that this is something where there is a significant prize, and that is what motivates people. Well, if you are successful and you finish the Iditarod, you will be able to claim $1,149. Your dogs are going to eat up that money pretty quickly. Most of this is so much for the love of mushing and the love of the animals.

People always ask: Well, how hard is it? What kind of challenges do the mushers encounter along the way?

It is everything from encounters with animals, whether it is a moose along the trail—and we have seen some bad outcomes from that—to just physical obstructions along the trail.

Richie Diehl of Aniak ran smack into a tree—literally, smack into a tree. He hit his face on the trail near Nikolai. He said he was kind of cruising along and he had his head turned. It was still dark. He looked forward and, bam, he ran into a tree.

He probably could have ducked if he noticed it, but he didn't, and then he was kind of knocked off. He did an all-out sprint to chase his team down and dove to catch his sled. He lined up the dog team, again got everybody organized, grabbed some toilet paper, some wet wipes, and started mushing down the trail as he wiped the bleeding off his skin. You are just not stopping. You are not stopping for yourself. For your dogs, if your dogs are injured, you absolutely stop.

Anja Radano of Talkeetna fell in a large hole in the ice crossing the infamous Dalzell ice hole. While she is making her way across the frozen river, her sled slipped into the hole. She falls into the water, and she injured her ribs and her legs. She had been having a little bit of a struggle along the trail, but she said she would not have been able to get out of the waterhole there without the help of her dog team.

Then there is Linwood Fiedler, who was on his way to Nikolai, and his entire dog team got separated from the sled when his biner broke, but, fortunately for him, there was a fellow musher coming up, Mats Pettersson, who shows up on the trail shortly after. He helped him get his whole team, and potentially—potentially—saved the lives of these dogs.

You have trail conditions that are hard this year, and part of the trail, quite honestly, because of the warmer weather we have seen, they were what we call tusset, which is just mounds of hard, matted grass in just kind of a bumper strip all the way going through. It is very hard on sleds. There were a couple of mushers who took 30 hours to go through this one stretch, and they ultimately decided enough and scratched.

You have the terrain. You also have the fact that you are going all out for days on end, and limited sleep has its effect. We heard some comments from Lance Mackey, who is a four-time Iditarod champ. He was talking about how he was imagining things on the trail, a little bit of a hallucination, seeing and hearing things that aren't there, thinking he was hearing people say, ''Go, Lance,'' as he was making the run between Rohn and Nikolai. You have to do all you can to keep yourself awake because you are in the back of a sled.

Remember, you are not sitting down. This is not all comfy and cozy for 1,100 miles. You are standing on the back of the sled. Oftentimes, you are running along or walking along behind. You are helping your dogs move through. You have to constantly replenish yourself and your dogs, and that means taking trail snacks and drinking nonstop.

There is always a question about what everybody eats. Aliy Zirkle, who has come in fourth, attributes her diet to rolled oat bars made out of peanut butter, banana, sesame seeds, and other things because they are easy, and they don't get frozen. You have to think about things like how do I eat while I am still moving and things don't get frozen.

They do have an opportunity to get some good meals. They get wined and dined, if you will, when they get to a checkpoint. When you are in a village, you have the kids come out, and everybody is looking for autographs. They want to say hello to them. They want to find out what position everybody is in, but they also, oftentimes, get a warm meal like a stew, but before the humans eat—before the mushers eat, the dogs have to eat. The dogs have to

be cared for. The dogs have to be taken care of first because life on the trail is taking care of the dogs. They are making sure they have a warm and a comfortable place to rest, are fed, and they are watered. They are checked out by the veterinarians.

This is one thing that is pretty interesting. People think, well, you are just going into a town. A lot of these places, it is not a town. It is not like you can just go to a tap and fill up your dog bowls for water for your dogs. Now, your dogs have been on the trail for several hours. They are thirsty. They have been eating snow along the way, but they are thirsty. They need to be hydrated.

If you are out on the trail and you have 14 or 15 dogs, what do you do? You melt snow or you melt ice. Where is the stove? Well, you have your little camp stove that you have in the back of your sled. Think about it. You are sleep-deprived, you are hungry, you are tired, but you have to take care of your dogs first. You put your straw down to bed them down. You check their feet, and you put dry booties on them. You melt the water. You have to then heat up the dog food that has been dropped along the way in places where you know your team is going to be stopping. You could be working with your dogs for a good hour before you can even start thinking about yourself and how you satisfy your hunger, your thirst, your sleep.

It is a pretty amazing race. Again, I am just in awe of the animals. I am in awe of the mushers. I am also in awe of the many, many, many, many people who come to be volunteers for it, this race. Most people have no idea what it takes to pull off a race like this, but I am told there are more volunteers who help us at this race than any other organized race like this in the country.

What we have is a volunteer Air Force, if you will. Those stashes of food I talked about, those don't get there by accident. There is no road to drive them by, so you have pilots who will volunteer to take whatever it is, straw for bedding or big coolers and containers of food, to the various checkpoints. They will drop them off so they are pre-positioned out there, but those guys, they are all volunteers.

At the banquet in Nome, at the end of this week, the people who put on the banquet are volunteers not necessarily from Nome but from all over the country. The last time I was up there, I went back in the kitchen to say thank you to the men and women who were working there. They all had their little nametags, and they say where they are from. There is a whole group who was from a little town in Florida. They had all taken a week's vacation from their work to come up and just be there for the Iditarod, to welcome the mushers coming in.

I asked: What do you do here as a volunteer? They said: We are in charge of rolls and butter. Ok. But this is how much of a commitment they have made to this race. They have been doing it for years. They are a group who just comes up from Florida, they cash in their miles, they take leave from work, and this is where they take their vacation because they realize this is such an extraordinary happening. You have volunteers from all over the country, from Canada, and the communities along the trails.

The veterinarians. There are 50 veterinarians along the trail because at the checkpoints, the dogs must be checked by the vets. We are going to take care of those animals and make sure—so you have veterinarians; you have dog handlers; and you have vet techs who come from across the Nation. They are there volunteering their time to be at this extraordinary event.

Again, the pilots who fly to drop the supplies are volunteers. They act as race judges. They aid in the event of an injury or a lost dog. The list goes on and on and on in terms of those who volunteer. Ultimately, it simply could not happen were it not for the volunteers who put the extra mile in to make it happen.

So today we are celebrating and acknowledging the efforts of all those who pitched in to help, the fans who cheered on the teams throughout the race, the communities that served as hosts along the way, and all the mushers and all their teams who put their hearts and put their souls into this really tough but incredible expedition.

We, in Alaska, are all congratulating Pete Kaiser on his win. He is the only musher from the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta since the inaugural Iditarod back in 1973. He is the first Yup'ik Iditarod champion in the history of the Iditarod race. He is an incredibly humble man. He is a great role model. He is an inspiration to his community, and I know they are all exceptionally proud.

After he won, Pete said he hoped his victory would be celebrated not just by the Yup'ik people within his region but by all Native people throughout Alaska.

So, Pete, I think, we are here to tell you that today, Alaskans in the western part of the State, all over the State, including as far away as Washington, DC, are all celebrating and recognizing you and your extraordinary canine athletes.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

SUNSHINE WEEK

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, we are celebrating an important week in our system of self-government. This week is known as Sunshine Week. For the last 14 years, advocacy groups, good government watchdogs, and media organizations have joined forces to observe the importance of transparency and freedom of information. With transparency and freedom of information, there is more accountability in government. As a long-time champion of an open, accessible government, I speak today in support of those enduring principles.

Sunshine Week coincides each year with March 16. That is the day one of the Nation's Founding Fathers and fourth President of the United States was born. That person was James Madison, widely known as the Father of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

From his writings in the Federalist Papers, it might be said that he was the architect who framed our system of checks and balances. Madison believed all powers of the government are derived of, by, and for the people. That is what brings me to the floor today.

The public has a right to know what their government is doing and how their government is spending the taxpayers' dollars. What is more, the American people owe a debt of gratitude to our fellow citizens who bravely come forward, often at great professional risk, to report wrongdoing in government. We ought to expect that out of government employees or any fellow citizen who knows something is wrong.

I am here today to talk about a ray of sunlight coming from the Defense Department. More specifically, I want to alert you about the whistleblower hotline managed by the inspector general. Once in a while, good news comes out of that Department.

I spend a lot of time on government oversight. Congressional oversight is part of our constitutional assignment to protect the power of the purse and to ensure that the laws we pass are faithfully executed.

My sights are set quite often on the Pentagon when it comes to oversight. The U.S. military is the strongest and mightiest in the world. Our men and women in uniform put their lives on the line to protect our sacred freedoms. Each of us should be fighting tooth and nail to make sure that they have the resources they need. I am not, however, talking about writing blank checks; I am talking about making sure that defense dollars are spent wisely.

The Pentagon shoulders a strategic and vital mission for America but is by no means infallible—not by a long shot. As with almost any bureaucracy or corporate organization, its workplace culture dictates that each individual should go along to get along, and that is not how it should be. Institutional foot-dragging at the Pentagon, for example, has hampered efforts to root out sexual misconduct. You read about it too often. A systemic bookkeeping system has plagued the Department of Defense for decades.

Nevertheless, I keep pressing the Pentagon to fix this fiscal mess. Every

dollar lost to waste, fraud, and abuse is a dollar that could be put to better use for our men and women in uniform for better housing, as just one example.

I learned long ago that one of the best ways to expose wrongdoing is by listening to whistleblowers. Whistleblowers are the ones who have their noses and ears to the ground day in and day out. They are patriots doing their job in reporting wrongdoing. These patriots know the difference between right and wrong. So when their good conscience compels them to come forward, we should hear them out, and we need to encourage others to do the same.

Whistleblowers within the Defense Department help weed out improper payments, procurements, fraud, and other unethical schemes and misbehaviors that come at taxpayers' expense and the expense of military preparedness.

As cofounder and cochairman of the Whistleblower Protection Caucus, I lead efforts from Capitol Hill to strengthen protections and raise awareness for what is often an uphill battle for whistleblowers. In the rigid command of the U.S. military, the civilian workforce and uniformed members of the military are trained to follow protocol and to respect the chain of command. Instead of receiving a pat on the back for exposing wrongdoing, too many of these whistleblowers face retribution and reprisal. I often say they are treated like skunks at a picnic.

That brings me to the DOD whistleblower hotline, a vital conduit for whistleblower complaints. Once again, there is some good news about DOD and whistleblowers and trying to improve things there in a November IG report. It shows the huge backlog of tips has been reduced. You could say that it is a glimmer of hope in an otherwise swamp of secrecy.

You see, the report also exposes the bad news. The playbook of Federal authority—defend, delay, and deny—is alive and kicking. From fiscal years 2013 to 2018, the Office of the Inspector General found the number of reports tripled. It also showed the number of reprisal complaints doubled.

The report found that 350 Defense Department officials, most of them in the branches of the Armed Forces, retaliated against and sought to intimidate 195 whistleblowers. I can't speak about 195 cases, but I will bet, in many cases, many higher-ups in the chain of command would be embarrassed, and that is why it wasn't reported, and that is why these folks were retaliated against. This tells me also that higher-ups who are accused of retaliating against whistleblowers are going unpunished.

Consider, about 85 percent of the people who reported wrongdoing and faced professional punishment or personal embarrassment are still waiting for any remedy according to this inspector general report.

This sends a very unsubtle signal to whistleblowers: Blow the whistle at your own risk. When the top dogs who dish out retribution go unpunished, and some are even promoted, the message to the rank and file is loud and clear: Blow the whistle at your own risk.

Nearly 2 years ago, I came to the floor of the Senate to sound the alarm on this very subject. At that time I shared statistics from a 2016 IG report. It listed 406 hotline cases that had been open for more than 2 years. Nobody is in a hurry to do anything about wrongdoing in the Defense Department when things like that can accumulate. More than half of those 406 cases—246 cases to be exact—had been open for more than 1,000 days, and some had been lying around for 4 years. So back when I gave that speech a couple of years ago, I noted that the IG's office wasn't moving the needle, despite increases in personnel and money in the IG's office. The workforce-to-workload ratio was mismatched. Cases were adding up, and the corrosive workplace culture within the IG was a festering sore. Allegations of tampering with investigations and whitewashing cases were tarnishing the reputation of the premier whistleblower oversight unit at the Pentagon. Congressional watchdogs, like myself, should not have to watch the Pentagon watchdogs to keep oversight on track.

As I said, there is some good news. Things seemed to turn the corner when Acting Inspector General Fine recognized the antics of a bureaucracy run amuck.

I am glad to see a ray of sunlight coming from the IG's office. However, we still aren't out of the woods.

I want to thank those in the IG's office who are toiling to reduce this hotline backlog; however, the DOD needs to step up and face the music. DOD needs to own these failures in letting retaliators off the hook.

Failing to hold these folks accountable is a huge slap in the face to those in the Department who are performing their responsibilities every day with dedication and excellence, being patriotic people, blowing the whistle, and pointing out waste, fraud, and abuse.

It also happens to be a slap in the face of the taxpayers. It is telling these patriotic whistleblowers: Thanks but no thanks. Feel free to disclose your report, but we may press the mute button after processing the claim.

Make no mistake about it—the hotline becomes meaningless if whistleblowers lack confidence in the system. They will stop calling and stop reporting waste, fraud, and abuse.

My advice to Inspector General Fine is this: Put some mustard on it, and add some hot sauce while you are at it. Get down to the brass tacks, and recommend disciplinary action against those who retaliate against patriotic people pointing out waste, fraud, and abuse.

In closing, I would like to share a tip with the Department of Defense. This U.S. Senator will continue shining the spotlight on waste, fraud, and abuse at the Pentagon—and, of course, elsewhere—and I will continue advocating for whistleblowers with every tool at my disposal.

As an Iowa farmer, I know what a load of manure smells like. I am also very aware of why farmers make hay when the sun shines, and that is a very good lesson for good government. Sunshine helps hold government accountable to the American people, and that is why we celebrate Sunshine Week this week and every year now for, I think, 14 years—because Sunshine Week promotes openness and transparency in government.

That is why the Congress passed the Physician Payments Sunshine Act in 2010. This law establishes a mandatory national disclosure program in which drug and medical device manufacturers report payments to prescribers in teaching hospitals. However, it appears that some parties may not be disclosing this information.

That is why, in addition to what I told you about overseeing things in the Defense Department, it is necessary to call out HHS and CMS to be forthcoming about whether opportunities exist for us to work together to strengthen the law where all these things aren't being reported as they should be. Sunshine is the best disinfectant.

FREE TRADE

Mr. President, lastly, I would like to talk about free trade for a minute. I am calling on the administration to promptly remove the section 232 tariffs on steel and aluminum imports from Canada and Mexico. This will help clear the path for the United States-Mexico-Canadian Agreement to be ratified in all three countries. These tariffs and their retaliation are having a negative impact on Americans. The United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement is supposed to be a free-trade agreement, but we don't have free trade with these tariffs in place.

As chairman of the Committee on Finance, I look forward to helping the President with this important task. And a little bit of advice for the President would come this way: I think he imposed tariffs on Mexican and Canadian steel and aluminum because he didn't think they were going to negotiate and said that is why he put the tariffs on. Obviously they negotiated in good faith because the President said he has a very good agreement. I happen to agree that he has a very good agreement. So wouldn't you think, then, that the tariffs ought to come off?

Somebody down at the White House recently told me: Well, you can't conflate the tariffs on aluminum and steel with the USMCA agreement. Well, don't tell me you can't conflate them when you conflate them when you say to the other side: If you don't negotiate, we are going to put these tariffs on.

I think there is a clear path to getting this done.

The President is concerned about the transshipment of steel from China, through Canada, into the United States, which obviously wouldn't be fair. They are concerned, as well, about surges in exports to the United States.

I think he would find Prime Minister Trudeau very open to receiving assurances that if the House of Commons in Canada moves ahead with approval of it, these tariffs would go off. At the same time, I think they will get assurances from the Canadian Government that they will make sure transshipment from China, through Canada, to the United States won't happen and that surges in exports won't happen as well.

If we can get the Canadian Government to approve this agreement, it seems to me it is going to be a lot easier to get through the Congress of the United States. And I think that just as soon as Mexico changes some labor laws they promised they would change to make labor more fair and less unfair to the American worker, I think the Mexican Senate will approve this agreement. But time is a factor here because Canada has to get this all done before they adjourn in June for their October elections.

It seems to me that when the President says he has a good agreement—and there is a certain amount of anxiety out there about all these trade negotiations that are going on—we could get this thing settled pretty fast and reduce that anxiety, and we could make sure we enhance our economy more than the fine policies of this President, through taxes and through deregulation, have already improved the economy and keep it growing.

I would ask the President to consider moving this as fast as he can and get off of this business of negotiating trade and tariffs for quotas because that is not much better for the United States and not much better even for the Canadians, and it isn't going to satisfy the Canadians that they can move ahead before their election.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, Democrats have put forward proposals claiming that it is the duty of the Federal Government to create a so-called Green New Deal.

My colleagues have listed a variety of goals, like net-zero greenhouse gas emissions within a decade, good jobs for all, and a sustainable environment and infrastructure, but they haven't proposed any specific policy changes or a roadmap of how to reach these goals. The reason for that is clear. As the resolution's authors have said, these proposals would require a massive Federal Government takeover and reorganization of our country as a whole. We are learning that what it would take to accomplish these goals is unrealistic. We should call the Green New Deal exactly what it is—an attack on what should be the limited role of the Federal Government in our lives.

I want to address Nebraskans directly, and I want to analyze a few details that are part of this resolution's attack on rural America, which is an attack on Nebraska because our State's economy and the well-being of all Nebraska families is reliant on a strong agricultural economy.

One section of the resolution speaks to our Nation's agriculture sector. Properly managing our environment is important, and Nebraska's agricultural producers who feed and fuel our world know better than anyone about conservation and stewardship. This is a serious issue, and it deserves a serious and a sensible approach.

The early fact sheets that came out describing the Green New Deal offered mind-boggling proposals, like eliminating cows. This idea was so ridiculous that the Democrats balked and distanced themselves from this concept. In fact, while the Nebraska Democratic Party announced their support for the Green New Deal, Nebraska's Democratic Party chairman recently apologized to fellow Nebraskans for the anti-agriculture ideas that are included in it.

Tom Vilsack, a former Iowa Governor and former Secretary of Agriculture in the Obama administration, was spot-on with his comments about the greatness of American agriculture during a congressional hearing in 2016. He pointed this out:

> Every one of us that's not a farmer, is not a farmer because we have farmers. We delegate the responsibility of feeding our families to a relatively small percentage of this country. Eighty-five percent of what's grown in this country, it's raised by 2- to 300,000 people. It is an incredible freedom that we take for granted . . . and rather than being criticized, we ought to be celebrating these people . . . and we don't do it enough.

I could not agree more. Nebraska farmers and ranchers feed a hungry world. Our soybeans, dairy, wheat, pork, eggs, and potatoes reach family dinner tables around the globe.

Nebraska is known as the Beef State. We are the No. 1 exporter of beef in the Nation. In 2017, Nebraska exported well over $1 billion in beef products. Our beef producers are known around the globe as the best at what they do.

Here are some facts.

Fact: According to a recent USDA report, beef production accounts for only 3.3 percent of all greenhouse gas emissions in the United States.

Fact: According to a Smithsonian article published in 2016, wetlands account for nearly 22 percent of global methane emissions. I would suggest to you that no one wants to eliminate wetlands.

Nebraska ag producers care for our land and our water, and our cattle producers already have elevated levels of water regulations. For example, our feedlots must maintain a livestock waste control facility permit from the Nebraska Department of Environmental Quality. Existing and new livestock operations must be inspected by the DEQ to determine if a waste control facility construction permit is required. Our producers also need a national pollutant discharge elimination system permit if their livestock facility has the potential to discharge into surface waters.

As I said, Nebraska is the Beef State, but we are also the Cornhuskers, and the two go hand-in-hand. Nebraska is a top producer of corn, and that corn is fed to livestock and establishes Nebraska as the No. 1 cattle on feed State in the Nation. Our producers do this while conserving our natural resources—our land and our water.

Consider this: The Omaha-based Lindsay Corporation recently developed a tool that connects to the center pivot irrigation system and remotely controls the water based on the irrigation prescription for each individual field. The company estimated that since the tool was launched, it has saved over 21 billion gallons of water, over 34 million kilowatt hours of energy, and over 57 million pounds of carbon dioxide emissions globally.

Nebraska also has a unique system of 23 natural resources districts. The districts are managed by locally elected boards. The boards have tax levy authority to support conservation efforts tailored to each of the district's unique needs. Through this process, we regulate our groundwater more than any other State, and it is an effective use because our local communities are the ones in control. No other State in the country has this advanced form of ground and surface water management. Because of the adoption of more efficient irrigation systems by our corn and soybean producers, water applied in three natural resources districts in Nebraska has decreased significantly, conserving our water.

Nebraska's producers also take good care of our soil. Our natural resources districts can require landowners to manage soil erosion on their land and connect them with cost-sharing programs to help implement effective soil management practices. The use of planned grazing on our ranches—my family's ranch included—improves the amount and the diversity of grass available to cattle, and cattle improve the overall health of that rangeland.

The Natural Resources and Conservation Service estimated that soil erosion and planned or, as some call it, rotational grazing practices have saved over $80 million in annual damages from flooding or erosion. Additionally, with the adoption of no-till farming practices in row crop production, combined with cover crops like millet and rye, we have vastly improved the health of our soil.

The bottom line is this: Ag producers are conservationists who utilize proven practices to manage our land and water resources.

As more facts have come out, we have learned that the cost alone of the Green New Deal is astounding. One estimate by the American Action Forum

found that if the deal were fully enacted, it would cost anywhere from $51 trillion to $93 trillion over the next 10 years—$93 trillion. That is a staggering expense that our families, our businesses, and our economy simply cannot afford.

One of the main goals of the Green New Deal is a mandate to move our country to 100 percent renewable energy and achieve carbon neutrality within the next decade. The American Action Forum's estimate warns that households would shoulder this weight with up to a nearly $4,000 increase in their yearly electric bills, and if our country relied on foreign energy, those rates would skyrocket even higher.

Higher electricity bills are a concern for me, and they are a concern for Nebraska families, but my colleagues across the aisle don't seem fazed. Recall that in 2009, former President Obama said he was willing to have the average household pay nearly $1,600 per year to reduce carbon emissions by 15 percent. Hard-working families said then that they could not afford that. So how can people now afford up to spending $4,000 a year?

Attempting to move to all renewable energy would also mean shutting down every nuclear, coal, and natural gas plant. According to some estimates, this would cost Nebraskans and the American people $7 trillion by 2030. If we eliminated the use of natural resources like gas, oil, and coal production, the United States would rely on other countries to supply our energy.

The United States leads all G20 countries with the best record of carbon dioxide emissions reduction in recent years. From 2005 to 2017, the United States reduced carbon dioxide emissions by 862 million tons—a 14-percent cut. Comparatively, in the same timeframe, India increased its carbon emissions by 1.3 billion tons, and China raised its emissions by 4 billion tons—a 70-percent increase. Though China is moving toward plants with higher efficiency, China already accounts for nearly half of the global coal consumption.

The Green New Deal misses a crucial point: The United States is already making voluntary changes to lead the world in reducing carbon dioxide emissions. A line from the 16-page resolution reads that the Green New Deal would include ''overhauling transportation systems in the United States to remove pollution and greenhouse gas emissions.''

A background document released by the Green New Deal's author called for a plan to build out high-speed rail and replace every combustion engine vehicle at a scale where air travel stops becoming necessary. As chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee's Transportation and Safety Subcommittee, I welcome all commonsense, bipartisan proposals to improve our infrastructure so that we can provide the safe and efficient movement of our people and our goods.

Yet the Green New Deal is a far cry from a commonsense proposal. The call to replace every combustion engine wouldn't just hurt our Nation's infrastructure; it would mean scrapping our personal cars and the commercial trucking industry. It would mean eradicating planes and air travel altogether. Don't forget that we are a Nation of vastness. Light rail is not feasible. It is not feasible in many parts of our country, and people in sparsely populated areas have a right to receive services, participate in commerce, and have transportation options that meet their unique needs.

In closing, as the activists continue to push their wish lists, I am going to continue to focus on addressing those regulations that make life difficult for families and businesses in Nebraska. Excessive regulations cause our ag producers to focus on mountains of paperwork instead of on ways to innovate and implement new practices so they can continue being good stewards of our land. The key to finding realistic solutions in addressing carbon dioxide emissions lies in the hands of America's innovators, not in the heavy hand of the Federal Government through an economic takeover.

In moving forward, I am going to work on updating the aging infrastructure that our citizens rely on in their everyday lives. I am going to fight for policies that will help to promote economic growth and help families across this country provide for their loved ones, and I will continue to highlight the good work our farmers and ranchers are doing to protect our air, water, land, and wildlife.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

THE GREAT LAKES

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the need to vigorously protect the Great Lakes.

The Great Lakes are a vital natural resource not only for my home State of Michigan but for the entire Nation. In addition to providing drinking water for nearly 40 million people, the Great Lakes serve as an economic engine for our entire country. This freshwater system is associated with adding nearly $6 trillion to the U.S. GDP while supporting millions of jobs. It accounts for more than 50 percent of all U.S.-Canadian border trade and facilitates the shipping of over 200 million tons of cargo every year.

But ask Michiganders what the Great Lakes mean to them, and they will tell you that they are a great deal more than simply a source of commerce; the Great Lakes literally define our State. They not only define our borders but who we are among the States. We are, in fact, the Great Lakes State. We love to spend our summers on or near the lakes and, in the process, form the family memories that we hold for a lifetime. It is no exaggeration to say that for Michiganders, the Great Lakes are part of who we are. It is in our DNA.

Over the years, Democrats and Republicans alike have understood the importance of maintaining the vitality of the Great Lakes. That is why, in 2004, President George W. Bush signed an Executive order to promote a Great Lakes regional collaboration.

Then, in 2010, President Obama built on his predecessor's leadership. In his very first budget request, President Obama called for the funding for what would later be known as the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative. The GLRI today remains a bipartisan success story because it provides a platform for Federal Agencies and States to come together to address the biggest threats to our lakes.

Let me give you a few examples of the positive impact that the GLRI has had in my home State of Michigan.

In Deer Lake, near Ishpeming in the Upper Peninsula, GLRI funds were used to successfully eliminate mercury runoff that had contaminated local wildlife. Over just a few years, these funds were used to restore the natural habitat, and as a result, Deer Lake was no longer considered a Federal area of concern.

Thanks to the support of the GLRI, sufficient improvements were made to prevent runoff at the Gloede Drain in the Clinton Township of Macomb County, reducing flooding and soil erosion in an area that many Michiganders call home.

In Detroit, 30 steel mills, oil refineries, chemical manufacturers, and other plants discharged pollutants into the Detroit River for decades. However, with the implementation of $89 million worth of GLRI waterway cleanup projects, the water quality has improved, and Detroit now has a thriving and vibrant downtown RiverWalk that has become an economic engine for small businesses.

There is no question the GLRI is a proven success and has been vital to Michigan's environment and to Michigan's economy. Yet, despite this success, President Trump, once again, is willing to risk the health, safety, and vitality of one of the world's largest freshwater systems by proposing a 90-percent cut—yes, a 90-percent cut—to the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative. Unfortunately, this is not the first time. Since taking office, President Trump has tried to eliminate the funding to the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative each and every year he has been in office, and each and every year, Congress has united in a bipartisan way to ensure that this critical program remains funded.

Let me be clear. Slashing GLRI funding would have an immediate and catastrophic impact on the future of the Great Lakes and on both the nearly 10 million Michiganders whom I represent as well as our entire country.

I again ask my Senate colleagues for their support. The Great Lakes are not just a Michigan priority; they are not just a regional priority—they are truly a national priority. Fully funding the

Great Lakes Restoration Initiative should never be a partisan issue—it is simply the right thing to do—and, together, we can protect the Great Lakes for this generation and future generations to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of Calendar No. 67; that the nomination be confirmed; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

The nomination considered and confirmed is as follows:

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Coast Guard Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203(a):

To be captain

Alexander C. Foos

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 97, 104, and 106.

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

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of William I. Althen, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission for a term of six years expiring August 30, 2024. (Reappointment); Marco M. Rajkovich, Jr., of Kentucky, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission for a term of six years expiring August 30, 2024; and Arthur R. Traynor III, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission for a term expiring August 30, 2022.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Althen, Rajkovich, and Traynor nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 91 and 96.

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

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Rodney Hood, of North Carolina, to be a Member of the National Credit Union Administration Board for a term expiring August 2, 2023, and Todd M. Harper, of Virginia, to be a Member of the National Credit Union Administration Board for a term expiring April 10, 2021.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Hood and Harper nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 59.

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

The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Donald W. Washington, of Texas, to be Director of the United States Marshals Service.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Washington nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 63, 64 and 66.

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

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Janice Miriam Hellreich, of Hawaii, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2024; Robert A. Mandell, of Florida, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2022; and Bruce M. Ramer, of California, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2024.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Hellreich, Mandell, and Ramer nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

TRIBUTE TO CLIFF KELLEY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in 1963, Leonard and Phil Chess, brothers and

owners of the legendary Chess Records, bought WHFC-AM 1450 with the goal of promoting their company. They renamed the station WVON—Voice of the Negro. This tiny station with just 1,000 watts of power became a broadcast hit, giving a voice to marginalized communities in the Chicagoland area. Much of their airwaves were filled with music, but politics wasn't far behind.

WVON hosted legends like Robert Kennedy, Jackie Robinson, and Reverend Martin Luther King. King used this station as his bully pulpit to organize around housing and job discrimination. It was Reverend Jesse Jackson that called into the station to report of King's assassination. When riots happened on Chicago's West Side, it was the disc jockeys of WVON that went out with loudspeakers on trucks to calm things down. WVON is a station of history and eventually became more than the Voice of the Negro, it became the Voice of the Nation.

For the last 25 years, my friend Cliff Kelley has been a true voice of the Nation as host on WVON. He has been the ''Governor of Talk Radio'' and formed a bond with listeners that is rare. At the end of this month, he will be stepping down from his daily show, but he will continue hosting his weekly American Heroes show for veterans. Cliff will serve as a community ambassador and a regular fill-in host.

Cliff is a native of Chicago's South Side and a graduate of Englewood High School, Roosevelt University, and John Marshall Law School. Before hosting his show, Cliff served 16 years as a former 20th Ward Chicago alderman. He championed racial equality, was an elected school board member, and a pioneer for LGBTQ rights. He fought for LGBTQ rights long before it was popular.

Cliff continued as a voice of conscience and community as well as a radio personality. He covered stories that weren't in the papers. His show helped launch countless people's careers, including Senators, Governors, congressmen, business leaders, and a President. A former colleague you may remember guest hosted his show quite a few times when Cliff went on vacation. He was a State Senator at the time, but Barack Obama always had time for Cliff's show as a guest or a host.

Luckily for us, Cliff's voice is still going to be heard today. We honor Cliff's decades of daily radio work, but we know that, as long as there are battles for justice to be waged, Cliff Kelley will lead the fight.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD–423.

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

DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. JAMES E. RISCH,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 19–04 concerning the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Spain for defense articles and services estimated to cost $107 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. HOOPER,
Lieutenant General, USA, Director.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 19–04

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Spain.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment* $89.6 million.
Other $17.4 million.
Total $107.0 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Eight (8) Assault Amphibious Vehicles, Personnel (AAVP–7A1) Reliability, Availability, Maintainability/Rebuilt to Standard (RAM/RS).

Two (2) Assault Amphibious Vehicles, Command (AAVC–7A1) Reliability, Availability, Maintainability/Rebuilt to Standard (RAM/RS).

One (1) Assault Amphibious Vehicle, Recovery (AAVR–7A1) Reliability, Availability, Maintainability/Rebuilt to Standard (RAM/RS).

Non-MDE: Also included are Enhanced Armor Applique Kits (EAAK), spare and repair parts, tools and test equipment, technical data and publications, training and training material, U.S. Government and contractor technical and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Navy (SP–P–LHO).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: March 14, 2019.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Spain—Assault Amphibious Vehicles

The Government of Spain has requested to buy eight (8) Assault Amphibious Vehicles, Personnel (AAVP–7A1) Reliability, Availability, Maintainability/Rebuilt to Standard (RAM/RS); two (2) Assault Amphibious Vehicles, Command (AAVC–7A 1) Reliability, Availability, Maintainability/Rebuilt to Standard (RAM/RS); and one (1) Assault Amphibious Vehicle, Recovery (AAVR–7A1) Reliability, Availability, Maintainability/Rebuilt to Standard (RAM/RS). Also included are Enhanced Armor Applique Kits (EAAK), spare and repair parts, tools and test equipment, technical data and publications, training and training material, U.S. Government and contractor technical and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistics and program support. The total estimated program cost is $107 million.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security of the United States by improving the security of a NATO ally which is an important force for political stability and economic progress in Europe. It is vital to the U.S. national interest to assist Spain in developing and maintaining a strong and ready self-defense capability.

The proposed addition of these eleven (11) vehicles to Spain's fleet will afford more flexibility and maintain Spain's expeditionary capability to counter regional threats and continue to enhance stability in the region. Spain currently operates 19 Assault Amphibious Vehicles (AAVs) and is proficient at using them to their fullest capability. Spain will have no difficulty absorbing these additional vehicles.

The proposed sale of this equipment will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be BAE Systems, York, Pennsylvania, and Anniston, Alabama. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government or contractor representative in Spain.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 19–04

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The vulnerability to countermeasure information for Assault Amphibious Vehicles is considered classified SECRET.

2. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures or equivalent systems which might reduce system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

3. A determination has been made that the Government of Spain can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U,S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

4. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to the Government of Spain.

NOMINATION OF GENERAL JOHN ABIZAID

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I come to the floor to correct the record concerning statements the Senate majority leader made yesterday morning,

in which he claimed that GEN John Abizaid's nomination to be Ambassador to Saudi Arabia ''is being held up.''

Allow me to ease the majority leader's concerns. Far from being ''held up,'' the Foreign Relations Committee, with my full support, has been extremely diligent in taking up General Abizaid's nomination; he appeared on the very first committee nominations hearing of the 116th Congress, and his nomination is advancing through the regular committee process expeditiously. I look forward to his approval by the committee and, hopefully, a speedy confirmation. As with all nominees, his final confirmation is under the control of the majority leader.

I am concerned that the majority leader has an inaccurate view of the nominations situation facing the Foreign Relations Committee. He stated yesterday that ''if we want to solve problems in the Middle East, through diplomacy, we'll need to confirm diplomats.'' Unfortunately, we cannot confirm diplomats that we do not have.

It took 23 months before the Trump administration bothered to nominate General Abizaid, leaving a gaping hole in our diplomatic posture to Saudi Arabia and the region. It is possible that this failure of leadership is the result of the President believing that his son-in-law, Jared Kushner, is capable of doing this job from the White House.

Regardless of the reason, Saudi Arabia is not an isolated example. It took even longer, over 2 years, before the Trump administration nominated a candidate to be U.S. Ambassador to Turkey. We are now 26 months into the Trump administration, and we still lack ambassadorial nominees to critical countries like Egypt, Pakistan, and our close ally, Jordan. This failure is a reckless abdication of a constitutional responsibility that is essential to projecting American power abroad. There is only one person responsible for this failure: President Trump; yet the majority leader appears to be curiously oblivious to that fact.

Let me be clear: When the committee has received nominations, we have worked with efficiency and diligence to vet and advance those nominations. I have devoted my time and staff resources to ensure this because of my strong belief that the State Department, USAID, and other foreign affairs agencies must be appropriately staffed. We cannot promote our foreign policy, protect American citizens, and advocate for American businesses without a robust diplomatic corps. In the 115th Congress, the committee reported 169 nominations. I reject any assertion that we have not done our part to ensure that the State Department is appropriately staffed.

All too often, however, the committee has received nominations late or not at all.

There is, unfortunately, there is another severe problem that we cannot ignore with regard to this administration's nominees. Delays in advancing Trump political nominees is largely due to poor vetting by this administration. When the President nominates and renominates individuals with restraining orders for threats of violence, who engaged in incidents that should, frankly, mean they never should have been nominated, or made material omissions, sometimes on a repeated basis, in their nomination materials, the Foreign Relations Committee must do our due diligence on behalf of the American people. Someone has to. My staff and I have had to spend significant additional time on vetting because of the White House's negligence or incompetence.

The United States and our allies continue to face tremendous challenges around the world. We must continue to lead on the international stage and work in collaboration with international partners to achieve our shared security goals, but to have our diplomats in place, they must be nominated in a timely fashion and vetted properly. Despite the majority leader's confusion on this issue, that is the real hold-up here.

S.J. RES. 7

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to express a concern over the Rubio amendment to the Sanders-Lee joint resolution, S.J. Res. 7, which was passed by voice vote in yesterday's debate.

The Rubio amendment attempts to make clear that nothing in the joint resolution is intended or may be interpreted to affect any intelligence or counterintelligence activity or investigations relating to threats in or from Yemen, which involves the collection, analysis, or sharing of intelligence with any coalition partner.

I do not believe that it was the intention of the authors of S.J. Res. 7 to restrict these intelligence activities per se. I believe it was Senator RUBIO's intention to make sure that that legitimate intelligence activities, as specified, were not affected.

However, my concern springs from the full implications of what ''sharing intelligence'' means. I assume it is meant to share useful intelligence the United States may acquire about the intentions, activities, characteristics, and other information about, for example, the Houthis or Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula. That is entirely appropriate.

But if the intelligence being shared is actually information that allows Saudi Arabia or other members of the Saudi-led coalition to specifically target and conduct military operations, such as airstrikes, against specific sites in Yemen, then that would get perilously close to the U.S. being directly involved in hostilities in Yemen, including under the War Powers Resolution.

Section 8 of the War Powers Resolution considers U.S. Armed Forces to be ''introduced into hostilities'' if, among other activities, members of the U.S. Armed Forces ''coordinate'' the activities of foreign forces. Arguably, enabling Saudi forces to target specific sites in Yemen could constitute ''coordination'' under the War Powers definition.

Why is this important? It is important, first, to preserve the scope of application of the War Powers Resolution, which the Congress enacted to rein in the power of the executive branch to make war anywhere under any circumstances.

Second, the more direct assistance U.S. Armed Forces provide to the Saudi-led coalition, the closer they are associated with the actions of those countries. That could lead to shared liability in those activities if and when those activities lead, inadvertently or otherwise, to atrocities on the ground in Yemen.

Again, I do not believe that it was the intention of the author of this amendment to create the legal space for this to occur. I would advise the Department of Defense and the appropriate intelligence agencies to be mindful of this issue and be cautious about what intelligence information is shared and for what purposes it is used.

H.R. 269

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following letter be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
March 14, 2019.

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

DEAR LEADER MCCONNELL, I am requesting to be consulted before the Senate enters into any unanimous consent agreements or time limitations regarding H.R. 269, the Over-the-Counter Drug Safety, Innovation, and Reform Act. I further request that this legislation not be incorporated into any larger legislative vehicles that the Senate as a whole may consider until the concerns I describe below are fully addressed.

This legislation streamlines the outdated over-the-counter (OTC) drug approval process at the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)—a process originally developed in 1972. Specifically, the legislation allows the FDA to approve OTC versions of prescription drugs administratively, rather than going through the lengthy notice-and comment-rulemaking procedures under the Administrative Procedure Act. The legislation also encourages more innovation and investment in the OTC space by providing an 18-month market-exclusively component that rewards a return on investment for new OTC drugs. The 18-month market exclusivity period is crucial to creating a thriving OTC drug market; however, H.R. 269 does not contain adequate oversight mechanisms to ensure that this exclusivity provision is not abused by some OTC drug manufacturers after the reforms of H.R. 269 are implemented by the FDA.

Although the legislation encourages more innovation and investment in the OTC space, it does not include any conditions under which an OTC drug manufacturer would forfeit eligibility for the 18-month exclusivity

period. For example, there is no ''failure to market'' provision for OTC drug approvals in the legislation similar to the provisions applying to generic drugs under Hatch-Waxman to prevent OTC drug manufacturers, who can otherwise enter the market, from refraining to do so (a practice called exclusivity parking).

Anti-competitive behavior—like exclusivity parking—has disrupted the generic drug industry. In fact, exclusivity parking has become common in the context of patent litigation settlement agreements where proprietary drug manufacturers pay generic drug manufacturers to delay entering the market, allowing proprietary drug manufacturers to charge higher prices for long periods of time (i.e. pay-for-delay settlements). The Federal Trade Commission has estimated that this behavior costs consumers $3.5 billion per year as a result of higher brand-name drug prices. And even though the process for obtaining OTC drug approval under H.R. 269 is more straightforward than that for obtaining market approval for a generic drugs—anti-competitive behavior (e.g., exclusivity parking) may creep into the OTC drug space if Congress fails to include sufficient oversight mechanisms in the legislation to ensure adequate accountability and effective competition.

Modernizing the OTC drug approval process under H.R. 269 will benefit consumers and advance the public health; however, H.R. 269 as currently drafted does not give the FDA the necessary oversight tools to ensure accountability in the OTC space. Including a ''failure to launch'' provision in H.R. 269—that is, a mechanism that gives an OTC drug manufacturer a reasonable amount of time to bring an FDA approved OTC product to market—will protect the incentive to innovate and invest, while also providing adequate accountability. Indeed, to ensure effective competition in the OTC space, Congress must provide the FDA with the necessary oversight tools to prevent abuse of the OTC regulatory approval process under the reforms of H.R. 269.

Thank you for protecting my rights as a Senator to weigh in on this legislation, which has not gone through regular order during my time as a member of the Committee to which this legislation has been referred to in the 116th congress.

Sincerely,

MIKE BRAUN,
United States Senator.

RECOGNIZING THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I congratulate the American Legion on its 100-year anniversary.

On March 15, 1919, the first American Legion caucus was held. Later that year, Congress established the American Legion as a federally chartered corporation with purposes that include ''to cement the ties and comradeship born of service; and to consecrate the efforts of its members to mutual helpfulness and service to their country.'' The original membership to the American Legion was extended to those who served in the Armed Forces during World War I, which had ended a few months before the organization was started. Over the past 100 years, its membership has grown to nearly 2 million, with more than 12,000 posts.

I recently joined fellow Senators in cosponsoring S. 504, the Let Everyone Get Involved in Opportunities for National Service, or LEGION, Act, which would enable the American Legion to establish its own membership criteria instead of requiring an act of Congress to change eligibility requirements. In this legislation, we recognize the American Legion ''provides invaluable services to its members and supports the community of veterans who sacrificed in service of the United States,'' and it ''has aided, assisted, and comforted the families of the men and women who were called to serve or volunteered to serve . . .''

I join many others across our country, including local posts, in recognizing the American Legion's century of representation of American veterans. In Idaho alone, there are approximately 9,750 Idaho members of the American Legion as of 2018.

Thank you to the American Legion and its membership for your outstanding service to our country and America's veterans. Congratulations on 100 years of achievements on their behalf. I look forward to our continued work ahead to ensure veterans have access to the highest quality services worthy of their remarkable dedication to our Nation.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF FUELCELL ENERGY

• Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize FuelCell Energy as it celebrates 50 years of dedication to the research and delivery of clean, affordable fuel cell solutions.

Founded in 1969 by Dr. Bernard Baker as the Energy Research Corporation, the company has grown exponentially over the past half century. Starting as a highly regarded research company focused on electrochemical battery and fuel cell technologies, FuelCell Energy is now a worldwide leader in its field.

The Danbury, CT, based company provides efficient commercial fuel cell solutions for the supply, recovery, and storage of energy. Fifty years of tireless commitment, diligent effort, and creative innovation has resulted in SureSource power plants located in three continents. These power plants have produced over 8.7 million megawatt-hours of ultraclean power.

FuelCell Energy invests its work in all steps of the process: recognizing a need, developing a solution, and then implementing a solution in an economic and sustainable manner. The breadth of their successes and the critical level of forward progress in the realm of clean energy are truly impressive. Thanks to their remarkable efforts, FuelCell Energy enables universities, commercial enterprises, government entities, and other industries the opportunity to make clean choices in a more affordable and accessible way than ever before.

As they mark this important anniversary, the company continues to look toward the future, searching for even more effective options that will benefit our planet and its people. Though there is still more progress to be made, FuelCell Energy stands at the forefront of past innovation and future possibility.

Devoted to creating energy solutions that will make it easier for more and more industries to use clean power, FuelCell Energy is a positive model for modernization and advancement in this vital field. I applaud the accomplishments of FuelCell Energy's visionary leaders and highly skilled and dedicated workers and hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating FuelCell Energy on 50 years of excellence.•

REMEMBERING EUBA HARRIS-WINTON

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the contributions of Euba Harris-Winton to Fort Smith and the State of Arkansas. She passed away on Monday, March 11, at the age of 95 and leaves behind a large, loving family and countless Arkansans whom she helped and inspired throughout her life.

Euba was born on June 26, 1923, to Rev. Daniel Haven Edward Harris and Martha T. Hill Harris in Cotton Plant, AR. Her school years were spent in Fort Smith where she attended Howard Elementary School and Lincoln High School. After attending Westark Community College and Philander Smith College, she returned to Fort Smith to raise a family with her husband, Ellsworth Daniel Winton. They had 10 children: five girls and five boys.

She was a devout member of the United Methodist Church, and her great faith and passion for service led her to become the executive director of the Mallalieu Community Development Center in 1970. The center's mission was to strengthen the outreach ministry of the church. As part of that mission, she worked on efforts to fight poverty, improve substandard housing, increase educational opportunities, and personally provide help to anyone who asked. She led the organization for 25 years and improved the lives of countless Arkansans in the process.

Throughout her life, she met with leaders at all levels of government to advocate for others and served on numerous boards and councils. In an article in the Lincoln Echo several years ago, Bennie Mae Ware Gunn remarked that, ''Euba is known and respected for being both relentless and resourceful in her pursuit of justice and opportunities for others. However, she is also known for her sensitivity and compassion.''

That is certainly true of my experience with her and that of so many others she influenced or helped over the years. I was honored to know Mrs. Euba and will personally miss her example, kindness, advice, and willingness to help others.

She was a rare individual who never stopped fighting to improve the world

around her and was an inspiration to us all. I know her legacy lives on through her extended family and in every person she touched with her compassion, strength, and wisdom.●

RECOGNIZING NORTHSIDE HIGH SCHOOL'S DUAL BASKETBALL STATE CHAMPIONSHIPS

● Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize and congratulate my alma mater, Northside High School in Fort Smith, AR, on winning 6A State championships in both boys and girls basketball this year.

The high school basketball season was as exciting as ever in the Natural State, but folks in my hometown of Fort Smith were especially enthusiastic when tournament time came around because both the boys' and girls' teams had advanced to postseason play. Both squads have won multiple State titles, and the fans were eager to add another this season.

Both the boys' and girls' teams advanced through their respective tournaments and made it to the finals, overcoming challenges from talented teams from across Arkansas. The championship games were incredibly competitive, and each came down to the wire.

The Lady Bears faced off against Bentonville in their State title game. Led by Jersey Wolfenbarger's 21-point effort, including the game-winning basket as time expired, the team ended the contest on a 7–0 run to claim the school's seventh girls basketball State championship since 1999. Each of those titles was won under the direction of coach Rickey Smith. The team ended the season ranked 17th in the Nation in USA Today's high school rankings.

Not to be outdone, the Northside Grizzlies boys' team also had a memorable championship game that included a half-court basket to end the first half. Facing off against Bryant High School, Northside led for most of the contest. After Bryant tied the game late in the fourth quarter, Northside came up with a three-point basket and held onto the lead until the end of regulation. Junior center Jaylen Williams' play—he scored 20 points and grabbed 16 rebounds—earned him the MVP designation. The championship was the 11th in school history. The Grizzlies were led by coach Eric Burnett who believed his team was built for a good run in the tournament because of the difficulty of its nonconference schedule. This was their third consecutive championship game appearance, having won a championship in 2017 as well.

Needless to say, it was a very special day in Hot Springs, where the title games were played, and in the Fort Smith community, as each team brought home State championships in the same year for the second time since 2007.

As a former Northside Grizzly and someone with family roots in Fort Smith, I am proud that both the Grizzly and Lady Bears basketball teams earned the highest achievement possible in our State. To do so in the same year is an even greater testament to the dedication and passion of the players, coaches, student body, administrators, and the fans of these terrific teams.

Congratulations again to the Grizzly and Lady Bears squads on this tremendous accomplishment, and I look forward to celebrating with them, Northside High School, and the Fort Smith community in the near future.●

TRIBUTE TO COURTNEY NOBLE

● Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor a great Ohioan, Courtney Noble, for her heroic actions this past December.

Ms. Noble works as a direct support professional for New Avenues To Independence, Inc.—NATI—in Mentor, OH. NATI is a social service organization that provides support and aid for people with disabilities and special needs in the greater Cleveland area.

On the morning of December 20, 2018, Ms. Noble was the only one on duty while tending to three male residents in the Heisley group home. As she was helping the residents get ready for their day, she heard popping and crackling and sounds coming from the garage. When she opened the garage door, she discovered that a fire had started and was rapidly growing out of control. Without hesitation, Ms. Noble sprang into action. She immediately evacuated all three residents from the house, one of whom was in a wheelchair.

Throughout the whole situation, Ms. Noble's biggest concern was the safety and well-being of her residents. Even as her car was engulfed in flames, she calmly escorted the three men to safety at a nearby child daycare center and called 911.

Thank you, Courtney Noble, for your courageous actions and for all the work you do as a caregiver. It is because of your quick thinking and fearlessness that three Ohioans are alive today. I am sure that my Senate colleagues will join me in honoring Ms. Courtney Noble for her exemplary acts.●

TRIBUTE TO SEAN O'DONNELL AND IVANNA FRITZ

● Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the distinct honor of recognizing Sean O'Donnell and Ivanna Fritz of Flathead County for their recent induction into the Montana Forensic Educations Association Coaches Hall of Fame.

Sean O'Donnell, a lifelong Montanan has spent the majority of his life in Kalispell, MT. Mr. O'Donnell attended Carrol College in Helena, MT, and it was here that Sean fell in love with coaching high school speech and debate. After graduation, he went back to Kalispell to teach and went on to join the Flathead coaching staff in 1992. Over the past 22 years, Mr. O'Donnell has gone on to win 10 State championships, as well as winning Class AA coach of the year twice.

Ivanna Fritz, from eastern Montana, fell in love with speech and debate in college, which she took as a requirement for a communication degree. Ms. Fritz then went on to coach high school speech in debate, joining the Flathead coaching staff in 1995, until taking up a teaching position at Glacier High School in 2007, where she teaches and coaches today. Ivanna has won a total of 13 State championships, along with winning Class AA coach of the year.

I congratulate Sean O'Donnell and Ivanna Fritz, for their remarkable journey of 20 years of teaching and coaching in Flathead County. I look forward to seeing their continued success.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. CURTIS JONES, JR.

● Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, today I wish to congratulate one of my constituents, Dr. Curtis Jones, Jr., on being named the 2019 National Superintendent of the Year. Dr. Jones is an outstanding public servant, and I am honored to commend him in the Senate today.

A native of Barnesville, GA, Dr. Jones is the son of a schoolteacher and a preacher. Prior to becoming an educator himself, Dr. Jones graduated from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point and served over 20 years in the Army, retiring as lieutenant colonel. Upon retirement from the Army, Dr. Jones began his career in education as a JROTC instructor before becoming a high school principal, assistant superintendent, and later superintendent of Griffin-Spalding County Schools.

Dr. Jones joined his current school district, Bibb County Schools, as superintendent in 2015. Under Dr. Jones' leadership, the school district has been completely turned around, and the graduation rate has increased by more than 20 percent. Dr. Jones has brought the Macon-Bibb County community together for a common cause, and it has been a joy to see the school district's progress as a result of his leadership and service to those students.

Throughout this entire process, Dr. Jones has repeatedly recognized the teachers, principals, and students in his school district for their contribution to this award. He has also attributed his success to the love and support of his family. Dr. Jones has truly made his State and country proud, and I congratulate him and his family on this high honor.●

TRIBUTE TO RICK BLOCKER

● Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, today I wish to honor a lifelong champion of the American labor movement, Mr. Rick Blocker, president of the Metro Detroit AFL-CIO, on the occasion of his retirement. As a member of the

U.S. Senate, it is both my privilege and honor to recognize Mr. Blocker for his lifetime of service and contributions that have strengthened our community and State.

Rick Blocker has been a tireless advocate for his brothers and sisters in labor throughout his career. From 1987 to 2013, he served as the secretary-treasurer and executive assistant to the president of the United Food and Commercial Workers, UFCW, Local Union 876 in Madison Heights, MI. In this role, he was responsible for managing the finances and expenditures of the over 19,000 members of Local 876. Rick also served as a trustee for the Michigan UFCW Unions and Employers Health and Welfare Fund where he maintained membership services, helped develop community programs, and assisted in contract negotiations.

Since 2013, Rick has served as president of the Metro-Detroit AFL-CIO. The Metro Detroit AFL-CIO is comprised of approximately 120 affiliated labor organizations that represent nearly 70,000 members. In this capacity, Rick serves as the lead voice of these affiliates and members to the public and the State AFL-CIO, representing the interests of working people throughout the region. Through his work, Rick continually advocates for economic and social justice and the betterment of workers lives, not just in metro Detroit, but across the State of Michigan.

Rick has spent his career and life in support of his community, organized labor, civil rights, and faith. Throughout his life, he has been involved with many organizations, including the Trade Union Leadership Council, the Coalition of Black Trade Unionists, the Coalition of Labor Women, is a founding member of the Change to Win Federation, a life member of the NAACP, and a trustee and executive director of New Bethel Baptist Church in Detroit. Rick also serves on Detroit Mayor Mike Duggan's Mayor's Workforce Development Board, with the mission to strive toward successful delivery of workforce programs across the city of Detroit.

Rick has spent his career in service to others, his community, and his brother and sisters in labor. I ask my colleagues to join me today in honoring my friend, Mr. Rick Blocker, for his leadership in furthering the causes of the organized labor movement and for his many other contributions to the metro Detroit region. I wish Rick and his family health and happiness in the years ahead.●

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME ON MARCH 13, 2019

The following bills were read the first time:

H.R. 1. An act to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, and strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1617. An act to direct the Director of National Intelligence to submit intelligence assessments of the intentions of the political leadership of the Russian Federation, and for other purposes.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:15 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2761, and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Speaker appoints the following Member on the part of the House of Representatives to the British-American Interparliamentary Group: Mr. HOLDING of North Carolina.

The message also announced that pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 2302, and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council: Mr. ZELDIN of New York and Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.

At 1:09 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the report of Special Counsel Mueller should be made available to the public and to Congress.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

At 3:32 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled joint resolution:

H.J. Res. 46. Joint resolution relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019.

The joint resolution was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 1. An act to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, and strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1617. An act to direct the Director of National Intelligence to submit intelligence assessments of the intentions of the political leadership of the Russian Federation, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–589. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Reauthorization of Dairy Forward Pricing'' ((7 CFR Part 1145) (Docket No. AMS–DA–18–0097)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–590. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Processed Raspberry Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Termination of Assessments'' ((7 CFR Part 1208) (Docket No. AMS–SC–18–0093)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–591. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Mango Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Amendment to Include Frozen Mangos'' ((7 CFR Part 1206) (Docket No. AMS–SC–17–0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–592. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Sustainment), transmitting, pursuant to law, the biennial report to Congress on strategic and critical materials requirements for the National Defense Stockpile (OSS–2019–0207); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–593. A communication from the Senior Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Financial Research, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Ongoing Data Collection of Centrally Cleared Transactions in the United States Repurchase Agreement Market'' (RIN1505–AC58) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–594. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Office of Fossil Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''SPR Standard Sales Provisions'' (RIN1901–AB29) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–595. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Georgia; Emission Reduction Credits'' (FRL No. 9990–74–Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–596. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Massachusetts: High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes'' (FRL No. 9990–94–Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–597. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Quality Designation for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide (SO2) Primary National Ambient Air Quality Standard; Arkansas' Redesignation of the Independence County Area'' (FRL No. 9990–00–Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–598. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Amendment to Control of Emissions of Volatile Organic Compounds from Consumer Products'' (FRL No. 9990–86–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–599. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California; South Coast Serious Area Plan for the 2006 PM2.5 NAAQS Correction'' (FRL No. 9990–89–Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–600. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Clean Air Plans; 2008 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area Requirements; San Joaquin Valley, California; Correction'' (FRL No. 9990–90–Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–601. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Oklahoma: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Programs Revision'' (FRL No. 9990–04–Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–602. A communication from the Acting Chief of the Branch of Domestic Listing, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Species Status for Trispot Darter'' (RIN1018–BC16) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–603. A communication from the Chief of the Branch of Domestic Listing, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Listing the Scarlet Macaw'' (RIN1018–BC81) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–604. A communication from the Chief of the Branch of Domestic Listing, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Removing Deseret Milkvetch (Astragalus Deserticus) From the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Plants'' (RIN1018–BB41) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–605. A communication from the Acting Chief of the Branch of Domestic Listing, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Species Status for the Candy Darter'' (RIN1018–BC44) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–606. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report on mining activities as required by the Mine Improvement and New Emergency Response Act of 2006; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–607. A communication from the Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's fiscal year 2017 FAIR Act inventory; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–608. A communication from the Assistant Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Loan Guaranty: Revisions to VA-Guaranteed or Insured Cash-out Home Refinance Loans'' (RIN2900–AQ42) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2019; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–609. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Navigation and Navigable Waters; Technical, Organizational, and Conforming Amendments'' ((33 CFR Parts 100, 110, 147 and 165) (Docket No. USCG–2018–1049)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–610. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Removal of Regulated Navigation Areas, Safety Zone, Security Zones, and Special Local Regulations Within District 7'' ((33 CFR Parts 100 and 165) (Docket No. USCG–2018–0231)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–611. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Mill Basin, Brooklyn, NY'' ((RIN1625–AA09) (Docket No. USCG–2018–1032)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–612. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulation; Gulfport Grand Prix, Boca Ciego Bay, Gulfport, FL'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2019–0059)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–613. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Security Zone; Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Corpus Christi, TX'' ((RIN1625–AA87) (Docket No. USCG–2019–0128)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–614. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Security Zone; Firestone Grand Prix of St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg, Florida'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2019–0050)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–615. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Security Zone; Chicago Harbor, Navy Pier Southwest, Chicago, IL'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2018–0713)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–616. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Security Zone; Cumberland River, Kentucky'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2019–0127)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–617. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Security Zone; Oregon Inlet, Dare County, NC'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2018–1065)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–618. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Security Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Port Gibson, MS'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2019–0126)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–15. A petition from a citizen of the State of Texas relative to constitutional conventions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BARRASSO, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works:

Report to accompany S. 94, A bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to facilitate the establishment of additional or expanded public target ranges in certain States (Rept. No. 116–8).

Report to accompany S. 310, A bill to amend the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act to reauthorize the Act (Rept. No. 116–9).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. KING):

S. 792. A bill to require enforcement against misbranded milk alternatives; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 793. A bill to establish and strengthen projects that defray the cost of related instruction associated with pre-apprenticeship and apprenticeship programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 794. A bill for the relief of Jose Alberto Martinez Moreno, Micaela Lopez Martinez, and Adilene Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 795. A bill for the relief of Alfredo Plascencia Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 796. A bill for the relief of Ruben Mkoian and Asmik Karapetian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 797. A bill for the relief of Shirley Constantino Tan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 798. A bill for the relief of Esidronio Arreola-Saucedo, Maria Elena Cobian Arreola, Nayely Arreola Carlos, and Cindy Jael Arreola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 799. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to clarify that the Security and Exchange Commission may seek disgorgement and restitution as a result of a violation of the securities laws, to establish the statute of limitations for disgorgement and equitable actions brought by the Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. ERNST, Mr. KAINE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. JONES, Mr. GARDNER, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 800. A bill to establish a postsecondary student data system; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 801. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to provide the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission and the Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission with access to certain drug payment information, including certain rebate information; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 802. A bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act , and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. THUNE, Ms. SINEMA, and Ms. MCSALLY):

S. 803. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore incentives for investments in qualified improvement property; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 804. A bill to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to protect the cultural practices and livelihoods of producers of Alaska Native handicrafts and fossilized ivory products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WYDEN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 805. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the processing of veterans benefits by the Department of Veterans Affairs, to limit the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to recover overpayments made by the Department and other amounts owed by veterans to the United States, to improve the due process accorded veterans with respect to such recovery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 806. A bill to prohibit the collection of data or information generated on the internet; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. ERNST (for herself, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. PAUL):

S. 807. A bill to require recipients of Federal funds to disclose information relating to programs, projects, or activities carried out using the Federal funds; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 808. A bill to ensure that certain incidents involving a covered employee that are reported to the title IX coordinator at an eligible institution of higher education have been reviewed by the president of the institution and not less than 1 additional member of the institution's board of trustees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 809. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for qualified conservation contributions which include National Scenic Trails; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WICKER:

S. 810. A bill to clarify the authority of the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration with respect to post-storm assessments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 811. A bill to provide for additional supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, for border security and disaster relief; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S. 812. A bill to modify the minimum allocation requirement for the emergency solutions grants program; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 813. A bill for the relief of Vichai Sae Tung (also known as Chai Chaowasaree); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 814. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to diabetes outpatient self-management training services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. CASEY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BURR, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. JONES, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 815. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable tax credit against income tax for the purchase of qualified access technology for the blind; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 816. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to expedite approval of exports of small volumes of natural gas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. RISCH, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 817. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove silencers from the definition of firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself and Mr. KING):

S. 818. A bill to exempt certain 16- and 17-year-old individuals employed in logging operations from child labor laws; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 819. A bill to modernize the reporting requirement under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. ERNST, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. BURR, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

S. 820. A bill to strengthen programs authorized under the Debbie Smith Act of 2004; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 821. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to prohibit certain member banks from using discount window lending programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 822. A bill to permit the televising of Supreme Court proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 823. A bill to require information sharing with respect to the ownership of election service providers; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. ERNST, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 824. A bill to increase the number of States that may conduct Medicaid demonstration programs to improve access to community mental health services; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 825. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require all States to take steps to ensure domestic ownership and control of election service providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

S. 826. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to modify the final rule relating to flightcrew member duty and rest requirements for passenger operations of air carriers to apply to all-cargo operations of air carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 827. A bill to designate certain National Forest System land and certain public land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior in the States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming as wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, wildland recovery areas, and biological connecting corridors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MARKEY, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 828. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to prohibit oil-, gas-, and methane hydrate-related seismic activities in the North Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic, South Atlantic, and Straits of Florida planning areas of the outer Continental Shelf, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE:

S. 829. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to award cooperative agreements to improve care for individuals with advanced illnesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 830. A bill to amend the Federal Work-Study program to permit institutions of higher education to use their Federal work-study allocations for full-time, off-campus cooperative education and work-based learning; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. ENZI):

S. 831. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to reissue final rules relating to listing the gray wolf in the Western Great Lakes and Wyoming under the Endangered Species Act of 1973; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 832. A bill to nullify the Supplemental Treaty Between the United States of America and the Confederated Tribes and Bands of Indians of Middle Oregon, concluded on November 15, 1865; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 833. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to participant votes on the suspension of benefits under multiemployer plans in critical and declining status; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 834. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to enhance the national strategy for combating and eliminating tuberculosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 835. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the care provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to newborn children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 836. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the retirement income account rules relating to church controlled organizations; to the Committee on Finance.

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

S. 837. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to decrease the distance away from home required for a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces to be eligible for the above-the-line deduction for travel expenses; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 838. A bill to protect integrity, fairness, and objectivity in decisions regarding access to classified information, and for other purposes; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 839. A bill to extend Federal Pell Grant eligibility of certain short-term programs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. SMITH, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 840. A bill to allow Americans to earn paid sick time so that they can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. KAINE, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 841. A bill to enhance the ability of Federal agencies to deliver relocation management services to the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 842. A bill to improve the mapping of wireless broadband coverage; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 843. A bill to provide high-skilled nonimmigrant visas for nationals of the Republic of Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. LEE, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 844. A bill to allow for expedited approval of generic prescription drugs and temporary importation of prescription drugs in the case of marginally competitive drug markets and drug shortages; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. REED, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 845. A bill to establish as United States policy that, pending confirmation of the Russian Federation's continued compliance with the New START Treaty, the United States should extend the Treaty through 2026; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 846. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to limit certain rolling stock procurements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 847. A bill to prohibit certain entities from using facial recognition technology to identify or track an end user without obtaining the affirmative consent of the end user, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. HARRIS:

S. 848. A bill to establish digital services in State and local governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 849. A bill to provide for the inclusion on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall of the names of the lost crew members of the U.S.S. Frank E. Evans killed on June 3, 1969; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

S. 850. A bill to extend the authorization of appropriations to the Department of Veterans Affairs for purposes of awarding grants to veterans service organizations for the transportation of highly rural veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 851. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to issue an occupational safety and health standard that requires covered employers within the health care and social service industries to develop and implement a comprehensive workplace violence prevention plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 852. A bill to provide for the consideration of a definition of anti-Semitism for the enforcement of Federal antidiscrimination laws concerning education programs or activities; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. Res. 109. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the March 31, 2019, presidential election in Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. Res. 110. A resolution keeping guns out of classrooms; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms.

HARRIS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. UDALL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BENNET, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. COONS, Mr. REED, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. KAINE):

S. Res. 111. A resolution recognizing the heritage, culture, and contributions of Latinas in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. COONS, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. Res. 112. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States condemns all forms of violence against children globally and recognizes the harmful impacts of violence against children; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself, Mr. CASEY, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. Res. 113. A resolution designating March 25, 2019, as ''National Cerebral Palsy Awareness Day''; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. COONS, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. Res. 114. A resolution expressing support for the designation of March 21, 2019, as ''National Rosie the Riveter Day''; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. Res. 115. A resolution recognizing the REALTORS Land Institute on the occasion of its 75th anniversary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. STABENOW:

S. Res. 116. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Social Work Month and World Social Work Day on March 19, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. Res. 117. A resolution designating March 22, 2019, as ''National Rehabilitation Counselors Appreciation Day''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. JONES, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. KAINE, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WICKER, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. WARNER, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROUNDS, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. Res. 118. A resolution recognizing the importance of paying tribute to those individuals who have faithfully served and retired from the Armed Forces of the United States, designating April 18, 2019, as ''Military Retiree Appreciation Day'', and encouraging the people of the United States to honor the past and continued service of military retirees to their local communities and the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. Res. 119. A resolution supporting the goals of World Tuberculosis Day to raise awareness about tuberculosis; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 105

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

S. 151

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) were added as cosponsors of S. 151, a bill to deter criminal robocall violations and improve enforcement of section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, and for other purposes.

S. 164

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 164, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove the prohibition on eligibility for TRICARE Reserve Select of members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who are eligible to enroll in a health benefits plan under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

S. 210

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 210, a bill to amend the Tribal Law and Order Act of 2010 and the Indian Law Enforcement Reform Act to provide for advancement in public safety services to Indian communities, and for other purposes.

S. 317

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) 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. 342

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 342, a bill to reauthorize title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to improve and encourage innovation in international education, and for other purposes.

S. 380

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 380, a bill to increase access to agency guidance documents.

S. 386

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 386, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the per-country numerical limitation for employment-based immigrants, to increase the per-country numerical limitation for family-sponsored immigrants, and for other purposes.

S. 436

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 436, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the development of public transportation operations safety risk reduction programs, and for other purposes.

S. 506

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S. 514

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S. 521

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 521, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 546

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 546, a bill to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2090, and for other purposes.

S. 548

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 548, a bill to reauthorize the Money Follows the Person Demonstration Program.

S. 590

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 590, a bill to award Congressional Gold Medals to Katherine Johnson and Dr. Christine Darden, to posthumously award Congressional Gold Medals to Dorothy Vaughan and Mary Jackson, and to award a Congressional Gold Medal to honor all of the women who contributed to the success of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration during the Space Race.

S. 622

At the request of Mr. JONES, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms.

HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 622, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 631

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 631, a bill to provide for the admission of the State of Washington, D.C. into the Union.

S. 638

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 638, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to designate per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, Liability Act of 1980, and for other purposes.

S. 642

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 642, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Master Sergeant Rodrick ''Roddie'' Edmonds in recognition of his heroic actions during World War II.

S. 666

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 666, a bill to require the Secretary of Labor to award grants to organizations for the provision of transition assistance to members and former members of the Armed Forces who are separated, retired, or discharged from the Armed Forces, and spouses of such members, and for other purposes.

S. 668

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 668, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 679

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 679, a bill to exempt from the calculation of monthly income certain benefit paid by the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense.

S. 693

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 693, a bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to require that the POW/MIA flag be displayed on all days that the flag of the United States is displayed on certain Federal property.

S. 716

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 716, a bill to impose sanctions under the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act to combat corruption, money laundering, and impunity in Guatemala, and for other purposes.

S. 726

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 726, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety of cosmetics.

S. 753

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 753, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 764

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 764, a bill to provide for congressional approval of national emergency declarations, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 99

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 99, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that Congress should take all appropriate measures to ensure that the United States Postal Service remains an independent establishment of the Federal Government and is not subject to privatization.

S. RES. 100

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 100, a resolution recognizing the heritage, culture, and contributions of American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian women in the United States.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 794. A bill for the relief of Jose Alberto Martinez Moreno, Micaela Lopez Martinez, and Adilene Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing private immigration relief legislation to provide lawful permanent resident status to Adilene Martinez, who is originally from Mexico but has been living in California for over 20 years. I believe she merits Congress' special consideration for this extraordinary form of relief.

Adilene, age 30, was brought to the United States by her parents Jose Alberto Martinez Moreno and Micaela Lopez Martinez. When Jose came to the United States from Mexico, he began working as a busboy in restaurants in San Francisco, California. In 1990, he started working as a cook at Palio D'Asti, an award-winning Italian restaurant in San Francisco.

Jose and his wife, Micaela, call San Francisco home. Micaela is a homemaker and part-time housekeeper. They have three daughters, two of whom are United States citizens. Their oldest daughter, Adilene, is undocumented and is currently working at the San Francisco Opera House. Adilene attempted to legalize her status through several channels with her family, but the current green card backlog for relatives from Mexico is very long.

In 2002, the Martinez family applied for political asylum. Their application was denied. An immigration judge denied their subsequent application for cancellation of removal. The Martinez family has become an integral part of their community in California. They are active in their faith community. They volunteer with community-based organizations and are, in turn, supported by their community. When I first introduced this bill, I received dozens of letters of support from their fellow parishioners, teachers, and members of their community.

The Martinez family truly exemplifies the American dream. Jose worked his way through the restaurant industry to become a chef and an indispensable employee at a renowned restaurant. With great dedication, Micaela has worked hard to raise three daughters who are advancing their education and look forward to continuing the pursuit of their goals.

I believe that Adilene's continued presence in the United States would allow them to continue making significant contributions to their community in California. I ask my colleagues to support this private bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 794

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

SECTION 1. PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR JOSE ALBERTO MARTINEZ MORENO, MICAELA LOPEZ MARTINEZ, AND ADILENE MARTINEZ.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b) of section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151), Jose Alberto Martinez Moreno, Micaela

Lopez Martinez, and Adilene Martinez shall each be eligible for issuance of an immigrant visa or for adjustment of status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence upon filing an application for issuance of an immigrant visa under section 204 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1154) or for adjustment of status to lawful permanent resident.

(b) ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—If Jose Alberto Martinez Moreno, Micaela Lopez Martinez, or Adilene Martinez enters the United States before the filing deadline specified in subsection (c), Jose Alberto Martinez Moreno, Micaela Lopez Martinez, or Adilene Martinez shall be considered to have entered and remained lawfully in the United States and shall be eligible for adjustment of status under section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1255) as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) APPLICATION AND PAYMENT OF FEES.—Subsections (a) and (b) shall apply only if the applications for issuance of immigrant visas or the applications for adjustment of status are filed with appropriate fees not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) REDUCTION OF IMMIGRANT VISA NUMBERS.—Upon the granting of immigrant visas or permanent resident status to Jose Alberto Martinez Moreno, Micaela Lopez Martinez, and Adilene Martinez, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to reduce by three, during the current or next following fiscal year—

(1) the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of birth of Jose Alberto Martinez Moreno, Micaela Lopez Martinez, and Adilene Martinez under section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(a)); or

(2) if applicable, the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of birth of Jose Alberto Martinez Moreno, Micaela Lopez Martinez, and Adilene Martinez under section 202(e) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1152(e)).

(e) PAYGO.—The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 795. A bill for the relief of Alfredo Plascencia Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to offer legislation to provide lawful permanent residence status to Alfredo Plascencia Lopez, a Mexican national who lives in the San Bruno area of California.

I offer legislation on his behalf because I believe that, without it, this hardworking man, wife who is a lawful permanent resident, and children would face extreme hardship. His children would either face separation from their father or be forced to leave the only country they know and give up the education they are pursuing in the United States.

Alfredo and his wife, Maria, have been in the United States for over 20 years. They worked for years to adjust their status through appropriate legal channels, but poor legal representation ruined their opportunities.

The Plascencias' lawyer refused to return their calls or otherwise communicate with them in any way. He also failed to forward crucial immigration documents. Because of the poor representation they received, Alfredo only became aware that they had been ordered to leave the United States 15 days prior to his scheduled deportation.

Alfredo was shocked to learn of his attorney's malfeasance, but he acted quickly to secure legitimate counsel and filed the appropriate paperwork to delay his deportation and determine if any other legal action could be taken.

Together, Alfredo and Maria have used their professional successes, with the assistance of private bills, to realize many of the goals dreamed of by all Americans. They have worked hard, and saved up to buy their home.

Their oldest child, Christina, is 28 years old and is currently a paralegal. Erika, age 24, serves in the United States Air Force and hopes to one day become a police officer. Danny, age 24, currently attends the University of California and volunteers at his local homeless shelter in the soup kitchen. Daisy, age 17, and Juan Pablo, age 13, are all in school and plan on attending college.

Allowing Alfredo to remain in the United States is necessary to enable his family to continue thriving in the United States. His children are dedicated to pursuing their education and being productive members of their community. I do not believe that Alfredo should be separated from his family. I am reintroducing this legislation to protect the best interest of Alfredo's U.S. citizen children and his wife, who is a lawful permanent resident. I believe that Alfredo will continue to make positive contributions to his community in California and this country. I respectfully ask my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 795

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

SECTION 1. PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR ALFREDO PLASCENCIA LOPEZ.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b) of section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151), Alfredo Plascencia Lopez shall be eligible for the issuance of an immigrant visa or for adjustment of status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence upon filing an application for issuance of an immigrant visa under section 204 of that Act (8 U.S.C. 1154) or for adjustment of status to lawful permanent resident.

(b) ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—If Alfredo Plascencia Lopez enters the United States before the filing deadline specified in subsection (c), Alfredo Plascencia Lopez shall be considered to have entered and remained lawfully and shall be eligible for adjustment of status under section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1255) as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) APPLICATION AND PAYMENT OF FEES.—Subsections (a) and (b) shall apply only if the application for issuance of immigrant visas or the application for adjustment of status are filed with appropriate fees within two years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) REDUCTION OF IMMIGRANT VISA NUMBERS.—Upon the granting of immigrant visas or permanent residence to Alfredo Plascencia Lopez, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to reduce by one, during the current or next following fiscal year—

(1) the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of birth of Alfredo Plascencia Lopez under section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(a)); or

(2) if applicable, the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of birth of Alfredo Plascencia Lopez under section 202(e) of that Act (8 U.S.C. 1152(e)).

(e) PAYGO.—The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 796. A bill for the relief of Ruben Mkoian and Asmik Karapetian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to reintroduce private relief legislation in the 116th Congress on behalf of Ruben Mkoian and Asmik Karapetian. The Mkoian family has been living in Fresno, California, for over 20 years. I continue to believe this family deserves Congress' special consideration for such an extraordinary form of relief as a private bill.

The Mkoian family is originally from Armenia. They decided to leave Armenia for the United States in the early 1990s, following several incidents in which the family experienced harassment, vandalism and threats to their well-being.

In Armenia, Ruben worked as a police sergeant on vehicle licensing. At one point, he was offered a bribe to register stolen vehicles, which he refused and reported to his superior, the police chief. He later learned that a co-worker had registered the vehicles at the request of the same chief.

After Ruben reported the bribe offer to illegally register vehicles and said he'd call the police, his family store was vandalized and he received threatening phone calls telling him to keep quiet. A bottle of gasoline was thrown into his family's residence, burning it to the ground. In April 1992, several men entered the family store and assaulted Ruben, hospitalizing him for 22 days.

Ruben, Asmik, and their son Arthur, who was 3 years old at the time, left Armenia and entered the United States on visitor visas. They applied for political asylum that same year on the

grounds that they would be subject to physical attacks if returned to Armenia. It took 16 years for their case to be finalized, with the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals denying their asylum case in January 2008.

At this time, Ruben and Asmik have exhausted every option to obtain immigration relief in the United States. It would be a terrible shame to remove this family from the United States and to separate them from their son Arsen, who is 20 years old and a U.S. citizen. The Mkoians have worked hard to build a place for their family in California and are an integral part of their community.

The family attends St. Paul Armenian Apostolic Church in Fresno. They do charity work to send medical equipment to Armenia. Ruben works as a driver for Uber. He previously worked as a manager at a car wash in Fresno and as a truck driver for a California trucking company that described him as ''trustworthy,'' ''knowledgeable,'' and an asset to the company. Asmik has worked as a medical assistant the past 6 years at the Fresno Shield Medical Center.

Reflecting their contributions to their community, Representatives George Radanovich (R–CA) and JIM COSTA (D–CA) strongly supported this family's ability to remain in the United States. When I first introduced a private bill for the Mkoian family, I received more than 200 letters of support and dozens of calls of support from friends and community members, attesting to the positive impact that this family has had in Fresno, California.

I believe that this case warrants our compassion. I respectfully ask my colleagues to support this private legislation on behalf of the Mkoian family.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 796

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

SECTION 1. PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR RUBEN MKOIAN AND ASMIK KARAPETIAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b) of section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151), Ruben Mkoian and Asmik Karapetian shall each be eligible for the issuance of an immigrant visa or for adjustment of status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence upon filing an application for issuance of an immigrant visa under section 204 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1154) or for adjustment of status to lawful permanent resident.

(b) ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—If Ruben Mkoian or Asmik Karapetian enters the United States before the filing deadline specified in subsection (c), Ruben Mkoian or Asmik Karapetian, as appropriate, shall be considered to have entered and remained lawfully in the United States and shall be eligible for adjustment of status under section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1255) as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) APPLICATION AND PAYMENT OF FEES.—Subsections (a) and (b) shall apply only if the application for the issuance of an immigrant visa or the application for adjustment of status is filed with appropriate fees not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) REDUCTION OF IMMIGRANT VISA NUMBERS.—Upon granting an immigrant visa or permanent resident status to Ruben Mkoian and Asmik Karapetian, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to reduce by two, during the current or next following fiscal year—

(1) the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of birth of Ruben Mkoian and Asmik Karapetian under section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(a)); or

(2) if applicable, the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of birth of Ruben Mkoian and Asmik Karapetian under section 202(e) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1152(e)).

(e) PAYGO.—The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 797. A bill for the relief of Shirley Constantino Tan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing a bill for the private relief of Shirley Constantino Tan. Ms. Tan is a Filipina national living in Pacifica, California. She is the proud mother of 20-year-old U.S. citizen twin boys, Jashley and Joriene, and the spouse of Jay Mercado, a naturalized U.S. citizen.

I believe Ms. Tan merits Congress' special consideration for this extraordinary form of relief because her removal from the United States would cause undue hardship for her and her family. She faces deportation to the Philippines, which would separate her from her family and jeopardize her safety.

Ms. Tan experienced horrific violence in the Philippines before she left to come to the United States. When she was only 14 years old, her cousin murdered her mother and her sister and shot Shirley in the head. While the cousin who committed the murders was eventually prosecuted, he received a short jail sentence. Fearing for her safety, Ms. Tan fled the Philippines just before her cousin was due to be released from jail. She entered the United States legally on a visitor's visa in 1989.

Ms. Tan's current deportation order is the result of negligent counsel. She applied for asylum in 1995. While her case appeal was pending at the Board of Immigration Appeals, her attorney failed to submit a brief to support her case. As a result, the case was dismissed, and the Board of Immigration Appeals granted Shirley voluntary departure from the United States.

Ms. Tan never received notice that the Board of Immigration Appeals granted her voluntary departure. Her attorney moved offices, did not receive the order, and ultimately never informed her of the order. As a result, Ms. Tan did not depart the United States and the grant of voluntary departure automatically led to a removal order. She learned about the deportation order for the first time on January 28, 2009, when Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents took her into immigration custody.

Because of her attorney's negligent actions, Ms. Tan was denied the opportunity to present her case in immigration proceedings. She later filed a complaint with the State Bar of California against her former attorney. She is not the first person to file such a complaint against this attorney.

On February 4, 2015, Ms. Tan's spouse, Jay, a U.S. Citizen, filed an approved spousal petition on her behalf. On August 20, 2015, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services denied her application due to the fact that she still had a final order or removal. Ms. Tan must go back to the immigration court and ask for the court to terminate her case and then reapply for her green card. Ms. Tan is now again facing the threat of deportation while she seeks to close her case before an immigration court.

In addition to the hardship that would come to Ms. Tan if she is deported, her deportation would cause serious hardship to her two United States citizen children, Jashley and Joriene.

Joriene is a junior at Stanford University and is pre-Med, majoring in Human Biology. In addition to his studies, Joriene is involved in Stanford's Pilipino-American Student Union. Jashley is a junior at Chapman University, majoring in Business Administration. Ms. Tan no longer runs her in-home daycare and is a homemaker.

If Ms. Tan were forced to leave the United States, her family has expressed that they would go with her to the Philippines or try to find a third country where the entire family could relocate. This would mean that Jashley and Joriene would have to leave behind their education and the only home they know in the United States.

I do not believe it is in our Nation's best interest to force this family, with two United States citizen children, to make the choice between being separated and relocating to a country where they may face safety concerns or other serious hardships.

Ms. Tan and her family are involved in their community in Pacifica and own their own home. The family attends Good Shepherd Catholic Church, volunteering at the church and the Mother Theresa of Calcutta's Daughters of Charity. Ms. Tan has the support of dozens of members of her community who have shared with me the family's spirit of commitment to their community.

Enactment of the legislation I am introducing on behalf of Ms. Tan today will enable this entire family to continue their lives in California and make positive contributions to their community. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to support this private bill.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill be included in the RECORD.

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

S. 797

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

SECTION 1. PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR SHIRLEY CONSTANTINO TAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b) of section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151), Shirley Constantino Tan shall be eligible for issuance of an immigrant visa or for adjustment of status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence upon filing an application for issuance of an immigrant visa under section 204 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1154) or for adjustment of status to lawful permanent resident.

(b) ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—If Shirley Constantino Tan enters the United States before the filing deadline specified in subsection (c), she shall be considered to have entered and remained lawfully and shall be eligible for adjustment of status under section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1255) as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) APPLICATION AND PAYMENT OF FEES.—Subsections (a) and (b) shall apply only if the application for issuance of an immigrant visa or the application for adjustment of status is filed with appropriate fees within two years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) REDUCTION OF IMMIGRANT VISA NUMBER.—Upon the granting of an immigrant visa or permanent residence to Shirley Constantino Tan, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to reduce by one, during the current or next following fiscal year—

(1) the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of birth of Shirley Constantino Tan under section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(a)); or

(2) if applicable, the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of birth of Shirley Constantino Tan under section 202(e) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1152(e)).

(e) PAYGO.—The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 798. A bill for the relief of Esidronio Arreola-Saucedo, Maria Elena Cobian Arreola, Nayely Arreola Carlos, and Cindy Jael Arreola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today, I offer private immigration relief legislation to provide lawful permanent resident status to Esidronio Arreola-Saucedo, Maria Elena Cobian Arreola, Nayely Arreola Carlos, and Cindy Jael Arreola. The Arreolas are Mexican nationals living in the Fresno area of California.

Esidronio and Maria Elena have lived in the United States for over 20 years. Two of their 5 children, Nayely and Cindy also stand to benefit from this legislation. The other 3 Arreola children, Robert, age 27, Daniel, age 22, and Saray, age 22, are United States citizens. The story of the Arreola family is compelling and I believe they merit Congress' special consideration for such an extraordinary form of relief as a private bill.

The Arreolas are facing deportation in part because of grievous errors committed by their previous counsel, who has since been disbarred. In fact, the attorney's conduct was so egregious that it compelled an immigration judge to write to the Executive Office of Immigration Review seeking the attorney's disbarment for his actions in his clients' immigration cases.

Esidronio came to the United States in 1986 and was an agricultural migrant worker in the fields of California for several years. As a migrant worker at that time, he would have been eligible for permanent residence through the Seasonal Agricultural Workers (SAW) program, had he known about it.

Maria Elena was living in the United States at the time she became pregnant with her daughter Cindy. She returned to Mexico to give birth because she wanted to avoid any immigration issues.

Because of the length of time that the Arreolas were in the United States, it is likely that they would have qualified for suspension of deportation, which would have allowed them to remain in the United States legally. However, the poor legal representation they received foreclosed this opportunity.

One of the most compelling reasons for my introduction of this private bill is the devastating impact the deportation of Esidronio and Maria Elena would have on their children–3 of whom are American citizens—and the other 2 who have lived in the United States since they were toddlers. America is the only country the Arreola children have ever known.

Nayely, the oldest, was the first in her family to graduate from high school and the first to graduate college. She recently received her Masters in Business Administration from Fresno Pacific University, a regionally ranked university, and now works in the admissions office. Nayely is married and has a young son named Elijah Ace Carlos.

At a young age, Nayely demonstrated a strong commitment to the ideals of citizenship in her adopted country. She worked hard to achieve her full potential both through her academic endeavors and community service. As the Associate Dean of Enrollment Services at Fresno Pacific University States in a letter of support, ''[T]he leaders of Fresno Pacific University saw in Nayely, a young person who will become exemplary of all that is good in the American dream.''

In high school, Nayely was a member of Advancement Via Individual Determination, AVID, college preparatory program in which students commit to determining their own futures through attaining a college degree. Nayely was also President of the Key Club, a community service organization. Perhaps the greatest hardship to Nayely's U.S. citizen husband and child, if she were forced to return to Mexico, would be her lost opportunity to realize her dreams and contribute further to her community and to this country.

Nayely's sister, Cindy, is also married and has a 7-year-old daughter and a 5-year-old son. Neither Nayely nor Cindy is eligible to automatically adjust their status based on their marriages because of their initial unlawful entry.

The Arreolas also have other family who are United States citizens or lawful permanent residents of this country. Maria Elena has 3 brothers who are American citizens, and Esidronio has a sister who is an American citizen. They have no immediate family in Mexico.

According to immigration authorities, this family has never had any problems with law enforcement. I am told that they have filed their taxes for every year from 1990 to the present. They have always worked hard to support themselves.

As I mentioned, Esidronio was previously employed as a farm worker, but now has his own business in California repairing electronics. His business has been successful enough to enable him to purchase a home for his family. He and his wife are active in their church community and in their children's education.

It is clear to me that this family has embraced the American dream. Enactment of the legislation I have reintroduced today will enable the Arreolas to continue to make significant contributions to their community as well as the United States. I ask my colleagues to support this private bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 798

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

SECTION 1. PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR ESIDRONIO ARREOLA-SAUCEDO, MARIA ELENA COBIAN ARREOLA, NAYELY ARREOLA CARLOS, AND CINDY JAEL ARREOLA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b) of section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151), Esidronio Arreola-Saucedo, Maria Elena Cobian Arreola, Nayely Arreola Carlos, and Cindy Jael Arreola shall each be eligible for issuance of an immigrant visa or for adjustment of status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence upon

filing an application for issuance of an immigrant visa under section 204 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1154) or for adjustment of status to lawful permanent resident.

(b) ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—If Esidronio Arreola-Saucedo, Maria Elena Cobian Arreola, Nayely Arreola Carlos, and Cindy Jael Arreola enter the United States before the filing deadline specified in subsection (c), Esidronio Arreola-Saucedo, Maria Elena Cobian Arreola, Nayely Arreola Carlos, and Cindy Jael Arreola shall be considered to have entered and remained lawfully in the United States and shall be eligible for adjustment of status under section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1255) as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) APPLICATION AND PAYMENT OF FEES.—Subsections (a) and (b) shall apply only if the applications for issuance of immigrant visas or the applications for adjustment of status are filed with appropriate fees not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) REDUCTION OF IMMIGRANT VISA NUMBERS.—Upon the granting of immigrant visas or permanent residence to Esidronio Arreola-Saucedo, Maria Elena Cobian Arreola, Nayely Arreola Carlos, and Cindy Jael Arreola, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to reduce by four, during the current or next following fiscal year—

(1) the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of birth of Esidronio Arreola-Saucedo, Maria Elena Cobian Arreola, Nayely Arreola Carlos, and Cindy Jael Arreola under section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(a)); or

(2) if applicable, the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of birth of Esidronio Arreola-Saucedo, Maria Elena Cobian Arreola, Nayely Arreola Carlos, and Cindy Jael Arreola under section 202(e) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1152(e)).

(e) PAYGO.—The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 822. A bill to permit the televising of Supreme Court proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 822

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 ''Cameras in the Courtroom Act''.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT TO TITLE 28.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 45 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end the following:

''§ 678. Televising Supreme Court proceedings

''The Supreme Court shall permit television coverage of all open sessions of the Court unless the Court decides, by a vote of the majority of justices, that allowing such coverage in a particular case would constitute a violation of the due process rights of 1 or more of the parties before the Court.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The chapter analysis for chapter 45 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end the following:

''678. Televising Supreme Court proceedings.''.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 839. A bill to extend Federal Pell Grant eligibility of certain short-term programs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President. In today's economy, approximately 80 percent of jobs require some form of postsecondary education or training beyond the high school level. The National Skills Coalition estimates that nearly half of all job openings between now and 2022 will be middle skill jobs that require post high school training, but not a four-year degree. While the number of students pursing postsecondary education is growing, the supply of skilled workers still falls short of industry demand. According to the Bureau of Labor and Statistics 7.3 million U.S. jobs are currently vacant in part because of a shortage of qualified workers.

Our Federal higher education policy must be modernized to meet the needs of students and employers. Under current law, Pell Grants—needs-based grants for low-income and working students—can only be awarded to students attending programs that are over 600 clock hours or at least 15 weeks in length. These grants cannot be used to offset the cost of targeted, short-term training programs offered at community and technical colleges that help students obtain employer-recognized credentials. When it comes to higher education, Federal policies need to support the demands of the changing labor market by increasing access to career pathways that align with industry demand. According to the Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce, shorter-term educational investments pay off—the average postsecondary certificate holder has 30 percent higher lifetime earnings than individuals with only a high school diploma.

Today, I am pleased to introduce with my colleague, Senator PORTMAN, the Jumpstart Our Businesses by Supporting Students or JOBS Act. The JOBS Act would close the skills gap by extending Pell Grant eligibility to high-quality, short-term job training programs offered at community colleges and other public institutions, so workers can afford the instruction they need to be successful in today's job market. Under the legislation, Pell-eligible job training programs are defined as those providing at least 150 clock hours of instruction time over a minimum of 8 weeks. Eligible job training programs must also provide students with licenses, certifications, or credentials that meet the hiring requirements of multiple employers in the field for which the job training is offered.

The JOBS Act also ensures that students enrolling in Pell-eligible short-term programs are earning high-quality postsecondary credentials by requiring that the credentials meet the standards of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, are recognized by industry or sector partnerships, and align with the skill needs of industries in States or local economies. Job training programs under this Act must also be evaluated by an accreditor and the State workforce board for quality and outcomes. The Virginia Community College System has identified approximately 50 programs that would benefit from the JOBS Act including in the fields of manufacturing, architecture/construction, energy, health care, information technology, transportation, and business management and administration.

The JOBS Act is a commonsense, bipartisan bill that would help workers and employers succeed in today's economy. As Congress works to reauthorize the Higher Education Act, I am hopeful that my colleagues will join me in advocating for Pell Grants to be made available to individuals enrolling in high-quality, short-term training programs that lead to industry-recognized credentials and good paying jobs.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 109—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE MARCH 31, 2019, PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION IN UKRAINE

Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 109

Whereas the Senate agrees with Senate Resolution 78, 115th Congress, introduced by Senators Menendez and Graham, which expressed the sense of the Senate recognizing 3 years of Russian military aggression in Ukraine;

Whereas the Senate concurs with Senate Resolution 27, 116th Congress, introduced by Senators Johnson and Durbin, which calls for a prompt multinational freedom of navigation operation in the Black Sea and urges the cancellation of the Nord Stream 2 pipeline;

Whereas the Senate endorses H.R. 596, 116th Congress, introduced by Representatives Connolly and Chabot, which affirms that it is the policy of the United States not to recognize the de jure or de facto sovereignty of the Russian Federation over Crimea, its airspace, or its territorial waters;

Whereas the Senate reaffirms the importance of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–272; 128 Stat. 2952),

which authorized increased security and economic assistance for Ukraine;

Whereas the Senate welcomes resolutions of Congress, such as House Resolution 202, 115th Congress, sponsored by Representative Delaney, which reaffirmed the commitment of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization;

Whereas the Senate notes the upcoming March 31, 2019, presidential election in Ukraine and the importance of a free and fair election to sustaining the principles and dreams of the 2014 Maidan Revolution;

Whereas the Senate expresses concern that the Government of the Russian Federation will continue to interfere in the election process and voting in the March 31, 2019, presidential election in Ukraine; and

Whereas the Senate agrees with former United States Ambassador to the Russian Federation Michael McFaul that ''Russian President Vladimir Putin is waging a global ideological war against Western liberal, democratic values. It has been underway for many years, and it extends from his own immediate neighborhood to Western Europe and, of course, the United States, where he intervened in the U.S. presidential election in 2016. The front line of this ideological war between Putinism and democracy, however, remains Ukraine.'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the United States Government does not prefer any particular candidate in the March 31, 2019, presidential election in Ukraine and seeks only a transparent and democratic election that reflects the will of the people of Ukraine;

(2) the United States Government will continue to support democracy and good governance in Ukraine, including anti-corruption initiatives, an independent media, and efforts to strengthen the rule of law, to support the ideals of the revolution of dignity of Ukraine;

(3) the United States should continue to work with allies to provide additional capacity building and technical support in order to deter Russian efforts to disrupt voting or undermine the legitimacy of the results of the presidential election in Ukraine; and

(4) not later than 90 days after the date on which this resolution is agreed to, the President should provide a briefing to Congress—

(A) assessing the scope and scale of Russian interference in the presidential campaign in Ukraine and vote tabulation on election day; and

(B) assessing the future course of United States–Ukrainian relations under whichever candidate is declared the winner of the presidential election.

SENATE RESOLUTION 110—KEEPING GUNS OUT OF CLASSROOMS

Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 110

Whereas Congress has consistently made clear that it is unlawful for Federal funds to be used for training or arming school personnel with firearms;

Whereas Congress passed the STOP School Violence Act of 2018 (title V of division S of Public Law 115–141) in response to the shooting in Parkland, Florida, and amended part AA of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10551 et seq.) to specify that ''No amounts provided as a grant [for school security under such part] may be used for the provision to any person of a firearm or training in the use of a firearm.'';

Whereas section 4102 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7113), as added by section 4101 of the Every Student Succeeds Act (Public Law 114–95; 129 Stat. 1970), defines drug and violence prevention in schools as including the ''creation . . . of a school environment that is free of weapons'';

Whereas existing research demonstrates that training or arming school personnel with firearms will not make schools safer;

Whereas an analysis by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of active shooters between 2000 and 2013 found that trained law enforcement suffered casualties in 21 of the 45 incidents in which officers engaged the shooter to end the threat;

Whereas a survey of gun violence on school campuses showed that out of 225 incidents of gun violence between 1999 and 2018, trained armed personnel or school resource officers failed to disarm an active shooter 223 times;

Whereas proposed and existing programs to train or arm school personnel with firearms require significantly less training than law enforcement officers receive;

Whereas research demonstrates that increased gun access and possession are not associated with protection from violence and a greater prevalence of guns increases the likelihood of gun violence;

Whereas a greater prevalence of guns in schools creates undue risk of students gaining unauthorized access to firearms and the potential for unintentional shootings and school staff using guns in situations that do not warrant lethal force;

Whereas students of color, students with disabilities, and other vulnerable groups would experience a disparate impact of programs that arm school personnel as those students are disproportionately disciplined and arrested;

Whereas heightened policing within public school spaces decreases a student's sense of safety and the associated anticipation of violence leads to increased anxiety, fear, and depression;

Whereas 73 percent of teachers in the United States do not want to carry guns in school and 58 percent say arming personnel would make schools less safe, according to a Gallup poll from March 2018;

Whereas the majority of parents of school-aged children oppose arming school personnel, according to surveys;

Whereas, as of March 2019, there is no evidence supporting the value of arming school personnel;

Whereas the broad consensus among participants in the listening tour for the final report of the Federal Commission on School Safety released in December 2018 was disagreement with programs that would arm school personnel, according to transcripts; and

Whereas, in that final report, the Department of Education endorsed the use of Federal funds to train personnel to use firearms: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that Federal funds shall not be used to train or arm school personnel with firearms.

SENATE RESOLUTION 111—RECOGNIZING THE HERITAGE, CULTURE, AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF LATINAS IN THE UNITED STATES

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. UDALL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BENNET, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. COONS, Mr. REED, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. KAINE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 111

Whereas the United States celebrates National Women's History Month every March to recognize and honor the achievements of women throughout the history of the United States;

Whereas there are nearly 28,000,000 Latinas living in the United States;

Whereas 1 in 6 women in the United States is a Latina;

Whereas Latinas have helped shape the history of the United States since its inception;

Whereas Latinas contribute to the society of the United States through working in many industries, including business, education, science and technology, medicine, engineering, mathematics, literature and the arts, the military, agriculture, hospitality, and public service at every level of government;

Whereas Latinas come from diverse cultures across North America, Central America, South America, and the Caribbean, and Afro-Latinas face disparities in recognition;

Whereas Latinas are dedicated public servants, holding posts at the highest levels of the Federal Government, including the Supreme Court of the United States, Cabinet-level positions, the United States Senate, and the United States House of Representatives;

Whereas Latinas make up an estimated 16 percent of women in the Armed Forces, and the first Latina to become a general in the Marine Corps reached that rank in 2006;

Whereas Latinas are breaking the glass ceiling in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields, with the first Latina to travel into space doing so during a 9-day Space Shuttle Discovery mission in 1993;

Whereas Latinas own nearly 2,000,000 businesses, and 1 in 6 women-owned companies in the United States is owned by a Latina;

Whereas Latina activists have led the fight for civil rights, including labor rights, LGBTQ rights, women's rights, and racial equality;

Whereas Latinas create award-winning art and are recipients of Emmy, Grammy, Oscar, and Tony awards;

Whereas Latina singers and songwriters, like Selena, also known as the Queen of Tejano music, and Celia Cruz, also known as the Queen of Salsa, have made lasting and significant contributions to music throughout the world;

Whereas Latinas serve in the medical profession, and the first female and first Hispanic Surgeon General of the United States was appointed in 1990;

Whereas Latinas are paid just 53 cents for every dollar paid to White, non-Hispanic men;

Whereas, in the face of societal obstacles, including unequal pay, disparities in education, health care needs, and civil rights struggles, Latinas continue to break through and thrive;

Whereas the United States should continue to invest in the future of Latinas to address the barriers they face; and

Whereas, by 2060, Latinas will represent ⅓ of the female population of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) celebrates and honors the successes of Latinas and the contributions they have made and continue to make to the United States; and

(2) recognizes the changes that are still to be made to ensure that Latinas can realize their full potential as equal members of society.

SENATE RESOLUTION 112—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE UNITED STATES CONDEMNS ALL FORMS OF VIOLENCE AGAINST CHILDREN GLOBALLY AND RECOGNIZES THE HARMFUL IMPACTS OF VIOLENCE AGAINST CHILDREN

Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. COONS, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 112

Whereas violence against children can take many forms, including sexual violence, physical violence, emotional violence, abuse, neglect, and exploitation;

Whereas, each year, more than 1,000,000,000 children worldwide are exposed to violence;

Whereas, each year, the global economic impact of physical, psychological, and sexual violence against children is estimated to be as high as $7,000,000,000,000, which is 8 percent of global gross domestic product (referred to in this preamble as ''global GDP'');

Whereas, around the world, an estimated 1 in 3 adolescent girls between 15 and 19 years of age, or 84,000,000 girls, have been victims of emotional, physical, or sexual violence, which is often perpetrated by individuals the girls know;

Whereas 1 in 5 girls in the developing world is said to be married before reaching 18 years of age and, of those girls, an estimated 1 in 9 is said to be married before reaching 15 years of age;

Whereas, according to the United Nations Children's Fund (commonly known as ''UNICEF''), if current child marriage rates continue, 120,000,000 girls, an average of 12,000,000 girls a year, will be married before their 18th birthday over the next decade;

Whereas 246,000,000 boys and girls experience school-related gender-based violence each year;

Whereas children with disabilities reportedly are 3 to 4 times more likely to experience physical or sexual violence;

Whereas tens of millions of children living outside of family care, including those living on the streets, working away from home, and in residential care, are particularly vulnerable to violence and abuse;

Whereas an estimated 152,000,000 children are involved in child labor and 4,300,000 children are subject to forced labor, including in situations of trafficking;

Whereas nearly half of the 68,500,000 individuals who are currently displaced by conflict and war around the world are children and displacement exposes those children to increased risk of exploitation, violence, and abuse;

Whereas, according to the United Nations, from 2016 to 2017, verified cases of child recruitment, including forcible recruitment, and participation in armed conflict—

(1) quadrupled in the Central African Republic;

(2) doubled in the Democratic Republic of the Congo; and

(3) persisted at alarming levels in Somalia, South Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, and Yemen;

Whereas more than 10,000 children were killed or maimed in 2017 in armed conflict;

Whereas the risks of online abuse and exploitation of children is constantly growing, with the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children reviewing cases involving 25,000,000 child sexual abuse images in 2015, up from 450,000 in 2004;

Whereas unaddressed exposure to violence disrupts the development of critical brain architecture and other organ structures, leaving children at lifelong risk of disease and reduced potential;

Whereas studies show toxic stress relating to exposure to violent or dangerous environments becomes damaging to learning, behavior, and health across a lifespan;

Whereas violence against children can lead to negative health consequences, including injury, noncommunicable and communicable diseases, and poor maternal and child health outcomes;

Whereas all forms of violence in childhood have a significant negative impact on educational outcomes, including school attendance and drop-out rates, and can further limit access to the physical, mental health, psychosocial and cognitive protections that safe educational settings provide;

Whereas decades of behavioral and social science research have demonstrated that building adaptive capacities, known as resilience, through stable and committed relationships with a supportive caregiver or other adult can lessen the harmful developmental effects of violence in children and youth;

Whereas, according to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, the United States invests 0.5 percent of official development assistance in programs that are designed to prevent and address violence against children and youth;

Whereas the United States, in coordination with public-private partnerships and other organizations, has endorsed the technical package called ''INSPIRE: Seven Strategies for Ending Violence against Children'' (referred to in this preamble as ''INSPIRE'') put forth by the World Health Organization, with substantial technical input from the United States Government, including from the Centers for Disease Control and United State Agency for International Development;

Whereas INSPIRE contains 7 evidence-based strategies to end violence against children that include—

(1) implementing and enforcing relevant laws;

(2) addressing harmful gender and other social norms;

(3) creating and sustaining safe communities;

(4) supporting parents and caregivers;

(5) improving household economic security to reduce violence in the home;

(6) improving access to health services, social welfare, and criminal justice support; and

(7) ensuring safe school environments that provide gender-equitable education and social-emotional learning and life skills trainings; and

Whereas the United States Agency for International Development, the Department of State, the Department of Labor, the Department of Homeland Security, and the Department of Health and Human Services each play a critical role in preventing and responding to violence against children and youth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United States—

(1) condemns all forms of violence against children and youth globally, including physical, mental, and sexual violence, neglect, abuse, maltreatment, and exploitation;

(2) recognizes—

(A) the harmful impact that violence against children and youth has on the healthy development of children; and

(B) the harmful economic impact of violence against children and youth; and

(3) should—

(A) develop and implement a comprehensive and coordinated strategy built on evidence-based practices, including the technical package called ''INSPIRE: Seven Strategies for Ending Violence against Children'' put forth by the World Health Organization; and

(B) adopt common metrics and indicators to monitor progress across Federal agencies to prevent, address, and end violence against children and youth globally.

SENATE RESOLUTION 113—DESIGNATING MARCH 25, 2019, AS ''NATIONAL CEREBRAL PALSY AWARENESS DAY''

Mr. ISAKSON (for himself, Mr. CASEY, and Ms. HASSAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 113

Whereas a group of permanent disorders of the development of movement and posture that are attributed to nonprogressive disturbances that occur in the developing brain is referred to as ''cerebral palsy'';

Whereas cerebral palsy, the most common motor disability in children, is caused by damage to 1 or more specific areas of the developing brain, which usually occurs during fetal development before, during, or after birth;

Whereas the majority of children who have cerebral palsy are born with cerebral palsy, but cerebral palsy may be undetected for months or years;

Whereas 75 percent of individuals with cerebral palsy also have 1 or more developmental disabilities, including epilepsy, intellectual disability, autism, visual impairment, or blindness;

Whereas, according to information released by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention—

(1) the prevalence of cerebral palsy is not changing over time; and

(2) an estimated 1 in 323 children has cerebral palsy;

Whereas approximately 764,000 individuals in the United States are affected by cerebral palsy;

Whereas, although there is no cure for cerebral palsy, treatment often improves the capabilities of a child with cerebral palsy;

Whereas scientists and researchers are hopeful for breakthroughs in cerebral palsy research;

Whereas researchers across the United States conduct important research projects involving cerebral palsy; and

Whereas the Senate can raise awareness of cerebral palsy in the public and the medical community: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates March 25, 2019, as ''National Cerebral Palsy Awareness Day''; and

(2) encourages each individual in the United States to become better informed about and aware of cerebral palsy.

SENATE RESOLUTION 114—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF MARCH 21, 2019, AS ''NATIONAL ROSIE THE RIVETER DAY''

Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. COONS, and Mr. ISAKSON) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 114

Whereas National Rosie the Riveter Day is a collective national effort to raise awareness of the more than 18,000,000 women in the civilian labor force during World War II;

Whereas the people of the United States have chosen to honor women workers who contributed from the home front during World War II;

Whereas those women left their homes to work or volunteer full-time in factories, farms, shipyards, airplane factories, banks, and other institutions in support of the Armed Forces overseas;

Whereas those women worked with the United Service Organizations and the American Red Cross, drove trucks, riveted airplane parts, collected critical materials, rolled bandages, and served on rationing boards;

Whereas it is fitting and proper to recognize and preserve the history and legacy of working women, including volunteer women, during World War II to promote cooperation and fellowship among those women and their descendants;

Whereas those women and their descendants wish to further the advancement of patriotic ideas, excellence in the workplace, and loyalty to the United States; and

Whereas March 21, 2019, during Women's History Month, is an appropriate day to designate as ''National Rosie the Riveter Day'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of March 21, 2019 as ''National Rosie the Riveter Day''; and

(2) acknowledges the important role played by women during World War II.

SENATE RESOLUTION 115—RECOGNIZING THE REALTORS LAND INSTITUTE ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 75TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. COTTON (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 115

Whereas, in 1944, the REALTORS® Land Institute was founded by 20 land specialists who met at the Drake Hotel in Chicago, Illinois, to establish a national organization that would provide education, information, marketing opportunities, and broker networking to enhance the ability of their members to conduct business as recognized professional land use specialists and, through collective action, preserve private property rights;

Whereas, as of 2019, the REALTORS® Land Institute has been an affiliate of the National Association of REALTORS® for 75 years;

Whereas, in 2019, the REALTORS® Land Institute celebrates 75 years of serving land owners, users, and realtors throughout the United States and Canada;

Whereas the members of the REALTORS® Land Institute have developed international marketing capabilities and networks throughout the world;

Whereas the REALTORS® Land Institute is comprised of members who subscribe to a strict code of ethics and to just and equitable principles in real estate transactions;

Whereas the REALTORS® Land Institute encourages continuing education and rewards members who complete an extensive education program and service to the land industry with a national designation of Accredited Land Consultant (commonly known as ''ALC''); and

Whereas the REALTORS® Land Institute is a national professional trade association, dedicated to advancing the effective use of the most precious commodity in the United States, land: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the REALTORS® Land Institute on the occasion of its 75th anniversary; and

(2) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit a copy of this resolution to the REALTORS® Land Institute.

SENATE RESOLUTION 116—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF SOCIAL WORK MONTH AND WORLD SOCIAL WORK DAY ON MARCH 19, 2019

Ms. STABENOW submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 116

Whereas the social work profession is dedicated to enhancing well-being and helping meet the basic needs of all people, especially those who are vulnerable, oppressed, and living in poverty;

Whereas, in 2019, the theme of Social Work Month, ''Elevate Social Work'', embodies the need to recognize the extraordinary contributions of the profession to the society of the United States;

Whereas the social work profession is expected to grow faster than average over the next 7 years, with more than 682,000 people expected to be employed as social workers by 2026;

Whereas social workers elevate and empower people, giving them the ability to solve problems, cope with personal roadblocks, and get the resources they need to succeed;

Whereas the social work profession is deeply woven into the society of the United States, with social workers active in government, schools, universities, social service agencies, communities, corporations, the military, and health care and mental health care settings;

Whereas social workers are the largest group of providers of mental health services in the United States, and the Department of Veterans Affairs is one of the largest employers of social workers who hold advanced degrees;

Whereas social workers travel across the United States and the world to help people in crisis, helping them overcome issues such as death and grief, epidemics, environmental pollution, and natural disasters such as wildfires, hurricanes, and floods;

Whereas social workers have been at the forefront of social justice for decades, pushing for equal rights for women, African Americans, Latinos, people who are disabled, people who are LGBTQ, and various ethnic, cultural, and religious groups;

Whereas, for more than a century, the social work profession has been on the cutting edge of helping to create changes to make the society of the United States a better place to live, including expanded voting rights, improved workplace safety, and the establishment of a minimum wage and social safety net programs that ameliorate poverty and hunger; and

Whereas social workers stand ready to help the society of the United States address current pressing issues, including equal rights for all, the need for improved availability of health care and mental health services, immigration reform, voting rights, and the environmental impact of global warming: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of Social Work Month and World Social Work Day on March 19, 2019;

(2) acknowledges the diligent efforts of individuals and groups that promote the importance of social work and observe Social Work Month and World Social Work Day;

(3) encourages individuals to engage in appropriate ceremonies and activities to promote further awareness of the life-changing roles that social workers play; and

(4) recognizes with gratitude the contributions of the millions of caring individuals who have chosen to serve their communities through social work.

SENATE RESOLUTION 117—DESIGNATING MARCH 22, 2019, AS ''NATIONAL REHABILITATION COUNSELORS APPRECIATION DAY''

Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 117

Whereas rehabilitation counselors support individuals with disabilities by—

(1) conducting assessments;

(2) providing counseling;

(3) supporting families; and

(4) assisting in the development of individualized plans for employment for individuals with disabilities who are in need of rehabilitation;

Whereas the purpose of professional organizations for rehabilitation counseling and education is to promote the improvement of rehabilitation services available to individuals with disabilities through—

(1) quality education for counselors; and

(2) rehabilitation research;

Whereas various professional organizations have vigorously advocated for up-to-date education and training and the maintenance of professional standards in the field of rehabilitation counseling and education, including—

(1) the National Rehabilitation Association;

(2) the Rehabilitation Counselors and Educators Association;

(3) the National Council on Rehabilitation Education;

(4) the National Rehabilitation Counseling Association;

(5) the American Rehabilitation Counseling Association;

(6) the Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor Certification;

(7) the Council of State Administrators of Vocational Rehabilitation; and

(8) the Council on Rehabilitation Education;

Whereas, in March of 1983, the president of the National Council on Rehabilitation Education testified before the Subcommittee on Select Education of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and was instrumental in bringing to the attention of Congress the need for qualified rehabilitation counselors; and

Whereas credentialed rehabilitation counselors provide a higher quality of service to

individuals in need of rehabilitation, and the development of an accreditation system for rehabilitation counselors supports the continued education of rehabilitation counselors: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates March 22, 2019, as ''National Rehabilitation Counselors Appreciation Day''; and

(2) commends—

(A) rehabilitation counselors for their dedication and hard work in providing counseling to individuals with disabilities who are in need of rehabilitation; and

(B) professional organizations for their efforts in assisting individuals with disabilities who are in need of rehabilitation.

SENATE RESOLUTION 118—RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF PAYING TRIBUTE TO THOSE INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE FAITHFULLY SERVED AND RETIRED FROM THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES, DESIGNATING APRIL 18, 2019, AS ''MILITARY RETIREE APPRECIATION DAY'', AND ENCOURAGING THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES TO HONOR THE PAST AND CONTINUED SERVICE OF MILITARY RETIREES TO THEIR LOCAL COMMUNITIES AND THE UNITED STATES

Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. JONES, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. KAINE, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WICKER, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. WARNER, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROUNDS, and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 118

Whereas there are approximately 2,000,000 retirees of the Armed Forces of the United States who have earned their retirement through career service, a service-connected disability, or both;

Whereas military retirees show an unrivaled dedication to service, having faithfully served their country and dedicated much of their lives knowing that at any moment they could be sent anywhere in the world and possibly asked to make the ultimate sacrifice to protect and defend the national security of the United States;

Whereas military retirees, through their perseverance and dedication—

(1) have proven to be leaders who are resilient, focused, disciplined, well-trained, and well-educated; and

(2) bring the best qualities of citizenship in the United States to lifelong service within their national and local communities as dependable, responsible citizens and neighbors;

Whereas the qualities of a military retiree often result in positive contributions to—

(1) the civilian workforce, as experienced and knowledgeable employees;

(2) local educational institutions, as teachers, counselors, and coaches;

(3) local government, as elected public servants; and

(4) communities, as dedicated and effective volunteers;

Whereas the dedication and focus of military retirees helps strengthen and stabilize local communities; and

Whereas the contributions of military retirees to their communities are the manifestation of the desire of the retirees to continue their selfless acts of volunteering and their lifelong service to the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates April 18, 2019, as ''Military Retiree Appreciation Day''; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to honor the past and continued service of military retirees to their local communities and the United States through appropriate ceremonies and other activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 119—SUPPORTING THE GOALS OF WORLD TUBERCULOSIS DAY TO RAISE AWARENESS ABOUT TUBERCULOSIS

Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 119

Whereas ¼ of the population of the world is infected with the tuberculosis bacterium (commonly referred to as ''TB'');

Whereas the World Health Organization (commonly referred to as the ''WHO'') estimates that 10,000,000 people developed TB in 2017, nine percent of whom were also infected with the human immunodeficiency virus (commonly referred to as ''HIV'');

Whereas, in 2017, TB killed an estimated 1,600,000 people, causing more deaths worldwide than any other single infectious agent;

Whereas ⅔ of new TB infections in 2017 occurred in India, China, Indonesia, the Philippines, Pakistan, Nigeria, Bangladesh, and South Africa;

Whereas TB is a leading killer of people infected with HIV, and 300,000 people with HIV died of TB in 2017;

Whereas additional vulnerable populations at high risk for developing TB include pregnant women and newborns;

Whereas TB is one of the six leading causes of death among adult women between the ages of 15 and 49 in low-income countries, and women with TB can face stigma, discrimination, and in some settings ostracization by their families and communities;

Whereas the global TB epidemic and the spread of drug-resistant TB present a persistent public health threat to the United States because the disease does not recognize borders;

Whereas antibiotic-resistant pathogens are a growing problem worldwide, and drug-resistant TB can occur when the drugs used to treat TB are misused or mismanaged;

Whereas studies have demonstrated direct person-to-person transmission of drug-resistant TB;

Whereas multi-drug resistant TB (commonly referred to as ''MDR-TB'') is caused by bacteria with resistance to rifampin and isoniazid, the two most potent treatments for TB infection;

Whereas, according to the 2018 WHO Global Tuberculosis Report, in 2017 an estimated 3.5 percent of all new TB cases and 18 percent of previously treated cases were MDR-TB or rifampin-resistant TB;

Whereas, in 2017, an estimated 558,000 people around the world developed MDR-TB or rifampin-resistant TB, yet only approximately 25 percent of those individuals have been identified and treated;

Whereas extensively drug-resistant TB (commonly referred to as ''XDR-TB'') is a rare type of TB that is resistant to nearly all medicines, and therefore can be very difficult and expensive to treat, especially among patients with HIV and acquired immune deficiency syndrome (commonly referred to as ''AIDS'');

Whereas, according to the 2018 WHO Global Tuberculosis Report, in 2017, 127 countries reported at least one case of XDR-TB;

Whereas, in 2017, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimated that the cost of treating a single patient with MDR-TB in the United States averaged $164,000, and the average cost of treating a patient with XDR-TB was even higher at $526,000, compared with $19,000 to treat a patient with drug-susceptible TB;

Whereas MDR-TB and XDR-TB cases in the United States between 2005 and 2007 collectively cost the health care system an estimated $53,000,000, according to an analysis by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention;

Whereas the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates that costs resulting from all forms of TB in the United States totaled more than $460,000,000 in 2017;

Whereas, in a 2000 report, the Institute of Medicine found that a decrease in TB control funding and the spread of HIV and AIDS caused a resurgence of TB in the late 1980s and early 1990s;

Whereas a total of 9,105 TB cases were reported in the United States in 2017, representing all 50 States and the District of Columbia, and up to 13,000,000 people in the United States are estimated to be living with latent TB infection;

Whereas 75 percent of States have reported an increase in the proportion of complex cases of TB in recent years due to factors such as homelessness, HIV infection, drug resistance, substance abuse, refugee status, and other factors;

Whereas the rate of TB disease in African Americans is eight times higher than the rate in White non-Hispanic Americans, and significant disparities exist among other minorities in the United States, including Native Americans and Alaska Natives, Asian Americans, and Hispanic Americans, with 86 percent of all reported TB cases in the United States in 2016 occurring in racial or ethnic minorities;

Whereas, globally in 2017, an estimated 1,000,000 children developed TB and 230,000 children died of TB;

Whereas smoking greatly increases the risks of contracting TB and TB recurrence and impairs the response to treatment;

Whereas diabetes is a major risk factor for TB, and people with diabetes are more likely to develop TB and have a higher risk of death due to TB;

Whereas bedaquiline is an antibiotic that boosts an MDR-TB patient's chance of survival from approximately 50 percent to as much as 80 percent, and through a public-private partnership, the United States Agency for International Development (commonly referred to as ''USAID'') provided approximately 30,000 treatments in 110 countries from 2015 through the end of February 2018;

Whereas Bacillus Calmette-Guerin, a TB vaccine that is known as ''BCG'', provides some protection to infants and young children but has had little epidemiologic impact on TB worldwide;

Whereas there is a critical need for new drugs, diagnostics, and vaccines for controlling the global TB epidemic;

Whereas, in September 2018, the United Nations held the first high-level meeting on TB in which 120 countries, including the United States, signed a political declaration committing to accelerating the TB response, including by increasing funding for TB control programs and research and development efforts, with the goal of reaching all affected people with TB prevention and care;

Whereas the enactment of the Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–293; 122 Stat. 2918), and the Comprehensive Tuberculosis Elimination Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–392; 122 Stat. 4195) provided a historic United States commitment to the global eradication of TB, including a commitment to treat 4,500,000 TB patients and 90,000 MDR-TB patients between 2009 and 2013 and to provide additional treatment through coordinated multilateral efforts;

Whereas USAID—

(A) provides technical assistance to 22 countries highly burdened by TB to build self-reliance and support the adoption of state-of-the-art TB-related technologies;

(B) supports the development of new diagnostic and treatment tools; and

(C) supports research to develop new vaccines and other new methods to combat TB;

Whereas, in 2018, USAID launched—

(A) a new business model entitled ''Global Accelerator to End Tuberculosis'' to accelerate progress and build self-reliance with respect to TB prevention and treatment; and

(B) a new mechanism to directly support local organizations in priority countries;

Whereas TB incidence in the countries that receive bilateral TB funding from the United States through USAID has decreased by nearly ¼ since 2000;

Whereas, according the Copenhagen Consensus Center, TB prevention programs return $56 for each dollar invested, which is one of the highest returns on investment of any health intervention;

Whereas the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, partnering with other entities of the United States and individual States and territories, directs the national TB elimination program, coordinates TB surveillance, technical assistance, and prevention activities, and helps to support the development of new diagnostic, treatment, and prevention tools to combat TB;

Whereas the National Institutes of Health, through its many institutes and centers, plays the leading role in basic and clinical research on the identification, treatment, and prevention of TB;

Whereas the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria (commonly referred to as the ''Global Fund''), to which the United States is a top financial donor, provides more than 65 percent of all international financing for TB programs;

Whereas, to date, Global Fund-supported programs have detected and treated more than 17,400,000 cases of TB; and

Whereas March 24, 2019, is World Tuberculosis Day, a day that commemorates the date in 1882 on which Dr. Robert Koch announced his discovery of Mycobacterium tuberculosis, the bacteria that causes TB: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals of World Tuberculosis Day to raise awareness about tuberculosis;

(2) commends the progress of tuberculosis elimination efforts by entities that include the United States Agency for International Development, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the National Institutes of Health, the World Health Organization, and the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria; and

(3) reaffirms the commitment to strengthen the United States leadership and effectiveness of the global response to tuberculosis with the goal of ending the tuberculosis epidemic.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 200. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 46, relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 200. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 46, relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Fentanyl and fentanyl analogues were responsible for more than 28,400 overdose deaths in the United States in 2017, according to the National Institute of Drug Abuse.

(2) According to the Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Customs and Border Protection has reported that fentanyl smuggling between ports of entry at the southern border of the United States more than doubled from fiscal year 2017 to fiscal year 2018.

(3) According to the Department of Homeland Security, in the past 5 years, U.S. Customs and Border Protection has seen a 620 percent increase in families—or those posing as families—apprehended at the border, with fiscal year 2018 being the highest on record for family apprehensions at the border.

(4) The journey to the southern border for women and children traveling from Central America is fraught with incredible danger, including increased risk of violence and sexual abuse from gangs and coyotes.

(5) The bipartisan Secure Fence Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–367; 120 Stat. 2638) was signed into law on October 26, 2006, and mandated that the Department of Homeland Security achieve and maintain operational control of the international land border, using physical infrastructure as well as other means, to ensure ''the prevention of all unlawful entries into the United States, including entries by terrorists, other unlawful aliens, instruments of terrorism, narcotics, and other contraband''.

(6) Over the past 25 years, the United States Government has constructed 654 miles of physical barriers on the southern border.

(7) The Department of Homeland Security is only seeking to expand the physical barrier on the southern border in operationally necessary locations, not to build a physical barrier for all 1,954 miles of the southern border.

(8) U.S. Customs and Border Protection has identified 17 high priority locations on the southern border where there is a current operational need for physical barriers.

(9) On January 6, 2019, the President requested that Congress appropriate $5,700,000,000 for the construction of approximately 234 miles of new physical barriers to fully fund the top 10 high priority locations identified by U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(10) On February 15, 2019, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019 (Public Law 116–6) was signed into law, providing the Department of Homeland Security with $1,375,000,000 for ''the construction of primary pedestrian fencing, including levee pedestrian fencing, in the Rio Grande Valley Sector''.

(11) On February 15, 2019, the President announced the Treasury Forfeiture Fund would provide to U.S. Customs and Border Protection $601,000,000 for physical barriers along the southern border under the authority of section 9705 of title 31, United States Code, which established the Fund and allows the Secretary of the Treasury to provide monies from the Fund for use ''in connection with the law enforcement activities of any Federal agency''.

(12) On February 15, 2019, the President announced that Department of Defense funds would be made available from the Department's Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities account for physical barriers along the southern border under the authority of section 284 of title 10, United States Code, which authorizes the Secretary of Defense to ''provide support for the counterdrug activities or activities to counter transnational organized crime of any other department or agency of the Federal Government'', including for the ''[c]onstruction of roads and fences and installation of lighting to block drug smuggling corridors across international boundaries of the United States''.

(13) Section 8005 of division A of the Department of Defense and Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Act, 2019 (Public Law 115–245) permits the Secretary of Defense to transfer up to $4,000,000,000 of funds to other accounts, including the Department of Defense's Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities account, provided that ''such action is necessary in the national interest''.

(14) The sum of the amounts described in paragraphs (10) through (13) is $5,976,000,000, an amount in excess of the $5,700,000,000 sought by the President for 234 miles of physical barriers along the southern border in the request described in paragraph (9).

(15) On June 27, 2013, the Senate agreed to the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act (S. 744, 113th Congress), which was introduced by Senator Charles E. Schumer (Democrat of New York), and included the following congressional finding: ''As a Nation, we have the right and responsibility to make our borders safe, to establish clear and just rules for seeking citizenship, to control the flow of legal immigration, and to eliminate illegal immigration, which in some cases has become a threat to our national security.''.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO OBJECT TO PROCEEDING

I, Senator MIKE BRAUN, intend to object to proceeding to H.R. 269, a bill to reauthorize certain programs under the Public Health Service Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to public health security and all-hazards preparedness and response, to clarify the regulatory framework with respect to certain nonprescription drugs that are marketed without an approved drug application, and for other purposes, dated March 14, 2019 for the following reasons as stated in the RECORD.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have 6 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, March 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, March 14, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Financial stability oversight council nonbank designation.''

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, March 14, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 14, 2019, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''The President's Fiscal year 2020 budget.''

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 14, 2019, at 1:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''The President's Fiscal year 2020 budget.''

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 14, 2019, at 2 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

NATIONAL CEREBRAL PALSY AWARENESS DAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 113, submitted earlier today.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 113) designating March 25, 2019, as ''National Cerebral Palsy Awareness Day.''

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, 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. 113) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF MARCH 21, 2019, AS ''NATIONAL ROSIE THE RIVETER DAY''

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 114, submitted earlier today.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 114) expressing support for the designation of March 21, 2019, as ''National Rosie the Riveter Day.''

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I further 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. 114) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, MARCH 15, 2019, THROUGH MONDAY, MARCH 25, 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. 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, March 15, 2019, at 11 a.m.; Tuesday, March 19, 2019, at 9:30 a.m.; Thursday, March 21, 2019, at 2:10 p.m. I further ask that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, March 21, 2019, it next convene at 3 p.m., Monday, March 25, 2019, and that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, morning business be closed, and the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Bade nomination; finally, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture motions filed during today's session ripen at 5:30 p.m., Monday, March 25, 2019.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. 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 SULLIVAN.

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

The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO PETER KAISER

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, it is that time of day on the Senate floor when I get to recognize someone special from my State, someone we refer to as the Alaskan of the Week, someone who makes our great State of Alaska, in my opinion, the best and most unique State in the country. I know it is the pages' favorite speech of the week as well. I don't think you are going to be disappointed with this one, the young men and women here working as pages.

Now, some may take issue with the claim of the most unique State in the Union, but consider this: Right now we have teams of mushers and their dogs that are barreling 900 miles across the State of Alaska toward the city of Nome in some of the harshest conditions and some of the most difficult and rugged terrain on the planet Earth. The Iditarod—the ''Last Great Race on Earth''—is still under way in Alaska. Right now, mushers, literally as we speak, are rolling in to Nome today, tomorrow, and in the next few days.

We salute all of the mushers and their dogs, the athletes—these dogs are great athletes—for their hard work. We are particularly proud this year. For the first time in history, three women—Page Drobyn, Jessie Royer, and Aliy Zirkle—are among the top ten finishers in the Iditarod.

Like all races, there is a winner, and our Alaskan of the Week—we see a great picture of him and his dogs here—is the winner. After 9 days, 12 hours, 39 minutes, and 6 seconds on the trail, at 3:39 a.m., yesterday morning, in Nome, AK, Bethel resident Peter Kaiser crossed the finish line in Nome to win this year's Iditarod.

This win is also historic for a number of reasons. Pete is the first person from Bethel, AK, to win the race. He is the fifth Alaska Native to win and the first Alaskan of Yupik descent to take the title.

A crowd was there waiting for him. It seemed like half the town of Bethel was there waiting for him. As he crossed the finish line, they were chanting: Way to go, Pete. Way to go, Pete. Alaska Native dancers performed. There were hugs and tears of joy all around. His wife Bethany was there. Their two children, Ari Joseph and daughter Aylee, were also there.

This is also exciting because of the race's historic roots. Before I talk more about Pete, for a little bit, let me take you back to a remarkable piece of history that happened in Nome, AK, in 1925, when diphtheria serum was desperately needed in Nome for several very sick children.

It was 1925, in Alaska, and the nearest batch of serum was 1,000 miles away in Anchorage. There weren't—and, unfortunately, there still aren't—any

roads between Nome and Anchorage. As a matter of fact, Alaska has almost 200 communities that don't have any roads connecting them to other places. There were no commercial airlines back then. The nearest train station to Nome was roughly 700 miles away. So, in the winter, people traveled mostly by dog sled.

On the night of January 27, 1925, musher ''Wild Bill'' Shannon tied a 20-pound package of serum wrapped in protective fur around his sled. He and his nine dogs started the hundreds-of-miles journey—the ''Great Race of Mercy'' it was called back then—across the frozen Alaska land. The entire Nation was watching. This was reported in newspapers all across America.

Wild Bill went for some time. Miles later, he met up with another racer and another team of dogs, and this relay of dog mushers carrying the serum for the sick kids in Nome continued until the lifesaving serum reached Nome 5 days later—pretty remarkable.

The original race, as I mentioned, in 1925, began to be reenacted, with some twists, in 1973. There were no relays and just one musher and his dogs running the whole route. It continues today in honor of that lifesaving mission that happened—and saved the kids, by the way—in Nome almost a century ago.

What a race it is. The mushers face frostbite, howling winds, and blizzards. They risk getting lost in the great Alaskan wilderness. In fact, they risk their lives along the way.

Entering the race at all requires fierce determination, but winning the race, like Peter Kaiser just did, requires even more than determination. It requires years of grueling training, it requires guts, and it requires an Alaskan-sized heart. That is what Pete Kaiser has.

Let me tell you a little about Pete, our Alaskan of the Week and our 2019 Iditarod champ.

He is 31 years old. He was born and raised in Bethel, and he traces his mushing roots back to his great-grandfather, who came into the country as a gold miner and made extended trips with his dog team from the interior part of the State to Bristol Bay. His great-grandfather met and married a beautiful Yupik woman who had been raised in an orphanage, and that was his great-grandmother.

He grew up with dogs. He and his sister loved mushing. When Pete was in college, he decided he really wanted to know everything about dogs that he could, and that passion turned into dog mushing full time in the great State of Alaska. According to him, that mushing, that determination, and that hard work gave his life focus and purpose.

Pete has won another race, Bethel's Kuskokwim 300, four times in a row, and he has run every Iditarod since 2010, placing fifth three different times. This year, he won it all. He took the gold.

This was not an easy year on the trail. In 2017, it was one of the coldest Iditarods on record. Most of the trail most of the time out there was 30, 40, or maybe even 50 below zero. It was very cold, very dark. This year, interestingly, was one of the warmest. The lack of snow in some areas presented challenges. One area of the trail—almost 80 miles, on what we call tussocks or rolling tundra—was in many areas without snow. It was like mushing over bowling balls, said Pete after he won.

But he kept his cool and ran a strategic, determined race, and, importantly, he knew the area. While other mushers trained in the more urban areas, he stuck with rural Alaska, where the trail really gets rough, and he knew how to handle it.

He husbanded his strength and the power of his dogs to maneuver into position on the Bering Sea coast toward the end of the race. It was there, as other teams faltered, that he charged to victory, besting a good friend of his by just minutes, one of the closest finishes in Iditarod history.

Yesterday I got to call Pete to congratulate him. He said at the end, dog-tired, that it was all a blur. They don't sleep much—for almost 9 days.

Speaking of dogs, he said that his champion dogs were eating a lot right now and getting a well-deserved rest.

You can see some of those beautiful dogs, who by the way, love to run. They love to run.

In Alaska, our Iditarod winners are like rock stars. They become very famous overnight. Pete will be no different. He will be an inspiration to so many, partly because of his hometown and his humble roots.

Myron Angstman, another longtime musher and Pete's hero, said that most local mushers aren't sponsored. He said: ''They're not wealthy and they don't have a family kennel already established.'' But Pete's success will inspire others.

Pete agrees. When a reporter asked him what his victory means for his community and for smaller towns in Alaska, he said that it ''shows that somebody'' from out in the rural parts of the State ''can have a dream and put it all together and work hard and things can happen like this.'' Those are inspiring words, and I am sure we will see new generations of mushers heeding Pete's call and jumping into the field as a result of his example and his success.

Thank you, Pete, for reminding all of us that with enough hard work, grit, guts, and determination, any kid from any small town or any village can follow their dreams and make them a reality.

Congratulations, again, to you and your wonderful, hard-working dogs on being the 2019 Iditarod champ, and congratulations for being our Alaskan of the Week.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 5:01 p.m., adjourned until Friday, March 15, 2019, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION

MICHAEL O. JOHANNS, OF NEBRASKA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION FOR A TERM OF TWO YEARS. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

TROY D. EDGAR, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE CHARLES H. FULGHUM.

PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD

EDWARD W. FELTEN, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 29, 2025. (REAPPOINTMENT)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 14, 2019:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

DONALD W. WASHINGTON, OF TEXAS, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

JANICE MIRIAM HELLREICH, OF HAWAII, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2024.

ROBERT A. MANDELL, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2022.

BRUCE M. RAMER, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2024.

IN THE COAST GUARD

COAST GUARD NOMINATION OF ALEXANDER C. FOOS, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

RODNEY HOOD, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 2, 2023.

TODD M. HARPER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING APRIL 10, 2021.

FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

WILLIAM I. ALTHEN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS EXPIRING AUGUST 30, 2024.

MARCO M. RAJKOVICH, JR., OF KENTUCKY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS EXPIRING AUGUST 30, 2024.

ARTHUR R. TRAYNOR III, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 30, 2022.