



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 20, 2019

No. 104

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 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.

Ruler of all, we honor You and bear witness to Your mighty power. Do for our lawmakers more than they can ask or imagine. Let Your holy word be a lamp to their feet and a light for their path. Give them a wisdom that clears a path through complexity.

Lord, sanctify their thoughts, words, and actions until their dominant desire is to please You.

We pray in Your holy 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.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NOS. 27 THROUGH 48 EN BLOC—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume the en bloc consideration of following joint resolutions of disapproval, which the clerk will report by number.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 27) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom and Australia certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 28) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 29) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 30) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 31) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 32) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 33) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 34) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 35) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 36) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Kingdom of Spain, and the Italian Republic of certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 37) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Republic of France of certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 38) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 39) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the United Arab Emirates and United Kingdom of certain defense articles, including technical data and defense services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 40) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to India, Israel, Republic of Korea, and Kingdom of Saudi Arabia of certain defense articles, including technical data and defense services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 41) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the Government of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of technical data and defense services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 42) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the United Arab Emirates and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of certain defense articles, including technical data and defense services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 43) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 44) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed retransfer of certain defense articles from the United Arab Emirates to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 45) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 46) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the United Arab Emirates certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 47) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services; and

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 48) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the United Arab Emirates certain defense articles and services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S4131

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask to speak as in morning business for 1 minute.

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

“THIS IS IOWA” CAMPAIGN

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, Gov. Kim Reynolds of my State of Iowa has unveiled what she calls the “This is Iowa” campaign. That campaign has encouraged people to choose Iowa to live and work.

Iowa has the second lowest unemployment rate in the Nation. As I travel Iowa with my county meetings, I hear from employers across Iowa that have high-paying skilled jobs they cannot fill. That is why Iowa was ranked the No. 1 State to find a job in 2019.

The cost of living is low and the quality of life is second to none. Check out thisiowa.com to learn more. In the words of Meredith Wilson, of “76 Trombones” fame, from Mason City, IA: “You really ought to give Iowa a try.”

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday, by a wide bipartisan margin, the Senate began considering this year’s National Defense Authorization Act.

The Senate has passed an NDAA each of the last 58 years. We authorize the resources, the equipment, the support systems, and the pay that keep our All-Volunteer Force the strongest in the world.

From the outside, this process may look routine, but as our colleagues on the Armed Services Committee know best, keeping America safe takes constant hard work and innovation.

We have all seen the recent headlines: “Russia ‘successfully tests’ hypersonic intercept missile that can shoot down Western weapons,” “China’s Military Technology Now Close to Parity With U.S.”

In just the last few hours, Iran shot down an American surveillance aircraft in international airspace over the Strait of Hormuz. Fortunately, the aircraft was unmanned.

Let me say that again. Last night, the Iranians shot down a U.S. aircraft in international airspace.

It could certainly not be clearer that we need to keep modernizing our national defense, continue rebuilding our readiness, and persist with our new national defense strategy.

Fortunately, this legislation includes billions of dollars for modernizing our

capabilities, restoring the Navy’s fleet strength, and investing in the latest generation of combat aircraft. There are billions more for critical research weapons aimed at keeping U.S. weapons systems on the cutting edge and ensuring American servicemembers never enter a fair fight. It prioritizes greater efficiency and transparency at the Pentagon so we can better support military families through the sacrifices of service.

Again, I would like to thank Chairman INHOFE and Ranking Member JACK REED for guiding the committee process. I hope the Senate can work through this legislation swiftly and give it the overwhelming bipartisan vote it deserves.

ARMS SALES

Mr. President, on a related matter, in addition to completing the NDAA, the Senate will today have to dispense with several more privileged resolutions concerning arms sales to close American partners in a troubled but important region.

These close partners deserve our support. I am glad we secured a bipartisan understanding yesterday to expedite their consideration so the 22 separate resolutions which Members have introduced will not jeopardize the Defense bill or the emergency border funding we must also consider next week.

Today this body, yet again, will debate and cast votes concerning our relationship with Saudi Arabia, just like we did in March and December and the previous March.

I think the vast majority of Senators share serious concerns over some of the policies and actions of our Saudi partners, but rejecting long-planned arms sales strikes me as an overly blunt tool with several unintended consequences.

For example, the arms sales affected by this vote are not just for Saudi Arabia but also for the United Arab Emirates, and they include sales that affect Israel, India, Korea, and Jordan.

Last December, the Senate passed a nuanced resolution that delivered exactly the message we wanted to deliver: our fury over the murder of Jamal Khashoggi, our concerns about the war in Yemen, and our desire for more accountability. That was the right approach.

There is no shortage of tools available to the United States that are more appropriate to communicate frustrations and urge better behavior, whether from the administration or our partners.

Senators could meet with Saudi officials to directly express their concerns. They could travel to the region to see firsthand complicated, fluid situations.

Rapid societal and economic change is providing Saudi citizens with unprecedented political openness but also troubling human rights concerns and erratic policy decisions. The dynamics at play are not black and white.

We can best shape these dynamics by working closely with our partners to encourage them in the right direction, rather than turning our back.

Concerned Members might also begin giving fairer treatment and more prompt consideration to the well-qualified experts who are waiting to contribute to our diplomacy. Recall that the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Near Eastern Affairs just started his job last Monday after he had been held up for more than a year. The top State Department job in the Middle East was held open for more than a year.

The nominees for Ambassador to the UAE, Egypt, and Libya are having hearings today. I hope their confirmations will move more quickly than those of other senior diplomats who languished for months.

So there is no shortage of productive steps at Members’ disposal, but recklessly canceling U.S. arms sales to key regional partners is not on the list.

So the question the Senate will soon consider is really this: whether we will lash out at an imperfect partner and undercut our own efforts to build cooperation, check Iran, and achieve other important goals or whether we will keep our imperfect partners close and use our influence; whether we will push Riyadh and Abu Dhabi away from the United States and push them closer to Moscow and Beijing or whether we will stay engaged and help our partners course-correct where we can; whether to signal at this hour of tension that we cannot be relied upon to stand with our friends, sending a message that will embolden Tehran, or whether to find more private, effective ways of encouraging better behavior while sending a message of solidarity in troubled times.

The situation in the Middle East, as we speak, could hardly be more fraught. The timing could not be worse for the Senate to send the wrong signal.

In just the last several hours, we have seen reports that a missile from inside Yemen has struck a utility plant in Saudi Arabia. This is after other attacks—almost certainly from the Iran-backed Houthi forces—on Saudi Arabia and the UAE, including attacks on civilian vessels and on a civilian airport.

Again, just last night, Iran shot down a U.S. intelligence aircraft that was flying in international airspace. So the Senate could hardly pick a worse time for clumsy and ill-considered resolutions that would hurt key relationships in the Middle East.

Let’s not cut ourselves off from our partners. Let’s not undercut the administration at a time of such delicate diplomacy and tension with Iran. So I ask my colleagues to vote down these resolutions.

NOMINATION OF KELLY KNIGHT CRAFT

Mr. President, on another matter, I had the opportunity to introduce a skillful leader and fellow Kentuckian before the Foreign Relations Committee only just yesterday. Kelly Knight Craft was confirmed by voice vote in 2017 to serve as the U.S. Ambassador to Canada. Now she is the President’s choice to serve as Ambassador to the United Nations.

Ambassador Craft's success in representing American interests in Canada certainly rewarded the Senate's vote of confidence. During a dynamic and sometimes challenging period in the U.S.-Canada friendship, she has navigated it with care. She has helped to shepherd the USMCA. She has helped to secure cooperation on sanctioning Russia for its aggression against Ukraine and on pursuing democracy for Venezuela. She has spoken out forcefully, when necessary, against China.

Not surprisingly, this talented diplomat has earned great respect both at home and abroad.

The Premier of Ontario has said:

Every premier I know thinks the world of her. . . . She really proved herself over some tough times.

The former Deputy to Ambassador Nikki Haley has described Ambassador Craft as a worthy successor—"smart, capable, and knowledgeable about the foreign policy challenges facing our country."

This body confirmed Ambassador Craft to her current post by voice vote. Since then, she has only gained even more experience, further refined her expertise, and demonstrated her talent even more clearly. Her testimony yesterday reinforced these things even further.

President Trump has made an excellent selection to serve our Nation in this critical role at the U.N. She deserves bipartisan support from the Foreign Relations Committee and, when the time comes, a swift confirmation here on the Senate floor.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. President, on a final matter, for nearly 2 months, my Republican colleagues and I have come to the floor constantly to raise the alarm on the humanitarian crisis down at the border. Record numbers of migrants have pressed upon the U.S.-Mexico border, including never-before-seen numbers of families and unaccompanied children. The agencies that care for these individuals and the facilities that house them have been stretched dangerously thin.

We all know this. That is why the administration requested supplemental funds 7 weeks ago. It is why agency heads and law enforcement officials have literally begged Congress to act. Yet, until yesterday, we had not seen progress, which leads one to ask why. It is because—stop me if this sounds familiar—the Democratic House of Representatives has been more interested in denying this White House whatever it asks for, however necessary it might be, simply because it has been this White House that has been asking for it.

My friend the Democratic leader has acknowledged publicly it has been the Democratic-controlled House that has been the hurdle. One House Democrat from a border State has likewise admitted that it has been the left flank of his own conference that has been the stumbling block.

As the press has noted, some leading Democrats have let partisanship so cloud their judgment that they have actually called the humanitarian problem a manufactured crisis or an artificial crisis. Really?

Well, these 7 weeks of wasted time have made two things abundantly clear—that partisanship doesn't change the facts and that "the resistance" doesn't pay the bills. The House Democrats have failed to get their act together, so now the Senate is going to move forward.

Yesterday, thanks to the leadership of Chairman SHELBY and Senator LEAHY, the Appropriations Committee approved a significant funding measure by an overwhelming vote of 30 to 1—just the kind of big, bipartisan vote we ought to see in this particular situation for noncontroversial funding for necessary programs to mitigate a national crisis.

The Republicans have been urging this kind of consensus literally for weeks, and now the Senate is finally rising to the occasion. We need to vote on this legislation before we recess at the end of the month.

The Senate should not let even more time slip by without addressing this crisis head-on, and if we receive the same kind of bipartisan cooperation that was signaled in the committee vote yesterday, we will not have to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

IRAN

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, over the past few months, tensions with Iran have escalated. There have been a series of attacks on tankers in the Gulf region, and this morning it was reported that Iran has shot down a U.S. drone.

These events are deeply concerning—all the more so because the Trump administration has not explained to Congress or to the American people how it views these events, how it plans to respond, and, most importantly, what the broader strategy for confronting Iran is.

President Trump left the diplomatic agreement a little more than a year ago. It was obvious to anyone who even had a cursory knowledge of Iran that it would create consequences. With that decision, there is a course set for conflict—conflict whose purpose or strategy has never been articulated to the American people.

The President says on TV: It is a much better Iran than when I took office. Well, they were not building nu-

clear weapons—and I opposed the Iran agreement, as you know. But they were not building nuclear weapons. They were proceeding along the path of the agreement, and the President, as he seems to, just gets a bug in his head, something he said in the campaign without thinking, and then upends foreign policy—another example of chaos in this administration. But he has done that. He has done that.

So now the issue is what is our strategy to deal with the consequences? The American people have to know this. We have seen too many conflicts in the Middle East escalate into war—escalate into a 10-year war.

The American people are not for spending a fortune and, more importantly, lives of Americans overseas. They want us to focus here at home, but the kind of adventurism—almost unplanned, unthought out, and, certainly, unexplained adventurism—of the President is the wrong way to go and could lead to severe consequences. And, I must say, even in closed-door briefings with Senators, the administration doesn't have a strategy.

This is not how democracy is supposed to work. This is not how the CEO of a major Nation or even a major company should behave, with no articulated strategy. The President needs to explain to the American people why he is driving us toward another endless conflict in the Middle East.

SAUDI ARABIA

Madam President, on Saudi Arabia, another matter concerning the administration's foreign policy, today the Senate will vote on resolutions of disapproval for arms sales to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the UAE.

These 22 resolutions introduced by Senator MENENDEZ would block billions of dollars in military sales, including the transfer of tens of thousands of precision-guided munitions that the Saudis have previously used to bomb innocent civilians in Yemen.

The timing of these votes is significant. Last night the United Nations issued a report that documented evidence that the Saudis meticulously planned the murder of Jamal Khashoggi and "forensically"—their words—disposed of the evidence.

According to the report, the Saudis referred to Mr. Khashoggi as a sacrificial animal and that dismembering the body would be easy—how gross, how cruel, how beyond words.

Are we going to blithely go along and let the Saudis continue? They are an ally. Everyone knows that. That doesn't mean you let allies do the most horrible things and just treat it as if nothing happened. But in the wake of such monstrosity, the Trump administration is proposing another round of billions of dollars in arms sales to Saudi Arabia.

Well, we should at least have a debate about whether that is the right course of action. Leader MCCONNELL was on the floor saying: What are the Democrats doing here? We are debating, Mr. Leader. You have one view; I

may have another. But the American people are entitled to a debate on this important issue, and that is what the law provides, and that is the tool we use—one of the few tools we have to actually cause debate in this Chamber, which the leader, with his legislative graveyard, has assiduously avoided. With his reducing the amount of time that we can talk about and vet nominees, he has assiduously avoided that, turning this Chamber into a graveyard that the American people despise. But here we have an opportunity to debate, and even here the leader seems to be decrying that fact, in my view.

The administration is claiming emergency power and trying to circumvent congressional review of these arms sales. That premise must be rejected. It sets a dangerous precedent for congressional oversight of future arms sales, and it can lead to renewed conflicts. We are also discussing that, parenthetically, in relation to Iran. Should Congress have some say there? You will hear more from me later on that.

The very least Congress can do is to debate the merits of sending Saudi Arabia billions of dollars in military technology it may use not to confront Iran but to perpetrate one of the largest humanitarian catastrophes of its generation.

Saudi Arabia, even though it be an ally, must be held accountable for its human rights abuses in Yemen and the grotesque murder of Jamal Khashoggi.

HARRIET TUBMAN

Madam President, now, on the Tubman issue, more than 3 years ago then-Treasury Secretary Jack Lew announced that he had ordered an accelerated redesign of the \$20 bill with a new design to feature Harriet Tubman's portrait on the face of the bill. The design was set to be released in 2020, the 100th anniversary of women getting the right to vote—a fitting tribute to an extraordinary American and an extraordinary New Yorker.

There are no women or people of color on our paper currency today, even though they make up a significant majority of our population. There haven't been for more than a century. The plan to put Harriet Tubman on the \$20 note was a long overdue way to recognize that disparity and rectify it.

But shortly after the Trump administration took office, all mention of the Tubman \$20 bill was deleted from the Treasury Department's website without any explanation. Then, Secretary Mnuchin testified that a decision had been made to delay the release of the \$20 note until 2028, and Treasury refused to confirm that Harriet Tubman's image would ever appear on it.

The official word from the White House was that the delay was required to accommodate anti-counterfeiting measures. But if you believe that, I have a bridge that I can sell you. It is simply not credible that with all the resources of the Treasury Department, a decade or more would be required to produce a \$20 bill.

A century ago, New Yorkers built the Empire State building in a little over a year. We landed a man on the Moon in what seems to be less time. Surely the 21st century Treasury Department can redesign a bill in a reasonable period of time. The questions as to why the White House, the Treasury, and maybe even the President delayed this are looming and real, given the President's attitude toward women and minorities.

I have asked the Department of Treasury inspector general to launch an investigation into the circumstances surrounding the Treasury's decision. The official reasons given aren't credible. The whole thing smacks of politics. President Trump has referred to efforts to replace Andrew Jackson on the \$20 bill as pure political correctness. To recognize more than half the people in our society, to recognize more than 25 percent of Americans who are people of color, all of whom have worked so hard to strive for this great country—is that political correctness? What is wrong with this President? What is wrong with this President, and what instincts is he appealing to? What bad instincts is he appealing to? It seems to be his practice, his way, his MO.

So among the questions the inspector general should examine is what role President Trump played in this apparent effort to renege on Treasury's 2016 commitment to honor Harriet Tubman.

Whatever the President's sentiments toward Jackson are, there is no reason to reverse the original Treasury Department decision to recognize Harriet Tubman's historic legacy on the \$20 bill, which would still feature our seventh President on the reverse side.

I hope the inspector general will get to the bottom of this, but in the meantime, I hope President Trump himself is asked to answer for these delays. It would truly be a sordid state of affairs if the President or his team, for political reasons, interfered with and infected the process for designing American currency.

BACKGROUND CHECKS

Madam President, now, finally, on background checks, in the early hours on Monday, a heavily armed man approached the Federal building in downtown Dallas and started shooting. This was a civilian walking into the middle of an American city with military-grade weapons, a mask, and body armor, and he was prepared to inflict the maximum level of damage possible.

It is to the credit of the incredible first responders that this accident did not result in the loss of innocent life, but it is remarkable that events like this now seem all too routine, and so the news cycle barely covers them before moving on.

Barely a week goes by without an incident like this somewhere in America. We are the only Nation in the developed world where these kinds of things—these horrible things—happen with regularity. Virginia Beach, Highland Ranch, Poway, and Aurora, IL, are

all examples of shootings that have taken place this year alone.

Later today, I will join several of my colleagues from the House and the Senate, including our former colleague, the great Gabby Giffords, to urge Leader MCCONNELL to bring background check legislation to the floor of the Senate. It has been 114 days since the House passed the measure, which more than 90 percent of Americans support, including more than 80 percent of Republicans and the majority of gun owners. But it seems that Leader MCCONNELL has set aside another plot in his legislative graveyard for this potentially lifesaving bill.

For too long, the gun lobby has reflexively opposed gun safety reforms, even the most obvious and non-controversial reforms, like closing loopholes in background checks, and, for too long, the Republican majority has marched in lockstep with them.

The American people demand we do these rational acts. The House has passed it overwhelmingly with a bipartisan vote. Where are Republicans? Are they still cowering before the NRA? I remind them, the NRA is a lot weaker today than it was a few years ago. It is time to do the right thing and stop being scared.

Let's move this bill to the floor. Let Leader MCCONNELL finally let us debate an issue long overdue.

ELECTION SECURITY

Madam President, finally, as we continue to debate the NDAA, I urge Leader MCCONNELL once again to allow and support amendments to protect our elections from future attacks.

Election security is a national security issue of the highest urgency. There aren't two sides to this debate. No one can defend doing nothing as the Russians, and maybe the Chinese, the Iranians, and the North Koreans, mess with the wellspring of our democracy—our elections.

As we have seen time and again from reports by the FBI, intelligence agencies, and the Mueller report, our elections came under attack from Russia in the last Presidential election. FBI Director Wray has warned that they are coming for us again, and he thinks it could be worse than in 2016.

Leader MCCONNELL will not deny that this is true. So what are we waiting for? We know the threat is there. We know we can take steps to minimize it. So why won't Leader MCCONNELL let us act?

We have several options for legislative action, many of them bipartisan. People on both sides of the aisle—Democrats and Republicans—care about this issue and have worked on legislation together, something not done frequently enough around here, and Leader MCCONNELL just sits on these bills.

Last week, Senator WARNER asked unanimous consent to simply say the FBI should be informed when a foreign power tries to influence an election. I believe Senator BLUMENTHAL will try

to do the same thing today. Is Leader MCCONNELL going to instruct one of his Republicans to block it again? Will he have the courage to block it himself if he wants it blocked?

The logical solution is to let us debate the bills. If Leader MCCONNELL will not cooperate on this matter, Democrats are going to stand up for our democracy on our own, if we have to. We are going to ask unanimous consent to allow debate on these bills. We will insist on amendments to the NDAA. Leader MCCONNELL has suggested he wants an open amendment process, so let's press the matter, and we will continue to push for more election security funding as part of a deal on budget caps.

There are not two sides on this one; there are just not. There is only one right answer: action to safeguard our election. I urge Leader MCCONNELL to let us move on this issue. Stop stalling, stop obstructing. The legislative graveyard is full enough as it is. Let's come together, Democrats and Republicans, to protect our grand, imperiled democracy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, we have begun consideration of this year's National Defense Authorization Act, which is annual legislation to authorize funding for our military and national defense.

Like last year's bill, this year's National Defense Authorization Act emphasizes military modernization and readiness and the need to ensure that we are prepared to counter threats from great powers like China and Russia, as well as terrorists and rogue states.

I am offering a handful of amendments to this legislation, including an amendment to address training opportunities for our Nation's military pilots and aircrews.

In my home State of South Dakota, we are privileged to play host to Ellsworth Air Force Base, home of two B-1 bomb squadrons of the 28th Bomb Wing, the airmen who are the backbone of operations, as well as the 89th Attack Squadron and its control stations for MQ-9 Reapers. It is also home to the Powder River Training Complex, training airspace for Ellsworth aircrews and crews from across the United States. In the very near future, Ellsworth will be the home of the forthcoming B-21 bomber.

When I was first elected to the Senate, Ellsworth's future was not looking bright. In fact, in 2005, just a few months into my first term, Ellsworth was targeted for closure by the Base Realignment and Closure Commission. Fortunately, thanks to the efforts of a lot of dedicated people, we managed to demonstrate to the Commission that Ellsworth was a vital national security asset and that closing the base and moving its fleet of B-1s would actually cost money.

Since then, strengthening Ellsworth has been a priority for me and for a lot of other people back home in South Dakota, and Ellsworth has been going from strength to strength.

One of my proudest achievements as a Senator was helping secure the expansion of the Powder River Training Complex, the training airspace over Ellsworth. The expansion quadrupled the size of the airspace. But prior to the expansion, the airspace was only large enough for one B-1 bomber to train at a time, which meant crews had to commute elsewhere to meet their training needs.

Today, the airspace is large enough to hold large-force training exercises, involving a variety of planes from other bases. In fact, the Powder River Training Complex is now the largest training airspace in the continental United States. In addition to the vast space it offers for training exercises, it also provides a valuable opportunity for pilots to train in conditions that resemble combat missions, such as low-altitude flying over mountainous terrain.

Since the Powder River Training Complex was expanded, Ellsworth has hosted a number of successful large-force exercises. This May, Ellsworth hosted its most recent Combat Raider large-force exercise, which featured B-1, B-2, and B-52 bombers, J-STAR and AWACS radar systems, F-16s, and KC-135 tankers. Notably, F-35s from Hill Air Force Base in Utah also participated, marking the first of what I think will be many training opportunities for the F-35 in the Powder River Training Complex.

These Combat Raider exercises highlight the potential of the PRTC for training our military aviators, and I want to make sure that we can meet these training needs as we look to bring the B-21 into the fleet. That is why I filed an amendment, Thune amendment No. 759, to require a strategic airspace review.

My amendment would require a report on how far our current national airspace system meets our national security requirements and how we might improve this system to meet current and future training needs.

The Air Force and the Federal Aviation Administration would be required to consult on this report to develop a full picture of the strategic value of our national airspace.

The report would also analyze whether the current airspace system gives the military sufficient access to the airspace it requires to meet its worldwide operational, training, and testing needs.

In particular, it seeks to determine whether current civil and military cooperation mechanisms are providing for the effective and efficient management of the national airspace system for military training. It also asks whether the current Department of Defense and FAA processes provide sufficient time to plan for large-force exercises.

For example, in the Powder River Training Complex, the Air Force needs to go through a lengthy process to secure altitude waivers from the FAA to fly higher on just a few days a year for just a few hours a day. We absolutely need to have appropriate procedures to ensure safety and coordination with commercial airlines, but the Air Force also needs enough lead time to schedule its aircraft and airmen traveling from other bases. We shouldn't be missing out on critical training opportunities because of a lengthy process that is ripe for expediting.

So my amendment would take a look at this process, including whether FAA air traffic control centers could temporarily or permanently realign their boundaries to streamline their role in military training.

For example, the Powder River Training Complex straddles the convergence of the Minneapolis, Denver, and Salt Lake City air traffic control centers, and coordinating with all three can be cumbersome. This report would explore whether we can make the process more efficient for both the FAA and the military.

It would also review whether the current airspace system is sufficient to prepare military aviators to meet high-end threats, including fifth-generation aircraft, unmanned aerial vehicles, and hypersonic weapons.

It is important that we ensure that our airmen can train in realistic conditions so they can deliver when America is counting on them the most. Just as in sports, you play like you practice—although we all know this isn't play, and the stakes for getting it right are very high.

That is why my amendment would investigate whether current civil and military cooperation mechanisms are sufficient for our military to replicate contested combat airspace, denied access airspace, and airspace without the use of GPS—the kinds of conditions aircrews would likely encounter if they got the call to fight tonight.

My amendment also takes a step back to look at the state of our national airspace system. It calls for an audit of special-use airspaces, military operations areas, commercial routes, and other routes, and it asks if parts of underutilized airspaces can be effectively returned to the national airspace to boost commercial route efficiencies in high-traffic areas in exchange for more generous military training flight permissions in low-traffic areas.

Comparatively, we don't get as much commercial airline traffic up in the Powder River Training Complex, creating a great opportunity for fifth-generation aircraft to really stretch their legs and meet their training needs.

I have talked a lot about our military's need to have the best training opportunities available. However, I want to clarify that this is not a one-sided amendment.

Our military goes to great lengths to respect commercial and general aviation needs, and that is reflected in my amendment. First and foremost, the FAA is consulted throughout the entire report process. Additionally, the bill reviews whether commercial and general aviation receive sufficient notice regarding exercises and special-use waivers, and, as I mentioned, it looks for ways to make Department of Defense and FAA interaction more efficient.

As a former chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee and a current member of the Commerce Subcommittee on Aviation and Space, I know that the management of the national airspace is complicated. My amendment simply seeks to gather information so that we can take a productive look at our national airspace and make sure our military aviators can get the most out of their training opportunities while respecting the needs of commercial and general aviation.

The Armed Services Committee chairman and ranking member, my colleagues, and staff members have a lot of amendments to consider. Hundreds of amendments have already been filed on the National Defense Authorization Act, and there are more to come. I would ask that my amendment No. 759 be considered for inclusion as we work together to restore and modernize our military and ensure our men and women in uniform have the tools they need to defend our country.

I thank my colleagues.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ARMS SALES

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, there has been a lot of confusion and outright misinformation about some proposed arms sales to our gulf partners—specifically, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates. I am grateful for the opportunity this morning to clear up a few things, especially considering the current high stakes in the region.

As many of you probably have heard, the Islamic Republic of Iran just this morning shot down an American surveillance aircraft over the Strait of Hormuz—yet another act of reckless, unprovoked aggression targeting lawful behavior on the high seas and in the skies. Still, I know that for some of my colleagues here, Iranian acts of violence are always to be excused or somehow always the fault of America and especially of the Trump administration, to which the only appropriate re-

sponse is to continue to appease the ayatollahs, to send them pallets of cash, as the last administration did, and give them billions of dollars in relief for sanctions—essentially to say: Pretty please, stop your acts of terrorist aggression and imperial ambition throughout the region.

It is my duty to inform all those colleagues that this is dangerous and misguided thinking. Iran, as it did in the mid-1980s, will meet American restraint with continued aggression. It will watch the outcome of today's votes in support for our friends in the gulf for signs of resolve or weakness. I urge my fellow Senators to send the right message to Tehran.

The administration plans to sell roughly \$8 billion in arms to our gulf partners so they can defend themselves, as well as the many thousands of Americans within their borders—all from Iranian aggression. Canceling those sales would not only endanger Americans overseas and deprive American industry of billions in exports, it would weaken some of the only countries in a position to effectively resist Iran's violent rampage throughout the Middle East.

We have heard many objections to these arms sales. First and most amazing, given the stakes, some Democrats object for procedural reasons. They are upset that the administration is proceeding over an informal hold placed by the senior Senator from New Jersey. In doing so, they claim that the administration is violating a long tradition of honoring informal holds by the chairman and ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. In effect, they are saying: Let's block arms sales to our allies in an emergency because the Secretary of State hurt the feelings of a few Senators.

The actual purpose of those holds—only a courtesy; not a rule; not a law—is to give those Senators time to fully examine a proposal and to foster engagement between the Senate and administration in good faith. But that is not how this hold is being used. These arms sales have been held for more than a year—more than a year. How much time does the Senator from New Jersey need to make up his mind? How many times does the Secretary of State have to call him and meet with him? How many briefings do they have to provide? How many memos do they have to send?

This is not a request for more information or trying to work together in good faith. This is a stalling tactic, through and through. It is yet another example of the Democrats engaged in psychological projection in accusing this administration of violating norms, when in fact they are the ones who have been violating longstanding, unwritten rules, customs, and norms.

The administration is moving forward with this sale by making an emergency declaration, as provided by law and as Presidents have done many times in the past. President Reagan

proceeded with sales of air-defense systems to, yes, Saudi Arabia using this very same provision. President George H. W. Bush did so as well, selling tanks and fighter aircraft to, yes, Saudi Arabia.

Even without this precedent, can there be any doubt—any doubt that our partners in the gulf are facing a genuine emergency as they fend off Iran? Oil tankers flying the flags of our allies and partners are ablaze in the Gulf of Oman. Civilian airports, oil pipelines, and American surveillance aircraft have all come under rocket attacks from Iran's terror proxy in Yemen.

Make no mistake—this is a genuine emergency, but too few of my colleagues are willing to see the plain facts. They want to talk about anything that will change the subject from Iran and its campaign of aggression throughout the Middle East.

A second objection is that some argue that our gulf partners are somehow beneath our support. Really? It was the United Arab Emirates, after all, that hosted Pope Francis earlier this year, and he conducted a mass for Christians in that nation. The Kingdom of Jordan is another important friend caught in the crossfire of this debate. Jordan has been a reliable and trustworthy partner of the United States for many years, and today it bears the brunt of the refugee crisis and chaos created by Assad's Iran-backed butchery in Syria.

While Democrats try to frame this vote as support for our gulf partners alone, let's not forget that numerous other strong allies of the United States would be affected by these votes as well, countries like the United Kingdom and France and South Korea and Israel—all part of the supply chain affected by these deals. Rejecting these sales will hurt them, too, and now is not the time to be rejecting our friends. Of course, you couldn't make any of these observations about the Islamic Republic of Iran, which is about as likely to host the Pope as it is to host a Pride parade.

Lost in the criticism of our partners is a much more worthy discussion about the elaborate architecture of torture and repression supervised by Ayatollah Khomeini, who is personally responsible for American citizens being held in appalling captivity for years at a time. One such American citizen, Bob Levinson, has been missing in Iran for more than a decade.

The same media and politicians who trumpet every misdeed of America's steadfast partners in the region—regardless of whether such misdeeds are fact or fiction—are strangely silent about the undisputed fact that Iran has the blood on its hands of more than 600 American troops in Iraq in the last decade. Six hundred Americans were killed at the hands of Iran. Yet we propose to deny arms sales to some of the only countries that are committed to resisting Iran's bloodstained, anti-American theocracy? It is time to get our priorities straight.

Third, still other critics fault our gulf partners for their involvement in the civil war in Yemen, as though they are the aggressors in Yemen rather than states that were pulled into a conflict to push an Iranian-armed rebel group off of the Arabian Peninsula at the request of the Government of Yemen and with the support of the United Nations. Evidently, some of my fellow Senators would counsel our gulf partners to do nothing as a rebel group, armed by their sworn enemy, plunged a neighboring country into chaos, shooting rockets at their airports and oil pipelines. That would indeed be quite a restrained foreign policy. Some might also call it the height of stupidity that we would never tolerate for our own citizens.

As to the appalling human rights conditions in Yemen, I think the current U.S. Ambassador to Iraq, Matthew Tueller, said it best to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: "Almost 100 percent of the humanitarian catastrophe in Yemen has been caused by the Iranian-backed Houthis." Almost 100 percent. Mr. Tueller is not some Trump appointee. He is not some partisan hack. He is a career Foreign Service officer who served as Ambassador to Yemen under, yes, President Obama. If there is anyone in the U.S. Government who is in a position to know what is going on in Yemen and who is to blame for the carnage in Yemen, it is the man on the ground rather than politicians in Washington.

Underlying this whole debate is a romantic wish—a naive delusion—that our foreign policy can always be pristine, requiring no compromises whatsoever, no acknowledgment of the messy facts around the world, or even that we could flee away from that messy, complicated, dangerous world entirely, relying solely on the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans to keep us safe. A cursory review of history proves that neither option is available. A cursory review of newspaper headlines proves it too.

Our main adversary in the Middle East—the Islamic Republic of Iran—is a revolutionary power dedicated, from its inception years ago, to the destruction of Americans and, indeed, America itself. They don't try to hide it. "Death to America" is their slogan, and they chant it all the time. Our departure from the field will not dissuade the ayatollahs from that purpose; it will only embolden them, as will the abandonment of our allies in the region.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, the arms industry is a unique industry. It is not like making shoes or apparel. It is not like selling watches. You are

selling things that, when used properly, kill other people. They are deadly weapons that we have. We have accumulated the technology by the taxpayer paying for this. We have helicopters, planes, guided missiles, and we are able to refuel planes.

It is not a jobs program, and it is not something that—we don't willy-nilly give weapons to everyone. We don't sell weapons to Russia and we don't sell weapons to China because we have disagreements, and we don't think it would be in our best interest to sell weapons to them.

We also don't sell weapons, typically, to people we think are untrustworthy. I think there is every evidence that Saudi Arabia can be put in that category. When you have direct evidence and when our own intelligence community has concluded that there is high confidence that the Crown Prince of Saudi Arabia butchered a dissident with a bone saw in a consulate in a foreign country, you would think that would give us pause as to giving Saudi Arabia or selling Saudi Arabia more weapons.

But it is worse than that. We are not only selling Saudi Arabia offensive weapons, we are also talking about giving them nuclear technology. The nuclear technology, they say, is only for energy, but you have to wonder. A country that sits atop one of the largest oil reserves in the world is now saying "Oh, we don't have enough fossil fuel. We need nuclear power"? There have been people who have gotten nuclear technology and then have moved on to nuclear weapons.

What could possibly be the worst thing to happen to the Middle East? It would be to have three powers there with nuclear weapons. We had Iran before. They now have the knowledge to enrich. They made an agreement not to enrich. They are still threatening to enrich uranium. What do you think will happen if Saudi Arabia gets nuclear technology and there is any rumor of their progressing on towards developing nuclear weapons? What will Iran do? Automatically, they will do the same thing.

It also happens in the conventional weapons arena. So every time we sell or give missiles to Saudi Arabia, what do you think Iran does? They have to either buy more or make more. It is an arms race. We are feeding both sides of an arms race.

But you will hear people in Washington say: But Iran—they are a malign influence. Well, yeah. So is Saudi Arabia. But what do we do when we have two powers that show tendencies toward evil and show tendencies toward acting in ways that are against our national interest? Do we just blindly give weapons to anybody who is opposed to Iran because Iran is a malign influence? Well, what about Saudi Arabia? They have spent \$100 billion spreading this radical jihadism to other cultures; \$100 billion around the world preaching hatred of Christians,

hatred of Jews, hatred of Hindus. Yet we give them more weapons.

There is a madrasa supported by Saudi Arabia—that is a so-called religious school in Pakistan—and 80 percent of the boys who graduate from the school—because, of course, girls aren't allowed to go to school under this kind of religion—80 percent of the boys who graduate from the school fight in the Taliban against the United States. Why would we give weapons to a country that teaches hatred of our country and actually trains fighters to fight against our soldiers? What person in what insane world thinks it is a good idea to fund people who fundamentally don't like us? Why in the world do we keep doing this?

Last week, we voted on sending weapons to Qatar. Do you know who Qatar supplies weapons with? Hamas. I thought we were allies with Israel. But we fund Qatar, which sends missiles and weapons to Hamas, who then bombs Israel. Qatar also hosts fundraisers for ISIS. Remember ISIS—the ones chopping people's heads off? Why would we give weapons to countries that give weapons to our enemies?

In the Syrian civil war, we went in on the side of those who were opposed to Assad. Now, Assad is no saint, no Democrat, no Jeffersonian Democrat, no believer in freedom; yet the people on the other side—most of them hate Israel. Most of them despise any rights for women. Most of them—many of them are allied with al-Qaida. Who is al-Qaida? The people who attacked us on 9/11. Al-Nusra, al-Qaida, ISIS—who do they get weapons from? Saudi Arabia and Qatar.

Even Hillary Clinton admitted this in one of the emails that were released. Hillary Clinton was talking to John Podesta by email, and she said: We have to do something about this. Saudi Arabia and Qatar are arming and providing logistical help to ISIS.

So why does it go on? Some would say: Because people make a big profit on this. This is a jobs program for the arms industry, and we have to make sure they make their profit.

I disagree. This is an industry that uniquely has to do with our national interests. It is uniquely paid for by the taxpayer. These weapons are owned by the taxpayer, and we should not sell them to people who are not our friends.

This is what the debate is about today. We will vote shortly on whether or not we should sell offensive weapons to Saudi Arabia.

What are they doing with the weapons? Well, they are bombing civilians in Yemen, for one. They are transferring some of the weapons in Yemen to al-Qaida. Al-Qaida and the larger umbrella group that attacked us on 9/11 are active. They are called AQAP in Yemen. There are news reports in the last week that Saudi Arabia is indiscriminantly giving arms to anybody who is opposed to the group they are fighting against, the Houthis.

Who supports the Houthis? The Iranians.

Is one side better than the other?

Are we so blind to the malign influence of Saudi Arabia that we give money and weapons to anybody regardless of what they do? You can chop up a dissident. You can cut a dissident up to pieces with a bone saw, and we will still give you weapons?

My goodness, I can't imagine. I do not think that people in this body who will continue to sell weapons to Saudi Arabia are listening to the people at home. I guarantee, if we asked the people at home, if we had a national poll and everybody got to give their opinion, how many people at home do you think are saying: Oh, well, they just chopped up a dissident—no big deal. Let's just keep sending them weapons. Oh, well, they are giving weapons to Hamas. Yes, you know, we don't really care. Or, well, they are bombing civilians.

The Saudis killed 150 people at a funeral procession—people marching at a funeral procession. They knew it was a funeral procession. This was no fog of war, no mistake. This was an intentional act to kill people at a funeral procession. There were 150 people killed and 450 wounded. About 1 year ago, they killed 40 schoolchildren on a schoolbus.

They are indiscriminately bombing civilians, and they are blockading Yemen, which is one of the poorest countries on the planet. Millions of people—some estimate between 14 and 17 million people—live on the edge of starvation because of this war. The Saudis are preventing food from coming in. They have blockaded Hodeida, which is one of the key ports where food needs to come in. Yemen imports 80 percent of their food. The Saudis are blockading them and people are starving, and we are allied with Saudis. We supply them with bombs that they drop on civilians and until the last few months we were refueling the very planes that were dropping the bombs.

People talk sometimes about, you know, a dream of peace in the Middle East. If you want to have a peace plan in the Middle East, people say: Well, it is Israel and Palestine who have to come to a peace agreement.

Do you know what the bigger problem is—an even bigger problem than that conundrum—which is a conundrum? It is figuring out how to have peace between Saudi Arabia and their allies and Iran. Everything around here is Iran, Iran, Iran, Iran. Do you know who spends the third-most amount of money on the military in the world? Saudi Arabia. First, it is the United States. We spend more than the next 10 countries combined. We spend more than all the rest of NATO combined, for that matter. Then, a distant second is China, and, then, there is Saudi Arabia.

Saudi Arabia spends more on their military than Russia and more than most of our NATO allies. Yet people say: Oh, we have to give them more arms because Iran is a bad actor. What if they are both bad actors?

Currently, Saudi Arabia and the Gulf sheikdoms around them spend 8 times more than Iran. I am not saying Iran is a great place or that the government is great. What I am saying is, when you have two bad actors, when you have two malign influences, do you think we always have to choose the lesser of two evils? Do we have to always look askance and say: Oh, whatever—you know, as long as we are doing something that is opposed to Iran.

One of our other so-called allies over there is Bahrain. We have a naval base there, and we say: It is important to have a naval base, and we have to look the other way. They have 4,000 political prisoners. Saudi Arabia actually imprisons people for political reasons, and they don't just kill them. They behead them and crucify them—I think, in that order. They put the bodies out for public display.

They executed a guy named Sheikh Nimr al-Nimr, who was of a minority religion. The Saudis are Sunnis. This guy was a Shia religious person and spokesman. He was executed. His nephew is being held in prison and has been for several years now. He was 17 when he was arrested. His crime was sending a text message to encourage people to protest against the authoritarian regime of Saudi Arabia.

I think the problem is that some people come to the conclusion that arms are always good and we should never do anything to condition the sale of arms to behavior. Well, I am not for sending more arms there, period, because it is a cauldron always threatening to boil over.

Let's say you were someone who would say: Oh, no, we have to arm them. Perhaps we should condition arms on good behavior. Perhaps, if you are cutting up a dissident with a bone saw in a foreign country, maybe we should stop arms for a while to see if maybe you can get better people in the government or maybe to see if your ways will change.

Saudi Arabia said: Oh, we are doing it differently now. We are not going to fund radical jihadism around the world.

But they spent \$100 billion infecting the world with the ideas of hatred of the West, hatred of Christians, hatred of Jews, and hatred of Hindus. There used to be a couple hundred of these schools in Pakistan. There is now said to be 20,000 schools in Pakistan. The Saudis support schools not just in Pakistan but throughout the world—in Indonesia and India and all over the Middle East. They support these schools that teach intolerance and hatred of the West. Yet we are one of their biggest arms suppliers. It makes utterly no sense, and it should be reconsidered.

We will have a chance to vote today, and the numbers are growing. When I first introduced a resolution to disapprove of arm sales to Saudi Arabia, I think I got 22 votes. We did it again a couple of months later, and I think we got in the forties. I think there is a

chance today that we will get close to 60 votes.

We will have to get to 67 to overcome a Presidential veto. Look, I am a big fan of the President on many fronts, but on this someone has to stand up, even a Member of his own party and say: Arms sales are not jobs programs, and they should be conditioned on behavior, and we should not sell arms to countries that hate us.

As for these countries that burn our flag and chant "Death to America," we shouldn't be arming them.

At one point in time, there were reports about ISIS. Remember the people who were beheading people in the desert over the last couple of years and spreading throughout the region? There were reports that they have \$1 billion worth of Humvees. Some of them were captured, but some came because of indiscriminate arms. There are arms everywhere.

So when we had the Syrian civil war going on, all throughout the news media—public, private, everywhere—everyone was saying that Saudi Arabia and Qatar were giving arms to anybody, indiscriminately giving arms to people. One of the groups that got arms and one of the groups that got anti-tank weapons—these are shoulder-launched missiles—said in a news report right after they got them: When we are done with Assad—they didn't talk about ISIS, and most of them didn't care about ISIS because they actually kind of agree with ISIS's religion—we are going after Israel next.

So we are arming people who are potential if not real enemies of Israel. We are arming people who are teaching hatred of the West, hatred of Christians, hatred of Hindus, and hatred of Jews. We are arming these people. Why are we doing that?

Let's say you don't agree with everything I have said, and you say: Well, maybe we should get them to behave better. Why don't you withhold arms for 6 months at the least?

Why don't we just stop for a while?

They have enough arms to blow up the Middle East 10 times over. Is there just no stopping? Is there no limitation to what we will do? Do we not believe that any of our arms sales should be conditioned on behavior?

This is a big deal and a big vote, and it is my hope that the American people will watch how people vote and decide: Is this who I want representing me? Do I want someone representing me who is selling arms to people who hate our country, who spend hundreds of billions of dollars on schools teaching hatred of our country? Do I want to have people representing me who continue to flood the Middle East with arms?

That is what this vote is about, and I hope the American public will pay attention to how people vote today and to which direction they want the country to go in.

We have had enough war. This is something I agree with the President on. We have had enough war. We have

been at war too long in too many places.

We have been 19 years in Afghanistan, and to what end? I was for the initial purpose of getting those who attacked us on 9/11. I would have voted to go. But after 19 years, it is nation-building. We are spending \$50 billion a year. We build roads, and they blow them up. We build schools, and they blow them up.

We have roads and schools crumbling in our country. We don't have an extra \$50 billion to spend in Afghanistan. We are \$1 trillion short this year. We are going to spend \$4 trillion, and we are bringing in \$1 trillion—not great economics, not great budget balancing on our part.

No. 1, we cannot afford to try to be everywhere all the time, and, No. 2, the money we are spending overseas is counterproductive.

We went into Iraq and toppled a dictator. What did we get? Chaos. In the chaos we get ISIS and other groups forming.

We went into Libya and toppled the dictator in Libya. What did we get? Chaos. It is so confusing in Libya that I am not even sure which side the U.S. Government is supporting. They were supporting the U.N.-sanctioned government and now they appear to be supporting military generals who are trying to overthrow that government.

One thing is for sure: The country of Qatar that we voted to send arms to last week is supporting the side opposite us. So we give arms to people who are directly involved in a civil war where we are involved on the other side of the civil war. To me, it seems utterly preposterous that we keep doing that. There is Qatar's support for the other side in Libya and their support for Hamas. They are letting ISIS and al-Qaida do fundraising in their country.

Maybe we need to take a break from the arms race in the Middle East.

I don't think that someone can make a practical or reasonable argument that there has been more peace since we sent more weapons over there. They have plenty of weapons to kill each other for another thousand years. They have been killing each other for 1,000 years. They have enough weapons to kill each other for another 1,000 years.

Maybe we don't need to be involved in every civil war in the world. Maybe we can't afford it, and maybe when we have gotten involved, we had the unintended consequences of actually making it worse.

People have this idea that when you topple a dictator, somehow the next person they elect is going to be Thomas Jefferson. Well, guess what. Every time we have toppled a dictator, the people they end up electing are not Thomas Jefferson. Sometimes in the elections we don't like whom they elected in the elections and people go back and topple them again.

So when Egypt actually had an election, they elected somebody from the

Muslim Brotherhood. Many in the Middle East and many in our country didn't want him. So we helped to get rid of him, and now we have a military rule with no elections and with the idea that you can be detained without trial. People say: Well, it is stable. It is another military autocracy, but we are going to put up with it.

We need to rethink our approach to the Middle East. We need to rethink the approach that we need to arm one or both sides in every war. We need to think whether regime change is a good idea, and we need to look at the practical effects of our foreign policy and say: Are we safer somehow?

I think one universal truth is that we are usually poorer by the time we are done, because what we end up doing is spending good money after bad.

I will give you a couple of examples in Afghanistan. In Afghanistan we spent \$90 million in a luxury hotel in downtown Kabul. You say: How does that \$90 million hotel protect us? Well, it doesn't, but it is money. Money runs through all this. Somebody is getting rich, but not the American taxpayer.

The guy who built it, I think, was a Jordanian national, but he built a shell of a hotel. He took the \$90 million. He got all the payment, and it was never built. It mostly doesn't have walls, and none of it was completed. It is now a danger because it sits up across from our embassy and snipers crawl up in the building.

So the thing is that we asked for \$90 million, and we need more now because, apparently, we now need to tear it down because it is a danger to our embassy and our soldiers.

So if we could just get \$200,000 more, they are going to spend another couple hundred thousand dollars tearing down a hotel that we asked you to build in the first place, which we had no business building whatsoever.

We built a gas station for them in Afghanistan, too. But because our purpose in the military is now sometimes to fight the enemy but also to fight climate change—you didn't know this, but part of the military's goal is climate change now—so we built them a gas station. But we want to reduce the carbon footprint. So we built a gas station that sells natural gas. Well, the problem was, No. 1, nobody in Afghanistan has a car. The average income is about \$800. Almost nobody has a car, and no one has one that burns natural gas.

So what they did is that they had to give them credit cards and buy them cars that actually ran on natural gas.

We wanted to visit over there and the military said it was too dangerous to take us there. So we have no idea if it is even in operation at this point.

I say we need to rethink this, and I urge today a vote against selling more arms to Saudi Arabia.

Thank you.

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

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I will be voting in support of the resolutions of disapproval, and let me tell you why. A strategic relationship with the United States should be coveted, and the difference between a relationship and a strategic relationship is very important.

We deal with people all the time that engage in practices that we don't like, abhor, and are against. Sometimes you have to sit down and talk with Putin about Syria. Sometimes you have to sit down and talk with the Chinese, even though they imprison the Uighurs. And there are even more egregious examples of the people you have to deal with, because that is part of the world as it is. But when you have a strategic relationship—and we have had one with Saudi Arabia for years—it is different.

What brings me here today? I want the people in Saudi Arabia—I have many friends there. I value my relationships there.

I appreciate all that Saudi Arabia has done in the past to work with the United States, militarily and otherwise, but I want to be clear to my friends in Saudi Arabia—and really throughout the world—a strategic relationship has certain requirements attached to it. You don't have to run your country like the United States would have you do. You don't have to mirror the United States in terms of your values, but you do have to respect the relationship.

There are certain minimum requirements that I think come with a strategic relationship: No. 1, you cannot kill somebody in the most brutal fashion in a consulate of another country—which violates every norm known to the international community—because they wrote a bad article about you.

You cannot imprison people and torture them in the fashion that has been going on in Saudi Arabia.

You cannot hold the Prime Minister of another country captive for a period of time to bend them to your will.

You cannot rendition people that just simply oppose your views. Terrorism cannot be defined as simple dissent.

The reason I am voting with Senator PAUL and others today is to send a signal to Saudi Arabia that if you act the way you are acting, there is no space for a strategic relationship. There is no amount of oil you can produce that will get me and others to give you a pass on chopping somebody up in a consulate. Did MBS do it? Yes—not because the U.N. said so but because our intelligence and my common sense lead me to believe there is no other viable alternative. You can figure this one out pretty quickly.

What happens next? It cannot be business as usual. Saudi Arabia has been a partner. They will have to be a partner in the future. Shooting rockets into Saudi Arabia from Yemen—Iran supporting the Houthi rebels—bothers me. Defensive armaments, I support, but the war in Yemen is out of control.

I am trying to deliver the strongest message I know how to deliver: Don't take this relationship for granted—and obviously you have.

It is disrespectful to the President of the United States to put him in this position. It is disrespectful to all the allies in Congress for you to put us in this position. Clearly, you don't care that much about this relationship. You care more about the critics and maintaining power at any and all cost.

Here is the deal: My relationship with Saudi Arabia is forever changed, and it will not go back to the way it used to be until Saudi Arabia changes its behavior. The leadership of Saudi Arabia has charted a course that is unsustainable. I reject. There is no amount of oil that can be produced to change my view that our values are more important than oil. We can get oil from other people, but your values come from within.

There is no amount of threat coming from Iran that is going to require me to give a pass to this brutal, barbaric behavior. More is expected of a strategic partner. Saudi Arabia doesn't protect the United States from Iran. To believe otherwise is recasting conditions on the ground.

Saudi Arabia has been a partner. I hope they can be in the future, but Saudi Arabia, through their leadership, made a tremendously bad decision, and it is just not Mr. Khashoggi. Until you change in Saudi Arabia, until you embrace the concept that the strategic relationship with the United States is important, therefore, I must respect it—I am not telling you how to run your country. I am not saying you have to be a Jeffersonian democracy. I respect the right of self-determination by all people, but I will not bless or turn a blind eye to brutality that, in my view, disqualifies a person or a country from being a strategic partner.

If this doesn't do it, what would? If we give this a pass, what is next?

We are going to stand up to the thugs in Iran. We are going to push back against China's cheating. We are going after al-Qaida, ISIS, and all the other bad actors on the planet. We are going to work with people we don't like, but when it comes to a strategic partnership, we need to put the world on notice: It comes with a minimum price, and that price is you cannot have a strategic relationship with the United States and behave in a fashion that shows no respect for human dignity, no respect for international norms.

You have lost me, and that is too bad. I have been on this floor a lot standing up for our friends in Saudi Arabia—which has not always been easy to do—but the days of treating Saudi Arabia the way I used to treat them are over.

My hope is we can find a way to restart this relationship, but it is going to require change. That is why I am voting to support these resolutions.

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. MENENDEZ. 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. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I come to the floor again to urge my colleagues to stand up for Congress as a coequal branch of government and assert our institutional rights in the arms sales process.

I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have joined with me in this effort to bring us here today.

As we get ready to vote on these resolutions, I want to again remind my colleagues what is at stake here. At the end of the day, these votes are not about any one President or any one arms sale. There will be another President in the White House someday. There will be another President who will want to claim Executive authorities to run over Congress and who will want to use emergency declarations to push through their agenda. We in this body must embrace our article I responsibilities and ensure that we serve as an effective check on whoever that Executive is.

Regarding these resolutions, in particular, we must both assert our role in upholding the rule of law at home and use our position to ensure that when our government seeks to sell weapons, those sales advance our national security interests and our values. It is the Congress that provided the President with the authority to sell arms while retaining strong oversight in the process.

At the risk of getting in the weeds, I want to briefly explain why Secretary Pompeo's 22 emergency certifications don't meet the basic requirements laid out by Congress in the Arms Export Control Act. I will be submitting a further statement for the RECORD detailing my statutory concerns, and I encourage my colleagues to read it.

First of all, Secretary Pompeo provided us with one single emergency declaration for 22 separate arms sales, when the law requires each come with its own individual justification. It is obvious why the Secretary flouted the statute: His bogus emergency doesn't pass the laugh test, in general. Furthermore, the Secretary is trying to justify these sales by relying on a section of the Arms Export Control Act—article 36(c)—that arguably does not grant him the authority to do what he is even trying to do.

Congress made fairly clear back in 2000 that this provision only allows for the United States to make emergency arms sales in very limited situations—for example, to sell arms to NATO partners and other steadfast allies that share our values, like Israel, Australia, and Japan.

This is a power grab, pure and simple, with lasting implications for the

role of Congress in the sale of arms around the world. We cannot, as an institution, stand for it.

Let me turn to the proposed sales. As a number of my colleagues and I have already laid out, the administration's argument that this is an emergency meriting pushing through \$8 billion worth of arms sales to Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates simply does not pass muster.

The weapons sales this administration is trying to push through without congressional review will not in any way equip the United States or our allies to better face any imminent threats from Iran.

The Assistant Secretary of State, R. Clarke Cooper, admitted as much multiple times last week before the House of Representatives. In one instance, he noted that the administration had been considering this emergency determination for months. In another, he conceded that a majority of these sales will not even be functional or come online for months or, even in some cases, years.

Let's take a moment to review why last year I decided to put a hold on a sale of 60,000 precision-guided munition kits. Saudi Arabia, at the helm of its coalition, has used these weapons to devastating effects in Yemen. The two resolutions we will consider individually relate to the sales of precision-guided munitions and parts.

We have heard that these weapons are humanitarian weapons. When they are used to precisely target civilians, how can we possibly continue to sell them? These are components of bombs that we know have killed thousands of civilians in Yemen—patients in hospitals, children on schoolbuses. In fact, the Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project last week released data showing more than 90,000 people have been killed in Yemen since 2015. The list goes on.

Yemen has become a humanitarian catastrophe. Twelve thousand people have died under the Saudi-led coalition. There are 85,000 children who have died from starvation in Yemen, an incomprehensible moral tragedy. Another 14 million people remain at risk, especially as cholera resurges across the country.

This is the challenge we have. It is our bombs that are dropping on those civilians. We cannot morally continue to support such a sale.

Secondly, Saudi Arabia, which continues to do this with impunity, also with impunity went ahead and dismembered Jamal Khashoggi, a journalist who was a resident here in the United States. The gruesome report of the U.N. Special Rapporteur on this issue is chilling. If the Senate wants to make it very clear that even if you are an ally, you cannot kill with impunity, this is the moment.

It is also the moment to tell the UAE that you can't take our weapons and give it to others whom we consider people on the terrorist list. That is going on here too.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for the Constitution, stand up for article I in our rights here, stand up for the Senate's institutional role to ultimately ensure that it has a say on arms sales, stand up for the proposition that we will not let any ally, simply because they are an ally, kill a journalist with impunity—something we cherish under our Constitution and the Bill of Rights and the freedom of expression under the First Amendment—and stand up for the proposition that we will not let our bombs fall on innocent civilians and have the moral responsibility, which will be a blemish on our history for years to come.

This is the moment for the Senate to stand up to its institutional prerogatives. This is the moment for the Senate to stand up for the Constitution. I have heard so many of my colleagues speak of the Constitution. This is the moment. This is the moment to stand up for some moral clarity.

This is the moment to send a global message: You cannot kill journalists with impunity. That is the message we must send to Saudi Arabia.

Vote yes on the resolutions of disapproval. Stand up for these propositions. Let's have a moment in which the Senate can be a profile in courage. I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, in just a few moments, we are going to consider S.J. Res. 28 through S.J. Res. 48. I urge my colleagues to oppose these resolutions and to consider the sales that we are talking about here on their own merits.

First of all, we are not talking about the killing of Mr. Khashoggi. That was a murderous act; it was an awful act; and it cannot be condoned or tolerated in any way, shape, or form. Yet it is not what we are voting on here today. Indeed, we hope to eventually bring to the floor a resolution, possibly even a bill, that speaks to that horrific act. Those negotiations have been going on for some time, and we hope to reach a conclusion, but we are not talking about that. We are talking about arms sales that the administration has determined are needed—and on which we have all been briefed—because of the current situation in the Middle East.

I want to speak very briefly about recent events that have been happening as far as Iran is concerned. Iran is conducting activities that are very worrisome and very troubling. When you have these kinds of things happen, it is obvious that a miscalculation can occur, which is the most worrisome thing here.

In any event, these arms sales are needed. To be clear, in the current statute, the administration is within its legal authority to declare an emergency. As stipulated in the Arms Export Control Act, which was passed by this body, the President can act swiftly if he concludes an emergency exists that requires a proposed sale that is in

the national security interest of the United States. That has occurred.

Presidential authority to waive congressional notification was invoked for the very first time by President Carter in 1979. It has been used on three other subsequent occasions. The administration has said, as in those cases, this is a one-time invocation of the waiver authority in response to an acute threat from Iran. The administration has since returned to the regular congressional notification process for further arms sales, which is in place today.

These sales are needed to address the legitimate security requirements of other countries we support in response to there being numerous threats from Iran and its proxies. These threats are real. As the events over just even the recent 24 hours have shown us, it is important that these countries be ready to assist us and to act on their own behalf to counter what Iran has been doing.

Yesterday, Iranian-backed Houthi militants struck a Saudi civilian desalination plant with a land attack cruise missile.

Last night, Iranian forces shot down a U.S. drone that was operating in international airspace over the Strait of Hormuz. It is the third U.S. aircraft they have targeted in recent weeks.

Last week, using limpet mines, Iran attacked two oil tankers that were traveling near the Strait of Hormuz. Yesterday, German Chancellor Merkel cited strong evidence that attributes that attack to Iran. There are very few people in the world who don't know for a fact that it has been Iran that has been responsible for all of this.

On that same day last week, the Iranian-supported Houthis fired a missile at Abha International Airport, in southern Saudi Arabia, and wounded 26 innocent Saudi civilians. Human Rights Watch announced this Houthi attack as a war crime.

On May 19, a rocket—likely by Iran's proxies—landed near the American Embassy in Baghdad.

On May 14, Iran's proxies used drones to strike two strategically important Saudi oil facilities.

Just 2 days earlier, on May 12, four more tankers were targeted by Iran while they were anchored in an Emirati port.

Each month, Iranian-sponsored Houthi rebels launch over 15 ballistic missiles and weaponized, unmanned aerial systems against Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates. This poses a significant threat and endangers the lives of 80,000 Americans who reside on the Arabian Peninsula.

These are the most recent examples of Iran's destabilizing actions on the world stage. These are serious, serious matters. As I said before, this is worrisome; this is troubling. The miscalculation of these kinds of things cause hostilities that lead to very large wars.

As Iran thinks through these things and calibrates them and tries to make

determinations as to what is in its best interest, it is not going well. If you listen to Iran's public statements, they clearly do not coincide with facts. More importantly, Iran is miscalculating the resolve of the American people. It is miscalculating the fact that it is dealing with President Trump; it is not dealing with a former President.

I have talked to the President about this many times. He does not want to go to war with Iran. The American people don't want to go to war with Iran. This body does not want to go to war with Iran. This President is absolutely committed to protecting U.S. lives and U.S. interests, and he will do so. Iran should not miscalculate on that matter, for the President is deeply committed to that proposition.

Iran needs to back away from the edge that it has taken everyone to and deal with this matter entirely differently than it has, or there are going to be dire consequences.

In the face of the attacks I have described and the intimidation, our allies have an obligation to develop capabilities to protect their citizens from such threats. These arms sales are an essential part of our effort in helping them build those capabilities and resist Iranian intimidation.

I share my fellow Senators' concerns about the humanitarian crisis in Yemen and the need for all combatants to avoid civilian casualties. This package includes the sales of precision weapons, which, when combined with partner efforts to improve intelligence in targeting, will enable those who use the weapons to ensure their actions are precise, discriminate, and proportional so as to minimize civilian casualties. The precision munitions in these sales would also prove to be essential to other countries' efforts in defending themselves from more direct attacks from Iran.

Some of us have been briefed by U.S. personnel who have worked specifically with the Saudis to make these improvements, and I encourage my colleagues to have similar conversations. If you care about reducing civilian casualties, you should be an enthusiastic supporter of providing these exacting capabilities, which will be transferred pursuant to these sales. These are important for reducing civilian casualties, and we should all support them.

In closing, I will repeat several key points.

First, the emergency declaration is legal.

Second, these sales are necessary to answer for the legitimate security requirements of other nations that work to keep safe our fellow Americans who work, travel, and live around the world.

Third, to reject these sales at this time and under these circumstances is to reward recent Iranian aggression, to encourage further Iranian escalation, and most importantly, to encourage the miscalculation on the part of the Iranians, which will be disastrous if

they continue down the road they are going.

For all of these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote against these resolutions.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON S.J. RES. 36

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will read S.J. Res. 36 for the third time.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for 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. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 177 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Table with 3 columns of names: Baldwin, Bennet, Blumenthal, Booker, Brown, Cantwell, Cardin, Carper, Casey, Collins, Coons, Cortez Masto, Duckworth, Durbin, Feinstein, Graham, Harris, Hassan, Heinrich, Hirono, Jones, Kaine, King, Klobuchar, Leahy, Lee, Manchin, Markey, Menendez, Merkley, Moran, Murkowski, Murphy, Murray, Paul, Peters, Reed, Rosen, Sanders, Schatz, Schumer, Shaheen, Sinema, Smith, Stabenow, Tester, Udall, Van Hollen, Warner, Warren, Whitehouse, Wyden, Young.

NAYS—45

Table with 3 columns of names: Alexander, Barrasso, Blackburn, Blunt, Boozman, Braun, Burr, Capito, Cassidy, Cornyn, Cotton, Cramer, Crapo, Cruz, Daines, Enzi, Ernst, Fischer, Gardner, Grassley, Hawley, Hoeven, Hyde-Smith, Inhofe, Isakson, Johnson, Kennedy, Lankford, McConnell, McSally, Perdue, Portman, Risch, Roberts, Romney, Rubio, Sasse, Scott (FL), Scott (SC), Shelby, Sullivan, Thune, Tillis, Toomey, Wicker.

NOT VOTING—2

Gillibrand Rounds

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 36) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 36

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of a manufacturing license, technical assistance license, or export license with respect to any of the following proposed agreements or

transfers to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Kingdom of Spain, and the Italian Republic is prohibited:

(1) The transfer of the following defense articles, including defense services and technical data, described in Executive Communication 1427 (EC-1427) submitted to Congress pursuant to subsections (c) and (d) of section 36 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019:

(A) Coproduction and manufacture in Saudi Arabia of Paveway Pre-Amp Circuit Card Assemblies (CCA), Guidance Electronics Assembly (GEA) CCAs, and Control Actuator System (CAS) CCAs for all Paveway variants.

(B) Coproduction and manufacture in Saudi Arabia of Paveway II Guidance Electronics Detector Assemblies (GEDA) and Computer Control Groups (CCG).

(C) The transfer of up to 64,603 additional kits, partial kits, and full-up-rounds.

VOTE ON S.J. RES. 38

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will read S.J. Res. 38 for the third time.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for 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. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 178 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Table with 3 columns of names: Baldwin, Bennet, Blumenthal, Booker, Brown, Cantwell, Cardin, Carper, Casey, Collins, Coons, Cortez Masto, Duckworth, Durbin, Feinstein, Graham, Harris, Hassan, Heinrich, Hirono, Jones, Kaine, King, Klobuchar, Leahy, Lee, Manchin, Markey, Menendez, Merkley, Moran, Murkowski, Murphy, Murray, Paul, Peters, Reed, Rosen, Sanders, Schatz, Schumer, Shaheen, Sinema, Smith, Stabenow, Tester, Udall, Van Hollen, Warner, Warren, Whitehouse, Wyden, Young.

NAYS—45

Table with 3 columns of names: Alexander, Barrasso, Blackburn, Blunt, Boozman, Braun, Burr, Capito, Cassidy, Cornyn, Cotton, Cramer, Crapo, Cruz, Daines, Dines, Enzi, Johnson, Kennedy, Lankford, Lankford, Gardner, Grassley, Hawley, Hoeven, Hyde-Smith, Inhofe, Isakson, Johnson, Kennedy, Lankford, McConnell, McSally.

Table with 3 columns of names: Perdue, Portman, Risch, Roberts, Romney, Rubio, Sasse, Scott (FL), Scott (SC), Shelby, Sullivan, Thune, Tillis, Toomey, Wicker.

NOT VOTING—2

Gillibrand Rounds

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 38) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 38

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to the following proposed exports to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland is prohibited:

(1) The transfer of the following defense articles, including services and technical data, described in Executive Communication 1422 (EC-1422) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed transfer of defense articles, defense services, and technical data to support the manufacture of the Aurora Fuzing System for the Paveway IV Precision Guided Bomb Program.

VOTE ON S.J. RES. 27, S.J. RES. 28, S.J. RES. 29, S.J. RES. 30, S.J. RES. 31, S.J. RES. 32, S.J. RES. 33, S.J. RES. 34, S.J. RES. 35, S.J. RES. 37, S.J. RES. 39, S.J. RES. 40, S.J. RES. 41, S.J. RES. 42, S.J. RES. 43, S.J. RES. 44, S.J. RES. 45, S.J. RES. 46, S.J. RES. 47, AND S.J. RES. 48 EN BLOC

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will read for the third time the remaining disapproval resolutions en bloc by number.

The joint resolutions were ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and were read the third time.

The joint resolutions having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolutions pass?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) would have voted 'yea.'

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 179 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Table with 3 columns of names: Baldwin, Bennet, Blumenthal, Booker, Brown, Cantwell, Cardin, Carper, Casey, Collins, Coons, Cortez Masto, Duckworth, Durbin, Feinstein, Graham, Harris, Hassan, Heinrich, Hirono, Jones.

Kaine	Murray	Smith
King	Paul	Stabenow
Klobuchar	Peters	Tester
Leahy	Reed	Udall
Manchin	Rosen	Van Hollen
Markey	Sanders	Warner
Menendez	Schatz	Warren
Merkley	Schumer	Whitehouse
Moran	Shaheen	Wyden
Murphy	Sinema	Young

NAYS—45

Alexander	Ernst	Perdue
Barrasso	Fischer	Portman
Blunt	Gardner	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Braun	Hawley	Romney
Burr	Hoeven	Rubio
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Cassidy	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Isakson	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Johnson	Shelby
Cramer	Kennedy	Sullivan
Crapo	Lankford	Thune
Cruz	McConnell	Tillis
Daines	McSally	Toomey
Enzi	Murkowski	Wicker

NOT VOTING—4

Blackburn	Lee
Gillibrand	Rounds

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 27) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 27

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to the following proposed exports to the United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, and Australia is prohibited:

(1) The transfer of the following defense articles, including defense services and technical data, described in Executive Communication 1424 (EC-1424) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed transfer of defense articles, defense services, and technical data to support the marketing, sale and on-going support for the ScanEagle and Integrator Unmanned Aerial Systems and for future Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) requirements for end-use by the United Arab Emirates Armed Forces; and hardware and defense services related to Wide Area Surveillance Payload (Redkite), laser designator, and integration of maritime search payload—Visual Detection and Ranging (ViDAR).

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 28) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 28

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates is prohibited:

(1) The sale of the following defense articles, including defense services and technical data, described in Transmittal No. 17-39, submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(b)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 4, 2019: The proposed sale of 20 RQ-21A Blackjack Unmanned Air Vehicles (UAVs); 40 Global Positioning Systems (GPS) with Selective Availability Anti-Spoofing Module (SAASM) Type II (MPE-S); air vehicle support equipment including 8 Ground Control Stations (GCS), 4 launchers, and 4 retrievers; spare and repair parts; publications; training; and technical support services.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 29) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 29

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following proposed foreign military sale to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is prohibited:

(1) The sale of the following defense articles, including defense services and technical data, described in Transmittal No. 19-01, submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(b)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 4, 2019: The proposed sale of follow-on logistics support and service for the Royal Saudi Air Force aircraft, engines, and weapons; publications and technical documentation; support equipment; spare and repair parts; repair and return; calibration support and test equipment; personnel equipment; United States Government and contractor technical and logistics support; and other elements of program support.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 30) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 30

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates is prohibited:

(1) The sale of the following defense articles, including defense services and technical data, described in Transmittal No. 19-18, submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(b)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 4, 2019: The proposed sale of a blanket-order United States Marine Corps training, training support, and other training related services in support of the United Arab Emirates Presidential Guard Command.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 31) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 31

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following proposed foreign military sale to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is prohibited:

(1) The sale of the following defense articles, including defense services and technical data, described in Transmittal No. 18-31, submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(b)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 4, 2019: The proposed sale of spare and repair parts, United States Government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services, and other related elements of program support for the Tactical Air Surveillance System aircraft program.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 32) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 32

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following proposed foreign military sale to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is prohibited:

(1) The sale of the following defense articles, including defense services and technical data, described in Transmittal No. 18-21, submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(b)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 4, 2019: The proposed sale of follow-on support and services for Royal Saudi Air Force aircraft, engines, and weapons; publications and technical documentation; support equipment; spare and repair parts; repair and return; calibration support and test equipment; personnel equipment;

United States Government and contractor technical and logistics support; and other related elements of program support.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 33) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 33

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates is prohibited:

(1) The sale of the following defense articles, including defense services and technical data, described in Transmittal No. 17-73, submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(b)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 4, 2019: The proposed sale of 20,004 Advanced Precision Kill Weapon Systems (APKWS) II All-Up-Rounds; weapons support and test equipment; spares; technical publications; personnel training; other training equipment; transportation; United States Government and contractor engineering; technical and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistical and program support.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 34) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 34

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates is prohibited:

(1) The sale of the following defense articles, including defense services and technical data, described in Transmittal No. 17-70, submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(b)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 4, 2019: The proposed sale of 331 Javelin Guided Missiles with container; System Integration and Checkout (SICO) service; Field Service Representative; United States Government and contractor technical and logistic support services' tools and test equipment; and other related elements of logistics and program support.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 35) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 35

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates is prohibited:

(1) The sale of the following defense articles, including defense services and technical data, described in Transmittal No. 17-0B, submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(b)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 4, 2019: The proposed sale of 28 AH-64E Remanufactured Apache Attack Helicopters; 10 new AH-64E Apache Attack Helicopters; 76 T700-GE-701D Engines (56 remanufactured, 18 new, 6 spares, 2 installed); 40 AN/ASQ-170 Modernized Target Acquisition and Designation Sight/AN/AAR-11 Modernized Pilot Night Vision Sensors (28 remanufactured, 10 new, 2 spares); 32 remanufactured AN/APR-48B Modernized Radar Frequency Interferometers; 47 AAR-57 Common Missile Warning Systems (31 remanufactured, 10 new, 6 spares); 150 Embedded Global Positioning Systems with Inertial Navigation (60 remanufactured, 74 new, 16 spares); 45 Manned-Unmanned Teaming-International (MUMTI) systems (28 remanufactured, 10 new, 7 spares); and 15 new MUMTI System Upper Receivers, training devices, helmets, simulators, generators, transportation, wheeled vehicles and organization equipment, spare and repair parts,

support equipment, tools and test equipment, technical data and publications, personnel training and training equipment, United States Government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistics support.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 37) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 37

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to any of the following proposed exports to the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, or France is prohibited:

(1) The transfer of the following defense articles, including defense services and technical data, described in Executive Communication 1425 (EC-1425) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed transfer of 44,000 GBU-12 Paveway II Kits and the proposed transfer of 16,000 GBU-10 Paveway II Kits.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 39) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 39

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to the following proposed export to the United Arab Emirates and United Kingdom is prohibited:

(1) The transfer to the United Arab Emirates and United Kingdom of the following export of certain defense articles, including technical data and defense services, described in Executive Communication 1426 (EC-1426) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposal to amend a technical assistance agreement to support the installation, integration, modification, maintenance, and repair of F110-GE-132 gas turbine engines for use in F-16 Aircraft by the General Headquarters of the Armed Forces of the United Arab Emirates.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 40) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 40

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to the following proposed export to India, Israel, Republic of Korea, and Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is prohibited:

(1) The transfer to India, Israel, Republic of Korea, and Kingdom of Saudi Arabia of the following license for export of certain defense articles, including technical data and defense services, described in Executive Communication 1417 (EC-1417) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed manufacturing agreement with Huneed Technologies Company, Ltd. in South Korea to transfer defense articles, defense services, and technical data to support manufacture, production, test, inspection, modification, enhancement, rework, and repair of F/A18E/F and derivative series aircraft panels for end use by the Boeing Company.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 41) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 41

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to the following proposed export to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates is prohibited:

(1) The transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates of the following license for export of technical data and defense services, described in Executive Communication 1419 (EC-1419) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed technical assistance agreement providing technical data and defense services to Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates in support of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia Ministry of Defense Transformation Project.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 42) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 42

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to any of the following proposed exports to the United Arab Emirates and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland is prohibited:

(1) The transfer to the United Arab Emirates and to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of the following defense articles, including technical data and defense services, described in Executive Communication 1421 (EC-1421) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed technical assistance agreement with Armed Forces of the United Arab Emirates to transfer defense articles, defense services, and technical data to support preparation shipment, delivery, and acceptance of the Guidance Enhanced (GEM-T) in support of the Patriot Program for end use by the Government of the United Arab Emirates.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 43) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 43

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to the following proposed exports to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is prohibited:

(1) The transfer of the following defense articles, including services and technical data, described in Executive Communication 1418 (EC-1418) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed transfer of technical data and defense services in order to provide technically qualified personnel to advise and assist the Royal Saudi Air Force (RSAF) in maintenance and training for the RSAF F-15 fleet of aircraft.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 44) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 44

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to the following proposed retransfer of defense articles from the United Arab Emirates to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan is prohibited:

(1) The retransfer of the following defense articles, including services and technical

data, described in Executive Communication 1428 (EC-1428) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2753(d)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed retransfer of 500 Paveway II laser guided bombs (including Mk-82 warheads, FMU-152A/B fuzes, and guidance kits) from the United Arab Emirates to Jordan.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 45) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 45

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to the following proposed exports to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is prohibited:

(1) The transfer of the following defense articles, including services and technical data, described in Executive Communication 1416 (EC-1416) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed export of 15,000 120mm M933A1 mortar bombs to Saudi Arabia for end use by the Royal Land Forces of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 46) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 46

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to the following proposed exports to the United Arab Emirates is prohibited:

(1) The transfer of the following defense articles, including services and technical data, described in Executive Communication 1415 (EC-1415) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed export of 100 M107A1 .50 caliber semi-automatic rifles and sound suppressors to the United Arab Emirates for use by the Armed Forces General Headquarters of the United Arab Emirates.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 47) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 47

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to the following proposed exports to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is prohibited:

(1) The transfer of the following defense articles, including services and technical data, described in Executive Communication 1423 (EC-1423) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed export of defense articles, including data and defense services, to support the performance of maintenance and repair services of F110 engines to support the Ministry of Defense of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 48) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 48

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to the following proposed exports to the United Arab Emirates is prohibited:

(1) The transfer of the following defense articles, including services and technical data, described in Executive Communication 1420 (EC-1420) submitted to Congress pursuant to

section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed transfer of defense articles, defense services, and technical data to support the export and integration of 60,000 FMU-152A/B Joint Programmable Bomb Fuze systems into the United Arab Emirates Armed Forces General Headquarters' fleet of the following aircraft and associated weapons: F-16, Mirage 2000, AT-802 Air Tractor and S2R-600 Archangel.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020—MOTION TO PROCEED—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the unfinished business.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to S. 1790, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at 1:45 p.m. today the Senate vote on the confirmation of the Baranwal nomination, with all other provisions under the previous order remaining in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, yesterday I had a chance to sit down with a group of my constituents visiting DC from the Rio Grande Valley. For those who have never been to the Rio Grande Valley, I highly recommend a visit. It is a beautiful region, a unique part of our country, rich in culture and history and full of hard-working people and businesses that fuel our State's and the Nation's thriving economy. As record numbers of people continue to mass migrate across our southern border, it has become one of the most heavily impacted areas in our country, and it is working hard to manage the growing humanitarian crisis.

Last month alone, 144,000 people were detained coming across our border. It was the largest monthly total since 2006. It only begins to paint the picture of how challenging this mass migration has become. The vast majority of the people who crossed last month were either unaccompanied children or families, putting a strain on resources across the border, particularly when it comes to detention facilities.

It is no mistake that the human smugglers, whom we call coyotes back home, have figured out that if you can smuggle an unaccompanied child or family across the border, you vastly improve the chances of successfully placing them in the United States.

That is because they understand our laws better than many Members of Congress do, and they know how to exploit them for their financial gain.

The detention facilities I referred to a moment ago have been around a long time—long before the current surge of families and children began arriving at our borders. They were built as short-term detention facilities for single adults. As trends have changed, the men and women of Customs and Border Protection have done everything in their power to make these facilities workable on an increasingly thin and inadequate budget.

I want to pause for a moment to say thank you to the men and women in uniform who are providing around-the-clock enforcement of our laws and providing quality and compassionate care to the migrants in their custody. It is a tough job. When you train to be a Customs and Border Patrol agent, you are not trained in child care, but that is what many of them find themselves doing—handing out juice boxes and diapers and providing assistance to those families as they seek to have their claims for asylum adjudicated.

This is a tough job, and it is getting tougher every day, particularly in the Rio Grande Valley and along the border. Of the 144,000 crossings last month, nearly 50,000 were apprehended in the Rio Grande Valley, making it the most heavily impacted of the entire border.

In fact, it should come as no surprise that Texas is impacted more than any other State because, of course, we share a 1,200-mile common border with Mexico. Two-thirds of the apprehensions so far this fiscal year have occurred in the Rio Grande Valley, El Paso, or Del Rio sectors. As Federal resources have rapidly depleted, Customs and Border Protection officers and agents have struggled to manage the processing, care, and transportation of these migrants, and local communities, it should be no surprise, have stepped in.

The Humanitarian Respite Center in McAllen is one of several locations working to care for the migrants and has had its doors open for 5 years now. In the summer of 2014, we saw then-unprecedented numbers of Central Americans, particularly children, arriving at the border. This was back when President Obama called this a “humanitarian and security crisis.” The scenes were heartbreaking and spurred many folks to action to try to offer their help.

Sister Norma Pimentel is the executive director of Catholic Charities in the Rio Grande Valley and led the creation of this respite center. Migrants who are released by CBP or ICE and are awaiting a court date are often dropped off at the center by officers or agents themselves. There they can get food, a hot shower, a good night's sleep, and travel to wherever they are going to await their court date.

There is certainly a need for this type of assistance under the cir-

cumstances, and it has been in existence only 5 years. The respite center has helped more than 150,000 people and continues its work as more people cross the border each day.

The number of unaccompanied children who illegally entered the United States last month is higher than in any other month since the 2014 surge that I mentioned a moment ago. The weight felt by those trying to provide assistance is getting heavier and heavier. As Federal resources dwindle, local communities in the Rio Grande Valley and along the entire Texas-Mexico border have been filling the gaps, despite the fact that, obviously, immigration and the sovereignty of our borders are Federal responsibilities. In the absence of Federal response, it is the State and local communities that have had to step up to help.

Like the respite center in McAllen, these communities regularly provide care, transportation, food, and shelter for migrants in need. I believe this generosity shows the true Texas spirit and helps illustrate how serious the problem has become and how desperately additional Federal resources are needed.

Thankfully, yesterday the Appropriations Committee took action. The committee announced an agreement on a border supplemental package that will include humanitarian assistance needed at the border. The nearly \$4.6 billion includes funding to support the missions of the Department of Health and Human Services, which is providing care for the record number of unaccompanied children who are arriving in the United States. It also provides funding for the Department of Homeland Security, which is working to enforce our laws and properly care for the adults and families in their custody, as well as the Departments of Justice and Defense. The hard-working men and women in these Departments are working tirelessly to care for the migrants in their custody, and I want to thank each of them for working day in and day out to enforce our laws. But, as I mentioned, these are not the only folks trying to provide support with minimal support from the U.S. Government.

Earlier this month I sent a letter to the chairman and ranking member of both the Appropriations Committee and the Homeland Security Subcommittee, requesting that the funding package include reimbursement for local communities that helped carry the weight of the humanitarian crisis. NGOs, nongovernmental organizations, like the respite center in McAllen are trying to do more and more with less and less. Cities and counties are diverting hard-to-come-by taxpayer dollars from their intended purposes, such as public safety, power, and clean drinking water, to do the job that is the responsibility of the Federal Government. It is unfair for these folks to pay for a humanitarian crisis that is not of their making. I am glad to see the Appropriations Committee taking some action to right this wrong.

The funding agreement yesterday includes \$30 million available nationwide for direct reimbursement for local governments, States, and NGOs that have spent millions of dollars to respond to this crisis. Communities, both along the border and throughout the State of Texas, will be able to request reimbursement directly through local and national boards of the Emergency Food and Shelter Program at the Federal Emergency Management Agency to help lessen the financial burden they have incurred over the past few months.

I want to thank the chairman and ranking member and all of our colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for supporting this effort to help alleviate this strain on Texas communities. The funding bill received broad bipartisan support in the committee and passed by a vote of 30 to 1. I hope we will soon have the opportunity to pass this important funding bill here in the Senate. I encourage our friends in the House to put politics aside and do the same.

As happy as I am that the appropriations committee has come up with this additional money, this is still a matter of treating the symptoms and not the underlying cause. President Trump, in his frustrations with congressional inaction, threatened to impose additional tariffs on the nation of Mexico. Fortunately, the negotiations that ensued came up with a plan for Mexico to work with the United States to begin to slow down or stop the flow of people from Central America across Mexico into the United States.

I have never seen anything quite like that before in terms of our relationship with Mexico. They have historically tended to view immigration as our problem, not theirs, as well as the drug problem, because the demand in America is our problem and not theirs. This really represents a change of attitude on behalf of President Lopez Obrador's administration, and I want to congratulate President Lopez Obrador and his administration for working with the United States to address a joint problem. This is not just Mexico's problem. This is not just the problem of the United States. This is our shared challenge. Working together, I am confident we can begin to address it.

Finally, I want to say that Congress has largely been AWOL when it comes to dealing with this humanitarian crisis up to this point. A couple of months ago, my colleague from the House of Representatives, HENRY CUELLAR, a Democrat from Laredo, TX, and I introduced a bill we called the HUMANE Act, which would fix some of the gaps in our laws that are being exploited by the human smugglers and are causing this humanitarian crisis in this huge flood of humanity coming into the United States.

If Congress would accept its responsibility and do its job, it would never have been necessary for the President to threaten additional tariffs on Mex-

ico, forcing this diplomatic negotiation. I am glad it resulted in a good and positive outcome, that negotiation, but the fault ultimately lies with Congress for not taking up and debating and voting on bipartisan legislation like the HUMANE Act that has been introduced in the Senate and in the House.

I will say that Chairman GRAHAM of the Judiciary Committee has been focused like a laser on this issue. We were scheduled to mark up a bill today in the Judiciary Committee that I believe would incorporate many provisions of the HUMANE Act as part of a bill which would, I believe, address this humanitarian pull factor because of exploitation of those gaps in our asylum laws. That now has been postponed, but I hope the discussions will continue because, ultimately, this is a matter of congressional responsibility. We can be glad that the Appropriations Committee stepped up and provided additional resources, including this \$30 million in reimbursement for local communities. We can be glad that Mexico and the United States are finally now working together on this shared challenge, but ultimately, if we are going to address not just the symptoms but the causes of this humanitarian crisis, it is up to Congress. I believe the American people will ultimately hold us accountable, as they should.

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

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GI BILL

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, this Saturday is June 22. It is not just any June 22. It marks 75 years to the day that Franklin Delano Roosevelt signed into law one of the most significant pieces of legislation in our Nation's history. It was called, and is called, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. We know it today as the GI bill.

Since 1944, the GI bill has helped literally millions of not just servicemen but a lot of servicewomen. When you look at our Armed Forces today, there are a lot of servicewomen who serve in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and in the Coast Guard. I remember being a midshipman at the Ohio State Navy ROTC in the 1960s, and we had no women in our unit. There were no women in any ROTC unit in colleges across the country, as far as I know. There were no women who were nominated to attend armed service academies—the Naval Academy, Air Force Academy, Merchant Marine Academy. None of them had women. I got to my squadron on the west coast during the Vietnam war, and we had about 300 men in my squadron. About 10 percent were officers. The others were enlisted men. We had no women in my squadron.

All that has changed. When you go to any college that has a ROTC unit today, they are allowing women in. In the academies, you find women. In my old squadron, we find women. They are not just E-1s, E-2s, and E-3s; they are O-4s, O-5s, O-6s, and they are doing a great job. The GI bill is for them too.

Since 1944, the GI bill has helped millions of World War II veterans purchase a home, pay for a higher education or obtain job training and, in turn, transformed our Nation's economy.

Our Presiding Officer, who has served our country in uniform, knows of what I speak. I was just off of Active Duty at the end of the Vietnam war and in Delaware when I finished up my MBA, which is financed in part by the GI bill. I had scraped enough money together to buy a house. I think it cost about \$35,000. I didn't have \$35,000, but with the help of the GI bill, I was able to get a mortgage and buy my first home, all those years ago.

In the years since World War II, the GI bill has continued to change the lives of millions of veterans by spurring economic opportunity and helping to create the middle class as we know it today. That is why earlier this week I was proud to reintroduce a bipartisan resolution in the Senate, alongside my colleagues Senators JOHNNY ISAKSON of Georgia and JON TESTER of Montana. They are the chair and ranking member of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, which designates this week as National GI Bill Commemoration Week, celebrating the historical significance of the GI bill and renewing our commitment to improving the lives of our Nation's veterans for years to come.

I want to share with you a couple of reasons why the GI bill is oftentimes referred to as the "greatest legislation" and share with you how it changed my life and really the life of my family.

After World War II, millions of returning veterans flooded our Nation's colleges, our universities, and our vocational schools. It was the GI bill that made financial support, education, and homegrown programs available to those 16 million veterans returning home and helped to usher in an era of unprecedented economic expansion.

According to the 1988 report from the Joint Economic Committee, it was estimated that for every \$1 the United States invested in our GIs through the GI bill, about \$7 were returned in economic growth for our country.

I am going to say that again. According to the Joint Economic Committee in 1988, it was estimated, for every \$1 the United States invested in the GI bill, about \$7 were returned to our economy. It is a pretty good return.

Those are big returns. I wish I could say for every dollar we invested in Federal Government spending that we got seven bucks back, in terms of economic growth. We don't. So this is something to know.

Thanks to the original GI bill, 450,000 engineers, 240,000 accountants, 238,000 teachers, 91,000 scientists, 67,000 doctors, 112,000 dentists, and thousands of other professionals entered our country's workforce, and many folks entered the workforce with skills in building trades, in assembly operations. You name it.

The GI bill truly democratized our higher education system. It established greater citizenship and civic participation and empowered the “greatest generation”—my parents’ generation—to lead our country following World War II.

At the end of World War II, my dad was the chief petty officer in the Navy and served until the end of World War II and a little bit after that and served many years after that as a chief petty officer in the naval reserve for, I think, 30 years in all. He came back. Before he went to work, he took advantage of the GI bill, and he had a real knack for fixing things and building things. He was very skilled in that regard. He had a high school education. He and my mom graduated from Shady Springs High School in Beaver, WV. They were married during World War II. My sister was born in 1945, and I was born in 1947. My dad used the GI bill, he once told me, to learn how to fix wrecked cars, how to be an auto body repairman. He ended up working at an Oldsmobile dealership in Beckley, WV, Burlison Oldsmobile, using the skills he gained from the GI bill. He worked there for a year or two. One day, a claims adjuster came in from the Nationwide Insurance company. Nationwide insured a car that was being repaired by my dad. The claims adjuster talked to my dad about the car and how it was coming. Somewhere in that conversation, the fellow from Nationwide Insurance said: You know, you could do what I do.

My dad said: You mean be a claims adjuster for Nationwide Insurance?

The guy said: Yes, you could do this. You have a lot on the ball.

Two years later, my father was a claims adjuster for Nationwide Insurance. He continued to repair wrecked cars as a hobby. We had any number of cars in our family that looked as good as new. He would take them on weekends and went to a garage and fixed them, painted them, and they were as good as new.

Out of that humble beginning as a claims adjuster for Nationwide Insurance—he was very proud of the work he did, but he ended up 20, 25 years later as one of the top instructors for Nationwide in their home office in Columbus, OH, teaching all the claims adjusters from across the country for Nationwide how to do the job adjusting claims, working on claims.

Here is a picture of my dad, Wallace Richard Carper. He went by Richard, his middle name, my middle name. He instructed a bunch of folks in the home office in the training school in Columbus, OH. Here he is with some of his compadres, some of the fellow teachers whom he worked with. It started with the GI bill.

I know people who used the GI bill to get an undergraduate degree or 2-year degree, associate’s degree, a master’s degree, a Ph.D. Not everybody used the GI bill for that. My father used it in a way that actually ended up enabling him to not only get a good blue-collar

job but also actually to end up doing this kind of work as well. I am proud of him and thankful to the GI bill for helping him get started and serve as a role model for my sister and me.

My own career, I served 5 years on Active Duty as a midshipman, before that at Ohio State, and served 5 years in the Vietnam war, three tours in Southeast Asia. I wanted to stay in the Navy. I wanted to go to graduate school after my career. The Navy wasn’t ready to send me to Monterey. I wanted to go to Monterey to graduate school. The Navy wasn’t ready to send me to a postgraduate school. They said to come back and talk to them in a couple of years.

I wanted to go to graduate school. I entered my regular commission, took a Reserve commission, and moved from California to Delaware—the University of Delaware—and enrolled on the GI bill to go to graduate school.

The next weekend, after I showed up in Delaware, I drove up the road to Willow Grove Naval Air Station in Pennsylvania, north of Philadelphia, and they were just getting the Navy P-3 aircraft. I had been a P-3 aircraft mission commander during the Vietnam war. I said: Are you looking for people who might help train these sailors at Willow Grove on how to use these P-3 airplanes?

He said: We need somebody. We need some help, and we are were happy to sign you up.

I flew with them for another 18 years and retired as a Navy captain.

Before I did those 18 years, I went to graduate school at the University of Delaware and earned an MBA, and that helped me go to work for the State of Delaware in economic development, right out of graduate school, and later had a chance to run for the State treasurer. Nobody wanted to run. In knowing I had an MBA from the University of Delaware, some people thought maybe I could be a pretty good State treasurer. We ended up starting with the worst credit rating in the country back in 1977, and 6 years later, we had doubled the credit rating. Pete du Pont was our Governor, and he was a great Governor.

I hope I helped a little bit along the way. That GI bill helped me in earning my MBA and, later, to have had a chance to have served in the House, then as Governor, and now here in the Senate. So I am deeply grateful to the people of this country for investing in me. I tried to work hard to repay that investment they made in me all those years ago.

Today’s veterans can take advantage of the post-9/11 GI bill. It is an incredible benefit that pays the full cost of tuition at public colleges and universities, offers a generous housing allowance, and pays for books. It can even be transferred to veterans’ spouses or children.

In 2017, I was proud when Congress enacted the Forever GI bill—legislation that expanded the GI bill and

strengthened the protection for our veterans, for Purple Heart recipients, for National Guard reservists, and for surviving spouses and children.

About 2 or 3 weeks ago, we had a send-off ceremony in the Delaware National Guard facility in Smyrna, DE, which is just north of Dover. There were 20 or so National Guard men and women. They were about to ship off for Iraq and other surrounding countries in that part of the world.

In my remarks to send them off and wish them well, I mentioned, when they come home, they will be eligible for the GI bill if they have a total of 36 months of service, which will enable them to go to college for free—to the University of Delaware, to Delaware State University, or to the Delaware Technical Community College. There will be no tuition, and books will be paid for. If they need tutoring, it will be paid for, and they will receive a \$2,000-a-month housing allowance.

When we came back from Southeast Asia at the end of the Vietnam war, in the GI bill, we received a \$250-a-month allowance for everything. That was it. It was all there. The GI bill that our veterans inherit today, receive today, is just incredibly generous and is, actually, very helpful in terms of recruiting people to serve in an all-volunteer military.

One of the aspects of the bill that I mentioned a minute ago was, if a GI doesn’t use his or her GI bill, his or her spouse can use it. If his or her spouse doesn’t use it, his or her dependent children can use it. Sometimes that happens, and I want to share one sad but, in the end, hopeful story about one servicemember’s GI benefits.

His name was Christopher Slutman. He grew up not too far from Delaware, but he ended up serving in New York City as a fireman and had been one for 15 years. In the words of Winston Churchill, he was twice a citizen because, in addition to doing that, he served in the Reserves for a number of years—not in the Navy but in the Marines.

His unit was activated. He was activated, and he ended up in Afghanistan on Active Duty. He took leave from his day job as a firefighter in New York City to put on a different uniform and ship out with his colleagues to go to Afghanistan. He was serving there on Active Duty—a marine reservist activated—when, one day while on patrol within the Humvee, they ran across a bomb that exploded and killed him, Christopher Slutman, and killed two other marines who were in the vehicle.

Along with CHRIS COONS, my colleague here in the Senate; LISA BLUNT ROCHESTER, our only Representative at large of the U.S. House of Representatives; our Governor, John Carney; the Secretary of Defense; the head of the Marine Corps; and a lot of other people, several days later, I stood on the flight line at Dover Air Force Base with the families of those three marines who died.

One of the people among the three families was Christopher Slutman's now widow. Shannon Metcalf Slutman was there, who has earned three degrees herself—her undergraduate from the University of Delaware, a master's degree, and a doctorate degree—and her three daughters were not. I think it was late at night. They were probably at home and probably in bed.

When Christopher Slutman died, he left behind a widow, and he left behind three little girls, ages 4, 8, and 10. His wife doesn't need to go to school any further. She is educated well beyond my dreams. Do you know what, though? They have three daughters, and we are going to make sure, when they are old enough to go to college, they will be able to inherit and use the GI bill's benefits that their father and their mother will never use.

A lot of times, we think about what the GI bill does to help servicemembers like me and like my dad, but it also helps a lot of families in ways we, maybe, never imagined. So I think we celebrate 75 years of the gift that this legislation provides to those survivors, like to the three Slutman girls, as they prepare to face the world without their father.

In closing, I am proud to join families across our country today in celebration of the importance of the GI bill over the last three-quarters of a century. It has enabled hundreds of thousands of veterans, including, as I said earlier, my dad and me, to pursue our dreams and to, hopefully, contribute in some way to our Nation and to our economy. This week, we reaffirm our commitment to making sure that all veterans today have similar experiences—maybe even better experiences—than we had and that they get the most out of their hard-earned GI bill benefits.

I ask all of my colleagues to join us today, here in this Chamber and across the country, in wishing the GI bill a happy 75th birthday. Here is to another 75 years of improving the lives of our Nation's veterans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

TRIBUTE TO BILLY PAYNE

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I rise to do something I rarely do. To start, I want to talk about a very special Georgian and a good friend of mine—a man by the name of Billy Payne. Billy is a husband, a father, a grandfather, a great Georgian, and, yes, a great American. Recently, he was one of five individuals to be inducted into the 2019 World Golf Hall of Fame. It is quite an honor. Billy Payne is a riveting storyteller, a creative thinker, and an effective leader.

Golf Magazine once wrote: "Wherever he goes, Payne is the most interesting person in the room."

Billy was born in Athens, GA, and he went on to play football for his hometown team, the Georgia Bulldogs. He earned a law degree from the Univer-

sity of Georgia and went on to open a small practice in Atlanta.

After helping to raise money for a new sanctuary at their church, Billy and Martha, his wife, were inspired and started looking for ways to make a difference in their community. The day after the new sanctuary was dedicated, Billy Payne came home from work and said to Martha: I've got it—we're going to bring the Olympics to Atlanta. Billy was undaunted by the magnitude of this decision.

He didn't have many connections at the time, but he called up city and State officials and formed a team to make a bid to host the 1996 Olympic Games. Billy spent the next 3½ years personally traveling to 110 countries to convince Olympic officials to bring the games to the city of Atlanta. On September 18, 1990, Atlanta won the bid for the 1996 Olympics all because of Billy Payne's leadership and his vision for the city.

The 1996 Olympics put Atlanta on the world map. It transformed the city and allowed us to build infrastructure that later helped Georgia to become the No. 1 State in the country in which to do business. To this very day, my alma mater, Georgia Tech, actually uses dormitories that were built to house the athletes in the 1996 Olympics in Atlanta.

After serving as President and CEO of the Atlanta Committee for the Olympic Games, Billy was invited to join Augusta National. In a very short period of time—actually, in 2006—he was selected to be the club's chairman, which is a role he served in for 11 years. Billy oversaw the Masters Tournament and turned it into a global brand with worldwide reach. When Billy took over at Augusta National, the club's membership was all male. Under his leadership, Augusta National broke the gender barrier and allowed women to join the club for the very first time.

He also started two major amateur events—the Latin America Amateur and the Asia-Pacific Amateur. The winners of these tournaments are invited to play in the Masters each year. As a result, young people from all over the world now have a chance to actually compete in the Masters every year.

In 2014, Billy launched the Drive, Chip & Putt Championship—a junior golf competition that gives 7- to 15-year-olds the opportunity to develop their golf skills, to compete with their peers, and to earn the opportunity to actually play and compete at the Augusta National on the Sunday before the Masters. I have seen this. It is an exciting event to see these young people compete at the very home of the Masters.

Probably the greatest achievement, however, for amateur golf may have been this year's first Augusta National Women's Amateur tournament. When the final pair walked onto the 18th green arm in arm—one the winner, the

other the runner-up, two women, arm in arm, cheering each other—it was a highlight in amateur sports. In my opinion, Bobby Jones, who is the hero of amateur sports in America, was in Heaven and probably stood up and cheered.

Finally, Billy had a hand in naming his alma mater's football field, Sanford Stadium, after his coach at the University of Georgia, Vince Dooley. Last month, the university's athletic board approved the name change, and now the field is officially known as Dooley Field at Sanford Stadium.

I would be remiss if I didn't say "Go Dogs" this morning.

Clearly, Billy Payne's impact on Georgia and the entire country is hard to measure, but I want to tell you a story that really tells the true heart of this leader from our State.

After he announced his retirement from being the chairman of Augusta National, he was at a private dinner and was asked by no less than Bret Baier what he was going to miss the most. Without hesitation, Billy said, "The people." Well, those of us at the table thought he might have been talking about the members, but he wasn't. He was talking about the employees at Augusta National. Its employees have been there for their entire careers, and they adore this man because he loves them. He treated them right, and he built their careers there.

His tenacious spirit, his love for humankind, and his steadfast leadership serve as an inspiration to us all. I thank Billy Payne for his lifetime of service to the State of Georgia and to the United States, and I congratulate him, his wife, and their kids on this induction into the World Golf Hall of Fame.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. President, on another topic, there is a growing crisis at our southern border, and we are told, next week, we are actually going to vote on an appropriations package for humanitarian aid at the southern border.

Recently, I and a colleague of mine, Senator STEVE DAINES of Montana, traveled down to the McAllen sector of the border in Texas. We went out on patrol overnight with the Customs and Border Patrol agents—we were out all night with them—and then went on patrol in the early morning hours just as dawn broke on the river. We saw firsthand that we don't have just an illegal immigration problem—we have a national security crisis right there at our southern border.

My biggest takeaway was that the drug trafficking down there has now risen to being a full-blown crisis. Between fiscal year 1997 and fiscal year 2018, the CBP saw a 22-percent increase in heroin, a 38-percent increase in meth, and a 73-percent increase in fentanyl seizures. In that year alone, fiscal year 2018, enough fentanyl was brought into the country illegally to kill every woman, man, and child in America. The Border Patrol agents we

spoke to estimated that they are only able to interdict between 7 and 10 percent, however, of the drugs that actually cross the border in the McAllen sector. That is a crisis. If for no other reason, we have a crisis.

In addition, the amount of human trafficking we are seeing at the border is unprecedented. Last month alone, 144,000 individuals were apprehended at our southern border. This is the highest number of apprehensions in over 13 years.

In just the first 8 months of the fiscal year, 411,000 unaccompanied children and family units were apprehended at our southern border, including 84,000 family units and 11,000 unaccompanied children, just last month—11,000 unaccompanied children. How does an unaccompanied child get all the way from Honduras or Guatemala to our border?

This is a conspiracy led by the cartels. I have seen it firsthand. We heard the gunfire across the river the night we were on patrol. It is real.

If this trend continues, 800,000 children and families could be apprehended at the southern border by the end of this fiscal year alone. To put that in perspective, we issue 1.1 million legal green cards a year that are a pathway to citizenship. This year alone, just the family units alone could be 800,000 people apprehended at the southern border. Clearly, our Border Patrol agents are overwhelmed.

When an unaccompanied child arrives at the border, they are cared for by Border Patrol agents until they can be placed in the care of the Department of Health and Human Services. However, the number of children arriving today greatly exceeds HHS's capacity to deal with them.

As of last week, 1,900 unaccompanied children were in CBP custody awaiting placement in HHS's care. But Health and Human Services had less than 700 beds in which to place them.

Now, according to the Department of Homeland Security, Border Patrol agents are spending more than half of their time caring for families and children, providing medical assistance, driving buses, and acting as food service workers instead of performing law enforcement duties.

Pulling Border Patrol agents away from their law enforcement duties only exacerbates the crisis at the border. We saw that firsthand on our overnight patrols.

The Acting Commissioner of CBP said recently: "We are in a full-blown emergency, and I cannot say this any stronger: the system is broken."

On May 1, the Trump administration requested \$4.5 billion in funds to help address the growing crisis at the border. At the time, we were debating disaster relief for my home State of Georgia and a dozen other States across the country.

On May 23, President Trump broke the logjam and agreed to separate border humanitarian aid from the disaster relief question and it allowed us, then,

within hours on this floor, to pass the disaster relief bill. Now we have to do the same thing for this humanitarian aid to the border.

Meanwhile, the humanitarian crisis at the southern border has only continued to escalate, and we have to do something about it right now.

This week, Health and Human Services and the Department of Homeland Security sent a letter to every Member of Congress. It said: "Absent an emergency appropriation, we anticipate running out of funding as soon as later this month."

The Department of Homeland Security has already started pulling resources away from critical missions in order to try and keep up with this surge of human traffic. Without additional funds by August, the Department of Homeland Security says they will have to redirect manpower and funding from TSA, FEMA, and the Coast Guard in order to address the crisis at the border.

The Acting Director of ICE just recently said: "We are begging. We are asking Congress to please help us."

This should not be a political issue. I am hoping that it will not be. This is about giving Federal agents the resources they need to care for children and families in their custody and respond to this crisis situation.

Even the New York Times editorial board said this: "Congress, give Trump his border money." That is the New York Times, not a big fan of our President.

The Senate will vote on this emergency funding next week, and I hope it will receive bipartisan support. It absolutely should. Going forward, we have to address the underlying cause of this crisis, however.

Since 2014, the number of unaccompanied children and family units arriving at the southern border has skyrocketed because of loopholes in our asylum and immigration laws. Minors and family units can easily assert broad and unspecific asylum claims. Then, they are released into the United States while they await formal removal proceedings, which could be months or years down the road.

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

Oftentimes, these kids and families are exploited by cartels on their journey to the United States and are in dire need of human services by the time they get here. It is truly heart-breaking what some of these people go through. These cartels profit off the most vulnerable. They fuel the drug trade and endanger communities across our country—indeed, the world, for that matter. We have to put the cartels out of business. We have to close these loopholes that encourage illegal immigration into our country.

Finally, we have to give the Border Patrol officers the tools they need to

do their jobs and protect our country. This means more technology, more personnel, and more barriers.

In conclusion, I want to say thank you to the women and men who protect our border. Their job isn't easy, but I will say this today: The best—and I mean the very best—are in our military uniforms around the world and doing our business, they are our Border Patrol people, who are protecting our border every day and night on our southern border here in the United States. We appreciate what you all do. God bless you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CUYAHOGA RIVER
BURNING

Mr. BROWN. Fifty years ago this Saturday, in Cleveland, OH, about 7 miles from where my wife and I now live, sparks from a railcar traveling over the Cuyahoga River near Lake Erie ignited debris in the water below, lighting our river on fire for what would be the last time. It wasn't the first time the river had burned. It wasn't the biggest fire ever on the river, but it surely had the most impact.

Soon after that fire, Time magazine published a story calling the Cuyahoga River one of the worst rivers in the country. It was hard even for us who live in Ohio to argue otherwise.

I remember how polluted the river was and the lake was when I was growing up. Even to a child, it was obvious that most of what was in the river didn't belong in that river. Industry used the river as an open sewer, and oil coated the Cuyahoga River.

We knew that for generations Ohio's industry powered our country, making the steel that won our wars, built our skyscrapers, and went into the cars and trucks that carried our products and workers around the country. But our river—the Cuyahoga River—paid the price.

The city's own wastewater system was outdated and ill-equipped for what was then America's tenth largest city. Americans were horrified by the scenes of that burning river. It was a wake-up call to people all over our great country that industrial pollution had real costs.

People were becoming more and more aware of the scope of our environmental problems—polluted air, dirty rivers and lakes, oil spills off our coasts.

Citizens woke up. Citizens demanded that their government take action. Our mayor in Cleveland, Carl Stokes, helped to lead the charge, pressing this Congress for Federal help.

Congress passed the Clean Water Act and the Clean Air Act. Congress created the Environmental Protection Agency. The country celebrated the first Earth Day, and we made real progress.

The city of Cleveland, the State of Ohio, and citizen activists transformed

the Cuyahoga River Valley. Representatives Ralph Regula, a Republican, and John Seiberling, a Democrat, led efforts to create the Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area, which later became the Cuyahoga Valley National Park.

Think of that. There aren't that many national parks east of the Mississippi River—a national park in the Cuyahoga River Valley.

Today our river is home to more than 60 species of fish. Families canoe and kayak and fish. The industrial river valley in downtown Cleveland, what we call the Flats, has been transformed into a center for recreation entertainment.

NPR this week said that the cleanup “has been such a success that environmental officials travel from around the world to take notes.”

All the cleanup we have done has not hurt our economy—far from it. We know the talking points. We hear from lobbyists in this building. We know the talking points we hear from corporations. They say that environmental protections hurt businesses and kill jobs.

The Cuyahoga proves them 180 degrees wrong. The river transports millions of tons of materials to and from local industries and supports 15,000 jobs. It produces \$1.7 billion in economic activity.

For all that progress, more needs to be done. Last week, I was on the shores of Lake Erie and held a roundtable with Ohioans who love this lake. They told me they are worried that after 50 years of progress on the Cuyahoga and across Lake Erie, the shallowest and most vulnerable of the Great Lakes, we are at risk of going backward. The lake is threatened by harmful algal blooms and by climate change. I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for being the most important Member of this Senate talking about that issue every day, every day, every day. The lake is threatened by invasive species, and it is threatened by emerging contaminants that are in our drinking water.

Unfortunately, we have a President and an administration that deny climate science and that yesterday, again, with their announcement, want to give polluters free rein.

The President has tried every year to gut the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, which keeps our five Great Lakes clean. Every single year the President has tried to do that. His EPA proposes leaving thousands of miles of waterways unprotected. They have abandoned the Paris Agreement—the best blueprint we have to combat climate change.

Having watched for 50 years, first as a young child, then, having seen what has happened, having watched for 50 years the cleanup of this great lake and the waterways in my State, which is still an industrial State and still an agriculture State, I know we can't go back. We can't let our country return to the days when our rivers flowed with

trash, sewage, and industrial waste, and our air and water made our children sick.

We can't ignore climate change, one of the great moral issues of our time.

Let's honor this 50th anniversary by committing ourselves to trusting our scientists, protecting our lakes and rivers, taking action to preserve our country for our children and our grandchildren before it is too late.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, it is my great honor to join Senator BROWN of Ohio here on this 50th anniversary.

The image of a river aflame is engraved in our collective memory. For Ohioans, for Senator BROWN, and for all others who care about our water and environment, the Cuyahoga River remains a rallying cry.

Time magazine ran a piece in 1969 calling it this: “Chocolate brown, oily, bubbling with subsurface gasses, it oozes rather than flows.”

No fish lived in it. It was too dangerous for drinking or swimming.

“The lower Cuyahoga has no visual signs of life, not even low forms such as leeches and sludge worms that usually thrive on wastes,” a Federal report said.

Virginia Aveni, captain of a vessel charged with cleaning up, told the Plain Dealer that the river “was a complete gel almost of petrochemicals.” There was a “sheen and thickness of the river . . . it was totally jammed with downfall from upstream” and had “every kind of litter you can imagine.”

Today, waterfowl are back, and paddlers enjoy themselves. It has been named River of the Year for 2019. Fish from the river are now safe to eat. A river that inspired a generation to act in the name of our environment has rewarded that effort.

By the time a spark jumped off a nearby passing train and lit the river on fire in 1969, it was no surprise. The river had burst into flames 13 times before between 1868 and 1969. This is the most economically damaging fire, in 1952, which cost over \$1.3 million—\$12 million in today's dollars.

An earlier fire in 1912 was the deadliest, killing 5 people.

What was different this time? America paid attention.

Of course the Cuyahoga was not our only polluted waterway. The Potomac River in Washington, DC, was, to describe it in Time's words “stinking from the 240 million gallons of waste [that] were flushed into it daily,” and “Omaha's meatpackers [filled] the Missouri River with animal grease balls as big as oranges.”

Americans wised up to what we were doing to our planet. We grew tired of unchecked industries using our common assets as their dumps, and things changed. It produced some of the most significant environmental and public health protections in history: the De-

ember 1970 establishment of the Environmental Protection Agency, the 1972 amendments to the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act, the Ocean Dumping Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act, the Resources Conservation and Recovery Act, and the Toxic Substances Control Act. And, of course, there was the big one—the National Environmental Policy Act.

Each one had broad popular support. Each garnered bipartisan support. It is hard to imagine that today, but it happened.

The American people have made hard-earned progress protecting our waters in the last 50 years. We want to swim in our lakes. We want to fish in our rivers. We want to drink from our streams.

We do not want to go back to the days when rivers oozed, but the Trump administration has the clear aim of allowing industry donors to pollute more and faster.

The price for this is paid in our rivers, on our lands, in our oceans, and in our climate. Right now, in our atmosphere and oceans, we are approaching the kind of environmental catastrophe that befell the Cuyahoga, only magnified many times over.

Let's ensure that the Cuyahoga did not burn in vain and that the lessons of the Cuyahoga River, Love Canal, Deepwater Horizon, and other preventable disasters are not repeated by us, now on a global scale. We took bipartisan action to protect our environment before. If we can break the devil's grip on the fossil fuel industry here, we can do it again.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, on rollcall vote 176, I voted nay. It was my intention to vote yea. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to correct my vote since it will not affect the outcome.

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

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

NOMINATION OF RITA BARANWAL

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I have come to the floor to speak in support of the nomination of Dr. Rita Baranwal to be Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy at the Department of Energy. Dr. Baranwal was reported from the Energy and Natural Resources Committee without opposition in both the 115th and 116th Congresses, and I am glad we will vote to confirm her today.

Over the past several years, the United States has lost influence in nuclear energy to countries like Russia and China. That is not a positive development, but advanced nuclear technologies have the potential to reposition the United States as a leader in the world market.

To achieve that, we will need strong, experienced, and consistent leadership at the Department of Energy. Dr.

Baranwal's experience as the director of the Gateway for Accelerated Innovation in Nuclear, also referred to as GAIN, provides her with an informed perspective to push forward the research, development, and deployment of advanced reactor technologies.

Congress began to demonstrate its strong support for advanced nuclear through the enactment of two bills in the last Congress, the Nuclear Energy Innovation Capabilities Act and the Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act. These new laws are intended to facilitate reactor development and streamline the licensing process at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

In addition, legislation I have sponsored, the Nuclear Energy Leadership Act, has garnered 17 bipartisan cosponsors in this new Congress. Our bill provides for the next steps on advanced nuclear technologies, including the need to ensure high-assay, low-enriched uranium fuel is available for them.

We need a strong leader in the Office of Nuclear Energy, someone who recognizes the potential of these technologies, who will move forward so that we can realize that potential and who will work to restore the United States' leadership in nuclear energy. I appreciate Dr. Baranwal's willingness to serve in this role and urge my colleagues to support her nomination.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rita Baranwal, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Nuclear Energy).

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 86, nays 5, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 180 Ex.]

YEAS—86

Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Baldwin	Gardner	Peters
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Bennet	Grassley	Reed
Blackburn	Hassan	Risch
Blumenthal	Hawley	Roberts
Blunt	Heinrich	Romney
Boozman	Hirono	Rubio
Braun	Hoeven	Sasse
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cantwell	Isakson	Scott (SC)
Capito	Johnson	Shaheen
Cardin	Jones	Shelby
Carper	Kaine	Sinema
Casey	Kennedy	Smith
Collins	King	Stabenow
Cooms	Lankford	Sullivan
Cornyn	Leahy	Tester
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Manchin	Tillis
Crapo	McConnell	Udall
Cruz	McSally	Van Hollen
Daines	Menendez	Warner
Duckworth	Merkley	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murkowski	Wicker
Enzi	Murphy	Wyden
Ernst	Murray	Young
Feinstein	Paul	

NAYS—5

Cortez Masto	Rosen	Warren
Markey	Schatz	

NOT VOTING—9

Booker	Harris	Rounds
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Sanders
Gillibrand	Moran	Toomey

The nomination was confirmed.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

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. 88, 90, 92, 93, 334, 195, 196, 197, and 287.

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

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of Seth Daniel Appleton, of Missouri, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; Dino Falaschetti, of Montana, to be Director, Office of Financial Research, Department of the Treasury, for a term of six years; Robert Hunter Kurtz, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; Bimal Patel, of Georgia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury; Allison Herren Lee, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for a term expiring June 5, 2022; Keith Krach, of California, to be an Under Secretary of State (Economic Growth, Energy, and the Environment); Keith Krach, of California, to be United States Alternate Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; Keith Krach, of Cali-

fornia, to be United States Alternate Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of five years; United States Alternate Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of five years; Jeffrey L. Eberhardt, of Wisconsin, a Career Member of the Senior Executive Service, to be Special Representative of the President for Nuclear Nonproliferation, with the rank of Ambassador.

Thereupon, 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 Appleton, Falaschetti, Kurtz, Patel, Lee, Krach, Krach, Krach, and Eberhardt nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session on the motion to proceed to S. 1790. I further ask that notwithstanding rule XXII, the postcloture time on S. 1790 expire at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, June 24.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Ohio.

(The remarks of Mr. PORTMAN pertaining to the introduction of S. 1925 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. PORTMAN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

CLEAN POWER PLAN

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, earlier this week, the Trump administration, through the EPA Administrator, Andrew Wheeler, issued what was called the Clean Power Plan rule. That replaces the Obama-era Clean Power Plan rule that dealt with carbon emissions from our powerplants. I am very

concerned about this proposed rule, and I want to share some of my concerns with the Members of the Senate and the American people.

The Obama Clean Power Plan rule was aimed at reducing carbon emissions by 30 percent by the year 2030 compared to the 2005 level. It was a strong proposal, but it gave maximum discretion to the States on how they could meet those targets. Those States that relied more on coal-burning power generation were given different standards than those States that had already transitioned to cleaner energy sources. It was a fair rule, a tough rule, and a rule that would significantly reduce carbon emissions in this country.

Powerplants are the largest single source of carbon pollution, and we know how harmful carbon pollution is to our environment. Nearly 40 percent comes from power generation.

We need strong Federal regulation. We were moving in that direction under the previous administration. Now we demote the current emissions standards to a mere suggestion. That is wrong, and I hope that does not become the case.

There are many reasons that we should be concerned about this rule. We should be concerned about what we are doing about carbon pollution. Let me cite a few.

In the area of public health, we know that if we don't control carbon emission, we will have more premature deaths. The New York Times estimates that there would be 1,400 annual premature deaths as a result of not properly regulating the carbon emissions coming from powerplants.

We also know that because of the impact carbon has on public health, the failure to regulate it means more children will miss schooldays because of their respiratory challenges and more parents won't be able to work because they have to take care of their children. So the result is lost schooldays and lost workdays because of the failure to regulate, which affects our economy and our educating workforce.

We know that children who are vulnerable to respiratory ailments, such as asthma, are particularly at risk, and there will be more days that they will be confined to some form of air-conditioning rather than being able to go out in the neighborhood.

It is also a matter of our economy. We know that clean energy produces more jobs. That is where we are headed, and the faster we get there, the better it will be for our economy.

We also know, as a matter of energy security, the faster we move in this direction, the more secure we will be. America has taken steps to wean ourselves off of imported energy, but our allies around the world are still too dependent, as we know from the way Russia uses energy as a weapon. We need to transition to renewable energy sources so there can be energy security for America's allies.

Lastly, on the environment, carbon is the major pollutant for nitrogen pol-

lution in our waters. I say that because many of you have heard me talk frequently on the floor about the Chesapeake Bay and the importance of the Chesapeake Bay. It is a national treasure. It is the largest estuary in our hemisphere. It is critically important to the way of life here in the Chesapeake Bay watersheds—six States and the District of Columbia. We recognize its economic value—\$1 trillion to our economy.

Well, 85 million pounds of nitrogen pollution goes into the Chesapeake Bay from the air. One-third of the Chesapeake Bay's total nitrogen load comes as a result of our failure to regulate carbon going into the air. This causes algae blooms in the Chesapeake Bay. It causes dead zones. It makes it much more difficult for the stakeholders to meet their stated goals.

I am proud of the Chesapeake Bay Program. All the local governments have agreed on their responsibility. It is tailored toward the States and enforced through the help of the Federal Government. But because of this rule change, it is now going to be more difficult to meet the goals we have set for the Chesapeake Bay. It is not just affecting the powerplants; it is affecting our quality of life, public health, the environment, and the economy.

The States have acted. I am proud of what Maryland has done. We have shown that you can clean up your carbon emissions through power production and you can grow your economy. We have done that in the State of Maryland. We have joined with other States in the RGGI—with Delaware, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, and New York—and we have shown a 40-percent reduction in emissions since 2009. That is what the States have done.

In the rule that is being proposed, they are saying they are leaving it up to the States. Maryland has done that, but we are downwind. The progress we are making is being negated by the pollution coming in from the Midwest. We need a national standard in order to be able to meet our targets.

I would urge my colleagues, let's get engaged. This rule is bad for our economy. It is bad for public health. It is bad for energy security. It is bad for the environment. We can do better. Let's work together so that we have proper regulation at the national level dealing with carbon emissions.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

VA MISSION ACT

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I wanted to join with my colleagues this week to mark the implementation of an updated and streamlined healthcare system that is specifically for our veterans. This is made possible by the VA MISSION Act.

In Tennessee, we have such a large and vigorous and wonderful population of veterans. I will tell you, we are so

grateful to them for their service, and we are so grateful they have chosen to make Tennessee their retirement home.

One of our colleagues asked me one day about how patriotic Tennessee is. They had been there to visit. They saw flags out in so many places. They saw signs out that were "thank you" signs to our veterans. I told them that I felt like it was because we do have a strong military presence. Fort Campbell is primarily in Tennessee. We have Millington, the air naval station. We have Arnold. We have our National Guard, and a couple of our units have just finished a good deployment. We cherish these veterans, and they are such an integral part of our communities and our churches.

We have worked diligently on this healthcare system for veterans to specifically meet their needs. That should be the mission of the VA. It is not to serve itself but to serve the veterans.

Once this new structure that is put in place by the MISSION Act is fully implemented, members of the military community who have been, in my words, neglected for too long—their access to healthcare neglected—they are finally going to get the attention and the care they need. I use the term "neglected" because anybody who knew they were headed to the VA clinic for a checkup knew that was not going to be a quick checkup. There is a lot of paperwork that goes into that process of asking for that checkup and then seeing it actually take place.

I have heard from hundreds of veterans, their stories and their experiences. Sometimes you will hear them say it was a comedy of errors. But it is no comedy; it is a catastrophe of errors. The consequences from this have really taken a toll on the life, the health, the safety, and sometimes the sanity of our veterans community.

The reason you hear these stories is because we have asked generations of veterans to put their physical and their emotional health in the hands of practitioners whose hands were tied by arbitrary rules and procedures that turned even simple procedures into what would be a logistical nightmare. I have no doubt that if we went around this Chamber and each Member of this Chamber were to stand, they could—without any notes, right off the top of their head—give us a story they have heard from a veteran. That should never happen.

But as of this month, we have dealt with a lot of these issues. We have removed some of the roadblocks. And the new Community Care Program, which adopted elements from the successful Veterans Choice Program, will continue to allow veterans to seek care closer to home. What was once a cluster of seven programs has been merged into one single system—a whole-of-health, whole-of-the-soldier approach. It makes this process simpler and easier to understand and to implement this program.

Options will expand even more with the authorization of local provider agreements and access to walk-in community clinics, which is specifically and precisely, what for years veterans have said they want:

Just let me go to the doctor in my hometown.

We have a neighborhood clinic over here.

We have a clinic over at the pharmacy, the CVS or the Walgreens. Let me go there and not have to drive to a clinic that is out of town.

One provision in particular that I believe is going to really make a big difference is the removal of barriers that have prevented VA healthcare professionals from practicing telemedicine. Any of us who have used telemedicine and have Skyped with a physician know this is a timesaver. It gets you in front of the doctor in a more expeditious fashion. It allows you to get that advice to start taking and treating your ailment sooner. It is a huge time-saver. This is now going to be available.

As we are crafting these updates, we are careful to consider the cost to the patient and to make sure that veterans won't have to worry about receiving a massive bill if they see a provider at a local community facility. The VA MISSION Act keeps costs at these clinics in line with those at the VA healthcare centers.

We have also taken steps to encourage consistent treatment at the VA healthcare centers by providing the funds necessary for these clinics to retain top talent. You have to have healthcare professionals in the clinics in order for these clinics to see their patients.

Most importantly, the VA MISSION Act supports these changes via an updated and extensive system of reporting and accountability. For years, this body has debated the merits of various healthcare regimes for children, the elderly, and the poor, but for some reason, we have asked veterans to accept a system incapable of providing care without snarling patients in miles and miles of redtape. For this, we owe the veterans community an apology.

It is an honor to work with our veterans and now say that the VA MISSION Act is being implemented and that care is coming to your community. I think this reflects the sincere desire to do right by our best and our bravest.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, we are just a few days away from the first official Democratic Presidential debate of the campaign season in Miami, but for anyone paying close attention, the first meaningful debate is actually about only 48 hours away in South Carolina.

On Saturday, 11 Democrats, including 4 of the top 5 in the current polls,

are going to take part in a candidate forum hosted by the Planned Parenthood Action Fund.

What is Planned Parenthood? Planned Parenthood is the country's largest abortion business. That is their mainstay of operation. Last year, Planned Parenthood reported committing more than 330,000 abortions—somewhere between one-third and one-half of all abortions committed in America last year. Planned Parenthood's president has said that providing, protecting, and expanding access to abortion is part of the organization's "core mission." It does this work with the help of more than \$500 million in annual subsidies from the Federal Government; that is, from taxpayers across this country, many of whom believe that abortion is immoral. Yet the position of Planned Parenthood is and has long been abortion at any time, anywhere, for any reason for free. That used to represent the most extreme position anywhere in the Democratic Party. It was shared by only a very small, hard-fringe portion of its elected leaders.

Just to review some history, in 2008, Hillary Clinton was still calling for safe, legal, and rare abortion access, and as she would regularly emphasize, "by rare, I mean rare." Yet, today, the radical things that the Nation's largest abortion business wants are basically indistinguishable from the position of every Democrat who is now running for President—abortion at any time, anywhere, for any reason for free.

In fact, it is actually worse than this because the position of every Senator who is currently running for the Democratic nomination and of at least one Governor is that a living, breathing baby who survives an abortion procedure can still be left to die after birth. All seven Senators who are currently running for the Democratic Presidential nomination voted against the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act earlier this year, and Governor Bullock of Montana vetoed a State-level version of that bill just before he entered the race.

As things currently stand, it is entirely possible that the next Democratic nominee for the highest office in our land will be publicly agnostic about the moral status of post-abortion infanticide—morally agnostic about post-abortion infanticide.

Let's be clear. These candidates are wildly and spectacularly out of the mainstream in American life. Over the last two decades, Gallup polling has consistently shown that a majority of Americans are opposed to unrestricted abortion access beyond the first trimester. The Gallup numbers actually show that well under one-third of Americans support abortion beyond the first 3 months, and a new NBC/PBS/Marist poll finds that fully four out of five Americans are opposed to all abortion in the third trimester. That includes a majority of self-identifying pro-choice voters. I want to say that

again. A majority of self-identified pro-choice voters in America are opposed to abortion in the third trimester. So the polling of Americans is actually quite different than what the Democrats are going to pretend it to be over the next 2 days when they talk into their echo chamber.

What is even more important than anything about public opinion is that the Democrats are also out of step with our fundamental American conviction that all men are created equal—all men and women and babies. Instead, they are increasingly committed to the proposition that some people are less than human and are, therefore, disposable. Sadly, though, the most radical leftwing voices are winning in their party's echo chamber, and Democratic candidates have now decided that they must prostrate themselves before the "flush with cash" abortion industry. This has consequences well beyond policy. As Democrats' abortion positions have become more extreme, they have no longer sought to even persuade fellow citizens with whom they disagree. Rather, they have become openly hostile to Americans who disagree on this great moral challenge.

My colleague from New York, for instance, Senator GILLIBRAND, who will be attending this weekend's forum in South Carolina, made her feelings clear earlier this month in an interview with the Des Moines Register. In promising that she would appoint only judges who would uphold *Roe v. Wade*, here is what she said. Listen to this quote:

I think there [are] some issues that have such moral clarity that we have as a society decided that the other side is not acceptable.

Imagine saying that it's OK to appoint a judge who is racist or anti-Semitic or homophobic.

[This is not an issue where] there is a fair "other side." There is no moral equivalency when you come to racism, and I do not believe there is a moral equivalency when it comes to changing laws that deny women reproductive freedom.

What? What are we talking about here? Are you kidding me? Did you catch what she just said?

According to a sitting U.S. Senator and a candidate for the Democratic nomination to be President of the United States, holding pro-life views in America is no longer acceptable. It is not a fair position, she tells us. It is the moral equivalency of racism or anti-Semitism. Perhaps in the Senator's next interview she will suggest that pro-life Americans belong in a basket of deplorables.

There is so much wrong with this statement that it is difficult to know where to begin. We could note the plain, simple fact that it is not pro-lifers who have an ugly link to racism. Rather, since the very beginning, the American abortion industry has been intimately connected to eugenics. This is the origin of the movement.

As Planned Parenthood founder Margaret Sanger put it herself—and think about this quote—"the imbalance between the birth rate of the 'unfit' and

the 'fit' [is] the greatest present menace to civilization."

Sanger's racial opinions are a matter of some dispute, but this part is clear—that she intentionally targeted efforts at Black neighborhoods in Harlem and in the Deep South. Many of the people involved in her efforts took things a step further—going so far as to forcibly sterilize African-American women whom they deemed to be unfit to procreate.

We can also note that it is, in part, because of this ugly history that, today, Black women in America are 3½ times more likely to have abortions than White women, and in some parts of Senator GILLBRAND's home State, Black children are actually more likely to be aborted than to be carried to term.

We could also point to the continued eugenic use of abortion—for example, to kill children who have nonlife-threatening diseases. In the United States today, two-thirds of all babies in the womb who are found to have Down syndrome are aborted, and in some parts of Europe, the rate is pushing 100 percent. There are public ad campaigns in two nations in Europe that celebrate the fact that they have gotten rid of all of their Down syndrome babies.

Instead of going point by point, I will just recommend that anyone who wants to better understand this disturbing history read Justice Clarence Thomas's concurring opinion last month in *Box v. Planned Parenthood of Indiana and Kentucky*. Yet, according to my Senate colleague, perhaps Justice Thomas is one of those racists—you know, one of those notorious pro-life racists who is stalking America.

In their leftward lurch to become the Planned Parenthood candidate, it is not just that the Democrats who seek this office are losing touch with where Americans actually are on the hard questions of abortion or with our fundamental American convictions, it is also, as my colleague from the State of New York has shown, that we are losing touch with even how to do politics like Americans, where you respect the dignity of people you differ with and argue about the ideas. You don't declare them an unfit and an unworthy, unacceptable other side. Americans have always had a genius for talking to each other. In our constitutional system, we set up debate fora like this to be able to facilitate, channel, and elevate debate—even heated, feverish debate about really sensitive topics.

Our Framers held firmly to the principle that men and women in their exercise of reason could come to agreements by persuasion and by dialogue even if it took a long time and even if the topics were difficult. Anything less than that would be a violation of the basic dignity of our fellow citizens. Our Founders knew that hard political issues should not be resolved at gunpoint; they should be resolved by debate, which starts by assuming the dig-

nity of your counterparty in that debate.

We are watching that conviction go by the wayside right now. Slandering pro-life Americans as being, in effect, Klan members and Nazis is just a way to crush debate, not to persuade. It is a way of saying that these people—people like my mom, who prays outside abortion clinics; people like my daughters and my wife, who have spent a lot of hours volunteering at crisis pregnancy centers; and people like the overwhelming majority of Nebraskans, whom I get to represent, or Indians, whom the Presiding Officer now gets to represent—are so morally repugnant that they don't deserve a voice, that they don't deserve to be treated like human beings, that they don't deserve to be engaged in debate, that they are not people you could possibly have a reasonable conversation with.

This is crazy talk.

It is not difficult to imagine where this approach leads. When we lose sight of the intrinsic and inexhaustible dignity of unborn children, we open the door to abortion's violence, and when we lose sight of the dignity of our fellow citizens in debate, we open the door to yet other kinds of violence.

I have spent a lot of time with pro-lifers in my life, probably a lot more time than most of my colleagues who are going to be at the Planned Parenthood debate in South Carolina on Saturday. I will tell you what you will not find among these people is partisan caricature. What you will find are people who are passionately devoted to the dignity of every human being no matter how small or how vulnerable or what disease one might have been diagnosed with. You will find a lot of Americans, young and old, in the pro-life movement who care deeply about women who are in need. You will also find a lot of enthusiasm for promising in vitro surgeries and for scientific developments in ultrasound and neonatal technology. You will find fellow citizens who are ready to advance the basic American commitment to life through the tools of dialogue, persuasion, and respect.

The dehumanization of our friends and neighbors, whether they are in the opposite party or in the womb, destroys our national life together and our national conversation. On both sides, we need to be constantly stitching back together that fabric that has been torn asunder.

I suggest to the Democrats who are heading to the South Carolina debate this weekend to spend less time wrestling with each other in order to say more ridiculously extreme, clickbait things for high-propensity primary voters and spend more time listening to the voices of their pro-life fellow citizens. My guess is they will learn something, and our national debate will be the better for it.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRAUN). The Senator from Oregon.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, Ernest Hemingway said that the world is a fine place and worth fighting for, and I couldn't agree more. My colleague from Delaware and I are here on the floor to fight for that world, to fight for our planet.

If you breathe in a lung full of air right now—and I invite anybody following this to do so—hold it for a few seconds, and breathe it out, the air that you will have just taken into your body, into your lungs, will have had 33 percent more carbon than when I was born. That is a dramatic transformation of the atmosphere on this planet. It doesn't matter where you go. You could be doing this exercise here in DC, back home in Oregon, or in Japan. It is still 33 percent more carbon in a single lifetime. Because that extra carbon is blanketing our entire globe, it is having a huge impact—an impact we see in all kinds of ways.

Back home in Oregon, there has been a huge impact with the forest fires. We had forest fires this year that started in March. Perhaps you have seen some pictures of walls of flames and fires in Montana, in Washington, in Oregon, and in California in the last couple of years—smoke that has blanketed our cities and our States for weeks on end.

This is not the norm. This is the result of changing climate chaos, and it is not good.

We see extreme weather across the country. We see more powerful hurricanes assaulting the Southeast. We see more Lyme disease in the Northeast and fewer moose because the ticks kill the moose and ticks carry Lyme disease to humans. We see the slowest planting season in four decades—too much rain, flooded farms.

As of June 3, the Department of Agriculture told us 40 million acres of corn that would normally have been planted haven't been planted.

Climate chaos is the greatest threat humans have ever seen on this planet, and it is happening for one simple reason: We discovered fossil fuels. We discovered that burning them could create a lot of energy, and we could transform the globe with that energy, but every single time you use those carbon sources, you put carbon in the air, and now we have started to really damage our own planet.

So what is the national response? Well, under President Obama, we had the Clean Power Plan—the CPP. The CPP laid out a pretty ambitious vision, an example for the world to follow, but, quite frankly, it wasn't enough. It doesn't accelerate enough our transition to renewable energy.

Just think about it this way: We have been gifted with a fabulous source of fusion energy. We don't have to recreate fusion reactors here on the planet because we have it safely stowed millions of miles away in the Sun. That is a fusion reactor. All we have to do is capture the energy that shines on planet Earth, and we are in pretty good

shape. That Sun heats up the air and creates wind, and we can capture that same energy by capturing the wind.

We have geothermal energy, potential wave energy. We have to transition to these sources and quit burning carbon, and we need an ambitious plan to do so. We need a turning point.

Future generations will either celebrate the moment when we committed ourselves to saving our planet or they will ask why we failed, and right now we are looking at failure. The rate of carbon pollution isn't going down; it is accelerating upward. We are accelerating into oblivion.

When I was born, it took about 2 to 3 years to increase a single point of carbon pollution, parts per million. You can see how this curve is now accelerating upward. Now we are at about 2.5 points per year. That is a huge difference.

We are kind of lulled into this false sense of comfort. Well, don't we have more insulation in our buildings? Aren't we blessed with cars that get greater mileage? We have appliances that use a little less energy. Well, yes, those things are true, but they are not enough. Even with that, the curve is accelerating upward. So we are in trouble, but we do have some blessings in this battle.

Solar and wind electricity have plunged in cost, and the result is they are now cheaper than or competitive with fossil fuels. That is before you take into account the massive subsidies granted by legislative action to fossil fuels. So they are actually cheaper, and that is before you take into account the externalities—the damage that fossil fuels are doing to our planet. So now we can really see that renewables are a complete win except for the greed manifested through our political campaigns to keep burning fossil fuels.

It means more dollars in a few corporations' pockets, pockets of a few really rich people who say that their generational need for wealth—which they can't take with them to the grave anyway—that generational need, they are willing to sacrifice our planet for all.

Now, they are not willing to bear the costs. They are not willing to pay for the damage to all the homes destroyed by those more powerful hurricanes. They are not willing to pay for all the forests destroyed by the forest fires in Oregon. They are not willing to pay for the structures destroyed by those fires. They are not willing to pay the farmers whose crop is going to produce less because they had to plant so late. In other words, they want the private profit while planet Earth and the rest of us bear the consequences of their greed.

So we need a strong plan, and we need it now. We need to have a clear, robust response to transition to renewable energy quickly. So let's build on the foundation of the Clean Power Plan. Let's make this the turning mo-

ment in history that future generations can celebrate because we really do have a very fine planet, and it is worth fighting for.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. While the Senator from Oregon is here, I just want to say he mentioned we have a very fine planet, and God knows we do, but it is also the only planet we have, and I think for certainly everybody who serves in this body—and maybe some of these young pages will have the opportunity someday to live on another planet but probably not.

The President of France was just down the hall 2 years ago. I am sure Senator MERKLEY remembers it. President Macron addressed us on a variety of subjects, but one of those was the future of our plant.

He said these words. I will never forget them. He said: We only get one planet, planet Earth. There is no planet B. This is it.

He reminded us of our obligation, really a moral obligation, to take care of this gift from God that he has entrusted into our care.

It is in that spirit that I am pleased to rise today with Senator MERKLEY and other colleagues to speak out against the so-called Affordable Clean Energy rule that repeals and replaces the Clean Power Plan from the previous administration.

As I said when this rule was proposed in, I think, August of last year—and our colleague, given where he is from in America, maybe they say this in his State too—but we have a saying here that you can put lipstick on a pig, but it is still a pig.

I said at the time when this rule was introduced that the only thing that has changed from the proposal to the final rule is maybe a little more lipstick.

The Trump EPA rule promotes neither affordable energy nor clean energy. What it actually does is it attempts to scam the American people into believing that the EPA is doing something to stem the tide of climate change.

I think this poster probably speaks well to that thought, but this proposal, I think, is a failure of vision, and I think it is an abdication of leadership in our fight against climate change. We need to fight this problem head-on.

The fact that our climate is warming, the fact that we have this extreme weather, whether it happens to be in the Midwest with floods, the Northwest with wildfires the size of my State, whether it happens to be in the number of category 5 hurricanes that we are seeing, extreme weather—literally within an hour or so of here, Ellicott City, where they have had two 1,000-year floods in 18 months.

My wife and I were out in Palo Alto, CA, last weekend for the graduation of our oldest son from business school, and the week before we arrived there, he told us that the temperature in the Bay Area, where I used to be stationed

in the Navy during the Vietnam war, he said that the temperature reached 104 degrees. I don't ever remember it ever reaching 94 degrees in the years I was stationed in Moffett Field Naval Air Station.

Something is going on here, and it is serious. I think we have a pretty good idea what is causing this, and we need to fight this challenge head-on.

The good news is this doesn't have to be something to divide us as a nation. It doesn't have to be something that divides us as Democrats and Republicans. It doesn't have to be something that divides us with respect to the rest of the world. This is something that should unite us.

There is an old saying that the enemy of my enemy is my friend. Well, the enemy of a world that has all this crazy weather, extreme weather—and maybe in a lot of places in the internal part of our country you don't see what we see. What we see is that my State is sinking. Delaware is the lowest lying State in America. We are sinking, and the seas around us are rising. That is not a very good combination.

Folks who don't happen to live on our coast—I was born in West Virginia, grew up in other parts of the country, but for us it is real. It is not just something that is esoteric. We see it every day.

The science behind climate change is, I believe, settled. Climate change is real. It is happening. It is a growing threat to our country, and it is getting worse every year.

Climate change is leading to rising global temperatures, rising sea levels, more frequent and severe weather events such as hurricanes, rainfall measured by the foot, not by the inch, and drought-fueled wildfires, as I said earlier, the size of my State.

The more I hear about these extreme weather events, the more I am reminded of the story in the Old Testament. I think it is in the book of Exodus, where you may recall that Moses gets a call from on high to lead the people of Israel out of Egypt where they are in bondage.

He tells God: God, I am not a very good public speaker, and I don't think you have the right guy to do this.

The Lord said to him: You have a brother, Aaron, who is a real good speaker, a real good talker. Why don't the two of you sort of lead this effort together?

So, urged by the Almighty, the two brothers visited the pharaoh who was running the show in Egypt. They called on him and said: We are here to ask you to let our people go. Set us free.

Pharaoh was stubborn. He rejected their plea, and there were consequences to that rejection. I think there were about 10 different plagues that were brought to bear on Egypt in an effort to try to convince the pharaoh to let the people go, like the hordes of locusts that covered the land.

Moses and Aaron would go back to see the pharaoh and would say: We

want you to let our people go. The pharaoh would say, basically: Get out of here.

Then, after that, snakes would come out and appear everywhere, all over the land.

They would go back and see the pharaoh, and he would say: Get out of here.

Lizards came out of the rivers and covered the land, and they went back to see the pharaoh, and he said: Get out of here.

Finally, the river was turned to blood, and they went back to see him, and he said: Get out of here.

Finally, after the 10th plague, he changed his tune. The 10th plague, as you may recall, if you remember the Old Testament—the 10th plague was the firstborn sons of every Egyptian family died.

That time when Moses and Aaron showed up to see the pharaoh, he said: Why don't you leave. Take all your people and your stuff and just leave, and they left—and they left.

Our President's dismissal of the extreme weather that is associated with the unrelenting worsening reality of climate change reminds me of the pharaoh's dismissal of the plagues unleashed on the people of Israel 2,000 years ago.

The pharaoh was dismissive. This President is dismissive. We have seen this movie before. In this movie version of it, our President is playing the role of pharaoh, and we need to make sure we don't succumb to that.

The Obama-Biden administration finalized the Clean Power Plan to reduce carbon pollution and try to stem the tide of climate change.

The Clean Power Plan established the very first Federal targets to reduce carbon emissions from our Nation's electric powerplants, which at the time were the largest source of carbon pollution in our country not that long ago.

The rule was not developed on a whim. The Clean Power Plan was finalized after a lengthy rulemaking process, which was 2 years or longer in the making. They considered over 3.5 million public comments, and I am told they responded to every one of them.

The Clean Power Plan set real carbon reduction targets for each State but gave flexibility and time for States to meet these individualized standards. EPA estimated the Clean Power Plan would have achieved over \$54 billion—that is billion with a "b"—in health and climate benefits if fully implemented. The Clean Power Plan provided long-term certainty for U.S. businesses, helping American companies make smart investments at home and compete in the global energy market around the world.

When finalized, critics of the Clean Power Plan—and there were plenty of them—argued the plan's carbon targets were too ambitious. That is only about 4 or 5 years ago. Critics swore that every American consumer who relies on electricity to keep the lights on would soon be in dire straits. Adminis-

trator Wheeler echoed these false claims just yesterday. Today, we know just how wrong the Clean Power Plan critics were.

Even though the Clean Power Plan was never fully implemented, States and utilities went ahead and started making investments in order to meet the plan's carbon standards. They began acting in a way that said: We believe this is the way we are actually going to go as a country, and we need to get onboard.

As with other clean air regulations, America's utilities have been able to find ways to meet the carbon reduction targets faster and much cheaper than originally estimated. When George Herbert Walker Bush was President, he pushed for a cap-and-trade approach to reducing acid rain in the northeastern part of our country. It was killing all of our forests, and he came up with a plan to reduce acid rain cap and trade. People said: It is going to cost too much; it is going to take too long. At the end of the day, it cost less than half of what it was supposed to cost, and I think it was accomplished in about one-third of the time.

Today, our Nation's utilities are already on track to meet and surpass the goals set by the Clean Power Plan way ahead of schedule—not on schedule but way ahead of schedule—because even though the Clean Power Plan was held up in court, it sent clear signals to the utility industry of this country.

All the while, the vast majority of Americans are now enjoying lower utilities—let me say that again. They are enjoying lower utility bills, not higher, and more than 3 million Americans are now going to work in the clean energy sector every day, which includes jobs in renewable energy generation and energy efficiency.

Despite the revolutionary changes in our energy sector, leading climate scientists are now telling us that we need to do even more to protect American lives and our economy from the threats of climate change.

In the past year alone, the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change issued an alarming report that concluded that if the global community does not enact "rapid and far-reaching" carbon reduction policies in the next decade, we could face irreversible damage to our planet as soon as 2040.

Just 6 months ago, 13 Federal agencies under the Trump administration concluded unanimously that if this country does not take more drastic actions to address climate change, every major sector of our economy could be negatively affected by climate change by the turn of the century—every one. Some sectors are expected to see hundreds of billions of dollars of loss every year. My recollection is, in the last year alone, we have suffered damages from extreme weather in our country that add up to hundreds of billions of dollars in 1 year alone.

What a science-based agency like EPA should be doing is building off of

Obama's forward-looking carbon reduction vision and strengthening the Clean Power Plan standards, not weakening them. But even though utilities are on track to meet carbon reduction targets and scientists are warning us to keep our foot on the gas pedal, the Trump administration, sadly, is hitting the brakes.

What this EPA has done fails to heed the warnings of climate scientists by weakening the Obama-Biden carbon standards put into place almost 4 years ago. The Clean Power Plan set clear targets for States to achieve a 32-percent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions from the power sector by 2030. Let me say that again. The Clean Power Plan set clear targets for States to achieve an almost one-third reduction in greenhouse gas emissions from the power sector by 2030.

In comparison, the Trump proposal fails to set any real carbon emission standards for the power sector. It fails to set any real carbon emission standards for the power sector.

This new proposed rule provides States with a menu of options for making coal-fired powerplants operate more efficiently, allowing States to decide whether to make coal plants implement those options. This means States could do nothing to clean up their powerplant emissions—nothing.

Add it up, and the dirty power scam fails to drive down powerplant carbon emissions. According to EPA's own analysis, this rule is, at best, going to keep powerplant carbon emissions at status quo levels. At worst, there are credible reports that show the scam may well result in an increase in carbon emissions.

Like all climate change policies by President Trump, the dirty power scam also fails to advance the American clean energy economy. Instead, this rule tries to take our country back to a decade ago, when this country relied much more heavily on dirty coal generation. EPA Administrator Wheeler even touted the dirty power scam as a way to support more coal energy production in the United States. But ask any utility CEO or investor. America's future is not in dirty coal; it is in clean energy.

As a native of West Virginia whose family members once worked in coal mines, let me say this. There are 50,000 people who work in coal mines in this country today, and those jobs are going down. Today, there are 3 million people who work in sustainable energy and clean energy and conservation businesses, and for each of those 50,000 miners, we have an obligation to them and their families. If they lose their employment opportunities because we are moving to cleaner, carbon-free air, we have an obligation to help them in terms of transitioning and training for other jobs that are available. We have 3 million jobs today in this country that nobody showed up to do because they don't have the skills, the education, or the desire to do those jobs.

Coal miners could do a number of jobs. People who work in coal mines could build windmills. They could build solar fields. They can do all kinds of stuff. They can build clean corridors for our transportation, fueling electric-powered vehicles across the highways across America. They could build hydrogen fueling stations. They can do all kinds of stuff.

Today, our utilities are making investments that will last 40 to 60 years, if not longer. We should be providing the right market signals today for a clean energy economy tomorrow.

The dirty power scam doesn't do that. What it does is create business uncertainty for our Nation's utilities and States grappling with the effects of climate change.

To recap, if I could, the dirty power scam does three things, regrettably: It fails to heed the warnings of climate scientists; it fails to drive down power-plant carbon emissions; and it fails to advance a clean energy economy.

Referring again to the failure of vision and leadership, that is why the dirty power scam is a failure of vision and an abdication of leadership in our fight against climate change. Repealing the Clean Power Plan and replacing it with a rule as ill-conceived as the dirty power scam will have serious consequences for the health of the public, our economy, and our planet. It is also a clear retreat from the EPA's responsibility to tackle the greatest environmental crises we face on our planet today, and those are climate change and the extreme weather that flows from it.

The people of this country deserve a strong economy. They deserve more job creation. They deserve cleaner air. They deserve better environmental quality. The American people and our neighbors around the world deserve a healthy planet that we can call home. The American people deserve better than the dirty power scam, plain and simple.

My colleagues and I are going to do everything in our power to make sure that the people of this country ultimately get the climate protection they deserve.

The last thing I would say before yielding back to Senator MERKLEY is that the issue of climate change is not something that should divide us. Ultimately, this is something that should unite us, not just within this body, not just within this country, but around the world. That is my hope and prayer because, at the end of the day, we can clean our air, we can clean our water, we can combat climate change, and we can create a lot of jobs—a lot more than the 3 million jobs we have already seen created.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, each year we have a debate on the National Defense Authorization Act. In the past,

it was a real debate—a debate for which people brought significant issues to the floor related to American national security. Their amendments were considered. We argued pro and con. We took votes. We lobbied our colleagues within our caucus or across the aisle with the wisdom of our viewpoint. That is a tradition; that is a practice; that is what this Chamber is all about—to take on the issues that we face as a Nation, wrestle with them, explore the pros and cons, find their strengths or weaknesses, sometimes come to compromises that take several viewpoints, and merge them together into an even stronger point of view. But I am deeply disturbed that the U.S. Senate is quickly losing the ability to consider the issues facing our Nation.

My colleague just spoke about the challenge of climate pollution, and I appreciate his doing so. But we have had few determined efforts to address the ideas different Members have for taking on that challenge, despite its devastation to so many ways and different parts of our country.

When it comes to the security of our country, no issue is more important than the question of going to war. Our Founders realized this is a decision that should never be vested in a single person, not even the President. They knew that a single individual might find political cause or corrupt purposes to make the decision to go to combat against a force and that such a decision should be debated in a Chamber like this and a Chamber like the House. That is why the Constitution gives to this body, the legislature of the United States of America, the power to go to war.

It is a question that came up early in our history. There was a challenge that we had off the Barbary Coast with corsairs, who are often referred to as pirates, taking charge of American brigs and holding them hostage.

Jefferson embraced the idea of going to war. He became President in 1801. Alexander Hamilton wanted to remind him what the Constitution said. As he said, "It belongs to Congress only to go to war." Any one of us should be able to pull out our pocket Constitutions, read article I, section 8—that deliberate delegation to this Chamber and the House to make that decision.

Well, right now we are in the drumbeat of war with Iran. There has been a lot of animosity between our two countries for a long period of time. The United States mounted a campaign through the Central Intelligence Agency to take out the directly elected leadership of Iran in 1953—a CIA-staged coup—and to install a leader, the Shah of Iran, who operated with great, shall I say, violence against the people. He had a secret police that was as feared as any in the world.

There were other points of animosity when the people of Iran rose up against that Shah and took hostage Americans. They kept them hostage for a great length of time during the Carter

administration. They did not release them until President Reagan came into office.

Then there was the Iraq-Iran war, a war in which hundreds of thousands of people in Iran died, and the United States assisted the Iraqis in that war against Iran. Well, we have had often no love lost between our two nations over this period of time.

I mention these few points of history to say that each side nurtures its grievances against the other, but something remarkable happened under the last administration. They worked to coordinate pressure from the entire world to strike a deal with Iran, to end their nuclear program, end the risk of Iran becoming a nuclear power. This agreement was something bought into by Russia and China, the European powers, and the United States. They did many concrete things, things that their rightwing did not like: dismantling their plutonium reactor, shipping enriched uranium out of their country, shutting down their centrifuges, allowing a massive amount of inspectors into their country to watch everything that they were doing.

In return, the deal was we would help them economically find a better standard of living. This is a moment of potential turning point in the relationship—this long animosity between the two countries—potentially a win-win, but then comes in a new administration, the Trump administration, and they don't like this possibility, this deal. The President says it is the worst deal ever struck. We, the United States, pulled out of the deal on May 8, 2018—just over a year ago. Since then, we have heard the drumbeats of war echoing on Capitol Hill.

The administration designated the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps as a terrorist organization and then proceeded to tighten the economic sanctions in order to pressure the economy of Iran.

So we had the end of the Uighurs, who are partners of ours, to be able to buy Iranian oil, greatly starving the economy of that nation. Then we deployed, in recent weeks, the *Abraham Lincoln* carrier strike force to the Gulf. Then we deployed a B-52 squadron to the Gulf. Then we heard the advocates in the administration saying: If anything happens with a connection with Iran, we will show them the ferocity of our forces. We will respond and show them not to mess with the United States of America.

Different officials cited different examples, but one was: If an Iranian militia in Iraq should happen to harm an American, that could be a trigger or if Iran were to disrupt the movement of oil from the Gulf, that could be a trigger.

When you deploy forces and then start looking for triggers, you can find one for war, if you want, but I stand here today to quote the Constitution of the United States of America, and that Constitution says the power of war

rests with this body—not the Oval Office.

As we have pressured Iran, we have had incidents occur that have been highlighted in recent days. Some mines were put on the side of a couple ships—blew a hole through the side, didn't sink the ships. The administration is pretty sure, they say, that Iran did this. Well, I always exercise some caution. We all remember the Iraq war. We remember that the administration then—the Bush administration—built what they said was a powerful case of weapons of mass destruction being cultivated by Saddam Hussein and the Iraq Government. We went to war on that evidence, and we were wrong.

Here we are at this moment and an administration that has predeployed forces, is squeezing the Iranian people as powerfully as possible. What happens in this situation? What is the goal? Some in the administration say the goal is negotiations. Now, let me get this straight. The United States broke the deal, strengthening the far right in Iran which said don't trust the Americans. We strengthened the Revolutionary Guard because the Revolutionary Guard did not like the deal to begin with. Then we economically squeezed the people of Iran, creating great hardship throughout the land—meaning we have moved the entire population in the direction of supporting the far right in that country.

Now, take these two things. We have strengthened not the moderates who want to see the nation on a different course but the far right. Then we have alienated much of the country and increased their support for the far right, and we have shown that when we sign a deal, we don't stand behind the deal because this administration broke the deal. How is that a foundation for negotiation? We are saying to Iran: We negotiated. You agreed, but we are breaking the deal, and now we want to negotiate again.

People don't tend to want to negotiate with folks who have broken the previous deal. So we here see that we have a challenge in which we stand on the precipice of potential war.

My colleague from New Mexico has an amendment that restates the fundamentals of our Constitution, and he has teamed up with my colleague from Virginia who is here on the floor as well, and I am certainly completely supportive of their effort. They are saying that while we are on this bill, on security, on Defense authorization, this is a moment we should be debating whether the President has the authority to go to war, and their amendment says: No, he does not. He must follow the Constitution, and he must come to this body for authorization. That is an important message for us to send. We must not leave the debate on Defense authorization without debating the Udall-King amendment.

My colleagues are here to speak to it in greater detail. I so much appreciate their work. This is a moment that this

Chamber must rise to the challenge of being a force that can wrestle with great issues before us, and there is no more important security issue at this moment than debating whether the President has the power to go to war. I stand with the Constitution. I hope my colleagues will all stand with the Constitution in this Chamber. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I also rise today with my colleagues to talk about the rumors of war we have been hearing in this body and in the news. I want to advocate for a very simple amendment whose timing is, I think, propitious as we discuss the National Defense Authorization Act. Why wouldn't we discuss what we are hearing from the White House and others? Why wouldn't we discuss the events that are happening on the ground in the Strait of Hormuz in the Middle East?

The amendment Senator UDALL has prepared that is a bipartisan amendment that is before the body—and we hope for a vote early next week—is a straightforward one. No funds would be used to prosecute a war against Iran unless this Congress has a vote to authorize it, to authorize such a war. As my colleague from Oregon mentioned, that is what the Constitution suggests, and that is the debate we should be having.

Part of the reason I feel so strongly about this is because I am a Virginian. We are the most connected State to the military mission of the United States. All States are connected and all States are Patriotic, but if you just add up the kind of per capita in Virginia—our Active Duty, our Guard, our Reserve, our DOD civilians, like the nurses who work at the Fort Belvoir Hospital, the DOD contractors like the shipbuilders in Newport News, our military families—we are the most connected to the Nation's military mission. I am personally connected to this with a son in the U.S. Marines. So as a Virginian I feel very strongly about this, and I also feel strongly about it because we are proud of the Virginians, Madison, Jefferson, and others, who are among the Founders who crafted the Constitution. They tried to do some things that were pretty revolutionary then, and they are still revolutionary. Some of our Constitution was a great borrowing exercise—taking wonderful ideas from other constitutions and laws and assembling them together in a wonderful document they put together in 1787, but there were a couple of ideas in the Constitution of 1787 that were not chosen from elsewhere, that were really unique to our country and are still unique. One of the unique ideas is this: War is not a matter for the Executive, the King, the Emperor, the Monarch, the Sultan, the Pope. No, war is a matter that needs to be declared by the people's elected legislative body.

That was revolutionary in 1787, and it is revolutionary today. The balance of power that was struck was that Con-

gress would declare war, and then once declared, there would only be one Commander in Chief—535 Commanders in Chief would be a disaster. The decision to initiate war would be for Congress, and then the President, working in tandem with military leadership, would be the Commander in Chief to prosecute a war if declared, but there should be no shortcut and no substitute for the debate in this body before the initiation of war.

The amendment that will be on the table—and then hopefully we will receive a vote on—that is bipartisan in nature would prevent funding for a war against Iran unless there is a vote of Congress to authorize such a war.

The amendment does make clear that no previous congressional act—for example, the 2001 authorization—can be tortured and twisted and stretched and bootstrapped into a declaration of war against Iran. The administration has sort of been trying to lay that as a predicate, suggesting that an authorization that passed in 2001 that did not mention Iran would authorize war against Iran, when not a single person who voted for it in 2001 ever thought it was to be used in justification for war against Iran. The administration would like to try to use that as a justification, they have said, in testimony here on the Hill.

Think about this: If they are so afraid to come to Congress and ask for an authorization that they want to try to use something from 18 years ago, what does it tell us about their confidence that they have a good justification that we need to be in a war?

The amendment we have does not prevent the United States from defending itself from attack against Iran. The President has the power as Commander in Chief under Article II, and the War Powers Resolution specifies that power and doesn't codify it. It doesn't need to be codified, but it makes clear that power is always inherent in the Office of the President.

Our amendment doesn't suggest that Iran's behavior is acceptable or consistent with international norms. I have been part of many efforts over the course of my time in the Senate to impose sanctions on Iran if they violated, for example, ballistic missile protocols, U.N. sanctions, or rules, and if they engaged in human rights abuses. The purpose here is not to stand up and defend Iranian behavior, but it is to stand for the proposition that we shouldn't be committed to a war without a vote of Congress.

I will say that this administration's actions and rhetoric have been unnecessarily provocative. It was the United States that pulled out of a diplomatic deal that was working, not Iran. When President Trump pulled out of the diplomatic deal at the time he did, his then-Secretary of State, Rex Tillerson; his then-Secretary of Defense, James Mattis; his then-National Security Advisor, General McMaster; his then and current Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of

Staff, Gen. Joseph Dunford—all said that the Iran deal was working, that Iran was complying with it, and that the United States should stay in it. The President pulled out of the diplomatic deal nevertheless and in the year since has reimposed sanctions and taken a number of steps that are provocative toward Iran—diplomatic provocation, rhetorical provocation, economic provocation, and military provocation.

We have been having a set of briefings—some classified—from the administration on this. I am not going to get into classified material, but one thing I will acknowledge—and I am impressed by this—is the administration's intel experts, when they brief us on the situation—even yesterday—they will state that Iran's activities are—and this is pretty much a direct quote—in response to the “U.S. Maximum Pressure” campaign.

The “U.S. Maximum Pressure” campaign that started with the United States backing out of the diplomatic deal is leading to Iran taking other actions that we don't like, but they are not taking those actions unprovoked. Their actions need to be understood as a response to the “U.S. Maximum Pressure” campaign.

Senator MERKLEY talked about it. We pulled out of the deal. We reimposed sanctions. We designated part of the Iranian Government as a foreign terrorist organization. We misrepresented routine military operations in the region. We moved more troops and Patriot missiles and aircraft carriers and other military material into Iran's region. This is not their moving material into our region; it is our moving material into their neighborhood.

Just this week, the administration announced the deployment of an additional 1,000 troops to the Middle East to counter Iran, and that is what this administration is doing—a “U.S. Maximum Pressure” campaign that tears up diplomacy and thus raises the risk of unnecessary war.

I will also point out that it is not just U.S. activity that is provoking Iran. When the United States allows Saudi Arabia to get missiles they shouldn't have and when the United States observes the Saudis building a missile program—by public reports, possibly with the support of China—that is viewed as very dangerous by Iran. When the United States transfers nuclear technology to Saudi Arabia—not even briefing Congress about it—and the Saudis say they would try to build up a nuclear arsenal to counter Iran, it is a provocation. So the maximum pressure by the United States and nations like Saudi Arabia are leading to an unnecessary escalation of tension in the region.

I want to conclude because my colleague from New Mexico, who is the author of this, also wants to speak about why we need to take it up, but let me just say this. I am going to state my position for the record.

I think another war in the Middle East now would be a disaster. I think it would be catastrophic for the United States to tear up a diplomatic deal and then look our troops in the face and say “Because we tore up a diplomatic deal, you have to now go fight another war” when we have been in the Middle East for 18 years. I think it would represent just about as catastrophic a failure of American foreign policy as you could imagine.

I think it would also have the disadvantage of taking our eye off the ball. I have always been taught to keep the main thing the main thing. I think the main thing right now in national security for the United States is to keep our eye on our principal competitor, which is China. When we take our eye off our principal competitor and we engage in wars we needn't be in, China will be the victor in that. That is a very dangerous thing for us.

So I think it would be catastrophic for the United States to be engaged in another war in the Middle East, particularly a war against Iran right now. But if the President feels differently about that; if some of his advisers think we ought to be about regime change in Iran, as they have said; if some of them think it would be easy to beat Iran in a war, as they have said; if some colleagues here on the floor think we should be in a war with Iran, as some have publicly urged, let them come to the floor of the Senate, in full view of the American people, and make that argument.

Let's have that argument right here in the greatest deliberative body in the world with the American public watching, and I will make my argument about why a new war in the Middle East would be catastrophic and see who wants to stand up and make the argument that a new war in the Middle East is something this great Nation should do. And if we then have that argument and cast a vote and I lose, I am going to be disappointed, but we will have done what the Constitution suggests that we must do.

Our failure to have that debate is so unfair to our troops. It is unfair to our troops to put them in harm's way with Congress hiding under their desk, not being willing to state yea or nay on whether we should be engaged in hostilities.

Let's honor the troops and the sacrifice we would ask them to make, follow the Constitution, and have this debate before the American public. That is what the amendment would essentially guarantee that this body would do, and that is why I so strongly support it.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I thank you for the recognition, and let me thank the two Senators that preceded me here. Senator MERKLEY spoke on this issue of whether we should be going to another war in the Middle

East, and Senator KAINE, whom I have watched since he has been in the Senate, has been relentless and very consistent about raising the issues of authorizations of force and relying on authorizations of force from 2001 and 2002—what we consider very outdated in terms of looking at the facts on the ground. I know he has been working hard—Senator KAINE has—in the Armed Services Committee. Both of us have been working in the Foreign Relations Committee to try to address this constitutional issue that is really before us.

I came to the floor of the Senate 4 weeks ago warning that this administration's reckless escalation of tensions with Iran was blindly leading us to the brink of war. I urged this body to assert its constitutional authority and pass my bipartisan legislation, the Prevention of Unconstitutional War with Iran Act. I called on all of us, Republicans and Democrats, to make it clear that the President alone cannot wage war against Iran without authorization from Congress.

Well, here we are, 1 month later, and tensions with Iran have only increased. The threat of conflict has only drawn closer. Today, we woke up to the news that Iranian forces shot down a U.S. drone. That comes on the heels of 1,000 American troops being sent to the Middle East. Yet the Senate does nothing—nothing to assert Congress's constitutional authority and nothing to assume the responsibility that the Founders clearly placed on our shoulders, the people's representatives.

The Republican leadership should not duck all debate on the military conflict with Iran. We need to vote. We owe it to our men and women in uniform, whose lives would be put on the line, to have this debate, to make the hard choices, and to take the tough votes.

Today, we are calling for a vote on an amendment to the 2020 National Defense Authorization Act. The amendment prohibits funding for military operations against Iran without explicit authorization from Congress. I am joined in this amendment by Senators KAINE, DURBIN, PAUL, MERKLEY, and MURPHY. My related bill has 25 cosponsors and still counting.

Article I, section 8, of the Constitution couldn't be clearer. It is Congress and Congress alone that has the authority to declare war. This amendment recognizing Congress's clear-cut authority should have broad bipartisan support. Whether you support armed conflict with Iran or believe that the war would be a disaster, you should have the courage to cast a vote when the Constitution says it is your job.

Let's be clear. This bill does not tie our Armed Forces' hands. Our military is highly capable, and we have an inherent right of self-defense, which this amendment clearly underscores. But we need to step up. The situation is more urgent day by day.

The President and Secretary of State have accused Iran of being responsible

for the attack on two oil tankers last week. Iran has denied that involvement. There is a somewhat conflicting report from the Japanese tanker owner. I do not know whether Iran, its surrogates, or another party is responsible for this heinous action, but this administration's itch to go to war is all too reminiscent of how we got embroiled in Iraq in 2003 and how the disastrous tanker war of the 1980s began.

We must not make the same terrible mistakes again. We do need to find out precisely what happened and who is responsible, but the response need not be another endless war in the Middle East. We need a thorough and objective investigation of this incident, as has been called for by a number of nations, and the Senators need a real intelligence briefing that covers sources and evidence and not just a statement of opinions from administration officials.

If the Trump administration is entering our forces into hostilities, then this Congress should demand that a report be submitted to Congress in accordance with the War Powers Act. Those who wrote that act made it clear: "Hostilities also encompasses a state of confrontation in which no shots have been fired, but denotes a situation in which there is a clear potential either for such a state of confrontation or for actual armed conflict." We may have already crossed this threshold. Some have said we have.

The Reagan administration failed to submit such a report to Congress during the tanker wars, and the Congress failed to hold that administration accountable, despite the overwhelming evidence of hostilities.

Now, the current administration has hinted that it does not need to go to Congress for approval for hostilities against Iran. They seem to believe that the 9/11 AUMF gives them legal authority for war. Many of us in Congress today voted for that AUMF, including myself, and let me be clear—no one who voted for it thought it would be used to justify a war against Iran 18 years later. Congress needs to make that clear before it is too late.

Yes, the Strait of Hormuz, the Persian Gulf, and the Gulf of Oman should be safe from navigation. Vital interests are at stake. But I agree with the statement issued by the U.S. Central Command in the aftermath of this recent attack:

We have no interest in engaging in a new conflict in the Middle East. We will defend our interests, but a war with Iran is not in our strategic interest, nor in the best interest of the international community.

A war with Iran is not in our strategic interest, and a majority of Americans agree. The American people are tired of forever wars in the Middle East that take our resources, produce no strategic gains, and, most tragically, endanger the lives of American men and women.

In any war with Iran, we will have few allies to back us. The international community is not behind the National

Security Advisor and Secretary of State's bellicose rhetoric. We would have to go it nearly alone.

The administration's maximum pressure strategy is supposedly intended to bring Iran to the negotiating table, but this strategy has predictably failed to produce any negotiations or make any diplomatic inroads. Instead, it is emboldening the hardliners in Tehran who also want confrontation.

The administration's pulling out of the Iran nuclear agreement was a colossal strategic blunder. It was supposedly intended to get the U.S. a better deal, but violating our obligations has only produced saber-rattling, brinksmanship, and the very real risk that a miscalculation or mistake will result in an all-out war.

The United States and the world were safer with the Iran nuclear agreement. It included strict verification requirements. The International Atomic Energy Agency and the President's own intelligence and defense teams agreed that Iran was complying.

The unilateral withdrawal only undermined relations with our allies, signaled that the United States will not keep its word, and destabilized the Middle East even more. This was a predictable result and many warned the Trump administration about this outcome.

Iran threatens to exceed the agreement's limits on nuclear fuel within days. While I hope Iran holds to its end of the bargain, the United States pulling out of the agreement and reimposing sanctions has opened the door for Iran to walk away as well.

Now we must do all we can over the next 17 months to make sure this President does not precipitously start a war with Iran, a country of 80 million people, about four times the size of Iraq, and with proxy forces throughout the region. A war would cost trillions of dollars and undoubtedly American lives. With each passing day and with each incident, the risk of a catastrophic war grows closer.

I realize some of my colleagues have a different view of the situation. Some talk about how all options must be on the table or say that the Iranian regime must be overthrown. I hope they reconsider and change their minds.

If they don't, they should at least have the courage of their convictions. If you want to empower this President to fight a war with Iran, let's vote on that question. The American people and our men and women in uniform deserve to know that their representatives will debate, discuss, and vote on these most difficult of decisions. That is why all of us in this body must demand that this amendment be heard, debated, and voted on. Senate gridlock cannot be an excuse.

The Constitution puts this decision squarely in our court. It is long past time for Congress to reassert its war powers authority. Our oath demands that we make any decision to go to war. The real possibility that this ad-

ministration will precipitate conflict in Iran requires us to face this question now. The fact that American lives will be on the line places the moral imperative on us to debate this issue and to make clear to the President and his administration that any decision to go to war with Iran must be made by Congress.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for the National Defense Authorization Act and to highlight amendments that I have sponsored or cosponsored to enhance opportunities for servicemembers and their families.

The NDAA represents one of the Senate's most important responsibilities. It authorizes funding to support our servicemembers, including those who are serving in harm's way. It sets policy for our Nation's military and authorizes critical national defense priorities. It is vitally important to ensure that our men and women in uniform, as well as our Department of Defense civilians, have the training, ships, planes, vehicles, and other equipment they need to help defend our Nation and its interests.

I commend Chairman INHOFE and Ranking Member REED and the other Members of the Armed Services Committee for their leadership and bipartisan work on this important legislation. They have done an excellent job.

This bill contains many provisions that are important to the State of Maine and to our Nation. To cite just a few items, I am pleased that the NDAA includes authorization for three Arleigh Burke destroyers, 94 fifth-generation Joint Strike Fighter aircraft, and six CH-53K King Stallion helicopters. These essential ships and aircraft will help to ensure that our military maintains its superiority in both the seas and skies. I also strongly support the 3.1 percent pay increase that members of the Armed Forces will receive when this bill is signed into law.

In addition, the NDAA expresses our commitment to key international partners and allies. For example, the bill includes a full \$500 million authorization to continue the cooperative missile defense programs with Israel, which are becoming increasingly vital in that volatile region. It also provides additional security assistance for Ukraine to help check continued Russian aggression on its eastern and southern borders.

To build on the impressive work done by Chairman INHOFE and the rest of the committee, I have introduced amendments to improve benefits for military widows, increased access to and awareness of Department of Defense and VA apprenticeship programs, and improved temporary duty travel lodging for DOD employees, such as those serving at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in Kittery, ME.

The first amendment, which I am pleased to join my colleague Senator

DOUG JONES in sponsoring, calls for the elimination of a longtime inequity in the Survivor Benefit Plan and the Dependency and Indemnity Compensation Plan. This inequity, which causes there to be an offset between the two programs, is commonly known as the military widow's tax. This unfair offset is currently preventing as many as 65,000 surviving spouses—more than 260 of them in Maine—from receiving the full benefits that they deserve.

The Department of Defense's Survivor Benefits Plan, or SBP, is primarily an insurance benefit that military families purchase, usually in their retirement, and it provides cash benefits to a surviving spouse or other eligible recipients when the military retiree passes away. On the other hand, the Department of Veterans Affairs Dependency and Indemnity Compensation Program, known as DIC, is a monthly tax-free payment to survivors and dependents of servicemembers who pass away from service-related conditions.

For example, if a military retiree pays premiums into the insurance program, then, their spouse ought to be able to receive those benefits when the retiree passes away. However, what we find instead is that if the surviving spouse receiving SPB insurance payment is also eligible for the separate payment from the VA, there is a dollar-for-dollar offset. In some cases this leads to the total elimination of the Service Benefit Plan. In other cases, the offset greatly reduces the amount that is received. In either case, it is out and out unfair, and it harms survivors of our servicemembers and military retirees.

I am often reminded by our military commanders that you recruit the soldier, but you retain the family. We have an obligation to make sure that we are taking care of our military families, who have sacrificed so much.

This problem goes back decades, but this year can be the time that we finally solve it. With more than 75 Senators—three-quarters of the Senate—and 340 Members of the House of Representatives supporting this effort as cosponsors of the stand-alone bill, this is the year. It is our time to do our duty, not only to support the brave men and women of our military but also to honor our commitment to their families.

I would urge all of my colleagues to join in this effort and to support the repeal of the military widow's tax as part of the National Defense Authorization Act, and, indeed, Senator JONES and I have introduced an amendment to do just that.

Mr. President, the second amendment I wish to discuss is one that I have introduced with Senator KLOBUCHAR. It would authorize servicemembers transitioning to civilian life to carry out skills training, apprenticeships, and internship programs at other Federal Agencies, in addition to the private sector. Currently, the military services are permitted to authorize

servicemember participation in job training, including apprenticeships and internships, beginning up to 6 months before their service obligation in the military is complete. In a recent report to Congress, the Department of Defense recommended that we expand this authority to allow for inclusion of Federal Agencies as well as the private sector as participants.

I am very grateful to Chairman INHOFE and to Senator REED for recently accepting this amendment and including it as part of the NDAA managers' amendment. That will ensure that these provisions are included in the Senate bill. This is a win-win for both servicemembers as well as Federal Agencies, as this simple expansion will create new opportunities for individual members of the military and allow the Federal Government to benefit from the talents that our highly trained soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines bring to their careers subsequent to their military service. It is a commonsense reform that will expand access to apprenticeships to our servicemembers and ease their transition.

Third is an amendment that I introduced with Senator CANTWELL. It would require the Department of Defense, in coordination with the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Labor, to report on their efforts to promote the utilization of apprenticeships and on-the-job training by servicemembers transitioning out of the military. So, obviously, this report is very much related to the earlier amendment that I just described.

The dramatic underutilization of apprenticeship and on-the-job training under the GI bill demonstrates the need to promote these vital programs. In fiscal year 2018, fewer than 1,500 veterans participated in apprenticeships and fewer than 1,400 participated in the other kinds of on-the-job training, and that is out of a universe of over a million beneficiaries of the VA's educational programs.

One obvious benefit of apprenticeship programs is that graduates learn hands-on skills for jobs that will immediately be available to them, and there are many of these kinds of good-paying jobs available in the State of Maine and elsewhere today.

Finally, there is an amendment that I have introduced with Senators SHAHEEN, KING, and HASSAN. This would address significant problems that the Department of Defense workers at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in Kittery, ME, and elsewhere in the country have encountered with the Department's Integrated Lodging Pilot Program, which was initially authorized in the 2015 NDAA. The intent of the pilot program was to save money by assigning TDY lodging first at government facilities and then at specific commercial lodging at prenegotiated rates. However, what we have seen with employees at our shipyard is that they are often being forced to stay in subpar or inconvenient lodging—sometimes, in areas that simply are not safe.

Workers have shared stories with me and with the other members of the Maine and New Hampshire delegations about being awoken in the middle of the night to the sounds of loud shouts while staying at required government lodging, as well as more serious incidences of robberies and shootings nearby. In other cases, travelers describe staying in remote lodging on military installations without security or desk attendants nearby to resolve standard issues that are ordinarily addressed quickly at commercial hotels—basic things like dealing with room keys that don't work or addressing other problems in the hotel rooms.

Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, in fact, has directed its travel office to no longer use the Integrated Lodging Pilot Program for travel to at least one installation due to repeated problems with personnel who were promised lodging only to find that it was not even available when they arrived, leaving these workers scrambling to find an alternative place to stay.

This was a pilot project that simply did not work. It is for these reasons that I have joined my colleagues from Maine and New Hampshire in introducing an amendment that simply allows this pilot program to end in December of this year as currently scheduled. This program may be something worth revisiting after we straighten out the problems with it—certainly, after Congress reviews the still uncompleted DOD report on the pilot. But for the time being, it clearly has not worked well for the workers at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard and other DOD employees, and it should be allowed to expire at the end of this year.

I am very proud of the role that the State of Maine plays in our national defense. From the accounting center in northern Maine to the Air National Guard base in Bangor that refuels so many military aircraft, to contractors like Bath Iron Works, where we will christen a ship on Saturday in honor of our former colleague Senator Daniel Inouye, to the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in Kittery, to countless other smaller suppliers, the State of Maine is essential to our national security.

Enactment of this bill is vitally important to the security of our Nation. I would encourage my colleagues to support the underlying bill, as well as these commonsense amendments.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

GUN SAFETY

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues who have come to the floor this week to call for action to prevent gun violence.

On Tuesday we marked the 4-year anniversary of the horrific shooting at the Mother Emanuel Church in Charleston, where a White supremacist killed nine people during Bible study.

Last week was the 3-year anniversary of the massacre at Pulse nightclub in

Orlando, when an act of terror and hatred took the lives of 49 people in the LGBTQ community.

After each of these tragedies, we say “never again” and “enough is enough.” But after each mass shooting, Congress fails to take action. The discussion fades into the background until another tragedy occurs, then this same cycle is repeated.

It is unacceptable that Congress has still yet to take meaningful action to address this epidemic. The victims who have been lost, their families, and those who have experienced life-changing injuries and trauma deserve action—as do all of our communities, because nearly every aspect of American life has been afflicted by gun violence.

Nowhere is the impact of gun violence and the way it has changed our lives more clear than in our Nation’s schools. Just this year, a friend of mine’s son started kindergarten. Shortly after the school year started, he and his other kindergarten peers had to participate in a drill—what to do if there is an active shooter or danger in your school.

At about the same time that my friend received information from the school that her son would be participating in a lockdown of sorts—a lockdown for 5-year-olds—she read an article by a teacher who had participated with her young students in such an active shooter drill. When the teacher got the kids still and turned off the lights in the room so they could practice staying safe, she noticed the little lights in the soles of their sneakers. You know those little light-up shoes that children have? The teacher wrote that she realized that if those children came to school with those shoes on a day when there was a shooter, even with the lights down, they would be targets. Well, needless to say, my friend’s son no longer has light-up sneakers.

It is time to finally meet words with action. It is time to finally take steps to keep the American people safe. It is time to finally pass commonsense gun laws.

A good start to address this public safety issue would be to improve our background check system. According to the Department of Justice, since 1994 background checks have stopped over 3 million dangerous individuals from obtaining guns, including people with violent criminal records, domestic abusers, and those with mental health issues.

But we know that there continue to be loopholes in that system. Research indicates that millions of guns are sold each year to individuals without background checks. We need to extend background checks to all gun sales and ensure that people who are legally barred from owning guns cannot easily access them.

I have joined with Senator MURPHY, who has been a passionate, dedicated leader on this issue, on legislation to do just that. Earlier this year, the

House of Representatives passed bipartisan gun safety legislation aimed at improving our background check system. There is real momentum and urgency on this issue. Strengthening background checks is a measure that the American people overwhelmingly support.

Unfortunately, Republican leadership in the Senate is more focused on putting the priorities of the gun lobby ahead of the will of the American people. It is outrageous that some in this body suggest that there is simply nothing that we can do to stop the gun violence that has plagued our country. The refusal to even bring up gun safety legislation for consideration is unconscionable. That must change.

I come from a State with a long tradition of responsible gun ownership. People across New Hampshire own guns for hunting, sports, and protection. I respect the tradition, and I am committed to upholding it, but I know that the people in New Hampshire don’t want dangerous weapons in the wrong hands. They are also deeply frustrated that Congress has refused to address the heartbreaking acts of violence that have become far too common in our country. Granite Staters, particularly our young people, are speaking out to voice these frustrations.

Last year, I was proud to march with students in Nashua who organized their own March For Our Lives rally, and students across our State have engaged in everything from writing to public officials to staging school walkouts. They are demanding that we take action, and Congress needs to listen to them.

I am going to keep pushing to pass commonsense gun safety laws, and it is long past time that the Senate finally take this issue up for debate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

TRIBUTE TO RECIPIENTS OF THE CONGRESSIONAL AWARD

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today I wish to congratulate this year’s winners of the Congressional Award. Established by Congress in 1979, the award recognizes the achievements of young Americans between the ages of 14 and 23 years old and celebrates their accomplishment in four program areas: voluntary public service, personal development, physical fitness, and expedition/exploration.

The award challenges participants to set goals in an area that interests them, encouraging them to pursue new

interests and grow along the way. If they successfully achieve their goals, they earn bronze, silver, and gold certificates and medals. Through the program, these young Americans gain new skills, earn greater confidence, and position themselves to be productive citizens.

Today, recipients of the gold medal will be presented with their Congressional Award at a ceremony here in our Nation’s Capital. On behalf of the U.S. Senate, I would like to congratulate all of the winners for their accomplishments and for the example they set for others. Among this impressive group, my State of Kentucky is home to eight gold medalists. Through their efforts, the recipients of the 2019 Congressional Awards are strengthening their communities and our Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of this year’s recipients of the Congressional Award Gold Medal be printed in the RECORD.

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

Alabama: Warren Griggs.
 Arizona: Chantel Abdulai, Morgan Cryder, Ryan Jiang, Baya Laimeche, Alexis Massie, Rosemary Richards.
 Arkansas: Sarah Douglass.
 California: Flora Ahn, Yuna Baek, Logan Bhamidipaty, Pooja Bhatnagar, Madeline Brown, Abigail Brown, Amanda Cai, Andrew Chang, Casey Chang, Ann Chen, Yujin Choe, Jiseon Choi, Jung-yoon, Choi, David Choung, Joshua Yoon-Ho Chung, Evelyn Chung, Wesley Dale, Harmeen Dhariwal, Julia Dillenbeck, Joseph Dong, Claire Fernandez, Teresa Fundter, Andrew Funk, Scott Funk, Trenton Gin, Jeseung Han, Ye-Eun Han, Jennifer Ho, Andrew Hong, Mirabel Xixin Hu, Jacqueline Huff, Priscilla Hui, Dayeon Hwang, Seung Hyun Hwang, Justin Hyon, Carmina Inguito, Andrew Jockelle, Mindy Jun, Sky Jung, David Jung, Rachel Kang, Maisha Khanum, Ami Kim, Andrew Kim, AnneClare Kim, Calvin Kim, Elissa Kim, Evan Kim, Grace Goeun Kim, Grant Kim, Josephine Kim, Junhee Kim, Renny Kim, Stephanie Kim, Steve Kim, Sungmin Kim, Tiffany Kim, Faith Kim, Alex Kim-Man Klassen, Erin Kwak, Yohan Kwak, Chaerin Chloe Lee, Claire Lee, David Lee, Ethan Lee, Ethan Lee, Jiin Lee, Jisung Lee, Justin Lee, Kendra Lee, Seohyeong Lee, Suhwoo Lee, Sunghee Lee, Jae Hoon Lee, Jay Lee, Jeong Eun Lee, Kelly Li, Tina Xiaotian Li, Daniel Lim, Nicole Jiayi Liu, Mackenzie Lo, Megan Loh, Vinit Majmudar, Kenichi Matsuo, Kevin Mok, Evan Morgan, William Mun, Paris Nguyen, Hyerin Noh, Laura Noronha, Yuna Oh, Anthony O’Leary, Sena Oten, Aylen Park, Brian Park, Chelsie Park, Elisa Park, Esther Park, Hailey Park, Heejae Park, Hyoungjin Park, Julie Park, Noah Park, Rachel Park, Rachel Gia Park, Steven Park, Sung Yun Park, Weena Park, Eric Park, Akshat Patwardhan, Grace Pecheck, Isha Pema, Cris Plunkett, Nathan Pollon, Ethan Posard, Archit Raichura, Rene Servin, Sophia Shi, Jaeyong Shim, Katherine Simic, Helen Sohn, Joshua Son, Annette Son, Kenneth Song, Margaret Sugarman, Albert Sun, Colman Sun, Seraphine Sun, Loyalty Traster-Lee, Kenneth Jr. Um, Colin Wang, Jiahui Wang, Johnny Young Wang, Chuhan Wen, Samantha Wong, Richard Wu, Jack Xiao, Zifeng Xie, Qixiang Xiong, Andre Yeung, Aaron Yi, Danniell Yi, David Dongwon Yi, Brian Yoon, Na Won Yoon, Patrick Yu, Emily Yuan, Peter Ze, Tiffany Zha, Lin Yue Zhang, Yixuan Zhu.

Colorado: Nour Abouyoussef, Bahara Amiri, Adam Mohmand.

Connecticut: Emily Bergwall, Jack Ferreira, Madison Henry, Jake McGillion-Moore, James Munroe, Gabriella Owens.

Florida: Lorraine Angelakos, Jessica Bennett, Jennifer Carvel, Lauren Eavenson, Cole Ellis, Michael LaShon Everhart, Katherine Gates, Alexander Goetschius, Keelie Hanley, Rileigh Hanley, Royce Howley, Cassandra James, Hannah Komroff, Ruhika Lankalapalli, Mark Lee, Connor Murphy, Maura Null, Harrison O'Donnell, Ali Jean Paksima, Mariah Perez, Christian Petrisko, Derek Petrisko, Lillian Pinkham, Matthew Powers, Michael Powers, John R. Robinson, Tanner Smith, Taylor Stevens, Lindsey Suncine, Sierra Tagman, Lillian Tougas, Shravva Vasireddy.

Georgia: Ridhi Choragudi, David Edenfield, Sophia Emmoth, Baird Kazazian, Justin Lee, Manas Mudunuri, Cutler Shiver, Albert Zhang.

Hawaii: Emily De Wulf.

Idaho: Aila Carr-Chellman, Asher Carr-Chellman, Jules Carr-Chellman, Sydney Davis, Kyler Liscinski, Quincey Lochar, Jasmine Willis.

Illinois: Ajay Balaraman, Max Bowman, Julia Canellis, Robert Daniel Claud, Amanda Dynak, Jacob Furfine, Cole Goggio, Michael Miller, Audrey Pack, Katherine Pack, Tris-tan Taylor.

Indiana: Thaddaeus Broussard, Sai Chalasani, Amanda Feagans, Agrayan Gupta, Aryaman Gupta, Vahin Vuppalanchi.

Iowa: Amy Ryan.

Kansas: Jillian Gillen, Aasim Hawa, Lucas Lopatofsky, Aditi Malay, John Tomlinson.

Kentucky: Tierra Beard, Cammeron Durham, Benjamin Ferguson, Lucas Fortwengler, Demetrius Gunn, Nathanael Sangster, Alex Satterwhite, Alderic Senecal.

Maryland: Candace Anderson, Joseph Farroha, Orion Gangopadhyay, Alex Jin, Bridgette Kim, William Longworth, Thomas Pallan, Elizabeth Rice, Jonathan Simak, Benjamin Smith, Robin Mia Tian.

Massachusetts: Michael Akerson, McAllister Bianchi, Justin Chang, Harsh Choudhary, Jean-Pierre De Jesus-De La Cruz, Yanxin Ma, Dwyn McNeil, Connor Ryan.

Michigan: Marvin Jiang.

Minnesota: Avery Lehr.

Mississippi: Jerry Clark, Jessi Davis, Taylor Fields, Jessica Gates, Jonah Holland, Jacob Lindsey, Morgan Lyons, Teiryne Miller, Cammie Moore, Kacilyn Pegues, Callie Philips, Mikayla Shelton, Maurissa Shumpert, CJ Weddle, T'ajahlon White.

Missouri: Bree Baker, Andrew Harrison Fruend, Robert Trey Fruend III, Abbey Grooms, Yijin Huang, Olivia Johanns, Nathaniel Marsters, Vivian Marsters, Trevor Rey, Caitlin Souers, Divya Srihari.

Nebraska: Mary Aumen, Ambrose Terneus. Nevada: Zachary Hammer, Ritvik Janamsetty, Salomee Levy, Zane Pasha.

New Hampshire: Sydney Richardson.

New Jersey: Zachary Asselta, Eunice Bae, Tanvi Bekal, Andre Biehli, Robert Cuff, Ciara DiMaiolo, Evan Doliszny, Caitlin D'Souza, James Foran, Anushka Iyer, Julia Jeong, Kunal Kanwar, Alexandra Kukal, James Joseph Laberee, Shannon Leahy, Krishna Parikh, Khushi Patel, Krishant Putrevu, David Takacs, Vicky Trieu.

New York: Kristen Brennan, Muhammed Colak, Madison Gorman, Blake Guzy, Becky Han, Joseph Hong, Tasneem Ibrahim, Saiomkar Iyer, Baird Johnson, Henry Lin, Jacqueline McCabe, Hannah Nyquist, Sophia Pao, Katherine Prior, Darshi Shah, Noah Stiles, Jacqueline Sutura, Olivia Zhou.

North Carolina: Abigail Amato, Lillian Amato, Angelina Bayrak, Kamin Bond, Carson Cook, Rucheer Dave, William David,

Ashlyn Edmisten, Garrett Gerda, Geoffrey Gerda, Hattie Rose Greene, Cole Heinrich, Kyla Jackson, Grayson King, Sruthi Mannepalli, Aislinn Niimi, Alaina Randolph, Bryson Rose, Brett Sims, Kristina Vaheer.

North Dakota: Lauren Knoll.

Ohio: Sai Ashish Bommasani, Ryan Brady, Grace Cousens, Rohan Desarapu, Paul Hager, Genevieve Hager van Carlowitz, Shrayan Kalahasthy, Ishita Kode, Manaswini Nedunuri, Varshini Odayar, Bailey Quitter, Pavan Raghupathy, Anjali Raju, Neha Rokkam, Emmanuel Augustin Scaria, Chatura Tamirisakandala, Samith Venkatesh, Heema Vyas.

Oklahoma: Ted Bigler, Pat Kane, Olivia Stump.

Oregon: Patrick Townsend.

Pennsylvania: Victoria Jawork, Josef Mueller, Juan Aleman IV, Ruby Chen, Rebekah Fodale, William Huang, Julia Jones, Ayush Sharma, Allison Yang, Alec Yarnoff.

Rhode Island: Grace Sowa.

South Carolina: Gunnar Hensley, Bella Kissell, Garrett May, Micah McKnight, Noah McKnight, Harrison Miller, Lucas Mayon.

Tennessee: Andrew Engebretsen, Christine Li, Mitchell Morrison.

Texas: Smriti Ahuja, Siddhant Ahuja, Hunter Beaton, Todd Christian, Paige Cromley, Connor Crowe, Saachi Dalal, Daniel Garza, Ashley Gibson, Sachi Kalvakaalva, Mamoon Khalid, Weronika Konwent, Shikha Lakhi, Jimmy Liu, Rehman Memon, Raheem Memon, Fernando Miranda-Fred, Matthew Mitchell, Elias Mosby, Samuel Mosby, Emily Kate Mosley, Rhea Mudnal, Grace Nemeç, Vishreshtha Pathak, Nevedita Ramachandran, Nikita Ramachandran, Cristian Roma, Ben Romero, Jana Sabri, Wilson Sands, Allison Sharer, Ashley Sharer, Ashley Turnage, David Wang.

Utah: Dua Azhar, Daimion Davis, Katelin Drennan, Kimberly Drennan, Fatima Faizi, Nihal Kariparduc, Thomas Klingonsmith, Sarah Shwani.

Vermont: Freedom Scott Guildford River Tansley.

Virginia: Isaac Beasey, Annika Jenkins, Sarni Kandil, Anne Kickert, Varun Kota, Madeleine LeBeau, Samantha Lee, Kasey Mize, Manvi Punukollu, Timothy Rah, Kayla Rothstein, Melina Seng, Ciara Smith, Sarah Valley.

Washington: Hailey Farrington, Trevor McArthur, Arya Selvam, Sarah Stewart, Phillip Wang, Rose Wittenmyer.

Washington, DC: Lee Clyne.

Wisconsin: Olivia McClain.

Wyoming: Alice Attebery, Mercedes Bartels, Alyssa Bedard, Sydney Bell, Makaylah Berkovitz, Madison Bindl, Abigail Bylow, Elijah Cole, Mykenzie Dean, Samantha Dijohn, Noah Dreiling, Abigail Fearneyhough, Emma Geringer, Andrew Gronning, Logan Grosz, James Hayes, Sydney Holies, Isabelle Houseman, Lane Hutchison, Caroline Johnson, Jayla Johnson, Katie Johnson, Makala Johnson, Lorin Jones, Michaiiah Jones, Samantha Jurkowski, Maeve Knepper, Kamry Knotwell, Selena Landa, Megan Leavitt, Araceli Ledesma, Carmen Leon, Arianna Lewis, Taylor Maese, Jazy Manoukian, Zoey Mares, Mackenzie Marler, Alyssa Miller, Claudia Miller, Audrey Mitchell, Junuenth Morales, Abby Morillon, Quentin Moter, Johanna Moter, Tommy Neal, Thanh Nguyen, Adelle Ostrom, Kendra Ostrom, Tiffany Passehl, Cody Perkins, Julianna Pizzato, Ruth Potter, Emily Purifoy, Haley Purifoy, Chloe Rankin, Dylan Raymond, Nicole Reyes-Aguilar, Grace Ritschard, Lauren Salsgiver, Kathryn Sauerwein, Camden Schmidt, Abigail Shameklis, Jakob Shuey, Colby Stockton, Nicole Talkington, Amelia Van Winkle, Cassidy Weibel, Eleccia Wells, Micayla Whitfield, Taylor Wilson.

LANDMINES IN YEMEN

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have spent much of my career in the Senate working to eradicate landmines, which kill and maim far more civilians than combatants. These insidious, inherently indiscriminate weapons often remain active for years or even decades after the fighting has ended and the soldiers have left, lying in wait for the unsuspecting footstep of a child on her way to school, or a farmer working in a field.

In 1997, the Yemeni Government signed the Mine Ban Treaty which outlawed the production, stockpiling, export, and use of anti-personnel mines. With the help of international donors, they made great strides in humanitarian demining, to the point that, by 2012, they were on the cusp of declaring the country landmine free. Unfortunately, the civil war between the Houthis rebels supported by Iran, and the Yemeni Government supported by the Saudi-led coalition, changed everything. The use of landmines made a resurgence, due to Iranian mines that the Houthis have planted by the thousands throughout the country. More than 9,000 Yemenis have reportedly been killed or injured by landmines, the overwhelming majority of them innocent civilians.

Children are especially vulnerable to mine accidents. They run and play; they explore open fields; they are curious about strange objects. Most children who step on a landmine will die from loss of blood before they can obtain medical attention, and the survivors often do not have access to the specialized care and support they need. Even children who do not become victims are affected by landmines in their communities. They cannot play or go to school without fearing for their lives, and they suffer from malnutrition when militants turn farmland into minefields.

As I have said many times before, the use of landmines is an affront to civilized societies. Regardless of who uses them, they are an illegitimate weapon, triggered by the victim, and are often used to terrorize and brutalize the innocent. They impede development for decades, even generations. In Vietnam today, for example, landmines continue to kill and injure civilians 44 years after the war ended. The Houthis' use of landmines cannot be justified any more than their use of child soldiers and other violations of the laws of war, and should stop immediately.

Similarly, the United States should stop supporting Saudi Arabia's indiscriminate bombing in Yemen which has caused thousands of civilian casualties. This war will not be won militarily, and the longer it drags on the more innocent people will pay the price, with their limbs, their livelihoods, and their lives.

The Department of State is supporting efforts to help locate and destroy landmines in Yemen, but far more needs to be done. Even though

the Yemeni army, the UN Development program, and nongovernmental organizations have cleared more than 300,000 mines in the country, it is estimated that at least 1 million remain.

The Leahy War Victims Fund, administered by the U.S. Agency for International Development, has provided artificial limbs, wheelchairs, rehabilitation, and vocational assistance to landmine survivors in many countries, and could be used in Yemen.

Yemen was an impoverished country before Iran and Saudi Arabia decided to go to war there, which has caused immense suffering among the Yemeni people. War crimes have been committed by both sides, and by providing weapons to the Saudis, we also are implicated. Every effort should be made to pressure the Houthis to stop using landmines and child soldiers, and the Saudis to stop their bombing of civilian areas. The Department of State should increase its support for humanitarian demining in Yemen, and the U.S. Agency for International Development should increase its support for organizations that help mine victims rebuild their lives.

WORLD REFUGEE DAY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, tomorrow, I will be back home in Burlington, VT, to take part in a joyous occasion. In an afternoon ceremony at the Ethan Allen Homestead, I will attend a naturalization ceremony in which 14 new Americans from 11 countries will be administered the Oath of Allegiance. The participants will be surrounded by family and friends as they stand proudly next to the American flag and formally became U.S. citizens. It will be an honor to stand with them.

As we celebrate these immigrants who will join our ranks as American citizens, today, on World Refugee Day, we must not forget the plight of millions of refugees who have not been as fortunate. Right now, there are over 70 million people across the globe who have been forcibly displaced from their home countries by the horrors of persecution, war, famine, and chaos. In 2018 alone, nearly 13.8 million people were newly displaced, meaning that 25 people were forced to flee their homes every single minute of 2018. Nearly half of all refugees are children under the age of 18, many of them just infants and toddlers.

On World Refugee Day, we must recommit ourselves to the hallowed American tradition of being a refuge for the persecuted and the oppressed. Welcoming refugees with dignity is not a Democratic or a Republican priority; it is the American way. We are a better country for it. No single administration will ever be able to erase that from our DNA as a nation of refugees and immigrants.

I couldn't think of a better way to highlight the indelible contributions of immigrants and refugees to our society than to share a personal story that my

good friend, U.S. District Court Judge Bill Sessions, recently offered at a naturalization ceremony at Vermont's State House marking the 17th anniversary of 9/11. Judge Sessions' remarks came just months after he suffered a life-threatening injury, only to later discover that the medical professionals who helped save his life were the very same immigrants he had sworn in as American citizens years earlier.

I for one, am most grateful that they were here in America to save his life.

I ask unanimous consent that Judge Sessions' statement be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF U.S. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE WILLIAM K. SESSIONS III, VERMONT STATE HOUSE NATURALIZATION CEREMONY—SEPT. 11, 2018

I am going to tell you my story. Of course I'm not going to tell you my whole life story, just that part which relates to my injury and illness a number of months ago. So on one level I will share with you my story, my experience. But it really isn't about me. It's about all those who came to my aid. It's about wonderful people who have recently moved here to this country to pursue their dreams, and it's about what these folks do for all of us.

I've been a federal judge since 1995, about 24 years. One of my favorite parts of the job is to preside at naturalization ceremonies. Over the years, I've had ceremonies, in courtroums, schools, museums, on boats and in legislative halls. Currently, there are 24 such ceremonies performed each year in Vermont, and between 700 and 800 people are sworn in as American citizens. I do two a year, aboard the Ticonderoga at Shelburne Museum and in the State House on September 11th of each year. The State House ceremony is very special. Patrick Leahy and I organized the first such ceremony on the first anniversary of the September 11th attack as a statement that we cherish what immigrants bring to this country, that our welcome to new citizens will not be diminished by the acts of terrorists. It's a large group of between 60 and 80 applicants for citizenship. We have held ceremonies on September 11th of each year ever since.

Naturalization ceremonies are joyous celebrations. The new citizens are from all over the world. In fact these ceremonies often evolve into celebrations of their own cultural traditions. Many come in their native dress, and all of their families share in their celebration. They come up after the ceremony for pictures with me. My photo must rest on hundreds of mantles.

There are a couple of themes that seem universal. First, they are all very happy. For many, this day is the culmination of a long struggle. Many have come from refugee camps in Bhutan or Nepal or war-torn areas, such as Somalia or Bosnia. Some were raised in Communist countries, including Russia, China and the Eastern Bloc countries. Some were from Central and South America, having come here to escape violence at home, and others were from Europe or Canada. They speak about their dreams of America. The American dream is so inspirational for so many new citizens: hope, freedom, education, employment. It is inspirational for us who have lived here all of our lives to be reminded that so many look to this country as a beacon of hope. And we are a multi-cultural community. We take pride in our diversity. The infusion of rich cultural traditions is in many ways our lifeblood.

At the same time, naturalization ceremonies mark transitions from their homes and extended families to our community, and that transition is hard. They bring with them such rich cultural traditions, but often they see in their children the influence of the western community. Fernanda spoke to this—you feel caught between two worlds.

But where do they go after being naturalized? There have been over 12,000 new citizens sworn in since I have been a judge. That's a very significant portion of our whole community. Yet I never understood where they go. How do they integrate into our Western culture? Just what were they doing here that impacts all of us? Now I have a much greater understanding of what they contribute for all of us.

Now to my story. In late February, Abi and I were skating on the frozen fields of Blue Ledge farm, our daughter's and son-in-law's property. I took a fall backwards, striking my head on the ice. The sound could be heard throughout the county. I gathered myself. I seemed to have a headache, but not more. We skated back to the car. I of course did nothing.

Over the next two months I occasionally had minor headaches. It seemed like nothing more than a distraction. Things changed on a Sunday night in May. I had trouble speaking. Abi wanted to take me to the nearby ER, I said I'd visit a doctor the next day. John Barstow called. He in his own blunt way ordered I go to the ER. Two vs. one, so we went Sunday night. A CT scan was done and sent to the University of Vermont Medical Center. A neurosurgeon reviewed it and sent back the following message: I had massive bleeding in the brain. I was to be transported to Burlington, and he had scheduled brain surgery for 4 that morning.

So I remember very well meeting the neurosurgeon outside of the operating room. He explained the presence of blood and the movement of the brain from the pressure. He then waited for my response, but I couldn't answer him. I could not speak, I couldn't make a sound. He was an older man, almost a contemporary of mine. He put his hand on mine and said in a very kind way: "We're going to make you all better." I could only nod.

I spent close to a month in the hospital, rotating between UVM Medical Center and Fanny Allen. One of my first observations was that people who took care of me were from all over the world. Those included nurses, medical technicians, and support staff. I just loved talking with them about their stories. They all had such pride in their cultural heritage. And they had such hope for their life here in the United States.

One day one of my favorite nurses said to me: "You probably don't remember me, but you swore me in as an American citizen." I didn't remember her, but I felt an immediate connection. The ceremonies were special to both of us, and I felt a joy and a level of comfort that she was taking care of me. Also there was such a sense of small world.

During my hospitalization I had a number of setbacks that are common with this type of operation. Those setbacks took away my strength. They also impacted my ability to walk and to speak. I began occupational and physical therapy and speech pathology to relearn those skills. On the second day of meeting my occupational therapist, she told me that I had sworn her in as a citizen on September 11th at a State House ceremony. She brought the program for the ceremony the next day. Yes indeed, I was the judge who performed her ceremony. And in the course of my rehabilitation, I met a number of therapists, many of whom were either naturalized citizens or were married to naturalized citizens. So the answer to my original

question: Where do immigrants go to integrate into the community? Many go in to the health care community.

But then how about the neurosurgeon? He had reviewed the CT scan, ordered that I be transported to Burlington. He scheduled surgery at 4 a.m., and waited all night to perform the operation. And he was so kind to me before the operation.

My follow-up appointment with him was one month after the operation. Abi and I went to his office. A CT scan was done, which he showed us. The bleeding had stopped, the blood was all gone, and the brain had moved back to where it was supposed to be, about 2.2 cm. He then said to both of us: "You will make a full recovery." As he was leaving the room, I said to him: "Doctor, thank you for saving my life." He stopped, looked directly at me and said: "You're welcome. And thank you, Judge." I had no idea why he would thank me and asked for what. His response: "On September 11th, 2006, on the fifth anniversary of the attack on New York and Washington, at a ceremony at the State House in Montpelier, you swore me in as an American citizen. It was a very special day for me."

So what have I learned from my experience? Immigrants bring to us their stories, the richness of their cultural traditions. This makes our community so much more diverse and interesting. We all benefit so much by their presence.

But now I look at the group being sworn in as citizens in a different light. Among the group may be nurses, medical technicians and aides who care for us when we are our most vulnerable; there may be therapists and speech pathologists who work to restore us who have been injured to our previous health; there may be doctors and surgeons who make life-altering decisions that may save our lives; there may be teachers and principals who care for and educate our children; there may be civil rights lawyers who defend our liberties, and police officers who protect us in the community. With the exception of native Americans we or our ancestors made that same voyage, often with those same dreams. We are them and they are us. We need to welcome them, but we also should thank them for all they do to make our community a safer, healthier and richer place in which to live.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I want to take the opportunity to join communities across the country and around the globe to commemorate the 19th observance of World Refugee Day.

Let me start with two sobering statistics from the UN agency charged with protecting refugees. The first is that 25 people were forced to flee their homes every minute of last year. The second is that more than 70 million people have now been forcibly displaced by conflict and persecution, the highest number the UN refugee agency has ever seen. So suffice it to say that the global need is real.

Which is why it is so heartbreaking to see Donald Trump's repeated efforts to try and slam America's doors shut to the world's most vulnerable.

It is particularly outrageous that the Trump folks aren't even on track to admit their own historically low cap of 30,000 refugees this year.

Let's be clear: Turning away refugees isn't some cornerstone of conservatism. Ronald Reagan admitted tens of thousands of refugees, so did George W. Bush.

In another era, that would have included my family, who fled Nazi persecution in the 1930s, seeking sanctuary in this country. I would have never had the honor of representing my State of Oregon here in this body had America sent my parents away.

Now, Edith and Peter Wyden aren't exactly household names, but here are a few that should be: Madeleine Albright, Albert Einstein, Gloria Estefan, Mila Kunis, and Elie Wiesel.

America is so much the richer for their contributions to diplomacy, physics, music, film and television, literature, and more.

So there is a practical reason for accepting refugees: Doing so makes America better.

There is also a moral reason for accepting refugees. Faith traditions speak of it as a duty to repair the world or to welcome the stranger. In Oregon, we just call it the right thing to do.

America is better than the administration's cruel and callous policies. I remain committed to challenging Donald Trump's exclusionary, anti-refugee policies on all fronts, and I challenge my colleagues to do the same.

Folks are looking to the Senate for strong, principled leaders. They want more than rhetoric; they want results.

So I urge my colleagues in the strongest terms to honor this World Refugee Day by rolling up their sleeves and working to revive America's historic, bipartisan commitment to the plight of refugees around the world.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, it has been said many times before, but it bears repeating today more than ever, on World Refugee Day—ours is a country built by immigrants. We have a proud tradition of welcoming foreigners to our shores.

The first European settlers in North America—those who founded our original Thirteen Colonies—were fleeing religious oppression and persecution. Over the following decades, America became, in the words of Thomas Paine, "the asylum for the persecuted." We welcomed Irish Catholics fleeing starvation and British rule, Germans fleeing political turmoil, Eastern European Jews fleeing the pogroms, and countless others. Over the generations, America welcomed Europeans displaced by war, and later, millions of refugees seeking political asylum from Communism during the Cold War.

In 1980, we passed landmark legislation—the Refugee Act—which provided a permanent and systemized procedure for admitting refugees. This law established the concept of a Presidential determination on refugee admissions, by which the President can set the number of refugees that the United States may admit in a given year. For the past 40 years, both Democratic and Republican administrations demonstrated a commitment to robust resettlement. Prior to the Trump administration, the average annual refugee admissions cap was 95,000 refugees. Administration of-

officials of both parties took seriously the Presidential determination and worked to maintain a resettlement rate on par with it.

At nearly every juncture in history since its founding, America has been called upon to be a leader in welcoming the persecuted. More often than not, we have answered that call and today, it sounds to us louder than ever. With more than 24 million refugees around the globe, America must step into our historic leadership role, not away from it.

Now is the time to increase the refugee admissions ceiling, not cut it. Now is the time to build up our resettlement infrastructure, not decimate it. Now is the time to open our door, not close it. But the Trump administration betrayed the foundational values of this Nation by slashing our annual refugee admissions ceiling to a dismal 30,000 refugees. This was an unprecedented low, both in number and humanity. That is why I introduced the GRACE Act. This bill prohibits any U.S. President from setting an admission ceiling below 95,000 refugees each year and requires administration officials to treat that figure as a goal.

We must not be silent. We must continue to meet the global crisis of displaced persons head on, and like our forefathers, we must extend a hand to those fleeing persecution around the world. Thank you.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO DYLAN WICHMAN

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the honor of recognizing Dylan Wichman, of Billings, for his impact on the Yellowstone community and surrounding areas.

Dylan, only a rising senior at Billings Central High School, earned second place at the State Science Fair and took first at Montana State University-Billings' regional fair for his wildfire predictive and preventative algorithm, FASTCAT. Dylan also participated in the International Science Fair in Phoenix, AZ alongside 1,800 other students from 80 countries. Dylan earned third place in his category.

Inspired by the tragic Paradise Fire in 2018, Dylan put in countless hours to develop FASTCAT. FASTCAT is an algorithm used to predict the size of wildfires before they even occur, to ensure Montanans will be safer and more prepared during fire season. Dylan's artificial intelligence algorithm utilizes a neutral network model, ensuring the algorithm's ability to problem solve as more data is input and analyzed. His innovative creation is an impressive improvement in Montana's existing fire safety and prevention programs. Dylan hopes to see his system implemented State and nationwide and globally in the future. Dylan will continue to work on his program alongside a professor at University of Montana next year.

I congratulate Dylan on his outstanding achievements and willingness to give back to his community. I look forward to seeing his success in his future endeavors.●

TRIBUTE TO BRIGADIER GENERAL DOUGLAS ANDERSON

● Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, today I wish to honor BG Douglas Anderson, who has distinguished himself during his more than 37 years of service to the U.S. Army and this Nation. Throughout the duration of his career, Brigadier General Anderson has served in positions of increased responsibility and trust, culminating as the commanding general of the 9th Mission Support Command at Fort Shafter, HI.

As the commanding general of the 9th Mission Support Command in the Pacific, Brigadier General Anderson has commanded the missions of 31 diverse units, encompassing more than 3,400 soldiers and civilians in three countries, five States and Territories, and crossing seven time zones. In this role, he rapidly increased the organization's readiness level to the highest levels the organization had seen in decades.

During his tenure, Brigadier General Anderson served in leadership, staff, and command assignments in light, ranger, airborne, and mechanized infantry units; commanded a Logistics Support Battalion; was the senior adviser to an Infantry Brigade of the Iraqi Army; the division director of human resources; commanded a personnel services brigade; was the director of the 80th Training; Command Operations/Planning/Training; commanded the 97th Training Brigade; commanded the Great Lakes Training Division; served as the deputy commanding general for the 63rd Regional Support Command; and was the director of the Army Reserve Engagement Cell, and deputy commanding general of the U.S. Army Reserve, U.S. Army Pacific. He has also served in numerous joint and overseas deployments and assignments in Iraq and Republic of Korea.

Brigadier General Anderson was commissioned in May 1988 as a distinguished military graduate of the Reserve Officer Training Corps program at Washington State University. He is a graduate of numerous military courses, including Infantry Officer Basic Course, Armor Officer Advanced Course, Engineer Officer Advanced Course (Tactics), U.S. Marine Corps Amphibious Warfare School, Combined Arms and Services Staff School, U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, U.S. Army War College, Advanced Joint Professional Military Education Course, Canadian Security Studies Program, and United Nations Senior Mission Leader's Course. He is an Army joint planner and joint qualified officer.

Brigadier General Anderson holds a bachelor's degree in political science

and public administration, a master's degree in human resources management, and a master's degree in strategic studies.

Brigadier General Anderson's leadership provided direct and tangible benefits to the Army, government and contracted civilians, citizen soldiers, and their family members. His outstanding service and contributions, coupled with a tireless devotion to duty, a strong love for this country and the soldiers and civilians who protect it, will have an enduring impact.

Brigadier General Anderson is married and has three children. He calls Atlanta, GA, home. Our Nation thanks him and his family for their dedicated service.●

TRIBUTE TO PEG SEMINARIO

● Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, as ranking member of the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, I rise to pay tribute to Peg Seminario, a fierce advocate for working people with more than 40 years leading the AFL-CIO and the labor movement in fighting for stronger protections and safer worker conditions for workers.

Peg has led the AFL-CIO's safety and health program since 1990 and throughout her career has played a leading role in the fight to promulgate strong health and safety standards pertaining to major hazards facing workers, including asbestos, lead, silica, noise, and ergonomics. In fact, she has had a hand in every major health and safety rule adopted since 1977—almost all of which were adopted since the inception of the Occupational Safety and Health Act, OSHA.

She has pushed Congress to protect and enhance the provisions of the OSH Act; to increase Federal funding for critical worker protection Agencies, including the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, the Mine Safety and Health Administration, and the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health; and worked tirelessly to see that first responders who responded after the 9/11 attack and suffered illnesses as a result received the necessary medical care they need and deserve.

I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing Mrs. Seminario's distinguished career and thanking her for her efforts to protect the health and safety of workers in America.●

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL ASSANTE

● Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Michael Assante, a leader, a visionary, and a patriot who has contributed so much to protect our Nation's critical infrastructure and our interests around the world.

Michael Assante began his impressive career as an intelligence officer in the U.S. Navy where he learned the intricacies of cyber security defenses. After leaving the Navy, Mike became

the chief information security officer at one of the largest U.S. utilities, American Electric Power. Mike continued to work in the private sector in the field of cyber security before he joined Idaho National Laboratory, INL, as a critical infrastructure protection specialist. At INL, Michael Assante assembled a unique team of computer experts, power engineers, control systems technicians, grid operators, infrastructure designers, law enforcement officials, and U.S. military special forces officers to tackle the most challenging cyber threats to critical infrastructure. This team has an impressive list of successes and its work continues to this day.

As Mike's accomplishments and recognition grew, he left INL and assumed senior positions at the North American Electric Reliability Corporation, the Council on CyberSecurity, the Center for Internet Security, NexDefense, the SANS Institute, and the Center for Strategic and International Studies. In all of these capacities, Michael Assante brought unique insights and strategies to the effort to protect our critical infrastructure from cyberattack. It was during this time that Mike became a resource to me and my staff, and he helped us better understand the magnitude of the cyber threat to our grid and opportunities for engineered solutions to interrupt the kill chain and mitigate the threat.

As a result of more than two decades of dedication, hard work, and impact, Michael Assante has a long list of noteworthy publications, collaborations, recognitions, and awards, but perhaps his greatest legacy is the thousands of professionals he trained to help protect our Nation's critical infrastructure.

Most Americans, including Mike's family and friends, will never know how much he did to protect U.S. national security interests. As a member of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, I can tell you that he is a giant in his field, and our country is safer because of his efforts. We are grateful for his many contributions.●

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-1719. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Irish Potatoes Grown in Colorado; Modification of the Handling Regulations for Area No. 2" ((7 CFR Part 948) (Docket No. AMS-SC-18-0067)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1720. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Melamine Formaldehyde Polycondensate Resin; Tolerance Exemption" (FRL 9994-34-OCSP) received in the

Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1721. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Trifloxystrobin; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL 9994-67-OCSP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1722. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, "Pilot Program to Establish the Government Lodging Program; Department of Defense Report on the Integrated Lodging Pilot Program (ILPP)" ; to the Committees on Armed Services; Appropriations; and Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1723. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Wildfire Suppression Aircraft Transfer Act of 1996" (RIN0790-AK42) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1724. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Restricting the Temporary Sojourn of Aircraft and Vessels to Cuba" (RIN0694-AH87) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 12, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1725. A communication from the Assistant Director for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Inflation Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties" (31 CFR Parts 501, 510, 535, 536, 539, 541, 542, 544, 546, 547, 548, 549, 560, 561, 566, 576, 583, 584, 588, 592, 594, 595, 597, and 598) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1726. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on appropriations legislation within seven days of enactment; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-1727. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Rule to List the Chambered Nautilus as Threatened Under the Endangered Species Act" (RIN0648-XE685) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1728. 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; Infrastructure State Implementation Plan Requirements for the 2012 PM2.5 NAAQS" (FRL No. 9995-41-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1729. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule en-

titled "Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Open Burning Rules" (FRL No. 9995-42-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1730. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Industry and Analysis, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Implementation of New Commerce Section 232 Exclusions Portal" (RIN0694-AH55) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 13, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1731. A communication from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Housing and Urban Development Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2018 through March 31, 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1732. A communication from the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Met Many Requirements for the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 but Did Not Fully Comply for Fiscal Year 2018" ; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1733. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, three (3) reports relative to a vacancy in the position of Director, United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1734. A communication from the Assistant Administrator of the Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of MAB-CHMINACA in Schedule I" ((21 CFR Part 1308) (Docket No. DEA-421)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1735. A communication from the Assistant Administrator of the Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of Furanyl Fentanyl, 4-Fluoroisobutyl Fentanyl, Acryl Fentanyl, Tetrahydrofuran, and Ocfeantanil in Schedule I" ((21 CFR Part 1308) (Docket No. DEA-490)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1736. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2018 Annual Determination To Implement the Sea Turtle Observer Requirement" (RIN0648-BG90) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1737. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Rule to List the Taiwanese Humpback Dolphin as Endangered Under the Endangered Species Act" (RIN0648-XE571) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1738. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Rulemaking to Designate Critical Habitat for the Main Hawaiian Islands Insular False Killer Whale Distinct Population Segment" (RIN0648-BC45) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1739. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Status of the Gulf of Mexico Bryde's Whale" (RIN0648-XD669) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-95. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana urging the United States Congress to provide adequate funding to the United States Army Corps of Engineers for the completion of the proposed project to deepen the Mississippi River Ship Channel to fifty feet; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 131

Whereas, deepening of the Mississippi River Ship Channel to fifty feet is a historic infrastructure project that is vital to our nation's economic prosperity; and

Whereas, the expansion of the Panama Canal has made it imperative to improve access on the Mississippi River for larger Post-Panamax ships for export and import of goods; and

Whereas, the United States Army Corps of Engineers and the state of Louisiana desire deepening the Mississippi River Ship Channel to fifty feet; and

Whereas, the project is approved and awaiting federal funding; and

Whereas, thirty-one states will receive economic benefits by the enhanced water carrying capacity of the Mississippi River Ship Channel, also known as the gateway to America's Heartland; and

Whereas, the Mississippi River Ship Channel and tributaries currently account for seven hundred fifty billion dollars of the nation's economy and two million four hundred thousand jobs; and

Whereas, each new additional foot of water draft will account for an additional one million dollars in cargo on a vessel. Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana memorializes the Congress of the United States to provide adequate funding to the United States Army Corps of Engineers for the completion of the proposed project to deepen the Mississippi River Ship Channel to fifty feet.

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution shall be transmitted to the secretary of the United States Senate and the clerk of the United States House of Representatives, to each member of the Louisiana delegation to the United States Congress, the assistant secretary of the Army for Civil Works, the commander of the United States Army Corps of Engineers New Orleans District, and the governor.

POM-96. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana urging the United States Congress to review the definition of abortion and the use of the term abortion for medical purposes of medical records when a woman has a spontaneous miscarriage; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 130

Whereas, a spontaneous miscarriage is the unavoidable and untreatable process of naturally ending a pregnancy before the twentieth week of gestation; and

Whereas, according to national estimates, approximately fifteen to twenty percent of all pregnancies in the United States end in miscarriage; and

Whereas, according to the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, roughly sixty percent of miscarriages occur when an embryo has an abnormal number of chromosomes during fertilization, a problem that happens by chance, not as a result of anything the parents did; and

Whereas, the devastation and grief associated with a miscarriage leave women to feel as though they had done something wrong to cause it; and

Whereas, the trauma is compounded by physicians, hospitals, clinics, health insurers, and other healthcare providers interchangeably using medical terminology such as abortion, spontaneous abortion, missed abortion, inevitable abortion, incomplete abortion, or septic abortion with spontaneous miscarriage; and

Whereas, towards the end of the last century, medical journals and healthcare professionals consciously began using the term spontaneous miscarriage instead of abortion as both an intuitive empathetic response to the stigma of abortion and as a reflection of legal, technological, professional, and social developments relative to women who experience miscarriage; and

Whereas, despite the evolution and clinical clarity of the use of the term spontaneous miscarriage, many women are horrified to find that the medical diagnosis or condition listed in their patient medical record indicates abortion; and

Whereas, although not technically incorrect based on customary and acceptable medical terminology, the use of the term abortion has a widely recognized modern day implication of intentionally causing the death of an unborn child; and

Whereas, charting, coding, and billing systems include Current Procedures Terminology (CPT) codes, International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems, 9th revision (ICD-9), diagnosis-related group (DRG) codes, and other diagnosis and procedure codes utilized in the United States healthcare system; and

Whereas, a conscious and collective assessment needs to be done at the highest level of regulatory authority in the United States to provide for definitive and distinctive use of the terms spontaneous miscarriage versus abortion: Therefore, be it Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana memorializes the Congress of the United States to review the definition of abortion and the use of the term abortion for purposes of medical records when a woman has a spontaneous miscarriage; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution shall be transmitted to the secretary of the United States Senate, the clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Louisiana delegation to the United States Congress.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI for the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

*Robert Wallace, of Wyoming, to be Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife.

By Mr. GRAHAM for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Daniel Aaron Bress, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Mary S. McElroy, of Rhode Island, to be United States District Judge for the District of Rhode Island.

Jason K. Pulliam, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas.

Stephanie A. Gallagher, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland.

Eric Ross Komitee, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York.

Rachel P. Kovner, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York.

Lewis J. Liman, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

Martha Maria Pacold, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

Mary M. Rowland, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

Steven C. Seeger, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

John L. Sinatra, Jr., of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of New York.

Mary Kay Vyskocil, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

David Austin Tapp, of Kentucky, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

Gary Richard Brown, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York.

Stephanie Dawkins Davis, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan.

Diane Gujarati, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York.

Frank William Volk, of West Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of West Virginia.

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.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 1915. A bill to require the recording and reporting of communications between the Department of Justice and the White House relating to civil and criminal investigations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWLEY:

S. 1916. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit companies that host videos from enabling child predators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 1917. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the system of public financing for Presidential elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 1918. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require alternative options for summer food service program delivery; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1919. A bill to require certain grantees under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 to submit a plan to track discriminatory land use policies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1920. A bill to establish jobs programs for long-term unemployed workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1921. A bill to provide that primary care services provided by the National Health Service Corps may include palliative care services; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1922. A bill to authorize Federal agencies to establish prize competitions for innovation or adaptation management development relating to coral reef ecosystems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE:

S. 1923. A bill to require the establishment of a Consumer Price Index for Elderly Consumers to compute cost-of-living increases for Social Security benefits under title II of the Social Security Act and to provide, in the case of elderly beneficiaries under such title, for an annual cost-of-living increase which is not less than 3 percent; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 1924. A bill to prevent the purchase of ammunition by prohibited purchasers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PORTMAN:

S. 1925. A bill to authorize State opioid response grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HARRIS:

S. 1926. A bill to increase access to pre-exposure prophylaxis to reduce the transmission of HIV; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 1927. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 with respect to association retirement plans and other multiple employer pension benefit plans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 1928. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the enrollment of retiring individuals in the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HARRIS, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1929. A bill to prohibit the Department of Housing and Urban Development from limiting the eligibility of DACA recipients for certain assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 1930. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, to direct the Commandant of the Coast Guard to report to Congress on efforts to increase gender diversity in the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 1931. A bill to require the Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration to establish a pilot project to provide increased transparency for customers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. MCSALLY, and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 1932. A bill to support water infrastructure in Reclamation States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MCSALLY:

S. 1933. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Biometric Identification Transnational Migration Alert Program in the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1934. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide benefits from the Department of Veterans Affairs for persons disabled by treatment under the Veterans Community Care Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. CASEY, Ms. SMITH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. COONS, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. UDALL):

S. 1935. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that working families have access to affordable health insurance coverage; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. WARREN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 1936. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to protect coverage for screening mammography, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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

S. 1937. A bill to promote merger enforcement and protect competition through adjusting premerger filing fees, and increasing

antitrust enforcement resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. HARRIS, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1938. A bill to provide for grants for States that require fair and impartial police training for law enforcement officers of that State and to incentivize States to enact laws requiring the independent investigation and prosecution of the use of deadly force by law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. BURR, Mr. GARDNER, and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 1939. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish the Strengthening Mobility and Revolutionizing Transportation (SMART) Challenge Grant Program to promote technological innovation in our Nation's communities; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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

S. 1940. A bill to permit legally married same-sex couples to amend their filing status for tax returns outside the statute of limitations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 1941. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to establish a permanent, nationwide summer electronic benefits transfer for children program; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CARPER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. KAINE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. REED, Ms. SMITH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. Res. 254. A resolution commemorating June 20, 2019, as "World Refugee Day"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. BENNET, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. SMITH):

S. Res. 255. A resolution recognizing June 2019 as "Immigrant Heritage Month", a celebration of the accomplishments and contributions immigrants and their children have made in shaping the history, strengthening the economy, and enriching the culture of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. TESTER):

S. Res. 256. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the week of June 16 through June 23, 2019, as "National GI Bill Commemoration Week" and celebrating the 75th anniversary of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JONES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. Res. 257. A resolution designating June 20, 2019, as "American Eagle Day" and celebrating the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. WARREN):

S. Res. 258. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May 2019 as "National Brain Tumor Awareness Month"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. Con. Res. 20. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President should posthumously award the Presidential Medal of Freedom to Harry W. Colmery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 16

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 16, a bill to amend title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the treatment of core seasonal industries affected by antidumping or countervailing duty investigations, and for other purposes.

S. 20

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 20, a bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require the disclosure of certain tax returns by Presidents and certain candidates for the office of the President, and for other purposes.

S. 27

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 27, a bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to transfer certain funds to the 1974 United Mine Workers of America Pension Plan, and for other purposes.

S. 178

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 178, a bill to condemn gross human rights violations of ethnic Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang, and calling for an end to arbitrary detention, torture, and harassment of these communities inside and outside China.

S. 193

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a

cosponsor of S. 193, a bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to require the safe storage of firearms, and for other purposes.

S. 261

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 261, a bill to extend the authorization of appropriations for allocation to carry out approved wetlands conservation projects under the North American Wetlands Conservation Act through fiscal year 2024, and for other purposes.

S. 286

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 286, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 296

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 296, a bill to amend XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 496

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 496, a bill to preserve United States fishing heritage through a national program dedicated to training and assisting the next generation of commercial fishermen, and for other purposes.

S. 510

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 510, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for certain requirements relating to charges for internet, television, and voice services, and for other purposes.

S. 528

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 528, a bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to provide a lactation room in public buildings, and for other purposes.

S. 546

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) 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. 632

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 632, a bill to amend the Internal

Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the inclusion of certain fringe benefit expenses for which a deduction is disallowed in unrelated business taxable income.

S. 638

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) 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. 695

At the request of Mr. SASSE, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 695, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to allow parents of eligible military dependent children to establish Military Education Savings Accounts, and for other purposes.

S. 880

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 880, a bill to provide outreach and reporting on comprehensive Alzheimer's disease care planning services furnished under the Medicare program.

S. 931

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 931, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit and make the credit fully refundable.

S. 1071

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1071, a bill to support empowerment, economic security, and educational opportunities for adolescent girls around the world, and for other purposes.

S. 1083

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1083, a bill to address the fundamental injustice, cruelty, brutality, and inhumanity of slavery in the United States and the 13 American colonies between 1619 and 1865 and to establish a commission to study and consider a national apology and proposal for reparations for the institution of slavery, its subsequent de jure and de facto racial and economic discrimination against African-Americans, and the impact of these forces on living African-Americans, to make recommendations to the Congress on appropriate remedies, and for other purposes.

S. 1207

At the request of Mr. ROMNEY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1207, a bill to approve the

settlement of the water rights claims of the Navajo Nation in Utah, and for other purposes.

S. 1243

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1243, a bill to provide standards for facilities at which aliens in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security are detained, and for other purposes.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1349, a bill to expand enrollment in TSA PreCheck to expedite commercial travel screening and improve airport security.

S. 1394

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1394, a bill to provide collective bargaining rights for public safety officers employed by States or their political subdivisions.

S. 1469

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1469, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit interfering in elections with agents of a foreign government.

S. 1764

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1764, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require the Federal Communications Commission to ensure just and reasonable charges for telephone and advanced communications services in the correctional and detention facilities.

S. 1779

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1779, a bill to repeal the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act.

S. 1822

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1822, a bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to issue rules relating to the collection of data with respect to the availability of broadband services, and for other purposes.

S. 1830

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1830, a bill to enhance the security of the United States and its allies, and for other purposes.

S. 1863

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland

(Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1863, a bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the sites associated with the life and legacy of the noted American philanthropist and business executive Julius Rosenwald, with a special focus on the Rosenwald Schools, and for other purposes.

S. 1906

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1906, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide financial assistance to eligible entities to provide and coordinate the provision of suicide prevention services for veterans at risk of suicide and veteran families through the award of grants to such entities, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 112

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 301

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 301 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 348

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 348 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 357

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 357 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the De-

partment of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 388

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 388 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 417

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 417 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 421

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 421 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 556

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 556 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 563

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 563 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 568

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Massachu-

setts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 568 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 569

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 569 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 576

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the names of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 576 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 592

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 592 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 593

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 593 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 654

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 654 intended

to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 694

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 694 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 702

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 702 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 706

At the request of Mr. ROMNEY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 706 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 739

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 739 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 789

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 789 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel

strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 792

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 792 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 797

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 797 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. PORTMAN:

S. 1925. A bill to authorize State opioid response grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I am here to continue the important conversation we had on this floor about the ongoing addiction crisis we face in this country. Over the past 2 years, I have come to the floor 57 times to talk about addiction, and usually it has been about opioids and the impact opioids are having—tearing our families apart, devastating our communities. There is certainly an opioid epidemic in this country with prescription drugs, fentanyl, heroin—it is true—but we also have to focus on the fact that we have a broader problem. That is what I am going to talk about today, along with what we can do about it.

Congress has done a lot in the last several years. When looking at what was proposed and what was passed, we put new policies in place at the Federal level to promote better prevention, better treatment programs, and better long-term recovery. We passed legislation to stop some of these deadly drugs from coming into our country. That has helped somewhat. Those legislative initiatives, such as the CARA Act, the 21st Century Cures Act, and the STOP Act, are starting to work.

Over \$3 billion of additional funds has been appropriated by this Congress just in the last 3 years alone to ensure that we have the ability to push back against this epidemic. In my home State of Ohio—one of the States hardest hit by this epidemic—we received nearly \$140 million from the CARA and Cures grants. It is going toward stuff that is working—evidence-based pre-

vention, innovative approaches to treatment and getting people into treatment, and closing some of the gaps in the continuum of prevention, treatment, and recovery. A lot of people were falling between the cracks. Closing those gaps has made a big difference in my State. We also equipped our first responders with what they need and the training they need to help push back.

The good news is, these programs are starting to work. Drug overdose deaths are still way too high, but for the first time in 8 years—8 years of increased overdose deaths every year—we are seeing a reduction in overdose deaths.

In my own State of Ohio, we have seen significant progress. We have had a 21-percent drop in our overdose deaths finally after 8 years of increases. This was the biggest drop in the Nation from July 2017 to June of 2018, according to the Centers for Disease Control National Center of Health Statistics. Nationally, again after 8 years of annual increased deaths, we have seen a leveling out—in fact, a very modest downturn. Between 2017 and 2018, overdose deaths fell from 73,000 to 71,000. In all, the overdose rate dropped in 21 States. Overall, there has been only about a 1-percent drop, so it is very modest but a lot better than the alternative we have seen for 8 years, which is increased deaths.

As we begin to turn the tide on the opioid epidemic, I am convinced that we would be doing even better if not for the influx of fentanyl. About 4 or 5 years ago, fentanyl came to our country in a big way—almost entirely from China and almost always through our own U.S. Postal Service, believe it or not—and it has caused all kinds of havoc. It is the deadliest of all the drugs. When you look at overdose deaths, the primary cause now is fentanyl. It is a synthetic drug that is 50 times more powerful than heroin.

We are beginning to push back again, including with our STOP Act, which has now been passed, which requires the post office to begin screening and stopping some of these packages from coming in. We will do a better job in working with China. We have commitments from them, and we hope they will follow through on them.

Even as this limited progress is being made on the opioid front, we have a new, growing danger. I have heard this over the past few years from law enforcement and from providers—from people on the frontlines of the drug epidemic. They are seeing a resurgence of what are called psychostimulants. Mostly it is pure, powerful methamphetamine from Mexico—crystal meth.

In the last couple of months, I have heard about this from the people in the trenches all over Ohio. I have talked to community leaders in Knox County; treatment providers in Southeast Ohio; service providers in Columbus; the ADAMHS Board in Adams, Lawrence, and Scioto Counties; the leadership of

the Hamilton County Heroin Coalition; and community leaders and law enforcement in Butler County and the Dayton area just last week. From all over the State, they all tell me the same thing: We are making some progress now on heroin, and that is good. We are making limited progress on keeping the fentanyl out. But we are spinning our wheels on combating particularly crystal meth, and they are also seeing a resurgence of cocaine—both of which are stimulants, and both of which are causing havoc in these communities, in part because, as a psychostimulant, it leads to more violent behavior.

They are having a devastating impact in my State. According to a 2018 report from Ohio University, these psychostimulants—including meth—were found in just nine overdose deaths in 2010. That number rose to 556 overdose deaths in 2017, which is the most recent data we have. That is an increase of 6,000 percent. That same year, Ohio had more than 1,500 people die of cocaine overdose, which is an almost 140-percent increase from the year before.

This problem isn't isolated to Ohio. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, deaths involving cocaine, crystal meth, and other psychostimulants have increased nationwide. In the more than 70,000 drug overdose deaths in 2017, more than 23,000 or nearly one-third involved cocaine, meth, or both. Just from 2016 to 2017, in that 1 year, death rates involving cocaine and crystal meth increased by approximately 33 percent. Increases occurred across all demographic groups and in all ZIP Codes.

In the case of meth in particular, usage rates have gone up as opioid rates have gone down. I am told by experts that this is for a few reasons. Some meth users initially turned to this drug to manage the heavy crashes that followed prolonged usage of opioids—heroin, fentanyl, and other opioids—and then they became just as addicted to meth as they had been to opioids. Others turn to meth because the drug is stronger and cheaper than other options.

By the way, the days of home chemists and one-pot meth labs in America are largely gone. You probably can remember, 5, 10, 15 years ago, the meth labs in your community. You are not hearing about those now. That is the good thing, but the bad thing is that you are not hearing about them because the stuff coming from Mexico is more powerful and less expensive. The super-labs in Mexico run by the drug cartels are mass-producing this meth. It is powerful, deadly, and low cost. I am told by law enforcement in Columbus, OH, that crystal meth now costs less than marijuana on the streets of Columbus.

Most of this pure crystal meth enters the United States from Mexico in bulk at ports of entry along our southwest border, often hidden in cars and trucks.

Our Customs and Border Protection officers, who are already stretched thin by the ongoing migration crisis, don't have the resources to identify these smuggled shipments. The INTERDICT Act, which we passed here, is beginning to help by providing some technology, but, frankly, we need research on better technology, and we need to provide more funding to ensure we can stop this deadly substance by identifying it at the border to keep it from coming in.

According to U.S. Customs and Border Protection, the amount of methamphetamine at our ports of entry has soared from about 14,000 pounds in 2012 to 56,000 pounds in 2018. We have also seen a 38-percent increase in methamphetamine trafficking along the southern border just in the 1 year from 2017 to 2018. One troubling measurement is that the number of crystal meth submissions to the Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation lab rose from 2,000 in 2015 to over 12,000 in 2018. That is a 500-percent increase in my home State. This is an indication of how much of this is being detained, being found by law enforcement and taken to these labs.

As I heard from folks all across Ohio, we are also seeing meth laced with other drugs, including fentanyl, heroin, and sometimes cocaine. I am told that sometimes the cartels mix these drugs into methamphetamine to lower the cost of the final product, meaning that the users may be consuming dangerous opioids without realizing it. Other traffickers do so because they know that fentanyl is incredibly addictive. You may think it is one thing, but it is really another. Any street drug you use is potentially deadly—remember that.

We still don't have the full picture of how these drugs are being mixed together and sold for consumption. Over the past 2 years, I have seen more reports of individuals in Ohio who used cocaine that, unknown to them, had been mixed with fentanyl. In the last month alone, at least 49 Ohioans in my hometown of Cincinnati, OH, were killed by that deadly combination. It has been hitting our African-American communities particularly hard.

Again, this highlights how the drug cartels sometimes try to hook users by cutting stimulants with addictive, deadly fentanyl, often with lethal outcomes.

The bottom line is, we have to address the broader issue of addiction, not just the issue of individual drugs. We know that crystal meth and cocaine are increasing pretty dramatically. That is why we have to continue our fight against opioid use but also provide more flexibility to our communities. As a result, today I am introducing new legislation designed to address the resurgence of crystal meth and cocaine into our communities.

To date, the grants provided by the 21st Century Cures Act—these are grants that go directly back to the States, and the States determine how

they are used in local communities. These are called State opioid response grants. They have been used to increase access to naloxone—a miracle drug that reverses the overdose. They have also been used for longer term addiction treatment and support services for opioids.

For all the good they have done, these grants can't be used effectively to combat the drug crisis beyond opioids, which ignores the new on-the-ground reality of addiction in my State and many others. So the legislation I am introducing today will make a simple change to existing law. It will allow the State opioid response grants to be more flexible so they can be used for whatever the drug addiction problem is on the ground, which will be a little different for every State and, for that matter, every community. In particular, dollars would be able to be used in programs focused on methamphetamine and cocaine treatment and recovery.

We know these existing funds are making a difference. We have to be sure and keep this program going. That is why my legislation will also reauthorize the State opioid response grants program with this flexibility but reauthorize it for 5 years, providing \$500 million annually to ensure there is stable funding.

A stable funding stream to these States is absolutely essential to having the predictability and the certainty we need to continue to make progress and to avoid these new drugs coming in and creating more devastation in our communities. It is a simple, commonsense change that will allow State and local organizations the flexibility they need to fight what is quickly becoming a two-front war on addiction.

The fact that we are continuing to see these new types of drugs pop up in Ohio and around the country highlights the reality that this is a fight against addiction. Addiction is a disease. Again, this Congress has done an unprecedented amount of work in this area in the last few years, and I commend us for that, but we have to do more. We have to provide this flexibility. We have to be sure we are focusing on the fight against addiction, not just on individual drugs.

While I am encouraged by the welcomed progress in preventing opioid overdose deaths, we cannot rest on our laurels. The cartels continue to pump new combinations of opioids and stimulants into vulnerable communities, hooking individuals on yet another toxic drug and perpetrating this cycle of addiction. Let's keep our unprecedented bipartisan efforts going in this body. Let's continue to partner with allies, local government and State governments, and with our nonprofits. Let's make sure the resources are there to continue to save lives and restore communities.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself,
Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. MCSALLY,
and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 1932. A bill to support water infrastructure in Reclamation States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the Drought Resiliency and Water Supply Improvement Act, which Senator CORY GARDNER (R-CO) introduced today. I am the lead Democratic sponsor on the bill, and Senators MARTHA MCSALLY (R-AZ) and KYRSTEN SINEMA (D-AZ) are also original cosponsors.

Drought—increasingly severe and prolonged drought—is a stark reality for California and the West. Climate change presents a triple threat to our water supply:

Higher temperatures causing a dwindling snowpack, increased evaporation and other effects that will reduce our natural storage and runoff. This could decrease flow in the Colorado River by 20% or more by mid-century and as much as 40% by the end of the century.

Longer and more severe droughts, including perhaps as much as an 80% chance of a megadrought of 20 to 50 years' duration in the Colorado Basin during this century.

Although this is more uncertain, the possibility of reduced overall precipitation, perhaps 10–15% less in California's Sierra Nevada mountains within the next 20–30 years.

We must respond to this challenge. The bill we are introducing today does so in three fundamental ways:

It significantly increases funding for an “all-of-the above” solution to improve our water supply, including surface and groundwater storage, conveyance, water recycling and desalination;

It reforms the Bureau of Reclamation's outdated project delivery system to more quickly approve and more cost-effectively fund new projects; and

It significantly invests not only in water supply projects, but also in environmental restoration to help imperiled species adapt to climate change as well.

Climate Change and Drought: I would like to say more about the effects of climate change on two critical areas for California: the Sierra Nevada Mountains, and the Colorado River Basin.

Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory scientists project that climate change will cause a 54 percent drop in the Sierras' snowpack within the next 20 to 40 years and a 79 percent drop by the end of the century. This change alone could be devastating for California, because we absolutely depend on this snowpack. The Sierra snowpack provides 30% of our water supply and is our biggest reservoir. We need to start now to provide substitute ways for storing precipitation in the Sierras, whether through surface storage, groundwater storage, or improved infrastructure to transport floodwaters to the best recharge areas.

This enhanced storage in its many forms will be helpful not only for water users but also to maintain enough cold

water for salmon. Cold water reserves are critical to prevent salmon runs from being wiped out during years of devastating droughts.

The outlook for the Colorado Basin is perhaps even more challenging. The Colorado River provides a critical part of the water supply for 19 million people in southern California, but that water supply is diminishing. Already in 2019 the water demands on the Colorado River exceed average inflows to the river by 1.2 million to 1.5 million acre feet each year.

That is a huge gap, and the Drought Contingency Plan that was just negotiated among the 7 Colorado River Basin states represents just the beginning of efforts needed to close even the existing gap. With climate change, far more needs to be done, especially with warmer temperatures and greatly increased evaporation in the Basin and with the considerable odds of a megadrought of 20 to 50 years' duration.

The bill we are introducing today provides the Colorado River Basin States with the tools to begin investing in a wide range of water supply projects to meet this challenge. I believe this bill will be critical for helping reach agreement in the next round of negotiations for Colorado River drought contingency plans due to be completed by 2026.

Funding Authorizations in the Bill: In response to the water supply challenges presented by climate change, the bill we are introducing today significantly increases funding authorizations for a wide variety of water supply and environmental restoration projects.

The proposed legislation builds on and doubles the 5-year funding authorizations in the 2016 Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation (WIIN) Act. The bill authorizes the following funding over the next 5 years:

\$670 million for surface and groundwater storage projects, and supporting conveyance;

\$100 million for water recycling projects; and

\$60 million for desalination projects.

In addition, the bill authorizes \$140 million for environmental restoration and compliance projects. These projects include forest, meadow and watershed restoration projects with water benefits and projects to help restore threatened and endangered species affected by Bureau of Reclamation water projects.

Low-Interest Loans for Water Supply Projects: The bill creates a new loan program at 30-year Treasury rates (currently about 2.6%) for water supply projects known as the Reclamation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (RIFIA). The loans would use existing criteria under the successful WIFIA program (the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act).

The Office of Management and the Budget (OMB) has approved loans of \$2.3 billion for WIFIA in fiscal year 2018

backed by appropriations of just over 1% of that amount or \$25 million in budget authority. OMB was able to approve loans backed by just 1% of the loan amount because there is a virtually non-existent default rate for water projects. Only 4 in a thousand water infrastructure projects default, based on a study conducted by the Fitch credit rating agency.

Given OMB's experience that Federal outlays need only cover 1% of the loan cost for water projects, the \$125 million in authorized Federal spending in the draft bill likely could support \$12.5 billion in water project lending authority.

Needless to say, \$12.5 billion is a meaningful amount of Federal low-interest lending assistance for new water supply projects. And, because RIFIA is limited to no more than 49 percent of total project costs, that same \$125 million in RIFIA budget authority will support no less than \$25.5 billion in new water infrastructure investments throughout the west.

Need to Improve Reclamation's Project Delivery System: The bill not only increases funding for drought resiliency projects, it expedites their approvals and assists them more cost-effectively, stretching taxpayer dollars further.

The traditional Bureau of Reclamation model for approving and funding new water supply projects has involved the following:

Reclamation studies new projects in detail, which can take a decade or more for major projects:

Once Reclamation's studies are complete, Congress authorizes projects individually, which can take another 3–5 years or more in many cases; and

Congress then funds 100% of the project construction cost over many years of incremental appropriations, with project sponsors paying back the federal government over 50 years at little to no interest.

One can quickly see that this model can end up taking decades to construct significant new water supply projects. This is especially the case given the limitations of Federal budgets and the increasing cost of major projects in recent years. Given the tremendous challenge posed by climate change to Western water supply, we need a nimbler and more responsive model.

Mike Connor, the Deputy Secretary of the Interior during the Obama Administration, testified in support of a new model during an October 8, 2015 hearing before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. Deputy Secretary Connor stated:

The traditional Reclamation business model, in which feasibility studies, consistent with the 1983 Principles and Guidelines for Water and Related Resources Development, are first authorized, funded, and submitted to Congress, and then construction is authorized and funded, does not always address the needs of project sponsors at the State and local levels. Moreover, given budget limitations and the availability of other available financing mechanisms, the

historic federal role in financing water storage projects through the Bureau of Reclamation must be revisited with a greater emphasis on non-federal financing.

Changes to Traditional Model: In response to the concerns articulated by Deputy Secretary Connor and others, the bill we are introducing today, building on the WIIN Act, makes five significant changes to the traditional Reclamation model. These changes expedite project approvals and make more cost-effective use of available federal funding.

1) Congressional authorization no longer required:

First, the bill eliminates the need for Congress to authorize individual projects. It can take 3–5 years for projects to get legislatively approved or longer. In fact, zero new water recycling projects have been authorized since 2009 due to the Federal earmark ban.

While Congressional authorizations are no longer required, Congress retains full veto authority over which projects get built through the appropriations process. Unless Congress approves funding for the study and construction of individual projects, Reclamation cannot proceed with them.

The advantage of the appropriations process as an alternative mechanism for Congressional approval is that it occurs every year. So rather than waiting 3–5 years or longer for Congressional approval under the traditional model, Congress decides each year whether or not to fund proposed projects.

2) Non-Federal funding is required upfront:

Second, the bill no longer requires 100% federal funding upfront as was necessary under the traditional Reclamation model. Instead, the bill allows a maximum of 50% Federal funding for Federally-owned projects, and a maximum of 25% federal funding for non-federal projects that are built by States, water districts, or Indian tribes.

Federal dollars can be stretched further by the partnerships with States and water districts that will be fostered under the bill. For example, the proposed expansion of Los Vaqueros Reservoir in California would be funded 50% by the State of California, which has already conditionally awarded funding, in addition to potentially 10–25% by the federal government and the remaining 25–40% by water users.

Multi-partner projects like the Los Vaqueros expansion will frequently have multiple benefits. For example, much of the State and Federal funding for the Los Vaqueros expansion would go to augment the water supply of wildlife refuges that provide essential water for migratory birds on the Pacific flyway. These benefits would complement the project's water supply benefits for many Bay Area water districts.

3) Feasibility studies are expedited:

Third, for the non-Federal projects authorized by the bill, the federal

study process would be significantly expedited, and it does so without waiving any environmental protection requirements. The bill makes clear that federal environmental laws must be fully and strictly followed.

Existing law, however, already addresses study procedures in parallel circumstances when the nonfederal entities are building a project and the federal government is only responsible for a minority of the project cost, no more than 25%. In these circumstances, the Federal government can and should expeditiously approve feasibility and other preliminary studies. There is existing precedent for such projects in the guidelines adopted by the Bureau of Reclamation for feasibility studies for water recycling projects under the Title XVI program. Like all the non-federal projects in this bill, these water recycling projects are built by non-federal entities with a maximum 25% federal cost-share.

The bill we are introducing today would direct Reclamation to model its feasibility study standards for all non-federal projects based on the Title XVI example. This will reduce delays in project approval and get these projects built faster.

4) The new loan program is cost-effective:

Fourth, the low-interest loan program created by the bill is an exceptionally cost-effective program. As I mentioned above, OMB has validated that low-interest water project loans need to be backed by Federal appropriations totaling only 1% of the project loan amount.

Federal funding of 1% of the loan amount will typically return 10–25% savings in the repayment cost of the loans for the water districts funding the projects. The total savings can be about 10% for AAA rated districts, and 20–25% for AA-rated districts.

For example, the water users who are supporting the proposed Sites Reservoir in northern California have estimated that the loans authorized by this bill would allow them to pay only \$512/acre-foot for water delivered by the project instead of \$682/acre-foot. This is a 25% reduction in their costs.

Thus, the Federal government can provide a loan at 1% of the loan amount and save the project sponsors 10–25% of the project cost. That is an exceptionally cost-effective federal investment.

There are at least three significant reasons that the loans are so beneficial for the project sponsors:

The sponsors pay about a 2.6% interest rate on their loans based on today's rates, versus 4% or greater rates for the alternative of municipal bond financing.

The districts would not need to start loan repayments until 5 years after substantial completion of the project, a substantial cost saver.

Loans are for 35 rather than 30 years, lowering annual debt service costs.

Significantly, the loans include all the taxpayer protections from the suc-

cessful WIFIA and TIFIA (Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act) programs. In particular, the RIFIA loans would be limited to 49% of the project cost, and the federal loans would have senior status in the event of any default. These provisions ensure the taxpayer won't be harmed in any default where the project retains at least 50% of its value, which is extremely likely for ratepayer backed water supply projects.

5) Federal grants and loans work together:

Fifth, the combination of low-interest loans and Federal grants of up to 25% of project costs for non-Federal projects can allow water users to make up the difference where the Federal government is no longer funding 100% of project costs up front. Many rural communities, and in particular agricultural communities, are not able to pay 100% of the cost of new water supply projects.

Under the bill we are introducing today, these communities will still have to provide a significant cost-share for improving their water supplies, and new water projects will have to be cost-effective enough to justify that investment. However, the Federal government can help build the best and most effective projects in increasing drought resiliency by providing assistance through both grants and loans.

Environmental Benefits: The longer and more severe droughts coming with climate change will adversely affect not just farms and cities, but also the natural environment. The bill includes provisions to improve species' drought resiliency as well.

The significant funding authorization of \$140 million for environmental restoration can be used to benefit many different species, including fish, migratory birds, and forest species. Some of the authorized uses of this funding include:

Improved habitat for salmon, Delta smelt and other fish species adversely affected by the Bureau of Reclamation's water projects;

Additional water for wildlife refuges hosting migratory birds along the Pacific flyway;

Improved stream gauges, monitoring and science to better understand how to restore species and to operate Reclamation water projects with reduced environmental impacts;

Assistance in implementing water-related settlements with State agencies and state water quality laws; and

Forest, meadow and watershed restoration efforts that improve the quality, timing, or other attributes of runoff to reservoirs or groundwater storage facilities.

I want to say a little more about the new authorization for forest, meadow and watershed restoration projects with water benefits. Wildfire and drought are two of our biggest challenges in California, and we need new tools to respond to them.

There are national forest lands and meadows upstream of many reservoirs

in California that are at serious risk of catastrophic fire.

If treatments of these lands restore healthier ecological conditions, it will improve water runoff into the downstream reservoirs and reduce the risk of large sedimentation dumps into the reservoirs from catastrophic fires.

Restoration of these lands may not be a top priority for the Forest Service because that agency's mission does not emphasize water benefits.

The bill being introduced today would authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to contribute a portion of the cost of these projects. The new funding source will in turn make these multi-benefit projects more likely to be implemented.

I believe it is critical that we develop new tools like this one for reducing the risk of catastrophic wildfires, and improving our drought resiliency.

I and the other cosponsors of today's bill are also looking for additional ways to increase the natural environment's resiliency to droughts in our states. We have circulated language for discussion and potential inclusion in the bill that would provide additional funding for "natural water storage projects."

These projects would help restore stream and river channels with natural materials like wetlands. Like many other projects prioritized by the bill, these projects could have multiple benefits, including increased groundwater recharge, improved flood protection, and increased floodplain habitat to benefit salmon and other species.

We look forward to receiving comments on ways to prioritize multi-benefit projects like natural water storage projects as we move forward with the bill.

In addition, the bill makes clear that it must be implemented consistently with all federal environmental laws, including the Endangered Species Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, the Clean Water Act and all other environmental laws. All applicable state laws must also be followed.

Offsets: Finally, the bill includes two provisions offsetting the new spending authorizations within it:

It extends the existing WIIN Act provisions allowing water districts to prepay their outstanding capital debts and convert to indefinite length water supply contracts. These provisions are expected to bring in additional revenue within the 10-year scoring window.

It sets up a process to deauthorize inactive water recycling project authorizations.

Conclusion: California is home to more than 40 million people, but our major state-wide water infrastructure hasn't significantly changed in the past 50 years, when we had only 16 million people.

We must modernize the system or we risk becoming a desert state.

I believe that this bill will place California on a long-term path to drought resiliency. Critically, this means put-

ting in place infrastructure to allow our cities, our farmers, and our natural communities to withstand the severe droughts that we are projected to face due to climate change.

I hope my Western colleagues will join me and the others who have introduced this bill, because drought is a serious threat for all of our states. Thank you, Mr. President, and I yield the floor.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 254—COMMEMORATING JUNE 20, 2019, AS "WORLD REFUGEE DAY"

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CARPER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. KAINE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. REED, Ms. SMITH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 254

Whereas World Refugee Day is a global day to acknowledge the courage, strength, and determination of women, men, and children who are forced to flee their homes due to persecution;

Whereas, according to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (referred to in this preamble as "UNHCR") and the Refugee Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-212), a refugee is someone who—

(1) is outside of the country of his or her nationality; and

(2) is unable or unwilling to return because of persecution or a well-founded fear of persecution for reasons of race, religion, nationality, political opinion, or membership in a particular social group;

Whereas according to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees—

(1) there are more than 70,800,000 displaced people worldwide, the worst displacement crisis in global history, including 25,900,000 refugees, more than 41,300,000 internally displaced people, and 3,500,000 asylum seekers;

(2) the refugee population under UNHCR's mandate has nearly doubled since 2012;

(3) 67 percent of the world's refugees come from just 5 countries: Syria, Afghanistan, South Sudan, Burma, and Somalia;

(4) children account for about ½ of the refugee population in the world, millions of whom are unable to access basic services including education;

(5) 13,600,000 individuals were newly displaced due to conflict or persecution in 2018, including 10,800,000 internally displaced persons and 2,800,000 refugees and asylum seekers, an average of 37,000 people per day;

(6) more than ½ of Syrians lived in displacement in 2018, either displaced across international borders or within their own country;

(7) for the fourth consecutive year, Lebanon hosted the largest number of refugees relative to its population, where 1 in 6 people are refugees;

(8) more than 1,400,000 refugees were in need of resettlement to a third country in 2018; and

(9) 25 countries admitted 92,400 refugees for resettlement in 2018;

Whereas refugee children are 5 times more likely to be out of school than nonrefugee children;

Whereas refugees who are women and children are often at greater risk of violence, human trafficking, exploitation, and gender-based violence;

Whereas the United States resettlement program is a life-saving solution critical to global humanitarian efforts, which serves to strengthen global security, advance United States foreign policy goals, and support regional host countries, while assisting individuals and families in need;

Whereas, during the first 6 months of fiscal year 2019, the United States welcomed 12,155 refugees into the country, which is fewer than 50 percent of the administration's refugee admissions goal of 30,000 refugees;

Whereas, at this pace, the United States may not meet its fiscal year 2019 refugee admissions goal;

Whereas refugees are the most vetted traveler to enter the United States and are subject to extensive screening checks, including in person interviews, biometric data checks, and multiple interagency checks;

Whereas refugees are major contributors to local economies, pay an average of \$21,000 more in taxes than they receive in benefits, and revitalize cities and towns by offsetting population decline and boosting economic growth throughout the country by opening businesses, paying taxes, and buying homes; and

Whereas several industries rely heavily on refugee workers to support their economic stability, and low rates of arrivals of refugees, especially in towns that rely on refugee populations to revitalize their industries, has had serious impacts on economic growth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms the bipartisan commitment of the United States to promote the safety, health, and well-being of the millions of refugees, including the education of refugee children and displaced persons who flee war, persecution, or torture in search of peace, hope, and freedom;

(2) recognizes those individuals who have risked their lives working individually and for nongovernmental organizations and international agencies, such as UNHCR, to provide life-saving assistance and protection for people displaced by conflicts around the world;

(3) underscores the importance of the United States refugee resettlement program as a critical tool for United States global leadership—

(A) to leverage foreign policy;

(B) to strengthen national and regional security; and

(C) to demonstrate international support of refugees;

(4) calls upon the United States Government—

(A) to continue providing robust funding for refugee protection overseas and resettlement in the United States;

(B) to uphold its international leadership role in responding to displacement crises with humanitarian assistance and protection of the most vulnerable populations;

(C) to work in partnership with the international community to find solutions to existing conflicts and prevent new conflicts from beginning;

(D) to alleviate the burden placed on frontline refugee host countries, such as the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, the People's Republic of Bangladesh, and the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, that absorb the majority of the world's refugees

through humanitarian and development support;

(E) to meet the challenges of the worst refugee crisis in recorded history by increasing the number of refugees welcomed to and resettled in the United States to not fewer than 30,000 refugees during fiscal year 2019 and not fewer than 95,000 refugees during fiscal year 2020; and

(F) to reaffirm its long-standing tradition of resettling the most vulnerable refugees, regardless of their country of origin or religious beliefs; and

(5) reaffirms the goals of World Refugee Day and reiterates the strong commitment to protect the millions of refugees who live without material, social, or legal protections.

SENATE RESOLUTION 255—RECOGNIZING JUNE 2019 AS “IMMIGRANT HERITAGE MONTH”, A CELEBRATION OF THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND CONTRIBUTIONS IMMIGRANTS AND THEIR CHILDREN HAVE MADE IN SHAPING THE HISTORY, STRENGTHENING THE ECONOMY, AND ENRICHING THE CULTURE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. BENNET, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. SMITH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 255

Whereas the United States has always been a Nation of immigrants, and throughout the history of the United States, immigrants and their children from around the world have kept the workforce in the United States vibrant and businesses in the United States on the cutting edge, and helped to build the greatest economic engine in the world;

Whereas the entrepreneurial drive and spirit of the United States is built on a diversity of origins;

Whereas the American dream first drew people to the United States and continues to drive business in the United States;

Whereas the success of the United States is a result of the many distinct experiences of the people of the United States, not in spite of it;

Whereas, as a Nation of immigrants, we must remember the generations of pioneers that helped lay the railroads and build cities, develop new industries, and fuel innovation and the exchange of ideas;

Whereas immigrants start more than a quarter of all new businesses in the United States, and immigrants and their children start more than 40 percent of Fortune 500 companies;

Whereas these businesses collectively employ tens of millions of people in the United States and generate more than \$5,500,000,000,000 in annual revenue;

Whereas immigrants enhance the productive capacity of the United States economy and contribute approximately \$2,000,000,000,000, or about 10 percent of annual gross domestic product of the United States;

Whereas immigrants in the United States contribute greatly to advances in technology and sciences;

Whereas 16 percent of all employed college graduates and 54.5 percent of individuals with a Ph.D. working in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and math are immigrants;

Whereas, between 2006 and 2012, 44 percent of new tech startups in Silicon Valley, widely known as the international hub for technological development and innovation, had at least 1 immigrant founder;

Whereas immigrants in the United States plant, cultivate, and harvest the rich diversity of agriculture products available today from the farmlands of the United States;

Whereas each immigrant farm employee supports 2 to 3 full-time jobs in processing, transportation, and retail;

Whereas immigrants involved in agricultural production aid in the food security and independence of the United States;

Whereas the work of immigrants has directly enriched the culture of the United States by influencing the performing arts from Broadway to Hollywood, as well as academia, art, music, literature, media, fashion, cuisine, customs, and cultural celebrations enjoyed across the United States;

Whereas generations of immigrants have come to the United States from all corners of the world, and many immigrants tirelessly fought for the independence of the United States, defending the ideals of the country;

Whereas more than 30,000 lawful permanent residents are serving in the Armed Forces of the United States;

Whereas, since 2002, more than 102,000 men and women, including individuals serving in Iraq, Afghanistan, South Korea, Germany, Japan, and elsewhere, have become citizens while serving in the Armed Forces;

Whereas Congress represents a rich diversity of communities across the United States and works closely with a variety of diaspora leaders from more than 60 ethnic caucuses to ensure that the voices of United States citizens from all backgrounds are heard; and

Whereas the United States was founded on the universal promise that we are all created equal: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes June 2019 as “Immigrant Heritage Month” in honor of the accomplishments and role of immigrants and their children in shaping the history and culture of the United States;

(2) pledges to celebrate immigrant contributions to, and immigrant heritage in, each State;

(3) welcomes immigrants and their children to find their place in the vibrant, multi-ethnic, and integrated society of the United States; and

(4) encourages the people of the United States to always remember the immigrant roots of the United States and to commemorate the immigrant communities that continue to move the country forward.

SENATE RESOLUTION 256—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF THE WEEK OF JUNE 16 THROUGH JUNE 23, 2019, AS “NATIONAL GI BILL COMMEMORATION WEEK” AND CELEBRATING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SERVICEMEN’S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. TESTER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs:

S. RES. 256

Whereas, on July 28, 1943, in seeking a solution to integrate returning members of the Armed Forces into civilian life, President Franklin D. Roosevelt called for a comprehensive set of veterans benefits during a

fireside chat saying, “While concentrating on military victory, we are not neglecting the planning of the things to come Among many other things we are, today, laying plans for the return to civilian life of our gallant men and women in the Armed Services.”;

Whereas, on June 22, 1944, in demonstration of the full support of the United States for the transition of members of the Armed Forces to civilian life, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed into law the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 284, chapter 268), more commonly known as the “G.I. Bill of Rights”;

Whereas the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944 was the culmination of the tireless work and advocacy of veteran service organizations and Members of Congress;

Whereas the Act made immediate financial support, transformative educational benefits, and home loan guarantees available to the 16,000,000 veterans who served in the Armed Forces during World War II;

Whereas the Act helped approximately 7,800,000 veterans enroll in post-secondary education or training, helped to democratize higher education in the United States, and caused total post-secondary education enrollment to grow exponentially from 1,676,856 in 1945, with veterans accounting for 5.2 percent of total post-secondary education enrollment, to 2,338,226 in 1947, with veterans accounting for 49.2 percent of the total;

Whereas the Act contributed approximately 450,000 engineers, 240,000 accountants, 238,000 teachers, 91,000 scientists, 67,000 doctors, 122,000 dentists, 17,000 writers and editors, and thousands of other professionals to the workforce of the United States and expanded the middle class more than at any other point in the history of the United States;

Whereas the Act expressed the duty, responsibility, and desire of a grateful United States to see to it that those who served on active duty in the Armed Forces are afforded every opportunity to become disciplined forces for prosperity and progress in the United States through economic opportunity and investment;

Whereas Congress passed subsequent Acts to provide educational assistance to new generations of veterans, including the Veterans’ Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-358), the Post-Vietnam Era Veterans’ Educational Assistance Act of 1977 (title IV of Public Law 94-502), the Veterans’ Educational Assistance Act of 1984 (title VII of Public Law 98-525), the Post-9/11 Veterans’ Educational Assistance Act of 2008 (title V of Public Law 110-252), and the Harry W. Colmery Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 2017 (Public Law 115-48);

Whereas, since the signing of the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944, the Department of Veterans Affairs has paid approximately \$400,000,000,000 in educational assistance to approximately 25,000,000 veterans and their loved ones who continue to excel academically in post-secondary education;

Whereas the Act created the Department of Veterans Affairs Home Loan Guarantee program, which, since 1944, has provided a pathway for approximately 24,000,000 veterans to purchase a home guaranteed by the Department, the majority of which are purchased with no down payment;

Whereas the Act improved health care opportunities for veterans by transferring medical facilities from the Army and the Navy and providing funding for hospitals of the Department of Veterans Affairs;

Whereas this combination of opportunities changed the social and economic fabric of the United States for the better, with a 1988 report from the Subcommittee on Education

and Health of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress concluding that for every \$1 the United States invested pursuant to the Act, \$6.90 was returned in growth to the economy of the United States;

Whereas 1,262 Members of Congress served in the Armed Forces on or after June 22, 1944, and, therefore, many Members of Congress directly benefitted from the enactment of the Act;

Whereas June 22, 2019, is the 75th anniversary of the date on which President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the Act into law; and

Whereas the week of June 16 through June 23, 2019, is an appropriate week to designate as “National GI Bill Commemoration Week”;

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses support for the designation of the week of June 16 through June 23, 2019, as “National GI Bill Commemoration Week”;

(2) honors the achievements of the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 284, chapter 268), more commonly known as the “G.I. Bill of Rights”, in democratizing higher education, increasing home ownership, establishing greater citizenship through economic empowerment, and empowering a generation that would serve for decades to guide the transformation of the United States into a global force for good;

(3) considers the veterans benefitting from the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944 on the 75th anniversary of its enactment—

(A) to be equal to the challenge of creating a lasting prosperity for the United States as their forebears; and

(B) to have the opportunity to become the heirs to the Greatest Generation;

(4) affirms the responsibility of Congress to be faithful stewards of educational assistance provided under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to ensure that such assistance endures as an honorable investment of public dollars; and

(5) encourages all people of the United States to celebrate June 22, 2019, as the 75th anniversary of the signing of the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944 by President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

SENATE RESOLUTION 257—DESIGNATING JUNE 20, 2019, AS “AMERICAN EAGLE DAY” AND CELEBRATING THE RECOVERY AND RESTORATION OF THE BALD EAGLE, THE NATIONAL SYMBOL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JONES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 257

Whereas the bald eagle was chosen as the central image of the Great Seal of the United States on June 20, 1782, by the Founding Fathers at the Congress of the Confederation;

Whereas the bald eagle is widely known as the living national symbol of the United States and for many generations has represented values, such as—

- (1) freedom;
- (2) democracy;
- (3) courage;
- (4) strength;
- (5) spirit;
- (6) independence;
- (7) justice; and
- (8) excellence;

Whereas the bald eagle is unique to North America and cannot be found naturally in

any other part of the world, which was one of the primary reasons the Founding Fathers selected the bald eagle to symbolize the Government of the United States;

Whereas the bald eagle is the central image used in the official logos of many branches and departments of the Federal Government, including—

- (1) the Executive Office of the President;
- (2) Congress;
- (3) the Supreme Court of the United States;
- (4) the Department of Defense;
- (5) the Department of the Treasury;
- (6) the Department of Justice;
- (7) the Department of State;
- (8) the Department of Commerce;
- (9) the Department of Homeland Security;
- (10) the Department of Veterans Affairs;
- (11) the Department of Labor;
- (12) the Department of Health and Human Services;
- (13) the Department of Energy;
- (14) the Department of Housing and Urban Development;
- (15) the Central Intelligence Agency; and
- (16) the United States Postal Service;

Whereas the bald eagle is an inspiring symbol of the spirit of freedom and the sovereignty of the United States;

Whereas the image and symbolism of the bald eagle has—

(1) played a significant role in art, music, literature, architecture, commerce, education, and culture in the United States; and

(2) appeared on United States stamps, currency, and coinage;

Whereas the bald eagle was endangered and facing possible extinction in the lower 48 States but has made a gradual and encouraging comeback to the land, waterways, and skies of the United States;

Whereas the dramatic recovery of the national bird of the United States is an endangered species success story and an inspirational example to other environmental, natural resource, and wildlife conservation efforts worldwide;

Whereas, in 1940, noting that the bald eagle was threatened with extinction, Congress passed the Act of June 8, 1940 (commonly known as the “Bald Eagle Protection Act”) (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.), which prohibited killing, selling, or possessing the species, and a 1962 amendment expanded protection to the golden eagle;

Whereas, by 1963, there were only an estimated 417 nesting pairs of bald eagles remaining in the lower 48 States, with loss of habitat, poaching, and the use of pesticides and other environmental contaminants contributing to the near demise of the national bird of the United States;

Whereas, in 1967, the bald eagle was officially declared an endangered species under Public Law 89-669 (80 Stat. 926) (commonly known as the “Endangered Species Preservation Act of 1966”) in areas in the United States south of the 40th parallel due to the dramatic decline in the population of the bald eagle in the lower 48 States;

Whereas the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) was enacted in 1973, and in 1978, the bald eagle was listed as an endangered species throughout the lower 48 States, except in the States of Michigan, Minnesota, Oregon, Washington, and Wisconsin, in which the bald eagle was listed as a threatened species;

Whereas, in July 1995, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service announced that in the lower 48 States, the bald eagle had recovered sufficiently to change the status of the species from endangered to threatened;

Whereas, by 2007, bald eagles residing in the lower 48 States had rebounded to approximately 11,000 pairs;

Whereas, on June 28, 2007, the Secretary the Interior and the Director of the United

States Fish and Wildlife Service removed the bald eagle from protection under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), but the bald eagle continues to be protected under the Act of June 8, 1940 (commonly known as the “Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act”) (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.), the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.), section 42 of title 18, United States Code (commonly known as the “Lacey Act”), and the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3371 et seq.);

Whereas Challenger, the trained, educational bald eagle of the American Eagle Foundation in Pigeon Forge, Tennessee, was invited by the Secretary of the Interior to perform a free-flight demonstration during the official bald eagle delisting ceremony held at the Jefferson Memorial in Washington, District of Columbia;

Whereas experts and population growth charts estimate that the bald eagle population could reach 15,000 pairs, even though a physical count has not been conducted by State and Federal wildlife agencies since 2007;

Whereas caring and concerned agencies, corporations, organizations, and people of the United States representing Federal and State governments and the private sector passionately and resourcefully banded together, determined to save and protect the national bird of the United States;

Whereas the recovery of the bald eagle population in the United States was largely accomplished through—

(1) the dedicated and vigilant efforts of Federal and State wildlife agencies and nonprofit organizations, such as the American Eagle Foundation;

(2) public education;

(3) captive breeding and release programs;

(4) hacking and release programs; and

(5) the translocation of bald eagles from places in the United States with dense bald eagle populations to suitable locations in the lower 48 States that had suffered a decrease in bald eagle populations;

Whereas various nonprofit organizations, such as the Southeastern Raptor Center at Auburn University in the State of Alabama, contribute to the continuing recovery of the bald eagle through rehabilitation and educational efforts;

Whereas the bald eagle might have been lost permanently if not for dedicated conservation efforts and strict protection laws such as—

(1) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.);

(2) the Act of June 8, 1940 (commonly known as the “Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act”) (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.);

(3) the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.);

(4) section 42 of title 18, United States Code (commonly known as the “Lacey Act”); and

(5) the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3371 et seq.); and

Whereas the sustained recovery of the bald eagle population will require the continuation of recovery, management, education, and public awareness programs to ensure that the population numbers and habitat of the bald eagle remain healthy and secure for generations to come; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates June 20, 2019, as “American Eagle Day”;

(2) applauds the issuance of bald eagle commemorative coins by the Secretary of the Treasury to generate critical funds for the protection of the bald eagle; and

(3) encourages—

(A) educational entities, organizations, businesses, conservation groups, and government agencies with a shared interest in conserving endangered species to collaborate

and develop educational tools for use in the public schools of the United States; and

(B) the people of the United States to observe American Eagle Day with appropriate ceremonies and other activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 258—EX-PRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF MAY 2019 AS “NATIONAL BRAIN TUMOR AWARENESS MONTH”

Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. WARREN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 258

Whereas an estimated 86,970 new cases of primary brain tumors are expected to be diagnosed in the United States during calendar year 2019;

Whereas pediatric brain tumors are the leading cause of death from cancer in children under the age of 19;

Whereas the average survival rate in the United States for all malignant brain tumor patients is only 35 percent;

Whereas, in 2019, an estimated 16,830 people in the United States will die as a result of a malignant brain tumor;

Whereas brain tumors may be malignant or benign, but can be life-threatening in either case;

Whereas nearly 700,000 people in the United States are currently living with a brain tumor;

Whereas treatment of brain tumors is complicated by the fact that there are more than 130 different types of brain tumors;

Whereas the treatment and removal of brain tumors present significant challenges due to the uniquely complex and fragile nature of the brain;

Whereas brain tumors affect the primary organ in the human body that controls not only cognitive ability, but the actions of every other organ and limb in the body, leading to brain tumors being described as a disease that affects the whole individual;

Whereas brain tumor research is supported by a number of private, nonprofit research foundations and by Federal medical research institutions;

Whereas basic research may fuel advancements and development of new treatments for brain tumors;

Whereas obstacles to the development of new treatments for brain tumors remain, and there are limited strategies for the screening or early detection of brain tumors;

Whereas, despite the high number of individuals diagnosed with a brain tumor every year and the devastating prognoses for such individuals, only 5 drugs and 1 medical device are approved by the Food and Drug Administration to treat brain tumors;

Whereas the mortality rates associated with brain tumors have changed little during the past 30 years;

Whereas there is a need for greater public awareness of brain tumors, including the difficulties associated with research on these tumors and the opportunities for advances in brain tumor research and treatment; and

Whereas May 2019, during which brain tumor advocates nationwide unite in awareness, outreach, and advocacy activities, is an appropriate month to recognize as “National Brain Tumor Awareness Month”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of May 2019 as “National Brain Tumor Awareness Month”;

(2) encourages increased public awareness of brain tumors to honor those individuals

who have lost their lives to this devastating disease or currently live with a brain tumor diagnosis;

(3) supports efforts to develop better treatments for brain tumors that will improve the quality of life and the long-term prognoses of those individuals diagnosed with a brain tumor;

(4) expresses its support for those individuals who are battling brain tumors, as well as the families, friends, and caregivers of those individuals; and

(5) urges a collaborative approach to brain tumor research, which is a promising means of advancing understanding of, and treatment for, brain tumors.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 20—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THE PRESIDENT SHOULD POSTHUMOUSLY AWARD THE PRESIDENTIAL MEDAL OF FREEDOM TO HARRY W. COLMERY

Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. CON. RES. 20

Whereas the life of Harry W. Colmery of Topeka, Kansas, was marked by service to the United States and its citizens;

Whereas in 1916, Harry Colmery earned a degree in law from the University of Pittsburgh and successfully argued 2 significant cases before the Supreme Court of the United States;

Whereas during World War I, Harry Colmery joined the Army Air Service, serving as a first lieutenant during the early stages of military aviation;

Whereas after World War I, Harry Colmery actively contributed to the growth of the newly formed American Legion and went on to hold several offices in the Legion and was elected National Commander in 1936;

Whereas in 1943, the United States faced the return from World War II of what was to become an active duty force of 15,000,000 soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines;

Whereas Harry Colmery spearheaded the efforts of the American Legion to develop legislation to ensure that these individuals, who had fought for the democratic ideals of the United States and to preserve freedom, could fully participate in all of the opportunities the United States provided;

Whereas in December 1943, during an emergency meeting of the American Legion leadership, Harry Colmery initially drafted the legislation that became the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944, also known as the GI Bill of Rights;

Whereas the GI Bill of Rights is credited by veterans’ service organizations, economists, and historians as the engine that transformed the postwar United States into a more egalitarian, prosperous, and enlightened Nation poised to lead the world into the 21st century;

Whereas since its enactment, the GI Bill of Rights has provided education or training for approximately 7,800,000 individuals, including 2,200,000 in college, 3,400,000 in other schools, 1,400,000 in vocational education, and 690,000 in farm training;

Whereas 2,100,000 World War II veterans purchased homes through the GI Bill;

Whereas the initial GI Bill has provided education and training to over 800,000 professionals that serve the Nation in specific career fields, including 450,000 engineers, 238,000 teachers, 91,000 scientists, 67,000 doctors, and 22,000 dentists;

Whereas in 1945, President Truman established the Presidential Medal of Freedom to recognize notable service during the war, and in 1963, President Kennedy reinstated the medal to honor the achievement of civilians during peacetime;

Whereas pursuant to Executive Order 11085 (27 Fed. Reg. 1759), the President may award the Medal of Freedom to any person who has made an especially meritorious contribution to—

(1) the security or national interest of the United States;

(2) world peace; or

(3) other significant public or private endeavors; and

Whereas Harry Colmery, noted for his service in the military, in the legal sector, and on behalf of the veterans of the Nation, meets the criteria established for the Presidential Medal of Freedom: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the President should posthumously award the Presidential Medal of Freedom to Harry W. Colmery of Topeka, Kansas.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 803. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 804. Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 805. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 806. Mr. YOUNG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 807. Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 808. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 809. Mr. ROMNEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 810. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. CARPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 811. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 812. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 813. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 814. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 815. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 816. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 817. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 818. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 819. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 820. Mr. PETERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 821. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 822. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 823. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 824. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 825. Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. CRUZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 826. Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 827. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 828. Ms. MCSALLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 829. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 830. Ms. HARRIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 831. Ms. HARRIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 832. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 833. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 834. Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 835. Mr. VAN HOLLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 836. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 837. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. JONES, and Mrs. CAPITO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 838. Ms. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 839. Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 840. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 841. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 803. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. **ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS FOR ACQUISITION OF A TRANSMISSION ELECTRON MICROSCOPE.**

(a) **ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR ACQUISITION OF A TRANSMISSION ELECTRON MICROSCOPE.**—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2020 by section 201 for acquisition of a Transmission Electron Microscope is hereby increased by \$5,000,000, with the amount of the increase to be available for Defense Research Sciences (PE 0601102A) for transmission electron microscopy (TEM) use in advanced analyses of materials for bio-

medical research, micro- and nano-electronics research, advanced manufacturing and materials research and development, superconductivity, and for other purposes.

(b) **OFFSET.**—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2020 by section 201 for AF RDT&E is hereby decreased by \$5,000,000 for Future Advanced Weapon Analysis & Programs (PE 0604200F).

SA 804. Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title X, add the following:

Subtitle I—Fair Chance Act

SEC. 1091. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Fair Chance to Compete for Jobs Act of 2019” or the “Fair Chance Act”.

SEC. 1092. PROHIBITION ON CRIMINAL HISTORY INQUIRIES PRIOR TO CONDITIONAL OFFER FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subpart H of part III of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“CHAPTER 92—PROHIBITION ON CRIMINAL HISTORY INQUIRIES PRIOR TO CONDITIONAL OFFER

“Sec.

“9201. Definitions.

“9202. Limitations on requests for criminal history record information.

“9203. Agency policies; complaint procedures.

“9204. Adverse action.

“9205. Procedures.

“9206. Rules of construction.

“§ 9201. Definitions

“In this chapter—

“(1) the term ‘agency’ means ‘Executive agency’ as such term is defined in section 105 and includes—

“(A) the United States Postal Service and the Postal Regulatory Commission; and

“(B) the Executive Office of the President;

“(2) the term ‘appointing authority’ means an employee in the executive branch of the Government of the United States that has authority to make appointments to positions in the civil service;

“(3) the term ‘conditional offer’ means an offer of employment in a position in the civil service that is conditioned upon the results of a criminal history inquiry;

“(4) the term ‘criminal history record information’—

“(A) except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C), has the meaning given the term in section 9101(a);

“(B) includes any information described in the first sentence of section 9101(a)(2) that has been sealed or expunged pursuant to law; and

“(C) includes information collected by a criminal justice agency, relating to an act or alleged act of juvenile delinquency, that is analogous to criminal history record information (including such information that has been sealed or expunged pursuant to law); and

“(5) the term ‘suspension’ has the meaning given the term in section 7501.

“§ 9202. Limitations on requests for criminal history record information

“(a) **INQUIRIES PRIOR TO CONDITIONAL OFFER.**—Except as provided in subsections

(b) and (c), an employee of an agency may not request, in oral or written form (including through the Declaration for Federal Employment (Office of Personnel Management Optional Form 306) or any similar successor form, the USAJOBS internet website, or any other electronic means) that an applicant for an appointment to a position in the civil service disclose criminal history record information regarding the applicant before the appointing authority extends a conditional offer to the applicant.

“(b) OTHERWISE REQUIRED BY LAW.—The prohibition under subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to an applicant for a position in the civil service if consideration of criminal history record information prior to a conditional offer with respect to the position is otherwise required by law.

“(c) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN POSITIONS.—“(1) IN GENERAL.—The prohibition under subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to an applicant for an appointment to a position—

“(A) that requires a determination of eligibility described in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of section 9101(b)(1)(A);

“(B) as a Federal law enforcement officer (as defined in section 115(c) of title 18); or

“(C) identified by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management in the regulations issued under paragraph (2).

“(2) REGULATIONS.—

“(A) ISSUANCE.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall issue regulations identifying additional positions with respect to which the prohibition under subsection (a) shall not apply, giving due consideration to positions that involve interaction with minors, access to sensitive information, or managing financial transactions.

“(B) COMPLIANCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS LAWS.—The regulations issued under subparagraph (A) shall—

“(i) be consistent with, and in no way supersede, restrict, or limit the application of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.) or other relevant Federal civil rights laws; and

“(ii) ensure that all hiring activities conducted pursuant to the regulations are conducted in a manner consistent with relevant Federal civil rights laws.

“§ 9203. Agency policies; complaint procedures

“The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall—

“(1) develop, implement, and publish a policy to assist employees of agencies in complying with section 9202 and the regulations issued pursuant to such section; and

“(2) establish and publish procedures under which an applicant for an appointment to a position in the civil service may submit a complaint, or any other information, relating to compliance by an employee of an agency with section 9202.

“§ 9204. Adverse action

“(a) FIRST VIOLATION.—If the Director of the Office of Personnel Management determines, after notice and an opportunity for a hearing on the record, that an employee of an agency has violated section 9202, the Director shall—

“(1) issue to the employee a written warning that includes a description of the violation and the additional penalties that may apply for subsequent violations; and

“(2) file such warning in the employee’s official personnel record file.

“(b) SUBSEQUENT VIOLATIONS.—If the Director of the Office of Personnel Management determines, after notice and an opportunity for a hearing on the record, that an employee that was subject to subsection (a) has committed a subsequent violation of section 9202, the Director may take the following action:

“(1) For a second violation, suspension of the employee for a period of not more than 7 days.

“(2) For a third violation, suspension of the employee for a period of more than 7 days.

“(3) For a fourth violation—

“(A) suspension of the employee for a period of more than 7 days; and

“(B) a civil penalty against the employee in an amount that is not more than \$250.

“(4) For a fifth violation—

“(A) suspension of the employee for a period of more than 7 days; and

“(B) a civil penalty against the employee in an amount that is not more than \$500.

“(5) For any subsequent violation—

“(A) suspension of the employee for a period of more than 7 days; and

“(B) a civil penalty against the employee in an amount that is not more than \$1,000.

“§ 9205. Procedures

“(a) APPEALS.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall by rule establish procedures providing for an appeal from any adverse action taken under section 9204 by not later than 30 days after the date of the action.

“(b) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER LAWS.—An adverse action taken under section 9204 (including a determination in an appeal from such an action under subsection (a) of this section) shall not be subject to—

“(1) the procedures under chapter 75; or

“(2) except as provided in subsection (a) of this section, appeal or judicial review.

“§ 9206. Rules of construction

“Nothing in this chapter may be construed to—

“(1) authorize any officer or employee of an agency to request the disclosure of information described under subparagraphs (B) and (C) of section 9201(4); or

“(2) create a private right of action for any person.”

(b) REGULATIONS; EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall issue such regulations as are necessary to carry out chapter 92 of title 5, United States Code (as added by this subtitle).

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 9202 of title 5, United States Code (as added by this subtitle), shall take effect on the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for part III of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 91 the following:

“92. Prohibition on criminal history inquiries prior to conditional offer 9201”.

(d) APPLICATION TO LEGISLATIVE BRANCH.—(1) IN GENERAL.—The Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 102(a) (2 U.S.C. 1302(a)), by adding at the end the following:

“(12) Section 9202 of title 5, United States Code.”;

(B) by redesignating section 207 (2 U.S.C. 1317) as section 208; and

(C) by inserting after section 206 (2 U.S.C. 1316) the following new section:

“SEC. 207. RIGHTS AND PROTECTIONS RELATING TO CRIMINAL HISTORY INQUIRIES.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ‘agency’, ‘criminal history record information’, and ‘suspension’ have the meanings given the terms in section 9201 of title 5, United States Code, except as otherwise modified by this section.

“(b) RESTRICTIONS ON CRIMINAL HISTORY INQUIRIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an employee of an employing office may not request that an applicant for employment as a covered employee disclose criminal history record information if the request would be prohibited under section 9202 of title 5, United States Code, if made by an employee of an agency.

“(B) CONDITIONAL OFFER.—For purposes of applying that section 9202 under subparagraph (A), a reference in that section 9202 to a conditional offer shall be considered to be an offer of employment as a covered employee that is conditioned upon the results of a criminal history inquiry.

“(2) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—The provisions of section 9206 of title 5, United States Code, shall apply to employing offices, consistent with regulations issued under subsection (d).

“(c) REMEDY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The remedy for a violation of subsection (b)(1) shall be such remedy as would be appropriate if awarded under section 9204 of title 5, United States Code, if the violation had been committed by an employee of an agency, consistent with regulations issued under subsection (d), except that the reference in that section to a suspension shall be considered to be a suspension with the level of compensation provided for a covered employee who is taking unpaid leave under section 202.

“(2) PROCESS FOR OBTAINING RELIEF.—An applicant for employment as a covered employee who alleges a violation of subsection (b)(1) may rely on the provisions of title IV (other than section 407 or 408, or a provision of this title that permits a person to obtain a civil action or judicial review), consistent with regulations issued under subsection (d).

“(d) REGULATIONS TO IMPLEMENT SECTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Fair Chance to Compete for Jobs Act of 2019, the Board shall, pursuant to section 304, issue regulations to implement this section.

“(2) PARALLEL WITH AGENCY REGULATIONS.—The regulations issued under paragraph (1) shall be the same as substantive regulations issued by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management under section 1092(b)(1) of the Fair Chance to Compete for Jobs Act of 2019 to implement the statutory provisions referred to in subsections (a) through (c) except to the extent that the Board may determine, for good cause shown and stated together with the regulation, that a modification of such regulations would be more effective for the implementation of the rights and protections under this section.

“(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 102(a)(12) and subsections (a) through (c) shall take effect on the date on which section 9202 of title 5, United States Code, applies with respect to agencies.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(A) The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (Public Law 104–1; 109 Stat. 3) is amended—

(i) by redesignating the item relating to section 207 as the item relating to section 208; and

(ii) by inserting after the item relating to section 206 the following new item:

“Sec. 207. Rights and protections relating to criminal history inquiries.”

(B) Section 62(e)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “or 207” and inserting “207, or 208”.

(e) APPLICATION TO JUDICIAL BRANCH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 604 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) RESTRICTIONS ON CRIMINAL HISTORY INQUIRIES.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

“(A) the terms ‘agency’ and ‘criminal history record information’ have the meanings given those terms in section 9201 of title 5;

“(B) the term ‘covered employee’ means an employee of the judicial branch of the United States Government, other than—

“(i) any judge or justice who is entitled to hold office during good behavior;

“(ii) a United States magistrate judge; or

“(iii) a bankruptcy judge; and

“(C) the term ‘employing office’ means any office or entity of the judicial branch of the United States Government that employs covered employees.

“(2) RESTRICTION.—A covered employee may not request that an applicant for employment as a covered employee disclose criminal history record information if the request would be prohibited under section 9202 of title 5 if made by an employee of an agency.

“(3) EMPLOYING OFFICE POLICIES; COMPLAINT PROCEDURE.—The provisions of sections 9203 and 9206 of title 5 shall apply to employing offices and to applicants for employment as covered employees, consistent with regulations issued by the Director to implement this subsection.

“(4) ADVERSE ACTION.—

“(A) ADVERSE ACTION.—The Director may take such adverse action with respect to a covered employee who violates paragraph (2) as would be appropriate under section 9204 of title 5 if the violation had been committed by an employee of an agency.

“(B) APPEALS.—The Director shall by rule establish procedures providing for an appeal from any adverse action taken under subparagraph (A) by not later than 30 days after the date of the action.

“(C) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER LAWS.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an adverse action taken under subparagraph (A) (including a determination in an appeal from such an action under subparagraph (B)) shall not be subject to appeal or judicial review.

“(5) REGULATIONS TO BE ISSUED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Fair Chance to Compete for Jobs Act of 2019, the Director shall issue regulations to implement this subsection.

“(B) PARALLEL WITH AGENCY REGULATIONS.—The regulations issued under subparagraph (A) shall be the same as substantive regulations promulgated by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management under section 1092(b)(1) of the Fair Chance to Compete for Jobs Act of 2019 except to the extent that the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts may determine, for good cause shown and stated together with the regulation, that a modification of such regulations would be more effective for the implementation of the rights and protections under this subsection.

“(6) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Paragraphs (1) through (4) shall take effect on the date on which section 9202 of title 5 applies with respect to agencies.”.

SEC. 1093. PROHIBITION ON CRIMINAL HISTORY INQUIRIES BY CONTRACTORS PRIOR TO CONDITIONAL OFFER.

(a) CIVILIAN AGENCY CONTRACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 47 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 4714. Prohibition on criminal history inquiries by contractors prior to conditional offer

“(a) LIMITATION ON CRIMINAL HISTORY INQUIRIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), an executive agency—

“(A) may not require that an individual or sole proprietor who submits a bid for a contract to disclose criminal history record information regarding that individual or sole proprietor before determining the apparent awardee; and

“(B) shall require, as a condition of receiving a Federal contract and receiving payments under such contract that the contractor may not verbally, or through written form, request the disclosure of criminal history record information regarding an applicant for a position related to work under such contract before the contractor extends a conditional offer to the applicant.

“(2) OTHERWISE REQUIRED BY LAW.—The prohibition under paragraph (1) does not apply with respect to a contract if consideration of criminal history record information prior to a conditional offer with respect to the position is otherwise required by law.

“(3) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN POSITIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The prohibition under paragraph (1) does not apply with respect to—

“(i) a contract that requires an individual hired under the contract to access classified information or to have sensitive law enforcement or national security duties; or

“(ii) a position that the Administrator of General Services identifies under the regulations issued under subparagraph (B).

“(B) REGULATIONS.—

“(i) ISSUANCE.—Not later than 16 months after the date of enactment of the Fair Chance to Compete for Jobs Act of 2019, the Administrator of General Services, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall issue regulations identifying additional positions with respect to which the prohibition under paragraph (1) shall not apply, giving due consideration to positions that involve interaction with minors, access to sensitive information, or managing financial transactions.

“(ii) COMPLIANCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS LAWS.—The regulations issued under clause (i) shall—

“(I) be consistent with, and in no way supersede, restrict, or limit the application of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.) or other relevant Federal civil rights laws; and

“(II) ensure that all hiring activities conducted pursuant to the regulations are conducted in a manner consistent with relevant Federal civil rights laws.

“(b) COMPLAINT PROCEDURES.—The Administrator of General Services shall establish and publish procedures under which an applicant for a position with a Federal contractor may submit to the Administrator a complaint, or any other information, relating to compliance by the contractor with subsection (a)(1)(B).

“(c) ACTION FOR VIOLATIONS OF PROHIBITION ON CRIMINAL HISTORY INQUIRIES.—

“(1) FIRST VIOLATION.—If the head of an executive agency determines that a contractor has violated subsection (a)(1)(B), such head shall—

“(A) notify the contractor;

“(B) provide 30 days after such notification for the contractor to appeal the determination; and

“(C) issue a written warning to the contractor that includes a description of the violation and the additional remedies that may apply for subsequent violations.

“(2) SUBSEQUENT VIOLATION.—If the head of an executive agency determines that a contractor that was subject to paragraph (1) has committed a subsequent violation of subsection (a)(1)(B), such head shall notify the contractor, shall provide 30 days after such notification for the contractor to appeal the determination, and, in consultation with the relevant Federal agencies, may take actions,

depending on the severity of the infraction and the contractor’s history of violations, including—

“(A) providing written guidance to the contractor that the contractor’s eligibility for contracts requires compliance with this section;

“(B) requiring that the contractor respond within 30 days affirming that the contractor is taking steps to comply with this section; and

“(C) suspending payment under the contract for which the applicant was being considered until the contractor demonstrates compliance with this section.

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) CONDITIONAL OFFER.—The term ‘conditional offer’ means an offer of employment for a position related to work under a contract that is conditioned upon the results of a criminal history inquiry.

“(2) CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORD INFORMATION.—The term ‘criminal history record information’ has the meaning given that term in section 9201 of title 5.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 47 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“4714. Prohibition on criminal history inquiries by contractors prior to conditional offer.”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 4714 of title 41, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1), shall apply with respect to contracts awarded pursuant to solicitations issued after the effective date described in section 1092(b)(2) of this subtitle.

(b) DEFENSE CONTRACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2338 the following new section:

“§ 2339. Prohibition on criminal history inquiries by contractors prior to conditional offer

“(a) LIMITATION ON CRIMINAL HISTORY INQUIRIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), the head of an agency—

“(A) may not require that an individual or sole proprietor who submits a bid for a contract to disclose criminal history record information regarding that individual or sole proprietor before determining the apparent awardee; and

“(B) shall require as a condition of receiving a Federal contract and receiving payments under such contract that the contractor may not verbally or through written form request the disclosure of criminal history record information regarding an applicant for a position related to work under such contract before such contractor extends a conditional offer to the applicant.

“(2) OTHERWISE REQUIRED BY LAW.—The prohibition under paragraph (1) does not apply with respect to a contract if consideration of criminal history record information prior to a conditional offer with respect to the position is otherwise required by law.

“(3) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN POSITIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The prohibition under paragraph (1) does not apply with respect to—

“(i) a contract that requires an individual hired under the contract to access classified information or to have sensitive law enforcement or national security duties; or

“(ii) a position that the Secretary of Defense identifies under the regulations issued under subparagraph (B).

“(B) REGULATIONS.—

“(i) ISSUANCE.—Not later than 16 months after the date of enactment of the Fair Chance to Compete for Jobs Act of 2019, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with

the Administrator of General Services, shall issue regulations identifying additional positions with respect to which the prohibition under paragraph (1) shall not apply, giving due consideration to positions that involve interaction with minors, access to sensitive information, or managing financial transactions.

“(ii) COMPLIANCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS LAWS.—The regulations issued under clause (i) shall—

“(I) be consistent with, and in no way supersede, restrict, or limit the application of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.) or other relevant Federal civil rights laws; and

“(II) ensure that all hiring activities conducted pursuant to the regulations are conducted in a manner consistent with relevant Federal civil rights laws.

“(b) COMPLAINT PROCEDURES.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish and publish procedures under which an applicant for a position with a Department of Defense contractor may submit a complaint, or any other information, relating to compliance by the contractor with subsection (a)(1)(B).

“(c) ACTION FOR VIOLATIONS OF PROHIBITION ON CRIMINAL HISTORY INQUIRIES.—

“(1) FIRST VIOLATION.—If the Secretary of Defense determines that a contractor has violated subsection (a)(1)(B), the Secretary shall—

“(A) notify the contractor;

“(B) provide 30 days after such notification for the contractor to appeal the determination; and

“(C) issue a written warning to the contractor that includes a description of the violation and the additional remedies that may apply for subsequent violations.

“(2) SUBSEQUENT VIOLATIONS.—If the Secretary of Defense determines that a contractor that was subject to paragraph (1) has committed a subsequent violation of subsection (a)(1)(B), the Secretary shall notify the contractor, shall provide 30 days after such notification for the contractor to appeal the determination, and, in consultation with the relevant Federal agencies, may take actions, depending on the severity of the infraction and the contractor’s history of violations, including—

“(A) providing written guidance to the contractor that the contractor’s eligibility for contracts requires compliance with this section;

“(B) requiring that the contractor respond within 30 days affirming that the contractor is taking steps to comply with this section; and

“(C) suspending payment under the contract for which the applicant was being considered until the contractor demonstrates compliance with this section.

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) CONDITIONAL OFFER.—The term ‘conditional offer’ means an offer of employment for a position related to work under a contract that is conditioned upon the results of a criminal history inquiry.

“(2) CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORD INFORMATION.—The term ‘criminal history record information’ has the meaning given that term in section 9201 of title 5.”

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 2339(a) of title 10, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1), shall apply with respect to contracts awarded pursuant to solicitations issued after the effective date described in section 1092(b)(2) of this subtitle.

(3) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2338 the following new item:

“2339. Prohibition on criminal history inquiries by contractors prior to conditional offer.”.

(c) REVISIONS TO FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council shall revise the Federal Acquisition Regulation to implement section 4714 of title 41, United States Code, and section 2339 of title 10, United States Code, as added by this section.

(2) CONSISTENCY WITH OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT REGULATIONS.—The Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council shall revise the Federal Acquisition Regulation under paragraph (1) to be consistent with the regulations issued by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management under section 1092(b)(1) to the maximum extent practicable. The Council shall include together with such revision an explanation of any substantive modification of the Office of Personnel Management regulations, including an explanation of how such modification will more effectively implement the rights and protections under this section.

SEC. 1094. REPORT ON EMPLOYMENT OF INDIVIDUALS FORMERLY INCARCERATED IN FEDERAL PRISONS.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘covered individual’—

(1) means an individual who has completed a term of imprisonment in a Federal prison for a Federal criminal offense; and

(2) does not include an alien who is or will be removed from the United States for a violation of the immigration laws (as such term is defined in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101)).

(b) STUDY AND REPORT REQUIRED.—The Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics, in coordination with the Director of the Bureau of the Census, shall—

(1) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, design and initiate a study on the employment of covered individuals after their release from Federal prison, including by collecting—

(A) demographic data on covered individuals, including race, age, and sex; and

(B) data on employment and earnings of covered individuals who are denied employment, including the reasons for the denials; and

(2) not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 5 years thereafter, submit a report that does not include any personally identifiable information on the study conducted under paragraph (1) to—

(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives; and

(D) the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives.

SA 805. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle F of title V, add the following:

SEC. 582. EXPANSION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR THE MY CAREER ADVANCEMENT ACCOUNT PROGRAM TO CERTAIN MILITARY SPOUSES.

(a) ELIGIBILITY FOR PARTICIPANTS WHOSE SPOUSES RECEIVE PROMOTIONS.—Beginning on October 1, 2020, a military spouse who is participating in the My Career Advancement Account program of the Department of Defense (in this section referred to as the ‘‘Program’’) may not become ineligible for the Program solely because the member of the Armed Forces to whom the military spouse is married receives a promotion in grade.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the Program.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of employment rates for military spouses that identifies—

(i) the career fields most military spouses frequently pursue; and

(ii) the extent to which such rates may be improved by expanding the Program to include reimbursements for licensing reciprocity.

(B) An assessment of costs required to expand the Program as described in subparagraph (A)(ii).

(c) FUNDING.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2021 for the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance, Defense-wide, not more than \$5,000,000 may be available for the purposes of this section.

SA 806. Mr. YOUNG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title II, add the following:

SEC. ____ . PLAN ON ADVANCEMENT OF FUNDAMENTAL HYPERSONIC SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ACTIVITIES.

(a) PLAN REQUIRED.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan to advance fundamental hypersonic science and technology activities.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The plan submitted under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) Identification of high priority hypersonics basic research efforts and fundamental research challenges of the Department of Defense.

(2) Identification of organizations designated to fund university hypersonic research.

(3) A plan for partnerships with universities on matters relating to the advancement of fundamental hypersonic science and technology research and development, including by establishing a consortium of research universities.

(4) Development of a strategy for using university expertise to support workforce development, acquisition program oversight, and basic research activities.

(5) Options for university experts to work in Department labs and test centers on hypersonics.

SA 807. Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VIII of the amendment, add the following:

SEC. 811. GUIDANCE ON BUY AMERICAN ACT AND BERRY AMENDMENT REQUIREMENTS.

(a) BUY AMERICAN ACT GUIDANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of Defense Pricing/Defense Procurement Acquisition Policy shall review, and if necessary update, and issue guidance to Department of Defense contracting officials on requirements related to chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code (commonly referred to as the “Buy American Act”). The guidance shall reflect any Department actions taken in response to the April 18, 2017, Executive Order No. 13738, “Buy American and Hire American” and in response to the recommendations of the Department of Defense Inspector General report entitled “Summary Report of DoD Compliance With the Berry Amendment and the Buy American Act”.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The guidance issued under paragraph (1) shall cover—

(A) the requirement to incorporate and enforce the Buy American Act provisions and clauses in applicable solicitations and contracts; and

(B) the requirements of the Buy American Act, such as inclusion of clauses, into the electronic contract writing systems used by the military departments and the Defense Logistics Agency.

(b) BERRY AMENDMENT GUIDANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of Defense Pricing/Defense Procurement Acquisition Policy shall review, and if necessary update, and issue guidance to Department of Defense contracting officials on requirements related to section 2533a of title 10, United States Code (commonly referred to as the “Berry Amendment”).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The guidance issued under paragraph (1) shall cover—

(A) the requirement to incorporate and enforce the Berry Amendment in applicable solicitations and contracts; and

(B) the requirements of the Berry Amendment, such as inclusion of clauses, into the electronic contract writing systems used by the military departments and the Defense Logistics Agency.

(c) BRIEFING ON ACTIVITIES.—Not later than March 1, 2020, the Secretary of Defense shall brief the congressional defense committees on activities undertaken pursuant to this section.

SA 808. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and

for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VIII of the amendment, add the following:

SEC. 811. REPORT ON CONTRACTOR DENIAL OF COST OR PRICING DATA REQUESTS.

Not later than December 31, 2020, and annually thereafter, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment shall submit to Congress a report summarizing each case in which a contractor refused a request from the contracting officer for uncertified cost or pricing data.

SA 809. Mr. ROMNEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1262. POLICY WITH RESPECT TO EXPANSION OF COOPERATION WITH ALLIES AND PARTNERS IN THE INDO-PACIFIC REGION AND EUROPE REGARDING THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Congress supports the finding on the People's Republic of China articulated in the 2018 National Defense Strategy and the 2017 National Security Strategy.

(2) The People's Republic of China is leveraging military modernization, influence operations, and predatory economics to coerce neighboring countries to reorder the Indo-Pacific region to the advantage of the People's Republic of China.

(3) As the People's Republic of China continues its economic and military ascendance, asserting power through a whole of government long-term strategy, the People's Republic of China will continue to pursue a military modernization program that seeks Indo-Pacific regional hegemony in the near-term and displacement of the United States to achieve global preeminence in the future.

(4) The most far-reaching objective of the defense strategy of the United States is to set the military relationship between the United States and the People's Republic of China on a path toward transparency and nonaggression.

(5) The People's Republic of China uses economic inducements and penalties, influence operations, and implied military threats to persuade other countries to heed the political and security agenda of the People's Republic of China.

(6) United States allies and partners are critical to effective competition with the People's Republic of China.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to expand military, diplomatic, and economic alliances and partnerships in the Indo-Pacific region and with Europe and like-minded countries around the globe that are critical to effective competition with the People's Republic of China; and

(2) to develop, in collaboration with such allies and partners, a unified approach to addressing and deterring significant diplomatic, economic, and military challenges posed by the People's Republic of China.

SA 810. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. CARPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1290. EXCLUSION OF IMPOSITION OF DUTIES AND IMPORT QUOTAS FROM PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITIES UNDER INTERNATIONAL EMERGENCY ECONOMIC POWERS ACT.

Section 203 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c)(1) The authority granted to the President by this section does not include the authority to impose duties or tariff-rate quotas or (subject to paragraph (2)) other quotas on articles entering the United States.

“(2) The limitation under paragraph (1) does not prohibit the President from excluding all articles, or all of a certain type of article, imported from a country from entering the United States.”.

SA 811. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1290. UNITED STATES PROPORTIONAL FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS.

The financial contributions of the United States to the United Nations shall be proportional to the number of member countries of the United Nations.

SA 812. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1290. UNITED STATES PROPORTIONAL FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO NATO.

The financial contributions of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization shall be proportional to the number of member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

SA 813. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title III, add the following:

SEC. 342. REPORT ON UTILIZATION OF 24TH TACTICAL AIR SUPPORT SQUADRON.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 1, 2019, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the utilization of the 24th Tactical Air Support Squadron and the sortie allocation to training in close air support.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Due to limited fighter and bomber aircraft availability, it is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of the Air Force should utilize additional contract close air support in fiscal year 2020 to meet the growing training requirements for Joint Terminal Attack Controllers in the Air Force, including the reserve components.

SA 814. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Section 5211 is amended to read as follows:
SEC. 5211. DEVELOPMENT AND ACQUISITION STRATEGY TO PROCURE SECURE, LOW PROBABILITY OF DETECTION DATA LINK NETWORK CAPABILITY.

The text of subsections (a) through (c) of section 211 are hereby deemed to read as follows:

“(a) STRATEGY REQUIRED.—Not later than April 1, 2020, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Chief of Staff of the Army shall jointly submit to the congressional defense committees a joint development and acquisition strategy to procure a secure, low probability of detection data link network capability, with the ability to effectively operate in hostile jamming environments while preserving the low observability characteristics of the relevant platforms, including both existing and planned platforms.

“(b) NETWORK CHARACTERISTICS.—The data link network capability to be procured pursuant to the development and acquisition strategy submitted under subsection (a) shall—

“(1) ensure that any network made with such capability will be low risk and affordable, with minimal impact or change to existing host platforms and minimal overall integration costs;

“(2) use a non-proprietary and open systems approach compatible with the Rapid Capabilities Office Open Mission Systems initiative of the Air Force and the Future Airborne Capability Environment initiative of the Navy; and

“(3) provide for an architecture to connect, with operationally relevant throughput and latency—

“(A) fifth-generation combat aircraft;

“(B) fifth-generation and fourth-generation combat aircraft;

“(C) fifth-generation and fourth-generation combat aircraft and appropriate support aircraft and other network nodes for command, control, communications, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance purposes; and

“(D) fifth-generation and fourth-generation combat aircraft and their associated network-enabled precision weapons.

“(c) LIMITATION.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2020 for operations and maintenance for the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force, for operations and maintenance for the Office of the Secretary of the Navy, and for operations and maintenance for the Office of the Secretary of the Army, not more than 75 percent may be obligated or expended until the date that is 15 days after the date on which the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Chief of Staff of the Army submit the development and acquisition strategy required by subsection (a).”

SA 815. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title X, insert the following:

SEC. ____ FEES ERRONEOUSLY COLLECTED BY DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS FOR HOUSING LOANS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Department of Veterans Affairs offers a Department backed home loan for which veterans are generally required to pay fees to defray the cost of administering the home loan.

(2) Veterans are exempt from paying the fees if they are entitled to receive disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(3) Between January 1, 2012, and December 31, 2017, veterans paid fees of more than \$286,000,000 in association with Department backed home loans despite being exempt from such fees. Fees paid included \$65,800,000 in fees that could have been avoided.

(4) Of those erroneously paid fees, \$189,000,000 in fee refunds are still due to veterans.

(5) More than 70,000 veterans may have been affected by these erroneously paid fees.

(b) REFUNDS OF ERRONEOUSLY COLLECTED FEES.—Section 3729(c) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3)(A) The Secretary shall develop a process for determining whether a fee has been collected under this section from a veteran described in paragraph (1).

“(B) If the Secretary determines that a fee was collected under this section from a veteran described in paragraph (1), the Secretary pay to such veteran an amount equal to the amount of the fee collected.

“(C) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a payment under this paragraph shall not be subject to Federal, State, or other tax liability or reporting requirement.

“(D) A payment under subparagraph (B) shall be made directly to a veteran, notwith-

standing any current loan balance of the veteran or the manner in which the fee was originally collected.

“(4)(A) The Secretary shall develop an automated process for refunding fees under paragraph (3)(B).

“(B) For any individual identified under the process developed under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall process the refund without requiring further request.”

(c) PLAN TO IDENTIFY INDIVIDUALS WHO WERE ERRONEOUSLY CHARGED FEES.—

(1) ERRONEOUS CHARGES JANUARY 1, 2012, TO DECEMBER 31, 2017.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to Congress a plan to identify veterans described in subsection (c)(1) of section 3729 of title 38, United States Code, from whom a fee was collected under such section during the period beginning on January 1, 2012, and ending on December 31, 2017.

(B) CONTENTS.—The plan submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(i) The number of veterans who may be due a refund of the fee.

(ii) A timeline for the refunding of fees.

(2) ERRONEOUS CHARGES BEFORE JANUARY 1, 2012.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to Congress a plan to identify veterans described in subsection (c)(1) of section 3729 of title 38, United States Code, from whom a fee was collected under such section before January 1, 2012.

(B) CONTENTS.—The plan submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(i) The number of veterans who may be due a refund of the fee.

(ii) A timeline for the refunding of fees.

(d) PLAN TO PROCESS REFUNDS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop a plan to process refunds of fees that were collected under section 3729 of title 38, United States Code, from individuals described in subsection (c)(1) of such section.

(e) ANNUAL REPORT ON REFUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not less frequently than once each year, the Secretary shall submit to Congress an annual report on refunds of fees collected under section 3729 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include, for the period covered by the report:

(A) The number of fees collected under such section that were refunded and applied to a home loan balance.

(B) The number of such refunds for which the Secretary received documentation of the application of a refund to a home loan balance.

(f) ACCURACY OF CERTIFICATES OF ELIGIBILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall update such policies as may be necessary to ensure that certificates of eligibility are accurate at the time they are used for the purposes of determining eligibility for housing loans guaranteed, insured, or made under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, and for purposes of determining eligibility for exemption from the collection of fees under section 3729 of such title.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the solution developed under paragraph (1).

(g) AUDIT PLAN.—

(1) PLAN REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall develop a plan to audit the Department on an annual basis to determine the rate at which fees are erroneously collected under section 3729 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) REPORTS.—Not later than 60 days after the completion of any audit conducted pursuant to the plan developed under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the findings of the Secretary with respect to the audit.

SA 816. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFINITION OF EMPLOYER UNDER NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT.

Section 2 of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 152) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by inserting “or any Indian Tribe, or any enterprise or institution owned and operated by an Indian Tribe and located on its Indian lands,” after “subdivision thereof.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(15) The term ‘Indian Tribe’ means any Indian Tribe, band, nation, pueblo, or other organized group or community which is recognized as eligible for the special programs and services provided by the United States to Indians because of their status as Indians.

“(16) The term ‘Indian’ means any individual who is a member of an Indian Tribe.

“(17) The term ‘Indian lands’ means—

“(A) all lands within the limits of any Indian reservation;

“(B) any lands title to which is either held in trust by the United States for the benefit of any Indian Tribe or Indian or held by any Indian Tribe or Indian subject to restriction by the United States against alienation; and

“(C) any lands in the State of Oklahoma that are within the boundaries of a former reservation (as defined by the Secretary of the Interior) of a federally recognized Indian Tribe.”.

SA 817. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 1025.

SA 818. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 1025 and insert the following:

SEC. 1025. SENSE OF SENATE ON TRANSFER OF INDIVIDUALS DETAINED AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA, TO THE UNITED STATES TEMPORARILY FOR EMERGENCY OR CRITICAL MEDICAL TREATMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of the Senate that the Secretary of Defense could temporarily transfer an individual detained at Guantanamo to a Department of Defense medical facility in the United States for the sole purpose of providing the individual medical treatment if the Secretary determines that—

(1) the medical treatment of the individual is necessary to prevent death or imminent significant injury or harm to the health of the individual;

(2) the necessary medical treatment is not available to be provided at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, without incurring excessive and unreasonable costs; and

(3) the Department of Defense has provided for appropriate security measures for the custody and control of the individual during any period in which the individual is temporarily in the United States pursuant to such transfer.

(b) INDIVIDUAL DETAINED AT GUANTANAMO DEFINED.—In this section, the term “individual detained at Guantanamo” means an individual located at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as of October 1, 2009, who—

(1) is not a national of the United States (as defined in section 101(a)(22) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(22)) or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is—

(A) in the custody or under the control of the Department of Defense; or

(B) otherwise detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay.

SA 819. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title II, add the following:

SEC. _____. REDESIGNATION OF THE COMMANDANT OF THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY AS THE DIRECTOR AND CHANCELLOR OF THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9414b of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “Commandant” each place it appears and inserting “Director and Chancellor”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any references in any law, regulations, map, document, paper or other record of the United States to the Commandant of the United States Air Force Institute of Technology shall be deemed to be reference to the Director and Chancellor of the United States Air Force Institute of Technology.

SA 820. Mr. PETERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of De-

fense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PILOT PROGRAM TO IMPROVE PUBLIC-PRIVATE CYBERSECURITY OPERATIONAL COLLABORATION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “appropriate congressional committees and leadership” means—

(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Armed Services, the Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the majority leader, and the minority leader of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Armed Services, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Speaker, and the minority leader of the House of Representatives;

(2) the term “appropriate Federal agencies” means—

(A) the Department of Homeland Security; and

(B) any other agency, as determined by the Secretary;

(3) the term “collaboration effort” means an effort undertaken by the appropriate Federal agencies and 1 or more non-Federal entities under the pilot program in order to carry out the purpose of the pilot program;

(4) the term “critical infrastructure” has the meaning given that term in section 1016(e) of the USA PATRIOT Act (42 U.S.C. 5195c(e));

(5) the term “cybersecurity provider” means a non-Federal entity that provides cybersecurity services to another non-Federal entity;

(6) the term “cybersecurity threat” means a cybersecurity threat, as defined in section 102 of the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015 (6 U.S.C. 1501), that affects—

(A) the national security of the United States; or

(B) critical infrastructure in the United States;

(7) the term “malicious cyber actor” means an entity that poses a cybersecurity threat;

(8) the term “non-Federal entity” has the meaning given the term in section 102 of the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015 (6 U.S.C. 1501); and

(9) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT; PURPOSE.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the heads of the appropriate Federal agencies, may establish a pilot program under which the appropriate Federal agencies, as coordinated and facilitated by the Secretary, may identify and partner with cybersecurity organizations capable of enabling information sharing of cybersecurity threats among cybersecurity providers in order to coordinate and magnify Federal and non-Federal efforts to prevent or disrupt cybersecurity threats or malicious cyber actors, by, as appropriate—

(1) sharing information relating to potential actions by the Federal Government against cybersecurity threats or malicious cyber actors with non-Federal entities; and

(2) facilitating coordination between the appropriate Federal agencies and non-Federal entities relating to cybersecurity threats or malicious cyber actors.

(c) PARTICIPATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The heads of other Federal departments and agencies may choose to participate in the pilot program on a voluntary basis.

(2) IMPACT ON OTHER INFORMATION SHARING ARRANGEMENTS.—Implementation of the pilot program shall not adversely impact the operations of the Federal cyber security centers or any other information sharing arrangements between a Federal department or agency and a private sector entity entered into before or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) FEDERAL COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall facilitate all Federal coordination, planning, and action relating to the pilot program.

(e) ANNUAL REPORTS TO APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES AND LEADERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and each year thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership a report on the collaboration efforts carried out during the year for which the report is submitted, which shall include—

(A) a statement of the total number collaboration efforts carried out during the year;

(B) with respect to each collaboration effort carried out during the year—

(i) a statement of—

(I) the identity of any malicious cyber actor that, as a result of a cybersecurity threat that the malicious cyber actor engaged in or was likely to engage in, was a subject of the collaboration effort;

(II) the responsibilities under the collaboration effort of each appropriate Federal agency and each non-Federal entity that participated in the collaboration effort; and

(III) whether the goal of the collaboration effort was achieved; and

(ii) a description of how each appropriate Federal agency and each non-Federal entity that participated in the collaboration effort collaborated in carrying out the collaboration effort; and

(C) a description of—

(i) the ways in which the collaboration efforts carried out during the year—

(I) were successful; and

(II) could have been improved; and

(ii) how the Secretary will improve collaboration efforts carried out on or after the date on which the report is submitted.

(2) FORM.—Any report submitted under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(f) TERMINATION.—The pilot program shall terminate on the date that is 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(g) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to—

(1) authorize a non-Federal entity to engage in any activity in violation of section 1030(a) of title 18, United States Code; or

(2) limit an appropriate Federal agency or a non-Federal entity from engaging in a lawful activity.

SA 821. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR ACQUISITION OF A TRANSMISSION ELECTRON MICROSCOPE.

(a) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2020 by section 201 for research, development, test, and evaluation is hereby increased by \$5,000,000, with the amount of the increase to be available for Defense Research Sciences (PE 0601102A).

(2) AVAILABILITY.—The amount available under paragraph (1) shall be available for transmission electron microscopy equipment and research to support the following:

(A) Advanced analyses of materials for biomedical research.

(B) Micro- and nano-electronics research.

(C) Advanced manufacturing and materials research and development.

(D) Superconductivity research.

(E) For such other matters as the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate.

(b) OFFSET.—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2020 by section 201 for research, development, test, and evaluation is hereby decreased by \$5,000,000, with the amount of the decrease to be taken from amounts made available for Future Advanced Weapon Analysis & Programs (PE 0604200F).

SA 822. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7131 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e)(1)(A) Not later than March 31 of each calendar year, the Office of Personnel Management, in consultation with the Office of Management and Budget, shall submit to each House of Congress a report on the operation of this section during the fiscal year last ending before the start of such calendar year.

“(B) Not later than December 31 of each calendar year, each agency (as defined by section 7103(a)(3)) shall furnish to the Office of Personnel Management the information which such Office requires, with respect to such agency, for purposes of the report which is next due under subparagraph (A).

“(2) Each report by the Office of Personnel Management under this subsection shall include, with respect to the fiscal year described in paragraph (1)(A), at least the following information:

“(A) The total amount of official time granted to employees.

“(B) The average amount of official time expended per bargaining unit employee.

“(C) The specific types of activities or purposes for which official time was granted, and the impact which the granting of such official time for such activities or purposes had on agency operations.

“(D) The total number of employees to whom official time was granted, and, of that total, the number who were not engaged in any activities or purposes except activities or purposes involving the use of official time.

“(E) The total amount of compensation (including fringe benefits) afforded to employees in connection with activities or purposes for which they were granted official time.

“(F) The total amount of official time spent by employees representing Federal employees who are not union members in matters authorized by this chapter.

“(G) A description of any room or space designated at the agency (or its subcomponent) where official time activities will be conducted, including the square footage of any such room or space.

“(3) All information included in a report by the Office of Personnel Management under this subsection with respect to a fiscal year—

“(A) shall be shown both agency-by-agency and for all agencies; and

“(B) shall be accompanied by the corresponding information (submitted by the Office in its report under this subsection) for the fiscal year before the fiscal year to which such report pertains, together with appropriate comparisons and analyses.

“(4) For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘official time’ means any period of time, regardless of agency nomenclature—

“(A) which may be granted to an employee under this chapter (including a collective bargaining agreement entered into under this chapter) to perform representational or consultative functions; and

“(B) during which the employee would otherwise be in a duty status.”

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be effective beginning with the report which, under the provisions of such amendment, is first required to be submitted by the Office of Personnel Management to each House of Congress by a date which occurs at least 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 823. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1086. AMENDMENTS TO THE SOAR ACT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “SOAR Reauthorization Act of 2019”.

(b) AMENDMENTS TO SOAR.—The Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act (division C of Public Law 112-10) is amended—

(1) in section 3007 (sec. 38-1853.07 D.C. Official Code)—

(A) by striking subsection (c) and redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c);

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in the subsection heading, by striking “AND PARENTAL ASSISTANCE” and inserting “, PARENTAL ASSISTANCE, AND STUDENT ACADEMIC ASSISTANCE”;

(ii) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “\$2,000,000” and inserting “\$2,200,000”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) The expenses of providing tutoring service to participating eligible students that need additional academic assistance. If there are insufficient funds to provide tutoring services to all such students in a year, the eligible entity shall give priority in such

year to students who previously attended an elementary school or secondary school identified as one of the lowest-performing schools under the District of Columbia's accountability system." and

(C) in subsection (c), as redesignated by subparagraph (A)—

(i) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking "subsections (b) and (c)" and inserting "subsection (b)"; and

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking "subsections (b) and (c)" and inserting "subsection (b)";

(2) in section 3008(h) (sec. 38–1853.08 D.C. Official Code)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking "section 3009(a)(2)(A)(i)" and inserting "section 3009(a)";

(B) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

"(2) The Institute of Education Sciences may administer assessments to students participating in the evaluation under section 3009(a) for the purpose of conducting the evaluation under such section." and

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking "the nationally norm-referenced standardized test described in paragraph (2)" and inserting "a nationally norm-referenced standardized test";

(3) in section 3009(a) (sec. 38–1853.09 D.C. Official Code)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking "annually";

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

"(i) is rigorous; and"; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking "impact of the program" and all that follows through the end of the subparagraph and inserting "impact of the program on academic achievement and educational attainment.";

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by striking "ON EDUCATION" and inserting "OF EDUCATION";

(ii) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by inserting "the academic progress of" after "assess"; and

(II) by striking "in each of grades 3" and all that follows through the end of the subparagraph and inserting "; and";

(iii) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(iv) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B); and

(D) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking "A comparison of the academic achievement of participating eligible students who use an opportunity scholarship on the measurements described in paragraph (3)(B) to the academic achievement" and inserting "The academic progress of participating eligible students who use an opportunity scholarship compared to the academic progress";

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking "increasing the satisfaction of such parents and students with their choice" and inserting "those parents' and students' satisfaction with the program"; and

(iii) by striking subparagraph (D) through (F) and inserting the following:

"(D) The high school graduation rates, college enrollment rates, college persistence rates, and college graduation rates of participating eligible students who use an opportunity scholarship compared with the rates of public school students described in subparagraph (A), to the extent practicable.

"(E) The college enrollment rates, college persistence rates, and college graduation rates of students who participated in the program as the result of winning the Opportunity Scholarship Program lottery compared to the enrollment, persistence, and graduation rates for students who entered but did not win such lottery and who, as a

result, served as the control group for previous evaluations of the program under this division. Nothing in this subparagraph may be construed to waive section 3004(a)(3)(A)(iii) with respect to any such student.

"(F) The safety of the schools attended by participating eligible students who use an opportunity scholarship compared with the schools in the District of Columbia attended by public school students described in subparagraph (A), to the extent practicable." and

(4) in section 3014(a) (sec. 38–1853.14, D.C. Official Code), by striking "fiscal year 2019" and inserting "fiscal year 2024".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (b) shall take effect on September 30, 2019.

SA 824. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . LEVERAGING COMMERCIAL SATELLITE REMOTE SENSING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In acquiring geospatial-intelligence, the Secretary of Defense shall leverage, to the maximum extent practicable, the capabilities of United States industry, including through the use of commercial geospatial-intelligence services and acquisition of commercial satellite imagery.

(b) OBTAINING FUTURE DATA.—The Secretary, as part of an analysis of alternatives for the future acquisition of Department of Defense space systems for geospatial-intelligence, shall—

(1) consider whether there is a suitable, cost-effective, commercial capability available that can meet any or all of the Department's requirements;

(2) if a suitable, cost-effective, commercial capability is available as described in paragraph (1), determine whether it is in the national interest to develop a governmental space system; and

(3) include, as part of the established acquisition reporting requirements to the appropriate committees of Congress, any determination made under paragraphs (1) and (2).

(c) DEFINITION OF APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—In this section, the term "appropriate committees of Congress" means—

(1) the congressional defense committees;

(2) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(3) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SA 825. Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. CRUZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title III, add the following:

SEC. 342. REPORT ON EFFECT OF WIND TURBINE PROJECTS ON SAFETY, TRAINING, AND READINESS OF AIR FORCE PILOTS.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the cumulative effect of wind turbine projects on the safety, training, and readiness of Air Force pilots.

SA 826. Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1086. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION AND THE GOVERNMENT OF BELGIUM BY WHICH THE COMMISSION WOULD ACQUIRE, RESTORE, OPERATE, AND MAINTAIN THE MARDASSON MEMORIAL IN BASTOGNE, BELGIUM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress make the following findings:

(1) The Battle of the Bulge was the largest land battle of World War II in which the United States fought, yielded more than 75,000 American casualties over the winter of 1944–1945, and stopped the final German offensive on the Western Front.

(2) The Battle of the Bulge is the second largest battle fought in the history of the United States Army.

(3) Following the war, Belgian groups raised funds to construct the Mardasson Memorial in Bastogne, Belgium, to honor Americans killed, wounded, and missing in action during the Battle of the Bulge.

(4) The Mardasson Memorial, inaugurated in 1950, is a five-pointed American star with the history of the battle, the names of the units that fought, and the names of the States engraved in gold letters throughout.

(5) The Mardasson Memorial, owned and maintained by the Government of Belgium, and the only memorial to the United States effort during the Battle of the Bulge, is in need of extensive repair to restore it to a condition commensurate to the service and sacrifice it honors.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress to support an agreement between the American Battle Monument Commission (hereinafter referred to as "ABMC") and the Government of Belgium—

(1) under the monument maintenance program of the ABMC, and subject to the requirements of such program, by which the ABMC would use its expertise and presence in Europe to oversee restoration of the Mardasson Memorial in preparation for the 75th anniversary of the Battle of the Bulge; and

(2) under the monument trust fund program of the ABMC, and subject to the requirements of such program, by which the ABMC assumes ownership and responsibility for the Mardasson Memorial, ensuring that the Memorial stands for decades to come, honoring American service and sacrifice, and inspiring future generations.

SA 827. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1272. REPORT ON IMPROVEMENTS TO DEFERENCE EFFORTS WITH RESPECT TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA AND THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with Commander of the United States Indo-Pacific Command and the Commander of the United States European Command, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report detailing efforts of the Department of Defense to improve the ability of the United States Armed Forces to conduct combined joint operations—

(1) to deny the ability of the People's Republic of China to execute a fait accompli against Taiwan; and

(2) to deny the ability of the Russian Federation to execute a fait accompli against one or more Baltic allies.

(b) MATTER TO BE INCLUDED.—The report under subsection (a) shall identify prioritized requirements for further improving the ability of the United States Armed Forces to conduct combined joint operations to achieve the objectives described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of that subsection.

(c) FORM.—The report under subsection (a) shall—

(1) be submitted in classified form; and

(2) include an unclassified summary appropriate for release to the public.

(d) FAIT ACCOMPLI DEFINED.—In this section, the term “fait accompli” means a scenario in which the People's Republic of China or the Russian Federation uses force to rapidly seize territory and subsequently threatens further escalation, potentially including the use of nuclear weapons, to deter an effective response by the United States Armed Forces through combined joint operations.

SA 828. Ms. MCSALLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . ILLEGAL BORDER CROSSINGS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) During the first 5 months of May 2019, the United States Border Patrol has apprehended more than 593,000 people illegally crossing the southern border of the United States, which represents more apprehension than in all of 2018.

(2) In May 2019, 132,887 people were apprehended by the United States Border Patrol, of whom more than 96,000 were part of family units or unaccompanied minors.

(3) This recent surge in illegal border crossings—

(A) has placed an unprecedented strain on the resources of the Department of Homeland Security, which has responded by directing U.S. Customs and Border Patrol resources away from legal ports of entry; and

(B) exceeds the capacity of the Department of Health and Human Services, which is responsible for the care of unaccompanied children who are apprehended at the border.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the recent surge of illegal border crossings—

(A) is a national security threat; and

(B) has put significant strain on the departments and agencies that are responsible for securing the border, implementing our Nation's immigration laws, and providing temporary housing for the people who are awaiting removal proceedings; and

(2) the recent increase in apprehensions along the southern border, coupled with the lack of sufficient resources at the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Health and Human Services will further exacerbate this humanitarian crisis.

SA 829. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part I of subtitle F of title V, add the following:

SEC. 5 ____ . PILOT PROGRAM ON EDUCATION SAVINGS ACCOUNTS FOR MILITARY DEPENDENT CHILDREN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—From amounts made available under subsection (k), the Secretary shall carry out a pilot program under which the Secretary shall establish education savings accounts for eligible military students to enable such students to attend public or private elementary schools or secondary schools selected by the students' parents.

(b) DURATION.—The pilot program under this section shall begin with the first school year that begins after the date of enactment of this section and shall terminate at the end of the fifth school year that begins after such date of enactment.

(c) SCOPE OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall select one military installation to participate in the pilot program under this section. In making such selection, the Secretary shall choose a military installation at which eligible military students will derive the greatest benefit from expanded educational options, as determined by the Secretary.

(d) DEPOSITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall deposit funds in the amount specified in paragraph (2) into each education savings account established on behalf of an eligible military student under this section.

(2) AMOUNT OF DEPOSIT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The amount deposited into each education savings account awarded to an eligible military student shall be \$6,000 for each school year.

(B) ADJUSTMENT FOR INFLATION.—For each school year after the first full school year of the program, the amount specified in subparagraph (A) shall be adjusted to reflect changes for the 12-month period ending the preceding June in the Chained Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers pub-

lished by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor.

(e) ELIGIBLE USES OF FUNDS.—Funds deposited into an education savings account under this section for a school year may be used by the parent of an eligible military student to make payments to a qualified educational service provider that is approved by the Secretary under subsection (f) for—

(1) costs of attendance at a private elementary school or secondary school recognized by the State, which may include a private school that has a religious mission;

(2) private online programs;

(3) private tutoring;

(4) services provided by a public elementary school or secondary school attended by the child on a less than full-time basis, including individual classes and extracurricular activities and programs;

(5) textbooks, curriculum programs, or other instructional materials, including any supplemental materials required by a curriculum program, private school, private online learning program, or a public school, or any parent directed curriculum associated with kindergarten through grade 12 education;

(6) educational services and therapies, including occupational, behavioral, physical, speech-language, and audiology therapies; or

(7) any other educational expenses approved by the Secretary.

(f) REQUIREMENTS FOR QUALIFIED EDUCATIONAL SERVICE PROVIDERS.—The Secretary shall establish and maintain a registry of qualified educational service providers that are approved to receive payments from an education savings account established under this section. The Secretary shall approve a qualified educational service provider to receive such payments if the provider demonstrates to the Secretary that it is licensed in the State in which it operates to provide one or more of the services for which funds may be expended under subsection (e).

(g) PARTICIPATION IN ONLINE MARKET PLACE.—As a condition of receiving funds from an education savings account, a qualified educational service provider shall make its services available for purchase through the online marketplace described in subsection (h).

(h) ONLINE MARKETPLACE.—The Secretary shall seek to enter into a contract with a private-sector entity under which the entity shall—

(1) establish and operate an online marketplace that enables the holder of an education savings account to make direct purchases from qualified educational service providers using funds from such account;

(2) ensure that each qualified educational service provider on the registry maintained by the Secretary under subsection (f) has made its services available for purchase through the online marketplace;

(3) ensure that all purchases made through the online marketplace are for services that are allowable uses of funds under this section; and

(4) develop and make available a standardized expense report form, in electronic and hard copy formats, to be used by parents for reporting expenses.

(i) IMPOSITION OF ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—No Federal requirements shall apply to a qualified educational service provider other than the requirements specifically set forth in this section. Nothing in this section shall be construed to require a qualified educational service provider to alter its creed, practices, admissions policy, or curriculum in order to be eligible to receive payments from an education savings account.

(j) REPORTS.—

(1) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than July 30 of the first year of the pilot program, and

each subsequent year through the year in which the final report is submitted under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall prepare and submit to Congress an interim report on the accounts awarded under the pilot program under this section that includes the content described in paragraph (3) for the applicable school year of the report.

(2) **FINAL REPORT.**—Not later than 90 days after the end of the pilot program under this section, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to Congress a report on the accounts awarded under the pilot program that includes the content described in paragraph (3) for each school year of the program.

(3) **CONTENT.**—Each report under paragraphs (1) and (2) shall identify—

(A) the number of applicants for education savings accounts under this section;

(B) the number of elementary school students receiving education savings accounts under this section and the number of secondary school students receiving such savings accounts;

(C) the results of a survey, conducted by the Secretary, regarding parental satisfaction with the education savings account program under this section; and

(D) any other information the Secretary determines to be necessary to evaluate the effectiveness of the program.

(k) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.

(l) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **ESEA DEFINITIONS.**—The terms “child”, “elementary school”, and “secondary school” have the meanings given the terms in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(2) **ELIGIBLE MILITARY STUDENT.**—The term “eligible military student” means a child who—

(A) is a military dependent student;

(B) lives on the military installation selected to participate in the program under this section; and

(C) chooses to attend a participating school or purchase other approved education services, rather than attending the school otherwise assigned to the child.

(3) **MILITARY DEPENDENT STUDENTS.**—The term “military dependent students” has the meaning given the term in section 572(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163; 20 U.S.C. 7703b(e)).

(4) **QUALIFIED EDUCATIONAL SERVICE PROVIDER.**—The term “qualified educational service provider” means an entity or person that is licensed by a State to provide one or more of the educational services for which funds may be expended under subsection (e), including—

(A) a private school;

(B) a nonpublic online learning program or course provider;

(C) a State institution of higher education, which may include a community college or a technical college;

(D) a public school;

(E) a private tutor or entity that operates a tutoring facility;

(F) a provider of educational materials or curriculum;

(G) a provider of education-related therapies or services; or

(H) any other provider of educational services licensed by a State to provide such services.

(5) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Defense.

SA 830. Ms. HARRIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr.

INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 729. STUDY ON USE OF ROUTINE NEUROIMAGING MODALITIES IN DIAGNOSIS, TREATMENT, AND PREVENTION OF BRAIN INJURY DUE TO BLAST PRESSURE EXPOSURE DURING COMBAT AND TRAINING.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a study on the feasibility and effectiveness of the use of routine neuroimaging modalities in the diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of brain injury among members of the Armed Forces due to one or more blast pressure exposures during combat and training.

(b) **REPORTS.**—

(1) **INTERIM REPORT.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives an interim report on the methods and action plan for the study under subsection (a).

(2) **FINAL REPORT.**—Not later than two years after the date on which the Secretary begins the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the results of such study.

SA 831. Ms. HARRIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XXX, add the following:

SEC. 3022. INVESTIGATION OF REPORTS OF REPRISALS RELATING TO PRIVATIZED MILITARY HOUSING AND TREATMENT AS MATERIAL BREACH.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subchapter IV of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2890 the following new section:

“§ 2890a. Investigation of reports of reprisals and treatment as material breach

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Chief Housing Officer designated under section 2872b of this title, in coordination with the Secretary of the military department concerned, shall investigate all reports of reprisal against a member of the armed forces for reporting an issue relating to a housing unit under this subchapter.

“(b) **MATERIAL BREACH.**—If the Chief Housing Officer, in coordination with the Secretary of the military department concerned, determines under subsection (a) that a landlord has retaliated against a member of the armed forces for reporting an issue relating to a housing unit under this subchapter, the landlord shall be deemed to have committed a material breach of the contract of the

landlord for purposes of section 2874b(1) of this title.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of such subchapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2890 the following new item:

“2890a. Investigation of reports of reprisals and treatment as material breach.”.

SA 832. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____ . JUSTICE FOR SERVICEMEMBERS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Justice for Servicemembers Act”.

(b) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of this section are—

(1) to prohibit predispute arbitration agreements that force arbitration of disputes arising from claims brought under chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code, and the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. 3901 et seq.); and

(2) to prohibit agreements and practices that interfere with the right of persons to participate in a joint, class, or collective action related to disputes arising from claims brought under the provisions of the laws described in paragraph (1).

(c) **ARBITRATION OF DISPUTES INVOLVING THE RIGHTS OF SERVICEMEMBERS AND VETERANS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Title 9, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“CHAPTER 4—ARBITRATION OF SERVICEMEMBER AND VETERAN DISPUTES

“Sec.

“401. Definitions.

“402. No validity or enforceability.

“§ 401. Definitions

“In this chapter—

“(1) the term ‘predispute arbitration agreement’ means an agreement to arbitrate a dispute that has not yet arisen at the time of the making of the agreement; and

“(2) the term ‘predispute joint-action waiver’ means an agreement, whether or not part of a predispute arbitration agreement, that would prohibit, or waive the right of, one of the parties to the agreement to participate in a joint, class, or collective action in a judicial, arbitral, administrative, or other forum, concerning a dispute that has not yet arisen at the time of the making of the agreement.

“§ 402. No validity or enforceability

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, no predispute arbitration agreement or predispute joint-action waiver shall be valid or enforceable with respect to a dispute relating to disputes arising under chapter 43 of title 38 or the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. 3901 et seq.).

“(b) **APPLICABILITY.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—An issue as to whether this chapter applies with respect to a dispute shall be determined under Federal law. The applicability of this chapter to an agreement to arbitrate and the validity and enforceability of an agreement to which this chapter applies shall be determined by a court,

rather than an arbitrator, irrespective of whether the party resisting arbitration challenges the arbitration agreement specifically or in conjunction with other terms of the contract containing such agreement, and irrespective of whether the agreement purports to delegate such determinations to an arbitrator.

“(2) COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS.—Nothing in this chapter shall apply to any arbitration provision in a contract between an employer and a labor organization or between labor organizations, except that no such arbitration provision shall have the effect of waiving the right of a worker to seek judicial enforcement of a right arising under a provision of the Constitution of the United States, a State constitution, or a Federal or State statute, or public policy arising therefrom.”.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Title 9 of the United States Code is amended—

(i) in section 1 by striking “of seamen,” and all that follows through “interstate commerce” and inserting “persons and causes of action under chapter 43 of title 38 or the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. 3901 et seq.)”;

(ii) in section 2 by inserting “or as otherwise provided in chapter 4” before the period at the end;

(iii) in section 208—

(I) in the section heading, by striking “Chapter 1; residual application” and inserting “Application”;

(II) by adding at the end the following: “This chapter applies to the extent that this chapter is not in conflict with chapter 4.”; and

(iv) in section 307—

(I) in the section heading, by striking “Chapter 1; residual application” and inserting “Application”;

(II) by adding at the end the following: “This chapter applies to the extent that this chapter is not in conflict with chapter 4.”.

(B) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—

(1) CHAPTER 2.—The table of sections for chapter 2 of title 9, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 208 and inserting the following: “208. Application.”.

(ii) CHAPTER 3.—The table of sections for chapter 3 of title 9, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 307 and inserting the following: “307. Application.”.

(C) TABLE OF CHAPTERS.—The table of chapters of title 9, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“4. Arbitration of servicemember and veteran disputes 401”.

(d) LIMITATION ON WAIVER OF RIGHTS AND PROTECTIONS UNDER SERVICEMEMBERS CIVIL RELIEF ACT.—

(1) AMENDMENTS.—Section 107(a) of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. 3918(a)) is amended—

(A) in the second sentence, by inserting “and if it is made after a specific dispute has arisen and the dispute is identified in the waiver” before the period at the end; and

(B) in the third sentence by inserting “and if it is made after a specific dispute has arisen and the dispute is identified in the waiver” before the period at the end.

(2) APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to waivers made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e) APPLICABILITY.—This section, and the amendments made by this section, shall apply with respect to any dispute or claim that arises or accrues on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 833. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title V, add the following:

SEC. 594. PILOT PROGRAM ON DIGITAL ENGINEERING FOR THE JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Defense may carry out a pilot program in accordance with this section to assess the feasibility and advisability of activities to enhance the preparation of students in the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps for careers in digital engineering.

(b) COORDINATION.—In carrying out the pilot program, the Secretary of Defense may coordinate with the following:

(1) The Secretary of Education.

(2) The National Science Foundation.

(3) The heads of such other Federal, State, and local government entities as the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate.

(4) Such private sector organizations as the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate.

(c) ACTIVITIES.—Activities under the pilot program may include the following:

(1) Establishment of targeted internships and cooperative research opportunities in digital engineering at defense laboratories, test ranges, and other organizations for students in and instructors of the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

(2) Support for training and other support for instructors to improve digital engineering education activities relevant to Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs and students.

(3) Efforts and activities that improve the quality of digital engineering education, training opportunities, and curricula for students and instructors.

(4) Development of professional development opportunities, demonstrations, mentoring programs, and informal education for students and instructors.

(d) METRICS.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish outcome-based metrics and internal and external assessments to evaluate the merits and benefits of activities conducted under the pilot program with respect to the needs of the Department of Defense.

(e) AUTHORITIES.—In carrying out the pilot program, the Secretary of Defense may use the authorities under chapter 111 and sections 2363, 2605, and 2374a of title 10, United States Code, and such other authorities the Secretary considers appropriate.

(f) REPORT.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on any activities carried out under the pilot program.

SA 834. Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION PERSONNEL.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Securing America’s Ports of Entry Act of 2019”.

(b) ADDITIONAL U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION PERSONNEL.—

(1) OFFICERS.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall hire, train, and assign not fewer than 600 new Office of Field Operations officers above the current attrition level during every fiscal year until the total number of Office of Field Operations officers equals and sustains the requirements identified each year in the Workload Staffing Model.

(2) SUPPORT STAFF.—The Commissioner is authorized to hire, train, and assign support staff, including technicians, to perform non-law enforcement administrative functions to support the new Office of Field Operations officers hired pursuant to paragraph (1).

(3) TRAFFIC FORECASTS.—In calculating the number of Office of Field Operations officers needed at each port of entry through the Workload Staffing Model, the Office of Field Operations shall—

(A) rely on data collected regarding the inspections and other activities conducted at each such port of entry; and

(B) consider volume from seasonal surges, other projected changes in commercial and passenger volumes, the most current commercial forecasts, and other relevant information.

(4) GAO REPORT.—If the Commissioner does not hire the 600 additional Office of Field Operations officers authorized under paragraph (1) during fiscal year 2020, or during any subsequent fiscal year in which the hiring requirements set forth in the Workload Staffing Model have not been achieved, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(A) conduct a review of U.S. Customs and Border Protection hiring practices to determine the reasons that such requirements were not achieved and other issues related to hiring by U.S. Customs and Border Protection; and

(B) submit a report to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives that describes the results of the review conducted under subparagraph (A).

(c) PORTS OF ENTRY INFRASTRUCTURE ENHANCEMENT REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall submit a report to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives that identifies—

(1) infrastructure improvements at ports of entry that would enhance the ability of Office of Field Operations officers to interdict opioids and other drugs that are being illegally transported into the United States, including a description of circumstances at specific ports of entry that prevent the deployment of technology used at other ports of entry;

(2) detection equipment that would improve the ability of such officers to identify opioids, including precursors and derivatives, that are being illegally transported into the United States; and

(3) safety equipment that would protect such officers from accidental exposure to such drugs or other dangers associated with the inspection of potential drug traffickers.

(d) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) TEMPORARY DUTY ASSIGNMENTS.—

(A) QUARTERLY REPORT.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, in consultation with the Executive Assistant Commissioner of the Office of Field Operations, shall submit a quarterly report to the appropriate congressional committees that includes, for the reporting period—

(i) the number of temporary duty assignments;

(ii) the number of U.S. Customs and Border Protection employees required for each temporary duty assignment;

(iii) the ports of entry from which such employees were reassigned;

(iv) the ports of entry to which such employees were reassigned;

(v) the ports of entry at which reimbursable service agreements have been entered into that may be affected by temporary duty assignments;

(vi) the duration of each temporary duty assignment; and

(vii) the cost of each temporary duty assignment.

(B) SOUTHWEST BORDER.—The report required under subparagraph (A) shall identify, with respect to each of the statistics described in clauses (i) through (vii) of such subparagraph, information relating to preventing or responding to illegal entries along the southwest border of the United States, including the costs relating to temporary redeployments along the southwest border.

(C) NOTICE.—Not later than 10 days before redeploying employees from 1 port of entry to another, absent emergency circumstances—

(i) the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall notify the director of the port of entry from which employees will be reassigned of the intended redeployments; and

(ii) the port director shall notify impacted facilities (including airports, seaports, and land ports) of the intended redeployments.

(D) STAFF BRIEFING.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, in consultation with the Assistant Commissioner of the Office of Field Operations, shall brief all affected U.S. Customs and Border Protection employees regarding plans to mitigate vulnerabilities created by any planned staffing reductions at ports of entry.

(2) REIMBURSABLE SERVICES AGREEMENTS QUARTERLY REPORT.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall submit a quarterly report to the appropriate congressional committees regarding the use of reimbursable service agreements by U.S. Customs and Border Protection, which shall include—

(A) the governmental or private entities with an active reimbursable service agreement, including the locations at which the contracted services are being performed;

(B) a description of the factors that were considered before entering into each of the active reimbursable service agreements referred to in subparagraph (A);

(C) the number of hours that U.S. Customs and Border Protection Officers worked during the reporting period in fulfillment of responsibilities agreed to under each of the reimbursable service agreements; and

(D) the total costs incurred by U.S. Customs and Border Protection relating to each reimbursable service agreement, including the amount of such costs that were reimbursed by the contracted entity.

(3) ANNUAL WORKLOAD STAFFING MODEL REPORT.—As part of the Annual Report on Staffing required under section 411(g)(5)(A) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 211(g)(5)(A)), the Commissioner shall include—

(A) information concerning the progress made toward meeting the Office of Field Operations officer and support staff hiring tar-

gets set forth in subsection (b), while accounting for attrition;

(B) an update to the information provided in the Resource Optimization at the Ports of Entry report, which was submitted to Congress on September 12, 2017, pursuant to the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2017 (division F of Public Law 115-31); and

(C) a summary of the information included in the quarterly reports required under paragraphs (1) and (2).

(4) DEFINED TERM.—In this subsection, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives; and

(D) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

(1) \$80,908,929 for fiscal year 2020; and

(2) \$97,132,268 for each of the fiscal years 2021 through 2026.

SA 835. Mr. VAN HOLLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title V, add the following:

SEC. 589. HONORARY PROMOTION OF COLONEL CHARLES E. MCGEE TO BRIGADIER GENERAL IN THE AIR FORCE.

The President is authorized to issue an appropriate honorary commission promoting to brigadier general in the Air Force Colonel Charles E. McGee, United States Air Force (retired), a distinguished Tuskegee Airman whose honorary promotion has the recommendation of the Secretary of the Air Force in accordance with the provisions section 1563 of title 10, United States Code.

SA 836. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Insert after section 5546 the following:

SEC. 5547. LIMITATIONS AND REQUIREMENTS IN CONNECTION WITH SEPARATIONS FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO SUFFER FROM MENTAL HEALTH CONDITIONS IN CONNECTION WITH A SEX-RELATED, INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE-RELATED, OR SPOUSAL-ABUSE OFFENSE.

(a) CONFIRMATION OF DIAGNOSIS OF CONDITION REQUIRED BEFORE SEPARATION.—Before a member of the Armed Forces who was the victim of a sex-related offense, an intimate

partner violence-related offense, or a spousal-abuse offense during service in the Armed Forces (whether or not such offense was committed by another member of the Armed Forces), and who has a mental health condition not amounting to a physical disability, is separated, discharged, or released from the Armed Forces based solely on such condition, the diagnosis of such condition must be—

(1) corroborated by a competent mental health care professional at the peer level or a higher level of the health care professional making the diagnosis; and

(2) endorsed by the Surgeon General of the military department concerned.

(b) NARRATIVE REASON FOR SEPARATION IF MENTAL HEALTH CONDITION PRESENT.—If the narrative reason for discharge, separation, or release from the Armed Forces of a member of the Armed Forces is a mental health condition that is not a disability, the appropriate narrative reason for the discharge, separation, or release shall be condition, not a disability, or Secretarial authority.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section:

(1) The term “intimate partner violence-related offense” means the following:

(A) An offense under section 928 or 930 of title 10, United States Code (article 128 or 130 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(B) An offense under State law for conduct identical or substantially similar to an offense described in subparagraph (A).

(2) The term “sex-related offense” means the following:

(A) An offense under section 920 or 920b of title 10, United States Code (article 120 or 120b of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(B) An offense under State law for conduct identical or substantially similar to an offense described in subparagraph (A).

(3) The term “spousal-abuse offense” means the following:

(A) An offense under section 928 of title 10, United States Code (article 128 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(B) An offense under State law for conduct identical or substantially similar to an offense described in subparagraph (A).

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to separations, discharges, and releases from the Armed Forces that occur on or after that effective date.

SA 837. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. JONES, and Mrs. CAPITO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . . . BLOCKING FENTANYL IMPORTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Blocking Deadly Fentanyl Imports Act”.

(b) AMENDMENT TO DEFINITION OF MAJOR ILLEGAL DRUG PRODUCING COUNTRY.—Section 481(e)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291(e)(2)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “in which”;

(2) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “in which” before “1,000”;

(3) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by inserting “in which” before “1,000”; and

(B) by striking “or” at the end;

(4) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by inserting “in which” before “5,000”; and

(B) by inserting “or” after the semicolon; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) that is a significant source of illicit synthetic opioids and related illicit precursors significantly affecting the United States;”.

(C) INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL STRATEGY REPORT.—Section 489(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291h(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(9) A separate section that contains the following:

“(A) An identification of the countries, to the extent feasible, that are the most significant sources of illicit fentanyl and fentanyl analogues significantly affecting the United States during the preceding calendar year.

“(B) A description of the extent to which each country identified pursuant to subparagraph (A) has cooperated with the United States to prevent the articles or chemicals described in subparagraph (A) from being exported from such country to the United States.

“(C) A description of whether each country identified pursuant to subparagraph (A) has adopted and utilizes scheduling or other procedures for illicit drugs that are similar in effect to the procedures authorized under title II of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 811 et seq.) for adding drugs and other substances to the controlled substances schedules;

“(D) A description of whether each country identified pursuant to subparagraph (A) is following steps to prosecute individuals involved in the illicit manufacture or distribution of controlled substance analogues (as defined in section 102(32) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802(32))); and

“(E) A description of whether each country identified pursuant to subparagraph (A) requires the registration of tableting machines and encapsulating machines or other measures similar in effect to the registration requirements set forth in part 1310 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, and has not made good faith efforts, in the opinion of the Secretary, to improve regulation of tableting machines and encapsulating machines.”.

(d) WITHHOLDING OF BILATERAL AND MULTILATERAL ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 490(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291j(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “or country identified pursuant to clause (i) or (ii) of section 489(a)(8)(A) of this Act” and inserting “country identified pursuant to section 489(a)(8)(A), or country twice identified pursuant to section 489(a)(9)(A)”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “or major drug-transit country (as determined under subsection (h)) or country identified pursuant to clause (i) or (ii) of section 489(a)(8)(A) of this Act” and inserting “, major drug-transit country, country identified pursuant to section 489(a)(8)(A), or country twice identified pursuant to section 489(a)(9)(A)”.

(2) DESIGNATION OF ILLICIT FENTANYL COUNTRIES WITHOUT SCHEDULING PROCEDURES.—Section 706(2) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003 (22 U.S.C. 2291j-1(2)) is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “also”;

(B) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking “and” at the end;

(C) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (E);

(D) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) designate each country, if any, identified under section 489(a)(9) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291h(a)(9)) that has failed to adopt and utilize scheduling procedures for illicit drugs that are comparable to the procedures authorized under title II of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 811 et seq.) for adding drugs and other substances to the controlled substances schedules;”;

(E) in subparagraph (E), as redesignated, by striking “so designated” and inserting “designated under subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D)”.

(3) DESIGNATION OF ILLICIT FENTANYL COUNTRIES WITHOUT ABILITY TO PROSECUTE CRIMINALS FOR THE MANUFACTURE OR DISTRIBUTION OF FENTANYL ANALOGUES.—Section 706(2) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003 (22 U.S.C. 2291j-1(2)), as amended by paragraph (2), is further amended by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

“(C) designate each country, if any, identified under section 489(a)(9) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291h(a)(9)) that has not taken significant steps to prosecute individuals involved in the illicit manufacture or distribution of controlled substance analogues (as defined in section 102(32) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802(32)));”.

(4) DESIGNATION OF ILLICIT FENTANYL COUNTRIES THAT DO NOT REQUIRE THE REGISTRATION OF PILL PRESSES AND TABLETING MACHINES.—Section 706(2) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003 (22 U.S.C. 2291j-1(2)), as amended by paragraphs (2) and (3), is further amended by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) designate each country, if any, identified under section 489(a)(9) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291h(a)(9)) that—

“(i) does not require the registration of tableting machines and encapsulating machines in a manner comparable to the registration requirements set forth in part 1310 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations; and

“(ii) has not made good faith efforts (in the opinion of the Secretary) to improve the regulation of tableting machines and encapsulating machines; and”.

(5) LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE FOR DESIGNATED COUNTRIES.—Section 706(3) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003 (22 U.S.C. 2291j-1(3)) is amended by striking “also designated under paragraph (2) in the report” and inserting “designated in the report under paragraph (2)(A) or twice designated in the report under subparagraph (B), (C), or (D) of paragraph (2)”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 838. Ms. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1086. ANNUAL REPORTS ON FEDERAL PROJECTS THAT ARE OVER BUDGET AND BEHIND SCHEDULE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “covered agency” means—

(A) an Executive agency, as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code; and

(B) an independent regulatory agency, as defined in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code.

(2) The term “project” includes any program, project, or activity other than a program, project, or activity funded by mandatory spending.

(b) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and every year thereafter, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit to Congress and post on the website of the Office of Management and Budget a report on each project funded by a covered agency (other than a program currently subject to reporting requirements under section 2433 of title 10 United States Code (commonly referred to as the “Nunn-McCurdy Amendment”))—

(1) that is more than 5 years behind schedule; or

(2) for which the amount spent on the project is not less than \$1,000,000,000 more than the original cost estimate for the project.

(c) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted and posted under subsection (b) shall include, for each project included in the report—

(1) a brief description of the project, including—

(A) the purpose of the project;

(B) each location in which the project is carried out;

(C) the year in which the project was initiated;

(D) the Federal share of the total cost of the project; and

(E) each primary contractor, subcontractor, grant recipient, and subgrantee recipient of the project;

(2) an explanation of any change to the original scope of the project, including by the addition or narrowing of the initial requirements of the project;

(3) the original expected date for completion of the project;

(4) the current expected date for completion of the project;

(5) the original cost estimate for the project, as adjusted to reflect increases in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers, as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics;

(6) the current cost estimate for the project, as adjusted to reflect increases in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers, as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics;

(7) an explanation for a delay in completion or increase in the original cost estimate for the project; and

(8) the amount of and rationale for any award, incentive fee, or other type of bonus, if any, awarded for the project.

(d) SUBMISSION WITH BUDGET.—Section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(40) the report required under section 1086(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 for the calendar year ending in the fiscal year in which the budget is submitted.”.

SA 839. Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military

activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 705. CHIROPRACTIC HEALTH CARE SERVICES FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FOR CERTAIN COVERED BENEFICIARIES.

(a) **PLAN REQUIRED.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall complete development of a plan to provide chiropractic health care services and benefits for eligible covered beneficiaries as a permanent part of the TRICARE program.

(b) **CONTENTS OF PLAN.**—The plan developed under subsection (a) shall require that a contract entered into under section 1097 of title 10, United States Code, for the delivery of health care services shall—

(1) include the delivery of chiropractic services to eligible covered beneficiaries;

(2) require that chiropractic services may be provided only by a doctor of chiropractic; and

(3) provide that an eligible covered beneficiary may select and have direct access to a doctor of chiropractic without referral by another health practitioner.

(c) **IMPLEMENTATION OF PLAN.**—The plan developed under subsection (a) shall provide for implementation of the plan to begin not later than 60 days after the date on which the plan is completed.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “chiropractic services”—

(A) includes diagnosis (including by diagnostic x-ray tests), evaluation and management, and therapeutic services for the treatment of a patient’s health condition, including neuromusculoskeletal conditions and the subluxation complex, and such other services determined appropriate by the Secretary of Defense and as authorized under State law; and

(B) does not include the use of drugs or surgery.

(2) The term “covered beneficiary” has the meaning given that term in section 1072(5) of title 10, United States Code.

(3) The term “eligible covered beneficiary” means a covered beneficiary excluding a dependent of a member or former member of a uniformed service.

(4) The term “dependent” has the meaning given that term in section 1072(2) of title 10, United States Code.

(5) The term “doctor of chiropractic” means only a doctor of chiropractic who is licensed as a doctor of chiropractic, chiropractic physician, or chiropractor by a State, the District of Columbia, or a territory or possession of the United States.

(6) The term “TRICARE program” has the meaning given that term in section 1072(7) of title 10, United States Code.

SA 840. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XVI, add the following:

SEC. ____ . REPORT ON USE OF ENCRYPTION BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE NATIONAL SECURITY SYSTEMS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report detailing the mission need and efficacy of full disk encryption across NIPRNET and SIPRNET endpoint computer systems, including the cost, mission impact, and implementation timeline.

SA 841. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Section 5211 is amended to read as follows:

SEC. 5211. DEVELOPMENT AND ACQUISITION STRATEGY TO PROCURE SECURE, LOW PROBABILITY OF DETECTION DATA LINK NETWORK CAPABILITY.

The text of subsections (a) through (c) of section 211 are hereby deemed to read as follows:

“(a) **STRATEGY REQUIRED.**—Not later than April 1, 2020, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Chief of Staff of the Army shall jointly submit to the congressional defense committees a joint development and acquisition strategy to procure a secure, low probability of detection data link network capability, with the ability to effectively operate in hostile jamming environments while preserving the low observability characteristics of the relevant platforms, including both existing and planned platforms.

“(b) **NETWORK CHARACTERISTICS.**—The data link network capability to be procured pursuant to the development and acquisition strategy submitted under subsection (a) shall—

“(1) ensure that any network made with such capability will be low risk and affordable, with minimal impact or change to existing host platforms and minimal overall integration costs;

“(2) use a non-proprietary and open systems approach compatible with the Rapid Capabilities Office Open Mission Systems initiative of the Air Force and the Future Airborne Capability Environment initiative of the Navy; and

“(3) provide for an architecture to connect, with operationally relevant throughput and latency—

“(A) fifth-generation combat aircraft;

“(B) fifth-generation and fourth-generation combat aircraft;

“(C) fifth-generation and fourth-generation combat aircraft and appropriate support aircraft and other network nodes for command, control, communications, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance purposes; and

“(D) fifth-generation and fourth-generation combat aircraft and their associated network-enabled precision weapons.

“(c) **LIMITATION.**—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for fiscal year 2020 for operations and maintenance for the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force, for operations and maintenance for the Office of the Secretary of the Navy, and for operations and maintenance for the Office of the Secretary of the Army, not more than 75 per-

cent may be obligated or expended until the date that is 15 days after the date on which the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Chief of Staff of the Army submit the development and acquisition strategy required by subsection (a).”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have 7 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 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, June 20, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

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, June 20, 2019, at 9:45 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the nomination of Robert Wallace, of Wyoming, to be Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife, Department of the Interior.

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, June 20, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 20, 2019, at 9:45 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Andrew P. Bremberg, of Virginia, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Office of the United Nations and Other International Organizations in Geneva, with the rank of Ambassador, Philip S. Goldberg, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Colombia, Doug Manchester, of California, to be Ambassador to the Commonwealth of The Bahamas, Adrian Zuckerman, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador to Romania, Richard B. Norland, of Iowa, to be Ambassador to Libya, Jonathan R. Cohen, of California, to be Ambassador to the Arab Republic of Egypt, and John Rakolta, Jr., of Michigan, to be Ambassador to the United Arab Emirates, all of the Department of State, and other pending nominations.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 20, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Daniel Aaron Bress, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, Peter Joseph Phipps, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Circuit

Judge for the Third Circuit, Mary S. McElroy, to be United States District Judge for the District of Rhode Island, Gary Richard Brown, Diane Gujarati, Eric Ross Komitee, and Rachel P. Kovner, each to be a United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York, Stephanie Dawkins Davis, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan, Stephanie A. Gallagher, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland, Charles R. Eskridge III, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, Lewis J. Liman, and Mary Kay Vyskocil, both to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, Martha Maria Pacold, Mary M. Rowland, and Steven C. Seeger, each to be a United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, Jason K. Pulliam, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas, John L. Sinatra, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Western District of New York, William Shaw Stickman IV, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, Frank William Volk, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of West Virginia, Jennifer Philpott Wilson, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, David Austin Tapp, of Kentucky, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, and Edward W. Felten, of New Jersey, to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 20, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MANUFACTURING, TRADE, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

The Subcommittee on Manufacturing, Trade, and Consumer Protection of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 05, 2019, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that John-Rex Spivey, a Navy fellow in Senator COLLINS's office, be granted floor privileges through January 31, 2020.

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

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following interns from the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee staff have privileges of the floor through July 31, 2019. Their names are Emma Runge, Kelsey Lessard, and Peter St. Amand.

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

AMERICAN EAGLE DAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 257, submitted earlier today.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 257) designating June 20, 2019, as "American Eagle Day" and celebrating the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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. 257) 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 MAY 2019 AS "NATIONAL BRAIN TUMOR AWARENESS MONTH"

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 258, submitted earlier today.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 258) expressing support for the designation of May 2019 as "National Brain Tumor Awareness Month."

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 258) was agreed to.

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

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

The preamble was agreed to.

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

WORLD ELDER ABUSE AWARENESS DAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 242.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 242) designating June 15, 2019, as "World Elder Abuse Awareness Day."

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 242) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of June 10, 2019, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS LONG-TERM LEGAL RESIDENTS RELIEF ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 559.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 559) to amend section 6 of the Joint Resolution entitled "A Joint Resolution to approve the Covenant To Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union with the United States of America, and for other purposes.

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

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

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

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the bill?

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

The bill (H.R. 559) was passed.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JUNE 24, 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, June 24; further, that following the prayer and

pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for use later in the day, morning business be closed, and the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 1790 under the previous order.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,
JUNE 24, 2019, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:57 p.m., adjourned until Monday, June 24, 2019, at 3 p.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 20, 2019:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

SETH DANIEL APPLETON, OF MISSOURI, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

DINO PALASCHETTI, OF MONTANA, TO BE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF FINANCIAL RESEARCH, DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY, FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

ROBERT HUNTER KURTZ, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

BIMAL PATEL, OF GEORGIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

RITA BARANWAL, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF ENERGY (NUCLEAR ENERGY).

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

KEITH KRACH, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AN UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENERGY, AND THE ENVIRONMENT).

EUROPEAN BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

KEITH KRACH, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ALTERNATE GOVERNOR OF THE EUROPEAN BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

KEITH KRACH, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ALTERNATE GOVERNOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS; UNITED STATES ALTERNATE GOVERNOR OF THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JEFFREY L. EBERHARDT, OF WISCONSIN, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE, TO BE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE PRESIDENT FOR NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

ALLISON HERREN LEE, OF COLORADO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 5, 2022.