United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 25, 2019 No. 107

Senate

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

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Gracious God, You have given us eyes to see, ears to hear, and minds to understand. Reveal Yourself to our lawmakers so that what they see, hear, and think will glorify You. Today, may they desire and do that which is most acceptable to You. Lord, use them so that Your will may be done in our Nation and world as they trust the unfolding of Your powerful providence. As they wait for You, O God, renew their strength, enabling them to mount up with wings as eagles, running without weariness and walking without fainting.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). The Senator from Iowa.

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

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

TAX TREATIES AND PROTOCOLS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, later today, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is scheduled to consider four protocols to the United States' tax treaties with Spain, Switzerland, Japan, and Luxembourg. I support swift action on these protocols both in committee and in the Senate, and I urge my colleagues to vote yes on them.

I encourage the committee to also take up the new tax treaties with Chile, Hungary, and Poland as soon as possible. These new treaties will provide important benefits to U.S. taxpayers and the U.S. Government.

After years of discussion and debate, the time has come to move forward on all of these bilateral agreements.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

TAX TREATIES AND PROTOCOLS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, let me first associate myself with the remarks of the chairman of the Finance Committee. These tax treaties are extremely important to a number of American businesses, and I thank him for his advocacy.

IRAN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, the Senate and the Nation are closely watching the situation in the Gulf. Last week, the recent recklessness from Tehran reached a new level. Iran fired on an unmanned U.S. intelligence aircraft that was flying over international waters. This is as violent and dangerous an overt provocation as any nation has aimed at the United States in, literally, years.

This is not a time for partisanship, but, unfortunately, we are already seeing extreme voices on the far left that are so afflicted by the ''Trump derangement syndrome'' that they repeat Iranian talking points and advertise the absurd notion that our country, our administration, our President are somehow to blame for Tehran's violent aggression. Blame America first. By 2019, nobody should need a history lesson on Iran, but, apparently, some need a refresher, because there should be no question about who is at fault.

Iran has disregarded international law and violated the laws of armed conflict since the first days of the Islamic Republic. Its malign activities as the world's most active state sponsor of terrorism include its crusade to destroy Israel, including its sponsorship of countless terrorist attacks; the malevolence throughout the Persian Gulf, including proxies in Yemen who have recently attacked civilian targets; perennial threats to close the Strait of Hormuz, a key international waterway that is essential to global commerce; and, of course, the longstanding asymmetrical war it has waged against us that began with the infamous takeover of the U.S. Embassy in 1979 and the 50-plus hostages who were held captive for 444 days; the provision of weapons, training, funding, and direction to terrorist groups, including Hamas, Hezbollah, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, the Taliban, and Shiite militias in Iraq, which are responsible for the murders of hundreds of U.S. servicemembers from Lebanon to Iraq to Afghanistan, and more attacks plotted on U.S. targets worldwide, including in our own homeland.

The record is blindingly obvious. It is why so many of us opposed the Obama administration's deal with Iran. Many of us understood that the agreement not only failed to properly address the nuclear threat but that it also completely ignored the other threats that Iran posed to international peace and stability. In fact, some prescient Members of this body warned that the deal would amplify Iran's dangerous behavior.

I remember back in 2015 when the current ranking member on the Foreign Relations Committee insisted the Obama administration's policy would invite the kind of mess we see today.

Here is what he said:

If there is a fear of war in the region, it will be one fueled by Iran and its proxies and exacerbated by an agreement that allows Iran to possess an industrial-sized nuclear program and enough money in sanctions relief to significantly continue to fund its hegemonic intentions.

This was said by our colleague from New Jersey, who was the ranking member on the Foreign Relations Committee back in 2015.

Here is my colleague from New York, the current Democratic leader, and what he said: ''Under this agreement, Iran would receive at least $50 billion in the near future and would undoubtedly use some of that money to redouble its efforts to create even more trouble in the Middle East and, perhaps, beyond.'' That was from the Democratic leader in that same year.

He acknowledged that the hard-liners' ''No. 1 goal [is] strengthening Iran's armed forces and pursuing even more harmful military and terrorist actions.''

This is exactly the situation President Trump inherited in 2017, as emboldened Tehran was committed to spending its new resources on military capabilities, exporting terrorism, and pursuing regional hegemony. So President Trump was right to seek a better deal and apply maximum pressure on Tehran until it changed its destabilizing behavior. Tough sanctions are compounding the economic pain the mullahs have brought on their own people through corrupt mismanagement.

Iran is responding to this legitimate and judicious application of diplomatic and economic pressure the way it has effectively operated for years—what do they always do?—through violence, attacks against commercial vessels in international waters, sponsored attacks against civilian targets in the Gulf, and then last week's unprovoked attack on our unarmed aircraft.

We face a choice here. Will we legitimize and incentivize Iran's use of terror and aggression or will we stay resolute and apply appropriate and proportionate pressure until Tehran respects the fundamental norms of international behavior?

Last Thursday, President Trump consulted with a bipartisan group of congressional leaders and national security chairmen and ranking members. The President weighed advice from a number of sources. It is clear he was listening to congressional leaders. Clearly, the President wants to avoid war—hence the deliberate and judicious approach he has taken since the shoot-down; hence his repeated efforts to give Iran's leaders an off-ramp toward negotiations.

Nevertheless, there is a general consensus that this act of aggression cannot stand. Tehran must understand it may not respond to legitimate diplomatic pressure with illegitimate violence. It is in our national security interest for the United States to deter attacks against American forces that are operating legally in international waters and to honor our long history of defending the freedom of the seas and the freedom of international commerce.

Since Iran's aggression and threats to global commerce threaten everyone, I hope all nations will join the United States and its allies in condemning Tehran and imposing significant consequences for its hostile acts.

Look, I understand the significant appetite in Congress for the President to consult with us as he continues to deliberate. Obviously, that is appropriate. My colleagues should share their views with the administration. I understand that the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees will be holding hearings with senior administration officials after July 4. What is not productive is an effort being promoted by the Democratic leader that would preemptively tie the hands of our military commanders, weaken our diplomatic leverage, embolden our adversaries, and create a dangerous precedent.

Therefore, I will strongly oppose the Udall amendment, which would gratuitously take crucial options off the table. It would hamstring both our commanders and our diplomats, all of whose leverage depends on the knowledge that the United States reserves the right to act forcefully if and when necessary.

Ten years ago, my friend the Democratic leader said verbatim: ''When it comes to Iran, we should never take the military option off the table.'' That is exactly what the amendment he supports would do.

Nearly every President has utilized a limited use of force against adversaries without pre-authorization from Congress. Nearly every President has done that. Of course, major hostilities require congressional concurrence and the support of the American people. So the Democrats should stop their fear mongering because no one is calling for major military operations—not the President, not his military commanders, not the Republicans in Congress.

This amendment would impose unprecedented limitations that would go far beyond the War Powers Resolution. As drafted, it could prevent U.S. military forces from defending themselves against an attack or conducting a timely counterattack. If we had actionable intelligence that an attack were imminent, it would prevent U.S. forces from doing anything about it. If Israel were attacked, it would prevent U.S. forces from providing immediate assistance to our closest ally in the region.

This amendment flies in the face of many Democrats' past clarity about Iran, and it casts doubt on our seriousness in defending our own military personnel, much less the freedom of the seas.

The Democrats must set aside the habit of unthinking, reflexive opposition to every single thing this President does. That is why I call it the Trump derangement syndrome. Perhaps it would help if they were reminded of what the Democratic candidate for President in 2016 had to say about what her policy would have been toward Iran and the Gulf had she been elected.

Here is what Hillary Clinton had to say:

I will reaffirm that the Persian Gulf is a region of vital interest to the United States. . . . We'll keep the Strait of Hormuz open. We'll increase security cooperation with our Gulf allies, including intelligence sharing, military support, and missile defense to ensure they can defend against Iranian aggression, even if that takes the form of cyberattacks or other nontraditional threats.

She went on:

Iran should understand that the United States, and I as President, will not stand by as our Gulf allies and partners are threatened.

She concluded by saying:

We will act.

That was from Hillary Clinton.

So nearly every word of that statement accurately describes the policy the Trump administration has pursued for the last 2 years.

Our Gulf allies and partners are threatened by Iran. Israel is threatened by Iran. The Strait of Hormuz is threatened by Iran. And America has been attacked by Iran. The threat is not in doubt. The question is whether Democrats still mean what they said or whether they completely changed their minds about how the U.S. must respond simply because—simply because—the White House has changed parties.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Now, Mr. President, on a related matter, this week the Senate is considering the National Defense Authorization Act. The current situation with Iran is a stark reminder of our urgent responsibility to ensure our military remains equipped and ready to deter threats and defeat potential challenges to our security.

When we pass the NDAA this week, the Senate will extend a 58-year tradition of authorizing the resources U.S. forces need to stay on the cutting edge. And I hope we will do so with wide, bipartisan support.

This year's NDAA directs $750 billion to fund the priorities of the Department of Defense, from the Navy's fleet strength to missile defense capabilities. It increases procurement for critical weapons systems, doubles down on research and development of next-generation technologies, and makes new investments in training and support services for servicemembers and their families.

In short, this is legislation that sends a clear signal to our men and women in uniform and to the rest of the world. Here is what it says: The United States

takes today's challenges seriously. We take our commitments seriously. And we take our defense seriously.

So especially in light of current events, I was incredulous to hear the Democratic leader call yesterday to postpone moving forward with the NDAA. Apparently, some of our Democratic friends need to go hit the Presidential campaign trail. They can't be here because they have to go campaign for not 1 day but 2 this week. They are too busy to stay in the Senate and authorize the resources that our All-Volunteer Armed Forces rely on. Postpone legislation on our national defense to accommodate the Presidential race in the middle of this ongoing crisis overseas? Come on. Come on.

I am sorry our Democratic friends feel compelled to skip out so they can compete for the favor of ''the resistance.'' The rest of us, the Republican majority—we are going to be right here. We are going to be right here working and voting to make America stronger and safer.

Of course, the NDAA does not exhaust the urgent priorities we should attend to this week. As my Republican colleagues and I have been arguing for 2 months now—2 months—Congress must address the humanitarian crisis down on the southern border. The situation is well documented. Nobody is in doubt.

For months, record numbers of people have arrived at the border, overwhelming—completely overwhelming agencies and facilities. The Department of Homeland Security has had to redirect resources and personnel from other critical missions to assist the Border Patrol. The Secretary of Health and Human Services has said: ''We are running out of money.'' This is the Secretary of Health and Human Services. ''We are functionally out of space.''

I was encouraged last week when badly needed emergency funding finally garnered some momentum. Under the leadership of Chairman SHELBY and Senator LEAHY, the Appropriations Committee approved funding 30 to 1. That is about as close to bipartisan as it could ever get.

There is no reason, no excuse, why this noncontroversial measure should not get a similar, overwhelmingly bipartisan vote here on the floor this week—this week, not some other time. Actually, there is no reason it shouldn't happen today. Partisan delays have exacerbated this crisis long enough. It is well past time my Democratic colleagues stop standing in the way and let the Senate get this done.

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.

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

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1790, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A 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.

Pending:

McConnell (for Inhofe) Modified Amendment No. 764, in the nature of a substitute.

A motion was entered to close further debate on McConnell (for Inhofe) Modified Amendment No. 764 (listed above), and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Wednesday, June 26, 2019.

McConnell (for Romney) Amendment No. 861 (to Amendment No. 764), to provide that funds authorized by the Act are available for the defense of the Armed Forces and United States citizens against attack by foreign hostile forces.

McConnell Amendment No. 862 (to Amendment No. 861), to change the enactment date.

McConnell Amendment No. 863 (to the language proposed to be stricken by Amendment No. 764), to change the enactment date.

McConnell Amendment No. 864 (to Amendment No. 863), of a perfecting nature.

A motion was entered to close further debate on the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of McConnell (for Inhofe) Modified Amendment No. 764.

McConnell motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Armed Services, with instructions, McConnell Amendment No. 865, to change the enactment date.

McConnell Amendment No. 866 (to (the instructions) Amendment No. 865), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell Amendment No. 867 (to Amendment No. 866), of a perfecting nature.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

9/11 VICTIM COMPENSATION FUND

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, before I begin, I just heard the leader conclude his remarks. He didn't mention the fact today that he is meeting with several constituents of mine from New York, including John Feal and other 9/11 first responders, to discuss a solution to the shortfall in the Victim Compensation Fund.

I am glad the leader has agreed to meet with them. It is a good thing, but it is not enough to have just a meeting. These brave men and women who selflessly rushed to the towers in the midst of danger, when no one knew what would come next, deserve a commitment that their bill will be considered in a timely manner here on the floor.

So, again, I urge Leader MCCONNELL to listen to the 9/11 first responders. Then give them your commitment, Leader MCCONNELL, that you will put their bill on the Senate floor as soon as it passes the House as a standalone bill. It will pass the House; it will certainly pass the Senate, given the cosponsorship; and the President will sign it. The families of those who, just like our soldiers, rushed to danger to protect our safety can breathe a sigh of relief.

Leader MCCONNELL is the one person—this is not a dual responsibility—I wish it were, at least when we are in the minority, but Leader MCCONNELL is the one person who controls the calendar on the Senate floor. He can stand in the way, as he has done before, or he can do the right thing and commit to give this bill the attention it deserves. I will be eagerly waiting to hear what the leader says after he meets with the first responders this afternoon.

IRAN

Madam President, on Iran and the NDAA, ever since President Trump unilaterally decided to abandon the Iran nuclear agreement, our two countries have been on a path toward greater conflict. In the past month, Iran has heightened its aggressive actions in the region, prompting responses from the U.S. Government. No one looks at Iran through rose-colored glasses. That is why Americans, myself included, are worried about the current course of events. Escalation happens quickly in the Middle East. Without a steady hand at the helm, without a coherent plan or strategy—things this President has lacked since the moment he took office—the danger of bumbling into war is acute.

Democrats have been urging Leader MCCONNELL to allow us a vote on an amendment to the NDAA concerning a possible conflict with Iran. We have an amendment, led by Senators UDALL, MERKLEY, MURPHY, and KAINE—cosponsored by Republican Senators PAUL and LEE—that would prohibit any funds authorized by the current NDAA to be used to conduct hostilities against the Government of Iran.

Again, this is a dangerous situation. Even if the President doesn't intend war, his erratic, inconsistent, and off-the-cuff policies could lead us to bumble into war. When we are at war, it doesn't matter how we got there. The loss of life and the loss of treasure, when we need so much attention here in America, is very real.

So we have an amendment, and we are urging Leader MCCONNELL to allow us a simple vote on an amendment to the NDAA concerning a possible conflict with Iran.

Let me repeat. The amendment is led by UDALL, MERKLEY, MURPHY, and KAINE, cosponsored by PAUL and LEE. So it is bipartisan. It prohibits any funds authorized by the current NDAA to be used to conduct hostilities against the Government of Iran.

Contrary to what the leader just said, the Udall amendment would not—would not—diminish our military's ability to respond to a provocation or act in self-defense. The way the leader characterized the amendment is just not true. He deliberately distorted the amendment. He knows better. The Udall amendment preserves absolutely our military's ability to act in self-defense, and it would make it perfectly clear that if President Trump wants to send our Nation to war, he would need Congress to authorize it first, as stipulated by our Constitution.

There is no greater power that the Founding Fathers gave to Congress than the ability to go to war. They were worried about an Executive who might be overreaching, who might be erratic, who might be inconsistent—and we have never had an Executive who fits those categories more than this current President—and they wanted Congress to be a check. If the President had to explain why he wishes to go to war, he might be more consistent and certainly less opaque. We should have this amendment on the merits, but we also should have it because this is how the Senate should work.

S. 1790

Leader MCCONNELL said he would have an open amendment process. Here is what he said:

[We'll] be turning to the NDAA shortly, that's one of the most important bills we do every year. It will be open for amendment.

Leader MCCONNELL's words, not mine.

We expect to have a lot of member participation.

Leader MCCONNELL's words, not mine.

It will be open for amendment, said Leader MCCONNELL. That meaning is pretty plain, but I must have misheard, and so must have America, because the NDAA, let me repeat, is not open for amendment—not even for a serious and timely and relevant debate on our policy with respect to Iran, not even for a matter of war and peace and the constitutional prerogative of this body to authorize it or not.

It is not just this amendment that is being excluded. My friend, the senior Senator from Minnesota, will offer an amendment on election security important to our national security. My Republican colleague will block it—no amendments.

There are so many clamoring on both sides of the aisle that the Senate go back to amending. If we are not going to do it on this bill, we are not going to do it at all this year. This is too common—no amendments, no bills, a graveyard in Leader MCCONNELL's Senate.

No Senator has been allowed to vote on their amendments for months. This is simply not how the Senate is supposed to be. So I urge Leader MCCONNELL, for the sake of the Senate and for the sake of war and peace and for the sake of the Constitution, to allow us a vote on our amendment. The leader should not run the NDAA like he has run the Senate for much of this year, like a legislative graveyard, where issues of consequence are buried so the callous political interests of the President and the leader can march forward atop their graves.

BORDER SECURITY

Madam President, on the border, as the Senate moves to consider a supplemental appropriations bill on the border, I want to turn my colleagues' attention to what is transpiring there at the border.

Over the past few months, we have read reports and seen images of deplorable conditions. At the Homestead facility in Florida, the Trump administration has allowed a for-profit detention company to operate what amounts to a modern-day internment camp: children ripped away from their parents, kept in cages, denied nutrition and hygiene, diapers, toothbrushes. How can our country do this? All because some in the President's purview think that might deter immigrants: use these poor little children—2 years old, 4 years old, we read about one 4 months old—as hostages and cruelly treat them. It is a black mark on our country. It is a black mark on those who allow it to happen at the Homestead facility in Florida and in other places.

Think of what law enforcement would do if a parent denied their child this kind of basic care, toothbrushes and diapers, and put them in cages. Why on Earth would it be acceptable for our government to do the same? Along with millions of Americans, I am appalled—appalled—by these conditions, and I am appalled by the thought that some in the Trump administration may actually want these deplorable conditions to continue because they think it will deter future migrants—migrants who are running away not because they are drug dealers, not because they are MS–13 members but because their children have been threatened by gangs: I am going to murder your son unless you do what I want; I am going to rape your daughter unless you do what I want. Who wouldn't flee? These are not evil people. To rip kids away from their parents, to separate families as a policy, to discourage immigrants fleeing violence, lawlessness, and degradation is sick and twisted. It is inhumane. The people who are in charge of this mess should be ashamed of themselves, and I can think of no other President—Democratic, Republican, liberal, conservative—who would allow this to continue.

Now we are working on a compromise appropriations bill here in the Senate to try to provide more resources and better conditions for these kids and their families, but we also have to grapple with the real challenges at the border and do more to reduce the number of migrants who feel they need to flee their countries in the first place. That is why Democrats have proposed to hire more immigration judges at the border to reduce the backlog of cases and reduce the number of immigrants who are held in limbo. That is why we have proposed allowing asylum seekers to apply for asylum within their own countries, not at our border. It makes sense. That is why we have also proposed additional security assistance to Central American countries to crack down on drug cartels, gangs, and human trafficking, to stem the violence that impels so many to make the journey north that is so perilous.

These are the kinds of policies we should be talking about. They are not controversial. They are not partisan. They are simply commonsense—commonsense solutions to the problems both parties have witnessed. The President—this President needs to end the inhumanity of his administration's border management and work instead with us on real solutions.

SHELBY V. HOLDER

Madam President, I appreciate my colleagues waiting, but there is a lot going on here this morning.

Finally, today marks the sixth anniversary of the Supreme Court's disastrous decision in Shelby v. Holder, where a conservative majority undercut decades of progress by gutting key provisions of the Voting Rights Act. It will go down as one of the lowest moments of the Roberts Court. When Justice Roberts says he is not political and he calls the balls and strikes, the Shelby decision is an overwhelming and persuasive argument that that is not the case with this Chief Justice.

Few pieces of legislation have reshaped America for the better quite like the Voting Rights Act. But 6 years ago, in a narrow 5-to-4 decision, the Court eliminated important safeguards in the law. By the majority's reckoning, such provisions were no longer needed because discrimination was no longer a problem. Discrimination was no longer a problem? Hello. Hello. The Court said it. Justice Roberts signed the decision. ''Mr. Balls and Strikes'' was saying there is no discrimination in America anymore. It wasn't a problem.

Well, in the 6 years since Shelby, 19 States have instituted voting restrictions, including laws in North Carolina that the Fourth Circuit said ''targeted African Americans with almost surgical precision.'' No more discrimination? Prior to the Court's decision in Shelby, North Carolina would have been required to seek approval from the Department of Justice's Civil Rights Division before enacting these pernicious laws. This is one of many examples of how State and local officials have been freed up to implement discriminatory laws while the courts struggle to keep up.

Now, in ordinary times, the Senate would debate ways to reinstate the safeguards that the Court abolished in Shelby. We would debate policies like automatic voter registration and restrictions on discriminatory voter ID laws and efforts that we would make to make it easier, safer, and more reliable for Americans to vote. That is what Senate Democrats have proposed.

But, of course, once again, Leader MCCONNELL has transformed the Senate into a legislative graveyard, where inaction is the order of the day. What a shame that the leader believes something as crucial as ensuring that Americans can exercise the franchise is unworthy of the Senate's time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1540

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I share our leader's outrage over what is going on right now at the border over these private facilities where these children are being housed and about the lack of an ability to bring amendments on the National Defense Authorization Act. As for the one that the leader mentioned, it is imperative that we go forward with this right now.

We have a situation where the President tweets us closer to war each day, 10 minutes short. He got us out of an agreement that, while imperfect, would have prevented us from being in the situation that we are in. Congress must be a check and balance on this administration, and under the Constitution, we should have the ability to do this. I cannot stress how important this amendment is.

Today, I am here to talk about another amendment that is also necessary to protect our democracy and protect our country, and that is about our elections—our very elections, a fundamental foundation of our democracy.

We know one thing, and whom do we know it from? We know it from the President's own Director of National Intelligence. We know it from his FBI Director. We know it from all of his security leaders, and that is that Russia invaded our democracy. They didn't use bombs, jets, or tanks. Instead, they planned a sophisticated cyber mission to undermine our democratic system. Special Counsel Mueller also concluded that Russian interference in our democracy was ''sweeping and systematic.''

Our elections are less than 500 days away. We know that Russia is actively working to attack our democracy again, and our intelligence officials are again sounding alarms. President Trump's FBI Director said Russia's efforts to interfere in our 2018 election were just a ''dress rehearsal for the big show in 2020.''

Has the administration worked with Congress to help craft legislation to make sure our election systems are fortified against future attacks? No, they actually stopped the bipartisan bill that was moving ahead at the end of last year.

I see my colleague from Oklahoma here, Senator LANKFORD. He and I led that bill, and the cosponsors, including the head of the Intelligence Committee, as well as the ranking member. It was a bill that had significant support and still has significant support. But just as we are about to mark up that bill in the Rules Committee, the White House made some calls to Republican Senators. Leader MCCONNELL made some calls to Republican Senators, and that bipartisan effort was stopped in its tracks, which would have paved the way to making sure that the Federal election money was given out to the States and that we would have had to have backup paper ballots. It would have paved the way for audits. Instead, it was stopped in its tracks, blocked by the White House.

Earlier this month, the President invited more election interference when he said he would accept help from a foreign adversary once again. That happened. It is unprecedented, and it is wrong. At a time when the President is failing to do his job to protect our democracy, Congress must do its job.

In fact, there is bipartisan legislation that has been introduced in the House right now that includes many of the things that I will be talking about today that includes additional funding. I do thank the Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. LANKFORD. He and I led the way, in addition to our colleagues in the Appropriations Committee—Senator SHELBY, Senator LEAHY, Senator COONS, and others—to make sure that we got $380 million out to the States over a year ago. It is time to step up again.

Everyone remembers what happened back in the 2000 election. We all saw those hanging chads displayed on TVs across the country. That experience taught America that we needed to update our election equipment. When we couldn't figure out who won for President of the United States, yes, maybe you need to update your election equipment.

So what happened back then? Well, we passed the Help America Vote Act. I wasn't here then, but that is what they did. It was landmark legislation that provided more than $3 billion to States to help them update their election infrastructure. That was 17 years ago, before the iPhone even existed, and the Federal Government has not made a big major investment to update our election technology since.

Russia knew that. What better way to upend our democracy than to try to break into our election equipment and to try to spread propaganda against campaigns and candidates in our election. That is what they did. They conducted sophisticated influence operations in 2016.

Where do I learn this? I learn this from the Trump intelligence advisers.

They hacked political committees and campaigns. They targeted election administrators and even private technology firms responsible for manufacturing and administering election systems. In Illinois, the names, addresses, birth dates, and partial Social Security numbers of thousands of registered voters were exposed.

Just recently, we learned that the election systems in two Florida counties were hacked by the Russians, and the Department of Homeland Security is conducting forensic analysis on computers used in North Carolina after it was revealed in the Mueller report that a voting software company was hacked by Russia.

How much more do we need to know as we go into these 2020 elections? I don't think much more. We have a common set of facts about what happened, and we know that there is a continued threat against our democracy. What we need to do now is address these facts with a common purpose—to protect our democracy and to make sure that our election systems are resilient against future attacks.

We have a long way to go when it comes to making sure our election systems are resilient. Right now, 40 States rely on electronic voting systems that are at least 10 years old. Do you think I am telling a surprise to Russia? No, they know this. Twelve States have no or partial paper ballot backups—12 states—and 16 States have no statewide audit requirement to figure out, after the fact, what happened and if their elections were secure. These statistics are alarming because experts agree that paper ballots and audits are the baseline of what we need to secure our election systems.

Many election officials continue to sound the alarm that they lack the funding necessary to replace outdated equipment, hire cyber security experts, and make other much needed improvements to their election system. So maybe, as a country, we can just say: Well, States, if you are not doing this, it is not our problem. That is yours.

No, this is a Presidential election before us, and if a few counties in one swing State or an entire State get hacked into and there is no backup paper ballot and we can't figure out what happened, the entire election will be called into question. No Democrat, no Republican, and no Independent can want that to happen, especially when we can prevent it from happening.

The House bill includes the same amount of money as we did last time, and that is about 3 percent of the cost of one aircraft carrier. The bill that I am proposing now that we move forward to is about 8 percent of the cost of one aircraft carrier, and that is to protect our entire democracy from the kind of modern warfare—not old-fashioned warfare but modern warfare—that we are seeing today, which is cyber warfare.

Protecting our democracy from future attacks will require modernizing our election systems and building new safeguards to prevent cyber attacks,

important steps that will require meaningful Federal assistance. Do you really think that the State of Arkansas or the State of Maine is supposed to be fully responsible for protecting us from a foreign power's cyber attack? I don't actually think so. If we could come together to quickly help States address things like those hanging chads back in 2000, which were in fact just a function of bad election equipment, we certainly must come together to protect ourselves from a cyber attack from a foreign power. By the way, the last time it was one foreign power. Maybe this time it will be another one.

We must do the right thing for our country. That is why I have worked with my colleagues in the House and Senate, including Senator LANKFORD, on legislation that would provide critical election funding in the coming years.

The bill before us today, our legislation, the Election Security Act, would also require States to use paper ballots, and it would provide funding for States to implement post-election audits. It would strengthen the Federal response to attacks on our election systems by requiring the President to issue a national security strategy to protect U.S. democratic institutions from cyber attacks and influence operations, and it would establish a bipartisan commission to develop recommendations—drawing upon lessons learned from our European allies, who have also been repeatedly subject to attacks from Russia—to counter election interference. This is the kind of legislation that the American people elected us to pass.

As I noted, the House is taking action. It will consider similar legislation this week. The Senate must take strong action on election security as well.

I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1540 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). Is there objection?

Mr. LANKFORD. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I started working on election security with Senator KLOBUCHAR in 2017. At the time, I served on the Senate Intelligence Committee. We have worked together, from the beginning, to make this a bipartisan—in fact, nonpartisan—issue. Elections are an American event. They have partisan results, but the act of voting is an American event, not a partisan event.

We had a hearing in the Rules Committee. We worked through the process. We continue to get feedback. In fact, she and I worked incredibly hard to be able to reach out to and have multiple meetings with secretaries of State from all over the country to be able to hear as much feedback as we could from the States, because elections are run by States. Elections are not run by the Federal Government. Each State runs their own election. Each county or precinct or parish has its own structure for doing elections. In fact, one of the strengths of our system is the diversity of how elections are actually done. So we had to do a lot of work behind the scenes with all of these different States, to meet with their leadership, to meet with Governors, and to meet with as many groups as we possibly could to get it.

The basic goal from the beginning was to achieve a piece of legislation that had a couple of features in it.

First, ensure timely information sharing between the Federal Government, State, and local officials because we learned in 2016 it was not timely information that was shared. The Federal Government had visibility on what Russia was doing; the States and the precincts did not. It took up to 14 months for the States to find out what the Russians were doing. That can never happen again.

Second, we must expedite security clearances for the State and local election officials. Again, we had this issue in 2016 when Federal officials saw what was going on by the Russians but said that the State individuals didn't have enough security clearance. So, instead, they got a nebulous memo that said to watch out for these IP addresses, with no explanation as to why. That can never happen again.

Third is a way to verify the results of our elections. That should be straightforward. Every State, every precinct should be able to verify that—to go back to the people in the area and say: This is how you voted, and this is how we verified that the number is accurate, that there aren't additional ballots showing up later that the machines didn't count, that suddenly pop up from nowhere. There are no hanging chads. There are no inconsistencies. So people can look and say: That was done efficiently and professionally.

The administration is taking steps on the first two of these. In fact, we had multiple hearings with DHS to talk about what they are doing to get security clearances. Now every single State has individuals within their State who have security clearances. Every State has greater cooperation now with the Federal Government. Multiple layers of cyber security have been offered to every single State so that each State can use their own cyber protection or add an additional layer from the Federal Government. It is up to that State to choose. It is not a mandated piece that has come down on them. Almost every State has taken that, though, and has said that they want those additional layers of cyber protection because it is not just about the voting machine or the piece of paper; it is how it is counted, how it is presented, how the unofficial results go out in the States the night of the election. All of those things matter.

DHS has leaned in, and they have done aggressive work on this in the last several years. That is why the 2018 election went so smoothly. DHS has done a tremendous amount of work already on this.

I have been clear, though, through this process that this cannot be a way of federalizing elections and trying to run the elections or saying that every piece of election equipment has to be run through some bureaucracy here in DC, whatever it may be. This is a State responsibility that the State has to take on. Right now, there is not a way for the States that do not have an election system—pieces of hardware for their elections—to change that hardware before 2020. The first of our elections is not in November 2020; it is 8 months from now, when our primaries begin. States cannot purchase the equipment, put it into place, train the volunteers, and make that transition before the 2020 election. So the emphasis is, what can we do to assist States in cyber protection? What can we do to get information to them? How can we run this?

In the days ahead, Senator KLOBUCHAR and I completely agree that every State should have a system with backup paper ballots—every State and every precinct. Right now that is not so, but no matter how much money we throw at the States right now, they could not make it so by the 2020 Presidential election. It is not possible to get there.

In the 2018 omnibus, we added $380 million to go to the States. Not all of that $380 million has even been spent yet. There is still quite a bit of it that is banked. But that has all been allocated to the States, and the States are deciding the best way to use that. In States like mine—Oklahoma—we use optical scanners and paper ballots. That money was used in my State to assist in cyber protection of the system, the transition of the information, and how the unofficial results get out to the public. It is a good way to use those funds to make sure any threats are being mitigated.

My State, like 21 other States, was one of the States that the Russians tried to engage in our election systems. They came to the State election board in my State, tried to get into it, found out the door was locked, and moved on to another State. They did not get into our system. But there are other areas where we could protect it.

Of the $380 million we allocated just last year, much of it has not even been spent. So I object to another $380 million on top of that when the first part of it hasn't been spent yet, and it will not make a difference in this year's election because the $380 million for last year was really preparing for the 2020 elections.

Here is my concern long term. I don't want election security to become a partisan issue. It would be easy for it to become that. H.R. 1, when it came out of the House, was clearly a very partisan bill.

I find myself at odds today with a partner in this, Senator KLOBUCHAR. We have worked together in a very nonpartisan way to resolve this issue. I think we still can resolve this and we can actually get a result, but a partisan proposal will not get us an end result in which both parties come together and resolve this.

I reiterate again that election security should never be a partisan issue. This is about the preservation of our democracy, and it is something that all parties—Independents, Republicans, Democrats, and all parties—agree should be a central issue.

Having stated all of that, begrudgingly, in this proposal because it is not a bipartisan proposal—I look forward to working through it and getting a bipartisan proposal done in the days ahead—I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I appreciate the work my colleague has done with me and others on this issue, but I do want to point out a few things.

No. 1, I agree that this should not be a partisan issue, and, in fact, our bill was as bipartisan as it gets with the two of us leading the bill, with Senators WARNER and BURR, the leaders of the Intelligence Committee, as cosponsors, and with Senator GRAHAM and Senator HARRIS from the Judiciary Committee. It was a strong bill, and I would be glad to call that up with an amendment if he would be willing to do that.

But one wonders, why wouldn't we be able to advance this bipartisan bill? It is because the White House made it decidedly partisan. They objected to its moving forward—our own bipartisan bill. Leader MCCONNELL did not want that bill to move forward. He made it very clear.

So let's be very precise about why we are having this discussion today, and that is that we could have done this bill with the backup paper ballots attached to the funding 1 year ago, but it was blocked by the Republicans. So now we are where we are. There is this idea that we just wait and every year say: It won't help the next election, and it won't help that next election. I believe in the importance and urgency of getting this done.

Secondly, I am not trying to federalize our elections. In fact, this model, while there is more money attached to it, is very similar to the model that we have discussed and that is included in our bill. It is this idea that if the States are willing to do what they are supposed to do, then they get Federal money. It does not federalize elections.

Third, the North Carolina example that I just brought up didn't just happen in 2016; it happened much more recently. So our concerns are based on the assessments that we have been given by the Trump security advisers based on what Trump's FBI Director said just last month. He didn't say it last year; he said last month that this is happening now and that Congress must do more to help defend our elections.

I will repeat that election security is national security. We must remember this. Last week, 22 State attorneys general sent Congress a letter asking us to take action to protect the integrity of our election infrastructure. We have received similar letters from State election officials, and leading law enforcement officials in nearly half the country are begging us to take action. Think about that.

While I have no doubt that there has been some progress and there is better communication, I tend to believe the people on the ground, the chief law enforcement officers in nearly half the States in this country. I tend to believe the FBI Director for President Trump himself, the National Intelligence Director for President Trump himself.

The integrity of our election system is a cornerstone of our democracy. The freedom to choose our leaders and know with full confidence that those leaders were chosen in free and fair elections is something Americans have fought and died for since our country was founded.

Going back to 1923, Stalin said to the Communist Party: Who votes? That may not matter. What matters is who counts the votes.

History is repeating itself, and obstructing efforts to improve election security is an insult to those who have fought for our freedom and those who work every day to protect our democracy. This is not about one election or one party. That is why we worked so hard to have a bipartisan bill and I was willing to make compromises on that bill.

We were gut punched by the White House. Senator BLUNT had sent that Rules Committee markup. It was ready to go. I think if that bill were called up right now, 75 percent of the Senators right here in this Chamber would vote for it, but we were gut punched by the White House. They didn't want the backup paper ballots. They didn't want to have those options. They didn't want to have additional money for election security.

So I don't want to hear about how this is a partisan effort to try to push this right now. This is not about one election or one party; it is about our democracy.

We need to be a united front in fighting against those who interfere with our democracy, and we must do everything in our power to prevent foreign interference from ever happening again. This is a bill we should be on because it is the Defense Authorization Act, and it is about the security of our country and free and fair elections. That is the fundamental basis for the security of America.

I look forward to working with my colleagues. I hope we will find some way to overcome these objections from the White House.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, do we have a schedule this morning in terms of debate on the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no consent agreement.

Mr. DURBIN. I will, of course, defer to the chairman and ranking member if they want to move forward on their legislation, but I would like to ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, if we can amend that—after a period of 10 minutes, the two leaders and the ranking member be allowed to speak for such time as they shall consume. That would work.

Mr. DURBIN. I would be happy to accept that as a friendly amendment.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. President, it pains me to say this on the floor of the United States Senate, but there is no other way to describe what America is facing today. By every objective and measurable standard, the policies of our government constitute child abuse when it comes to the treatment of these children on our border. Hardly a day goes by that we don't hear another horror story involving these migrants and particularly their children and babies.

Having been there and seen it and read the numbers, I will concede that we are being overwhelmed, and for that, there should be some understanding and perhaps even forgiveness if we don't respond as quickly as possible. But this has dragged on and on for months. There are children who are being held in detention under circumstances and conditions which are an embarrassment to this country and unacceptable in any civilized nation on Earth, period. It led me to join with 23 other Senators to write to the International Red Cross several weeks ago.

The International Red Cross is called in to countries around the world when jails and detention facilities have reached such a point that you need an international arbiter to come in and declare to that government and to the world how deplorable the conditions are.

I never dreamed there would be a moment when I would need to ask the International Red Cross to review our own detention facilities in the United States. What brings me to this point? Well, it is well publicized in the press.

There is a New York Times story of June 21. Let me read it.

A chaotic scene of sickness and filth is unfolding in an overcrowded border station in Clint, Tex., where hundreds of young people who have recently crossed the border are being held, according to lawyers who visited the facility this week. Some of the children have been there for nearly a month.

Children as young as 7 and 8, many of them wearing clothes caked with snot and tears, are caring for infants they've just met, the lawyer said. Toddlers without diapers are relieving themselves in their pants. Teenage mothers are wearing clothes stained with breast milk.

Most of the young detainees have not been able to shower or wash their clothes since they arrived at facility. They have no access to toothbrushes, toothpaste or soap.

''There is a stench,'' said Elora Mukherjee, director of the Immigrants' Rights Clinic at Columbia Law School. . . . ''The overwhelming majority of children have not bathed since they crossed the border.''

I might find that hard to believe had I not seen for myself, at the El Paso border crossing, what is happening. Albeit, it was several weeks ago, but the circumstances described in this article on June 21 mirror what I saw in El Paso.

Let me say at the outset and very clearly say that many of the men and women in the Border Patrol, Customs and Border Protection, are good, caring people who come from families themselves and privately have told me how heartbreaking these circumstances are. I am not going to make excuses for any wrongdoing by any of them or any Federal agency. I wouldn't try. But I do want to concede the point that there are many who want to do better but don't have the resources to do it.

So why aren't we doing more here? Why, in this empty Chamber, isn't the Senate coming together and working on a solution? We came up with over $400 million in February—a special appropriation for humanitarian purposes at the border supported on a bipartisan basis.

Last week, we reported a bill out of the Senate Appropriations Committee 31 to 1 to appropriate $4.6 billion to come down and do something about the circumstance at the border, a humanitarian response and more. I supported it. Most have supported it on both sides of the aisle. It is time to enact it and do it as quickly as possible. I stand ready for that to happen as quickly as we can schedule it.

In the meantime, we need to ask the basic question: How have we reached this point in this country? How have we reached the point when it comes to immigration that it is such a national embarrassment?

Take a look at the record of this administration in 2½ years. As you tick off the items of major policy decisions, you can find how we reached this point today.

Remember the first one, the Muslim travel ban? We were banning people from Muslim countries from coming into the United States.

Not too long after, this President decided he was going to eliminate DACA—a program that allowed 800,000 young people in this country a chance to live here without fear of deportation.

Then he turned around and eliminated the status of several hundred thousand in the United States who were in temporary protected status because they were escaping emergencies, crises in their own countries and natural disasters.

He followed that up with the notion of zero tolerance. Remember zero tolerance? Remember when Attorney General Sessions quoted the Bible, for goodness' sake, as his justification for separating infants, toddlers, and children from their mothers and fathers at the border? Zero tolerance.

Finally, a Federal court judge in San Diego said: Enough. I want to know who those children are, and I want to know where they are and where their parents are.

It was a common thing to ask. It sounds like an easy request, doesn't it? It turns out we didn't keep records. These kids were separated from their parents without a record of where they were going or where the parents were going. It took weeks, if not months, and still we can't resolve the whereabouts of some of those families who were separated.

Then came the President's decision that he announced by tweet a week ago that he was going to engage in mass arrests and mass deportations in the United States. Do you know what that means? It means children will be coming home from school to empty homes and wondering where Mom and Dad are. They are gone, you know. They have been deported. The fact that they have lived here for a number of years, had no problems with the law, and are part of the community, and the fact that those children and others in the household may be citizens doesn't seem to be important to this administration.

When we come down to it, we have reached a point when it comes to immigration—a stage I have not seen in modern times—where we are being inundated at the border and are in complete chaos here in the United States under the Trump administration. Oh, this President promised us when he was elected that he was going to get tough. Boy, he sure knows how to get tough. He doesn't know how to get effective. He doesn't know how to cope with something as terrible as the disintegration of the economies and social justice system in three Central American countries that leads people to cash in everything they own on Earth to give it to a transporter or smuggler to take them and their kids to the border. That is where we are. That is why we need to act.

First, we need humanitarian assistance—yes, count me in; the sooner the better—to put diapers on these babies, to give them basic foodstuffs, perhaps clean clothes. That is not too much to ask this great United States of America.

Secondly, let's come up with an approach on Central America that makes sense. Swearing at them, tweeting at them, saying you are going to cut off all assistance to them hasn't worked very well, has it, Mr. President?

I found out at the border that smugglers use the President's tough talk to sell their case: You better get moving. He is going to get tougher. He is going to build a wall. You better get moving. And in panic, they do. This approach is not working. It is clear that it is not working.

Finally, haven't we reached a point in the United States of America where we know we need comprehensive immigration reform? I was part of that effort 6 or 7 years ago. There were four Democrats and four Republican Senators. We sat for months—myself, John McCain, CHUCK SCHUMER, BOB MENENDEZ, MARCO RUBIO, LINDSEY GRAHAM, Jeff Flake, and MICHAEL BENNET. We sat for months every night working on another aspect of immigration reform. We put together not a good bill—I think it was a great bill. There was a lot of compromise in it that I didn't like, but that is what happens when you sit down across the table and in good faith try to resolve your differences.

We brought it to the floor of the Senate and got 68 votes in the Senate. Democrats and Republicans said they are for comprehensive immigration reform. As Senator ALEXANDER of Tennessee, a Republican, said a few weeks ago, if we had passed that bill and made it the law, we wouldn't be facing the mess we are facing today. He is right to a great degree. I don't think it would have solved all the problems, but it sure would have solved a lot of them.

What happened to that bill after it passed the Senate with 68 votes? It died in the House. The Republican House refused to even consider it. So here we sit with this mess on our hands, with a President who tweets at people and threatens mass arrests and mass deportation. And the situation goes from bad to worse, to even worse, to embarrassing when it comes to the treatment of children.

We can do better as a nation, this Nation of immigrants which I am proud to be part of. This Nation of immigrants has absorbed people from around the world in a systematic, orderly way in the past, and we can do it again.

We need border security. No one should come in this country if we don't know who they are and what they are bringing in.

Secondly, we cannot accept everyone who wants to come to America. It has to be done in an orderly, thoughtful way.

Third, we should never accept anyone coming into this country who is a danger, period. If they are here undocumented and dangerous, they should leave, period.

Having said that, don't we all agree on that? Can't we move forward in a constructive, bipartisan way to solve this problem, to end this embarrassment? Once and for all, we have to say to the President that tweets are not enough.

What this reporter saw, what she reported as stench on the border, is something that should be an embarrassment to all of us. We are better than that. We need to prove it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, yesterday we got down to work on amendments for the national defense authorization legislation. We filed a substitute amendment that included 93 bipartisan amendments. When I say 93, there are 44 Democratic, 44 Republican, and I think 5 more that we have from both sides. This is what we have been trying to do. Both Senator REED and I have been encouraging people to bring amendments to the floor for a long period of time. In fact, the majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, has made several appeals that in the event this gets bogged down, go ahead and bring your amendments down so we can work with you. That is what we did. The substitute that we used yesterday incorporated 93 amendments, and they were actually brought to us for fear that what happened a year ago would happen again.

I am not sure that the system is wrong when it does this, but any one Member of the Democrats or Republicans can stop an amendment from coming forward.

It takes unanimous consent. People don't understand that. Right now, we are in a position where one individual—last year, one individual, and at one point, two individuals said they were stopping all amendments unless they got certain consideration for their own amendment. That seems to be happening again now. Nonetheless, that is why we have all of these amendments, and that is what we have done.

I heard a couple of my colleagues say that Republicans are blocking consideration of an amendment on Iran, the Senator UDALL amendment. That is holding up the bill.

Members of both parties are raising objections to not just one single amendment but to all amendments. We are following a process that allows all Senators to have their say. That is a good thing, but it means that anyone can hold up this bill.

What do we do to preclude damage—irreparable damage—to the most important bill of the year, the NDAA? We have taken the initiative to bring up amendments and discuss amendments. I have a list with me of all of the amendments that are in the bill that we are talking about, the substitute bill—the Cotton amendment; the open source fusion centers; the Pacific Island states; the Perdue amendment—I can go through all 93 of them. The DOD Financial Improvement and Audit Remediation Plan, which Senator PERDUE has been talking about for a long period of time—we have it now. It is in the bill. CORNYN's bill on overseas absentee balloting—voting for members of the Armed Forces—that is in the bill. All these amendments are there, and that is what we have been doing.

That is why I found the whole idea of Senator SCHUMER's objecting to finishing this bill, as we had planned to do it, this week because of the political debates, the Presidential debates that are going on—I was pretty shocked yesterday to hear that my colleague from New York, the minority leader, said that we should delay votes on the NDAA so that seven Democratic Senators can participate in primary debates. That is clearly saying that politics is more important than the national security.

Whether it is seven or just one Democratic Senator who wants to participate, my answer would be the same: We need to get this bill done to protect the Nation. I say without apology that the national security preempts politics. This is the tradition of the Armed Services Committee. It is our tradition for a reason.

I repeat: Senator SCHUMER said we should delay votes on the most important bill of the year—a bill which has a quickly approaching deadline and which has wide bipartisan support—for political purposes. He said: ''There is no rush to complete the NDAA.'' He said that there will be ''no harmful consequences to our military.''

I disagree. We have to enact the NDAA by September 30, the start of the new fiscal year. We don't have that much time to spare. Think about all the things we have to do between now and September 30.

If we don't pass the NDAA on time, we will delay needed reforms to the privatized housing scandal. I would call it a scandal. We have had two hearings on that. Up until February, no one had said anything about it. No one said there is a problem. They talked about back in the days when we did privatize housing. I thought it was a good idea. I was here at the time. I am partially responsible. It worked for a while, a couple of years. And then I think a lot of the contractors got greedy, and they found shortcuts. I think we in the uniforms were somewhat responsible, too, because they did some things that—they didn't have the oversight they had before, and therefore they didn't have the responsibility. So that is a big deal, and that is something that needs to be corrected, and that is in the bill. That is going to be a part of the bill. If we don't pass the NDAA, it is not going to be.

If we don't pass the NDAA on time, we will delay $11.2 billion in military construction projects in 44 States. Yes, some of those are in my State of Oklahoma. We would handicap mission-critical infrastructure for combatant commands protecting America and U.S. interests across the globe. These are MILCON projects that need to be done.

If we don't pass the NDAA on time, we will delay disaster relief for military installations still recovering from the devastating storms and disasters in Florida, North Carolina, and Nebraska.

If we don't pass the NDAA on time, we will lose authorities for ongoing security cooperation in Afghanistan and Iraq, reducing pressure on terrorist threats, encouraging our enemies, and undermining our partners.

If we don't pass this NDAA on time, we will be slowing enactment of the Fentanyl Sanctions Act, which Senator SCHUMER is very much concerned about and has been critical to getting this done. I think it is very important to inhibit the flow of these deadly drugs across our borders.

If we don't get the NDAA done on time, we will let the EPA continue kicking the can down the road on the PFAS crisis and providing Americans safe drinking water.

All of these things are going to happen if we start delaying it. You might say we are only delaying it for a week, maybe 2 weeks; still, that delays everything else, and that also puts it into the timeframe where we are going to be busy doing all these other things we are going to have to do. We have a lot to do before September 30 and only a number of legislative days to do it. We have to pass the NDAA. We have to get a budget deal. We have to bring the appropriations bills to the floor. These are all vital to getting our troops the resources they need on time and with predictability.

This is a simple request that our military leaders have made. In fact, they said it is the best thing we can do for our national security. This is what is going on right now.

I also listened to a lot of the discussion on the floor. They are talking about the concentration camps, all these—the treatment of our kids. Let me say, even though that is not in the purview of the committee that has the bill, the NDAA—that is Health and Human Services—I have done some looking into that. And Don Archer in my office has spent time with HHS, and they found out these kids are being kept well. Fourteen hundred of these kids are going to go to my State of Oklahoma, and I am going to be sure that they are healthy when they get there and that they are fed properly. Everyone is going to have their own bed, their own resources. The staff servicing these kids is at a 2-to-1 ratio.

I know it sounds great. It sounds popular. If you want to demean this President and make it look like he is abusing kids, that rings high, but it is just not true. We are going to have to do something to correct the misuse. It is doing a great disservice not just to the kids but to the bill.

Our responsibility to provide for the common defense is so important, it is in the opening lines of the Constitution. I know a lot of people don't read

the old document anymore, but I think it is pretty important. I would hope that my colleagues agree—especially those on the campaign trail—that a candidate for a higher office in this country who truly understands the importance of defending this Nation and our ideas should understand the need to pass this bill on time. We have to pass the bill. We have to pass the bill as soon as possible.

I want to again commend the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, Senator REED, for his unwavering commitment to our men and women in uniform. He understands, as I understand, that this isn't the only important thing we have to do.

I would like for everyone to be aware that there is an effort to delay this bill for what I have to say would be purely political reasons. It is so that people who are on the committee can participate in a Presidential debate. Well, they have a daytime job, and they need to be doing their daytime job, which is defending America and passing the NDAA. That is what we intend to do.

I plan to be on the floor all day today, and I want to make sure this idea that somehow we are not getting amendments through, anticipating we might not be able to get them through—yesterday, we actually passed 93 amendments—93 amendments. It has taken several weeks to get all these amendments in. I am going to be reading off some of these amendments and making sure that the authors come down to the floor and talk about their amendment.

Senator BOOZMAN from Arkansas has an amendment that would modify authorized strength in the Armed Force Reserve. It is a very important amendment, and I am sure he is going to be coming down and talking about his amendment, as are the other Members. Some 44 Members actually have amendments they need to talk about. We will have that opportunity. I think we have all day long today to get that done and get this done and get back on track and pass the NDAA, the most important bill of the year.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, first let me thank Senator INHOFE for his leadership and his cooperation, which has gotten us to this point in the consideration of the fiscal year 2020 National Defense Authorization Act. The chairman has been thoughtful. He has been very reasonable.

We had a record hearing in our committee in terms of the number of amendments we dealt with and how we did it in a very collegial fashion. As a result, we were able to once again, as he has indicated, include 93 additional amendments in the substitute package that has been submitted. That is testimony to the good work of the chairman and the outstanding work of our staff, who have been working very diligently, and I appreciate it.

This is a very good bill. It passed out of committee by a vote of 25 to 2—totally bipartisan vote. It contains many needed authorities, funding authorizations, and reforms that will help the men and women of our Armed Services.

As both of us have indicated, it also contains numerous amendments from many of my colleagues on other issues of great importance, such as, for example, the intelligence authorization. We have included in this legislation the work of the Intelligence Committee not just for this year but the past 3 years. So we will now have up-to-date authorities for the intelligence community. We will authorize the Maritime Administration. We have provisions that range far and wide. We have an amendment dealing with the fentanyl crisis. We have an amendment dealing with the PFOS/PFAS in our water around military bases. This is a significant crisis we are beginning to recognize more and more each day.

This legislation is extremely supportive of the men and women in uniform and, indeed, touches on many other important aspects that are necessary as we move forward.

As we both said in our opening statements last week, we would like to have a robust debate on this bill and vote on amendments. It was the process for many years. We need to get back to the process where we have amendments—some of them contentious, some of them not so contentious, but there would be an agreed-upon path, a reasonable time for debate, and then a vote.

In fact, the Chairman and I try to work together. When we have differences, we say: Well, that will be resolved by a vote. If you can't agree to a consensus compromise, then in this Chamber you ultimately hope you can get a vote, and that will be the deciding factor.

I understand there are differences about the proceedings, particularly with respect to the issue of potential military action against Iran. I do not think anyone will argue with the fact that it is a very pressing issue and the Senate has a role we are obligated to fulfill. Last week, the chairman and I were both at the White House, and the President very graciously listened to our thoughts and ideas about the response to the drone strike.

We are in a situation where potential conflict or interaction with Iran is not hypothetical. Just 4, 5 days ago, we were confronted with a very serious situation. The President made a decision not to use a kinetic strike on Iran. I think that was an appropriate decision. But we are at a point now where the Senate as an institution—not as individuals accommodating the President but as an institution—has to take a position, I feel.

We understand, too, that as the administration applies more and more pressure on the Iranian regime, there will be several likelihoods. One will be that these reactions to our pressure will take place. As the President indicated in his televised comments, his first sense was this was probably not officially authorized, that it may have been a subordinate who had taken the action, which had minimized, to a degree, the severity. Of course, the most significant factor of all was that we had lost an expensive piece of equipment, but, thank goodness, we didn't lose any American personnel. Nevertheless, this pressure campaign is producing a counterreaction, and that counterreaction could be more and more dangerous to our interests. It could escalate. It would create a situation in which the question of armed conflict with Iran will not be, as I said, theoretical, but something we will have to confront.

The dangers of miscalculation and escalation on both sides are acute at the moment. So we have to, I think, as a Senate take a position with respect to this issue. That is why I think the amendment is extremely important.

What I would hope we would all like to see is that we are able to accomplish two things—one, to have an adequate debate and a vote on this amendment. There may be other amendments people will propose on which they will feel strongly about having votes, and we could consider those also; two, our ability to conclude our debate on the Defense authorization bill and move forward. I don't think we have given up on that pathway yet.

I think we are still trying to find a pathway to address these critical issues of national security, with respect to there being a potential conflict with Iran as well as our finishing this bill in a timely fashion. I don't think it will be months from now but really days from now or a week or more from now that we will finish this bill. I look forward to working with my colleagues to find this path forward.

Again, the chairman has been extremely responsive and thoughtful about this, and his views and participation will be critical to these efforts.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, the past week has lain bare just how dangerous it can be to have a President who approaches foreign policy as if it were a reality show, when the worst thing that can happen is to get kicked off before the next episode airs—a President who doesn't seem to recognize that his words and his decisions can have life-and-death consequences for the brave Americans who wear our Nation's uniform. No matter your political party, what we have seen from the White House of late should worry every single one of us.

In one breath, Trump is beating the drums of war, thumping his chest, and pushing for a conflict that would kill an unimaginable number of people—servicemembers and civilians alike. In the next breath, he tries to act like a peacemaker who wouldn't even think

of starting a new war. It is gaslighting, plain and simple. Yet it is the closest thing to a Trump foreign policy doctrine since his inauguration.

So, while I am glad he called off a military strike last week, it hasn't made me forget that he and aides like John Bolton are the ones who brought us to the brink of war in the first place. Trump will not get any points from me for taking a small step to avert a disaster he himself created, and I have no confidence whatsoever that his carelessness will not lead us right back to that same brink today, tomorrow, or a week from now because, when it comes to Iran, Trump's erratic, incoherent strategy isn't just worrisome, it is potentially deadly for the men and women who are willing to sacrifice everything to keep the rest of us safe.

Look, I ran for Congress so that when the drums of war were sounded, I would be in a position to make sure our elected officials would fully consider the true costs of war not just in dollars and cents but in human lives. That was the vow I made to the troops with whom I deployed and to all those who have served since I hung up my uniform. I am standing here today, on the floor of the U.S. Senate, to keep that promise.

Right now, more and more Americans are preparing to head to a war zone that is 6,000 miles east in order to protect this Nation. They are ready to do their jobs no matter what, just as they have done time after time, even as their President and, yes, the Representatives in this very Chamber have neglected theirs.

Again and again, this administration has laid out two scenarios it says would justify war with Iran. Then it has taken actions to make sure those circumstances become a reality, which sets us on a collision course that has life-and-death stakes and no easy off-ramp.

The first scenario is if Iran edges closer to making a nuclear weapon. Well, you don't need to be a physicist to understand that Trump himself made that possibility more likely by unilaterally pulling the United States out of the nuclear agreement. In doing so, he freed Iran from having to abide by the deal that limited its nuclear production. Now he is raging about Iran's doing the very things his actions encouraged Iran to do. It is circular logic with potentially fatal consequences.

The second scenario it has laid out is an attack on U.S. troops in the region—another possibility that has been made more likely by a series of Trump's recent moves, as he has made clear through his bombastic statements and tweets that he is looking for excuses to send more troops to the area. Now we are dealing with the entirely predictable fallout from those actions—the raised stakes, the stoked tensions, and the louder calls for war from some on the far right.

Iran is no friend of ours. We were adversaries long before Trump took office. Yet what we are facing today is, in part, a manufactured crisis by this President. The Trump administration seems to be making foreign policy decisions not based on our Nation's interests but to serve some ideological or political purpose. In that effort, it is using our troops as bait, as if it is trying to manufacture its own 21st century ''Gulf of Tonkin'' crisis that it can use to justify war.

In some sort of nightmare deja vu, it is as if it is drawing from the same script that led us into Iraq—sowing chaos, shrouding intelligence, putting troops in harm's way—for no clear reason and with no clear end state in mind. On some days, it almost seems like it is provoking—even promoting—war just for war's sake, repeating those mistakes of years past that have cost us so many heroic lives.

It is as if Trump and the extremists in his administration don't remember the sacrifices our troops have made in the war we are still waging just west of Iran. It is as if it has forgotten all those flagged-draped coffins that have returned home from Iraq and the many veterans who have come home with scars, both visible and otherwise, most of whom will never be the same.

Look, I am no dove. I understand that war is sometimes necessary, and our troops certainly do as well. While Trump and Bolton may have never deigned to put on the uniform, I volunteered and served in the military for 23 years. I chose to fight in a war I did not support on the orders of a President I did not vote for. Why? I did it because, while I may not have believed in the war, I believed—and still believe—in the Constitution, and my Commander in Chief gave a lawful order after his having been authorized to do so by Congress. So, while I may not have supported the war or that President, I am proud to have deployed to Iraq in order to have served my country.

I know what is at stake for the thousands of troops this administration is sending into harm's way, and I can tell you it is a whole lot easier to cover your eyes and order other Americans to sacrifice if you don't have to sacrifice anything yourself. Trump may have responded ''no'' all five times to his Nation's calling him to duty, but our troops respond with a salute, and time after time, they report for duty every single time. One, two, three, four—I know of troops who have done eight deployments. It is much easier to ignore the everyday realities of war from inside the security of the White House, but it is nearly impossible if you have been outside the wire yourself.

So, with the drums of war beating loudly again, I am standing here, under the great Capitol dome, trying to keep my promise to hold the Members of this body accountable—trying to make sure we do our jobs. Our troops do their jobs every single day. Because the costs of war in both dollars and cents and human lives will no longer just be theoretical if we keep to the path aides like Bolton are pursuing, our homeland will be in more danger; more wounded warriors will be sent to Walter Reed; and more fallen heroes will be laid to rest at Arlington.

Even if you are OK with that, the fact is, the President does not have the authority to declare war; only Congress has that power. We are the ones tasked with deciding when and how we send Americans into combat. We are the ones the Constitution has charged with that most solemn duty, not Donald Trump and certainly not unelected warmongers like Bolton. Lately, though, the White House has acted as if article I simply doesn't exist. Trump has acted as if he can just usurp his power from the legislative branch as though obeying the Constitution is optional. Well, it is not.

This should not be a partisan issue. No matter if you are a factory worker who pulls double shifts or the President of the United States, no one is above the law. No matter if you struggle to pay rent or your name is plastered in gold on the front of a building on Fifth Avenue, no one can overrule the Constitution. Our troops should never ever be chess pieces in some reckless ideological game. Now, in the midst of the very week that is dedicated to Congress's evading next year's defense funding, it is past time for Congress to reclaim that solemn responsibility—that sacred responsibility—of declaring war.

For too long, too many on the Hill have shrugged off that most solemn duty. Scared of the political risks in staring down election days, Congress has shirked its constitutional responsibility to our troops in its refusal to take up any new authorizations for use of military force. For decades, Congress has ceded its authority to the White House by failing to act. It has handed Presidents from both parties the ability to command our military without having clear authorization, effectively cutting the people's elected Representatives out of the war-making process entirely.

Enough. Enough of being so worried about political consequences that we fail to do our own jobs even as we expect our troops to do theirs every damned day without complaint. We need to do better by our servicemembers. We owe it to them to honor their sacrifices. Part of that means ensuring that no American sheds blood in a war that Congress has not authorized. Despite what some in the administration say, there is just no way that the AUMF that passed in order to go after the perpetrators of 9/11 can justify military action against Iran nearly two decades later and send our troops overseas who may not have even been alive when that AUMF was voted on.

If Trump and company want to go to war, they must bring their case to Congress and give the American people a say through their elected Representatives. They must respect our servicemembers enough to provide and prove

why war with Iran is worth turning more moms and dads into Gold Star parents, and they must testify about what the end state in Iran actually needs to look like. Then, when their case has been made and when Congress's debate is done, we in this body should vote. It is our duty. It is the least we can do for those who are willing to safeguard our democracy—our way of life, our Constitution—even if it means laying down their lives.

In the days ahead, vigilance is key. We can't simply believe the people who try to convince us that, in order to support our troops, we need to pass the NDAA as soon as possible. As a former unit commander, I know this is not true. The best thing we can do for our servicemembers is to make sure they know their actions are legally justified by their government. If that takes a week or two or three, then it is worth the discussion.

If the vote to authorize military force then passes, whenever that is, I will be the first person to volunteer to deploy. I will be ready to pack my ruck and dust off my uniform. I may no longer have legs, but I can man a truck. I can take on the grunt work or do whatever else it takes to uphold that oath to which all servicemembers and veterans have sworn—to, no matter what, protect and defend this Nation we love.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. 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. INHOFE. Mr. President, I just want to make one comment. I know that somehow it is popular to say demeaning things about our President and John Bolton.

I can remember the years that John Bolton was with the United Nations, representing the United States, and he did just such an incredible job. He is one that really has all the talent you could have in the background. He certainly knows more about defense than anyone else I know in this administration.

One of the proudest moments I had of this President was when he did away with that thing that John Kerry had during the last administration. They are always referring to our coddling the Iranians in the media.

I happened to be with Netanyahu when the President got us out of the arrangement with Iran, where we gave them—what—$1.7 billion to do anything they want to with, and they had to admit they would be promoting terrorism with the money we gave back to them. It was an absolute disaster.

Anyway, there is something about this President—in spite of the fact that right now we have the best economy we have had in my lifetime, and right now we have a type of full employment nationwide, and minority employment, we have never had anything at all like we are having right now. It is the result of two things this President did, and he did them with the help of the Republicans. We all lined up and helped him with this. It was reducing the marginal rate.

Reducing the marginal rate to increase the revenue coming into the United States is something we have known for a long time. It is not a Republican idea. That was John Kennedy. John Kennedy came up with the idea that we want to go ahead and increase revenue. At that time, he said, and his words were: We need more revenue for the Great Society programs, and the best way to increase revenue is to reduce marginal rates, and it worked.

Unfortunately, John Kennedy died right after that and couldn't see the product of his efforts. Then, after that, of course, Ronald Reagan did the same thing, and it had the same effect on the economy.

Then, when this President did it, we knew it would have that effect, but he did one more thing that they didn't, and that was he recommended, yes, you could increase the economy by reducing marginal rates, but the other way to do it is to reduce the onerous regulations that we got during the Obama administration.

During that administration, that is the biggest problem we had. People were leaving the country to go to places they could find energy. There was a war on fossil fuels—fossil fuels: oil, gas, and coal—and he ended that war. As a result of that, just in my State of Oklahoma, for example, our exports on crude have gone up 251 percent since that time.

Anyway, he also is rebuilding the military. Look what happened to the military back during the Obama administration. If you look at just the last 5 years of the Obama administration, he knocked down the amount of money that went into our military by 25 percent just in 5 years. That has never happened before.

Of course, all of that is over with now. We have a President who is a strong supporter. I will be talking about that later. It is just that the American people know better when they hear all the name-calling of this President. They don't like his style. Sure, I shudder a little bit when I hear a tweet coming, but when you stop and think about what he has been able to accomplish with his tweets, at least now people know there is another side. There is a truth out there that you can have access to instead of depending on just the liberal media.

The main thing I want to encourage is—we have people scheduled starting right after lunchtime—that Members come down and talk about their amendments. It is true we knew we were going to have some problems. We suspected we were going to have some problems getting to amendments because our rules provide that one Senator can stop the amendment process. An amendment can't come to the floor except by unanimous consent, and so they objected to unanimous consent until certain things can happen. Well, I don't criticize anyone, but we knew, because of that, that we were not going to be able to really get a lot of amendments on the floor for debate, and so we did it—in fact, we did it yesterday: ninety-three amendments yesterday.

Now, those 93 were from—equally divided—Democrats and Republicans. I have a list here, and they are going to be coming down to the floor, but I want to encourage our Members to come down because people have to know this is a good bill—this Defense authorization bill. We know it is going to pass. It has passed for 53 years, and so we know it is going to pass, but we also know it is the most important bill of the year. It is the one that takes care of our military that is fighting for our country.

So we have all of these amendments, and I encourage any of the Members, Democrats or Republicans, who are not scheduled to come down and talk this afternoon, to call up. We have lots of time open. We want to encourage them to do it. We want to make sure that not just the Members of this body and the other body across the Capitol but also the American people know we are doing something really great in terms of the Defense authorization bill. So I encourage you to call and come down to the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the first-degree filling deadline for the cloture motions filed during yesterday's session of the Senate be at 2:30 p.m. today.

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

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, later today we will hopefully be taking up legislation to address the humanitarian crisis along our southern border. This year, 2019, has seen an overwhelming flood of migrants. So far this fiscal year, roughly 600,000 individuals have been apprehended at our southern border—600,000. That is approximately 200,000 more people than were apprehended during fiscal year 2018, and we still have more than 3 months to go.

Agencies that deal with the situation on the border are stretched to the breaking point. Shelters are overloaded, and providing adequate medical care is becoming more and more difficult. The Department of Homeland Security has been forced to pull nearly 1,000 Border Patrol officers from other

areas to assist with the surge of migrants. The Department of Health and Human Services, which is tasked with caring for unaccompanied children who cross the border, will be out of money to care for these children by early July. That means that caregivers for these children would have to work without pay, and private organizations with Federal grants to care for these children would go without their funding.

The President sent over an emergency funding request to address this humanitarian crisis more than 7 weeks ago, and Republicans were ready to take it up immediately. But the Democrat-controlled House was not interested. Why? Because the President was the one doing the asking.

House Democrats' No. 1 priority is obstructing the President. It doesn't matter if he is asking for desperately needed funds to address a humanitarian crisis. Democrats aren't interested.

When it became clear the House was not serious about addressing this crisis, the Senate decided to move forward, and last week the Senate Appropriations Committee approved an overwhelmingly bipartisan measure to provide desperately needed resources for the southern border.

Now the House is seeking to take up a supplemental of its own. This should be good news, but, unfortunately, the House bill is just another exercise in partisanship. The House is attempting to take up a bill that the President won't sign, as House leaders have known from the beginning. While I suppose we should be glad the House is at least acknowledging the situation at the border now, passing partisan legislation that will go nowhere in the Senate or with the President is no help.

The Senate has come together and will pass a real bipartisan measure that the President is expected to sign. The House should drop the partisan posturing and obstruction and pass the Senate bill so that we can get these desperately needed funds to the southern border.

AGRICULTURE

Mr. President, I have been to the floor several times in recent weeks to talk about the challenges facing our agriculture producers.

While the economy as a whole continues to thrive, our Nation's farmers and ranchers are struggling. Thanks to natural disasters, protracted trade disputes, and several years of low commodity prices, farmers and ranchers have had a tough few years.

As the senior Senator from South Dakota, I am privileged to represent thousands of farmers and ranchers here in the Senate, and addressing their needs and getting the ag economy going again are big priorities of mine. That is why I spend a lot of time talking to the Department of Agriculture about ways we can support the agriculture community, and I am very pleased that we have one big victory to celebrate this week—the Department of Agriculture's adjustment of the haying and grazing date for cover crops planted on prevent plant acres.

Farmers and ranchers throughout the Midwest are currently facing the fallout from severe winter storms, heavy rainfall, bomb cyclones, and spring flooding. Planting is behind schedule, and some farmers' fields are so flooded that they won't be able to plant corn and soybeans at all this year. As a result, many farmers will be forced to plant quick-growing cover crops on their prevent plant acres for feed and grazing once their fields finally dry out and to protect the soil from erosion.

But before last week's Agriculture Department decision, farmers in Northern States like South Dakota faced a problem. The Department of Agriculture had set November 1 as the first date on which farmers could harvest cover crops planted on prevent plant acres for feed or use them for pasture without having their crop insurance indemnity reduced.

Farmers who hayed or grazed before this date faced a reduction in their prevent plant indemnity payments—those crop insurance payments designed to help them cover their income loss when fields can't be planted due to flooding or other issues.

November 1 is generally a pretty reasonable date for farmers in southern States. But for farmers in Northern States like South Dakota, November 1 is too late for harvesting, thanks to killing frost and the risk of late fall and early winter storms, and it is too late to maximize the use of cover crops for pasture, since a killing frost is liable to flatten cover crops before they are grazed.

I heard from a lot of farmers about this November 1 date and the dilemma they were facing about whether to plant cover crops that they might not be able to harvest or graze. So beginning in early May, my office approached the Department of Agriculture about changing the November 1 date.

I then led a bipartisan group of Senate Agriculture Committee members in sending a letter to the Department, making our case for farmers. Then, I followed the letter with a request for a face-to-face meeting with top Agriculture Department officials so that I could explain in person the challenges farmers were facing.

A week and a half ago, USDA Deputy Secretary Steve Censky and USDA Under Secretary Bill Northey came to my office. During our meeting, I emphasized that not only did the date need to be changed, but it needed to be changed now so farmers could make plans to seed cover crops. The decision about whether to plant a cover crop is a time-sensitive decision, and farmers were rapidly running out of time to make that call.

One week after our meeting, the Department of Agriculture announced that it would move up the November 1 date for this year by 2 months, to September 1—a significant amount of time that will enable a lot of South Dakota farmers to plant cover crops without worrying about whether they will be able to successfully harvest or graze them.

I met with South Dakota farmers in Aberdeen, SD, on Friday, and they were very happy about the Department of Agriculture's decision. Cover crops are a win-win. They are good for the environment because they prevent soil erosion, which can pollute streams and rivers and worsen flooding, and they are good for farmers because they improve soil health, protect soil from erosion, and can provide an important source of feed. That second benefit is particularly important for farmers right now.

Due to last year's severe and lengthy winter, feed supplies disappeared, leaving no reserves. Cornstalks, a source of grazing and bedding, will be in short supply this year, and so will the supply of alfalfa due to winterkill. Cover crops will be crucial to alleviating this feed shortage.

I am currently working with the Department of Agriculture to ensure that farmers have flexibility to use existing supplies of available seed for cover crops, and I will be encouraging the Agriculture Department to release Conservation Reserve Program acres for emergency haying and grazing this year to further address the feed shortage.

I am very pleased that the Department of Agriculture heard the concerns we were expressing and moved the November 1 haying and grazing date up to September 1 for this year.

South Dakota farmers and ranchers can rest assured that I will continue to share the challenges they are facing with the Agriculture Department, and I will continue to do everything I can here in Washington to support our Nation's farmers and ranchers and to get our agriculture economy back on its feet.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECESS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, pursuant to the order in place, we recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate stands in recess.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:29 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and was reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. CAPITO).

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

S. 1790

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, yesterday, the Senate overwhelmingly voted to proceed to the National Defense Authorization Act by a vote of 86 to 6. That is about as overwhelming a bipartisan vote as we have had lately, and it is for good reason. This bill represents one of our most fundamental duties as the U.S. Congress, which is to authorize military expenditures and to provide our men and women in uniform with the resources they need in order to protect the American people.

The Defense authorization bill would authorize funding for the Department of Defense to carry out its most vital missions, as well as support our alliances around the world and improve the quality of life for our servicemembers, including the largest pay raise in a decade. All of us have long understood the importance of passing this legislation each year, which is why for the past 58 years we have passed the Defense authorization bill each of those years without delay. The bill, of course, has gained broad bipartisan support in the Armed Services Committee and in the first procedural vote yesterday evening, but that doesn't mean that our colleagues across the aisle aren't eyeing it as the latest target for their obstructionist tactics.

We are hearing that our Democratic friends are actually threatening to filibuster this legislation in an attempt to force a vote on Iran, but this is really just a subterfuge. I don't buy it. In reality, the Democratic leader has urged the majority leader not to hold a vote on the Defense authorization bill this week because so many of his Members are running for President and need to be at the debate in Miami. He said the Senate should wait to have the vote until the full body is present. He said there is no rush to complete the National Defense Authorization Act. Just to translate, the minority leader wants the rest of us to stop working so that the Democrat Senators who are running for President can prepare for the debate in Miami instead of being here in Washington and doing their job. Instead of doing that, they want to audition for their next job—or so they hope. Well, the minority leader thinks we should delay giving our military families a pay raise so his Members can campaign for President. That is one of the more galling things I have ever heard proposed across the aisle.

The demand for a vote in relation to Iran is a smokescreen. It is a tactic being used to cover up for their colleagues who don't want to miss yet another vote. In the first 6 months of this year alone, Senate Democrats have played politics with nominees for important positions throughout the Federal Government and with border security funding in the midst of a humanitarian and security crisis that is occurring at the border. They dragged their feet on Middle East policy bills and now, apparently, on the National Defense Authorization Act.

Our constituents sent us here to Washington to cast votes—yes or no—on bills that shape our country and, in this case, strengthen our Nation's military. We should not tolerate the political ambitions of some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to take precedence over the men and women who serve us in the military. Their priorities may be elsewhere, but the rest of us are not buying it. It is appalling, and we will not let it happen.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Madam President, on another matter, I recently heard from one of my constituents in San Antonio about her growing concern with rising drug prices. She wrote to me:

> I personally haven't had to make the choice yet between making my mortgage or getting a drug I need or my family needs, but I know the day is coming. It's not a matter of if it will happen, but when for all of us in America.

She is certainly not alone. Countless Texans have conveyed to me their concerns about rising drug costs, and one man even told me that he and his wife feel like their health is being held ransom. Across the country more and more people are struggling to pay their out-of-pocket costs for their prescription drugs and are weighing financial decisions that no family should be forced to make.

Now, the good news is there is bipartisan agreement here in Congress—somewhat of a rarity these days—that something must be done to reel in these skyrocketing costs and to protect patients who are being taken advantage of by some pharmaceutical companies. We have spent a lot of time looking at this issue on both the Judiciary Committee and the Finance Committee, on which I sit, as well as the HELP Committee, which is also working on legislation to lower out-of-pocket healthcare costs.

When it comes to drug prices, we know that the high cost frequently is not the result of the necessary sunk cost for research and development of an innovative drug or a labor-intensive production process or scarce supply. The high cost frequently is because major players in the healthcare industry are driving up prices to increase their bottom line.

Later this week, the Judiciary Committee will hold a markup to consider some of the proposals by members of the committee to address this kind of behavior. One of the bills we will consider was introduced by Senators GRASSLEY and CANTWELL. It would require the Federal Trade Commission to look at the role of pharmacy benefit managers, which play an important—albeit an elusive part—in the pharmaceutical supply chain.

Another bill we will be reviewing has been introduced by Senators KLOBUCHAR and GRASSLEY and would combat branded pharmaceutical companies' ability to interfere with the regulatory approval of generic competitors.

I am glad we will also have a chance to consider a bill I introduced with my colleague Senator BLUMENTHAL from Connecticut called the Affordable Prescriptions for Patients Act. That bill takes aim at two practices often deployed by pharmaceutical companies to crowd out competition and protect their bottom line. Now, this bill, importantly, will not stymie innovation, and it will not punish those who rightfully gained exclusive production rights for a drug. That is what our patent system is designed to do. Those are two false arguments being pushed by opponents to my bill, though, and, believe me, there are many. The bill is designed, rather, to stop the bad actors who abuse our laws and effectively create a monopoly. Most drug companies don't fall into that category, but some definitely do.

First, the bill targets a practice called product hopping. When a company is about to lose exclusivity of a drug because their patent is going to expire, they often develop some sort of minor reformulation and then yank the original product off the market. That prevents generic competitors from entering the market. One example was the drug Namenda, which is used by patients with Alzheimer's. Near the end of the exclusivity period, the manufacturer switched from a twice daily drug to a once daily drug. That move prevented pharmacists from being able to switch patients to a lower cost generic and gave the company an unprecedented 14 additional years of exclusivity. Now, don't get me wrong. There are often legitimate changes that warrant a new patent, but too frequently we are seeing this deployed as a strategy to box out generic competition.

By defining product hopping as anticompetitive behavior, the Federal Trade Commission would be able to take action against those who engage in this practice. It is an important way to prevent companies from gaming the patent system and patients from carrying the cost of that corporate greed.

Our country thankfully is the leader in pharmaceutical innovation. None of us wants to change that, and that is partly because we offer robust protections for intellectual property. Sadly, though, some companies are taking advantage of those innovation protections in order to maintain their monopoly as long as possible. Our bill would target this practice, known as patent thicketing, by limiting patents companies can use to keep their competitors away. One famous example is the drug HUMIRA, which, as I understand, is the most commonly prescribed drug in the world. It is used to treat arthritis and a number of other conditions. AbbVie, the manufacturer of HUMIRA, has 136 patents on the

drug and 247 patent applications. This drug has been available now for more than 15 years. This type of behavior makes it difficult for biosimilar manufacturers to bring a new product to market to compete with that drug and thus bring down the price for consumers.

In the case of HUMIRA, multiple biosimilars have been FDA-approved and available since last year, but the vast array of patents obtained by AbbVie prevent any competition from entering the market until 2023. This artificial structuring delays market entry years past the exclusivity period the law originally intended to grant. While the patent on the actual drug formula may have expired, there are still, in this case, hundreds of other patents that have to be sorted through.

Our legislation would seek to end patent gaming that leads to high cost for consumers. Companies use these patents to extend litigation against would-be competitors. That process is lengthy, complex, and expensive. So by limiting the number of patents these companies can use and preventing this sort of gamesmanship, our bill would simplify the litigation process so companies are spending less time in the courtroom and, hopefully, more time in the laboratories, innovating new disease-curing, life-extending drugs. Competitors would be able to resolve patent issues faster and bring their drugs to market sooner. Better competition, which is our goal, creates a better product at a lower price for patients.

What my bill and those that we will be considering in the Judiciary Committee this week have in common is that they seek to prevent bad actors from gaming the system to exploit patients for profit. Since Senator BLUMENTHAL and I introduced this bill, we have received valuable feedback from our colleagues in the Senate, as well as from folks at the Federal Trade Commission, the Patent and Trademark Office, the Food and Drug Administration, and many stakeholders. Their input has helped us make adjustments to ensure our bill will effectively carry out our goal, which is to reduce drug prices without hampering innovation or creating overly burdensome regulations. We are finalizing our revised bill, and we will introduce it soon.

The Affordable Prescriptions for Patients Act will stop pharmaceutical companies from deploying defensive strategies to monopolize prescription drug patents and ensure that our healthcare system works for, not against, the American people.

I appreciate our colleagues in the Senate, especially Chairman ALEXANDER of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee; Chairman GRASSLEY, who is chairman of the Finance Committee; and Chairman GRAHAM, who is chairman of the Judiciary Committee, who continue to work with us to increase competition and bring down healthcare costs for patients across the country. I look forward to our markup on these bills later this week.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1247

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1247; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Mississippi.

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An objection is heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, the reason for this request for unanimous consent is very simply that this legislation is based on a straightforward, commonly accepted idea: If you see something, say something.

The Duty to Report Act, this measure, would require campaigns, candidates, and family members to immediately report to the FBI and the Federal Election Commission any offers of illegal foreign assistance. It is simply a duty to report illegality. It codifies into law what is already a moral duty, a patriotic duty, and a matter of basic common sense.

It is already illegal to accept foreign assistance during a campaign. It is already illegal to solicit foreign assistance during a campaign. All this bill does is to require campaigns and individuals to report those illegal foreign assistance offers or solicitations directly to the FBI.

I never thought—and few would have guessed—that there is a need for this kind of legislative mandate to do what is a patriotic and a moral duty. With the 2020 election on the horizon, we need to do everything we can to safeguard the integrity of our election.

The President has made remarks that are truly historically astonishing. He made those remarks just recently, which highlighted his own moral and patriotic depravity. He was asked whether he would accept help in 2020 from foreign governments or foreign nationals, and he simply said: ''I'd take it.''

That is very much reminiscent of what his son said when he was offered assistance from Russian agents with dirt on Hillary Clinton. He said, ''I love it.'' That kind of receptivity to illegality is not only un-American, it ought to be explicitly illegal, and all of us in this Chamber would reject it, I am sure. In fact, many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle were severely critical of President Trump's remarks.

His remarks are also reminiscent of what his son-in-law, Jared Kushner, said in a television interview—that he didn't know whether he would contact the FBI in that same kind of situation, again, that Donald junior encountered with offers of assistance from Russian agents. He didn't know whether he would. It is a hypothetical.

Well, we really know what both the President and Jared Kushner, as well as his son Donald junior think about this issue. According to the Mueller report, when a Kremlin-linked individual, Dimitri Simes, offered to provide Kushner with damaging information on Hillary Clinton, he took the meeting. That is not the only example. When George Papadopoulos, the Trump foreign policy campaign staffer, convicted on a Federal charge of lying to the FBI, was told by a Maltese professor that the Russians had dirt on Hillary Clinton in the form of thousands of emails and were willing to provide them to the Trump campaign, what did he do? Rather than go to the FBI, he eagerly alerted others on the campaign.

Just last week, Hope Hicks, Trump's Communications Director for a while, was interviewed by the House Judiciary Committee. She said that she ''knew that the President's statement was troubling''—in her words, ''knew that the President's statement was troubling'' and ''understood the President to be serious'' when he made those remarks.

The President's remarks should alarm every American and everyone in the law enforcement community. Our legislative efforts stem from this basic principle. The American people—not Russia, not China, and no one else—should decide who the leaders of our country are and the direction our democracy should go.

Eighty percent of the American people across the political spectrum—or more—support this legislation—Republicans, Democrats, and Independents. All we are doing is asking that MITCH MCCONNELL avoid blocking this important legislation and allow a vote on the Senate floor. This bill has 19 cosponsors in the Senate, including Senators WHITEHOUSE, BOOKER, HARRIS, WARREN, GILLIBRAND, KLOBUCHAR, SANDERS, HEINRICH, UDALL, MARKEY, LEAHY, MURRAY, CASEY, SMITH, CARDIN, MURPHY, WYDEN, MERKLEY, and HIRONO. It has been introduced in the House by Congressman ERIC SWALWELL, and it now has 30 cosponsors there, including the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, JERRY NADLER.

I invite my Republican colleagues to support me in passing this legislation. Republicans ought to stand up for the rule of law. They ought to speak out

for our national security. They should refuse to tolerate these kinds of words and behavior from an American Commander in Chief.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

S. 1790

Mr. CRAMER. Madam President, I rise today to emphasize the importance of this year's National Defense Authorization Act—both why it is important and what we must accomplish this week while we are still here.

The primary obligation of Congress is to provide for the common defense. For the past 57, 58-plus years, Congress has met this obligation primarily through passage of the NDAA. With this bipartisan legislation, we have provided our Armed Forces the resources and authorities they need to defend our country. This bill keeps America on track by confronting the readiness crisis in our military branches.

I am the first North Dakotan ever to serve on the Senate Armed Services Committee, and I consider this a great honor. North Dakota is home to two Air Force bases: Minot, which is home to two of the three legs of the nuclear triad, the B–52 bombers and Minuteman ICBM missiles; and one in Grand Forks, home to the RQ–4 Global Hawk mission and, effective in just a few days, on Friday, the 319th Reconnaissance Wing.

We are also home to multiple Army and Air National Guard units and missions, ranging from construction and combat engineers to security forces, to ISR and launch and recovery Reaper operations. Our Army National Guard, in fact, has an air defense artillery regiment that regularly protects us right here in the Capital region as part of Operation Noble Eagle.

Our military community is a foundational element to our State as it is to many States. To us, the NDAA is not just arbitrary funding numbers for abstract aircraft and equipment. This legislation supports those in my State and across the country who defend our Nation at home and around the world.

We are honored by the outsized role our patriots play in defense of our Nation and the cause of liberty. Our commitment to them and their families must be clear. When they are called into action, they will have every resource they need to carry out successful missions.

I want to address a fundamental aspect to this week's debate. Apparently, there are some in this body who would rather bypass budget negotiations and pass a continuing resolution. There are others who want to delay passage of this important priority until later in the year.

We cannot simply kick this can down the road. Passing a CR is handing our military community months of uncertainty and anxiety and could nullify much of the good work that we are doing here today and this week, such as improving the livelihoods of our servicemembers. Delaying passage to accommodate the political ambitions of a few of our Democratic colleagues is simply unacceptable and should be dismissed as quickly as it was suggested.

Those who offer their lives in service to our country represent the best of what America has to offer. What they give us, we can never repay, but we can do our best to help as they serve and transition back to civilian life.

For example, this NDAA seeks to improve the livelihood of our volunteer military force with benefits such as the largest pay increase in over a decade.

It also provides personal assistance for military spouses looking for work or hoping to retain their job after being relocated. We also included language that encourages the Air National Guard to provide tuition assistance.

To keep us safe from foreign adversaries, this year's NDAA bolsters our nuclear triad with an enhanced commitment to modernization—a move I firmly support. While recently visiting the Minot Air Force Base, I witnessed the reality the base's airmen face every day. Our brave men and women in uniform feel the weight of the world on their shoulders. Yet they remain vigilant and alert—and most of the time quite cheerful, I might add.

Deterrence works. It has always worked. Democratic and Republican administrations over the last several decades have supported this. Eliminating a leg of the deterrence does not eliminate the threat. The world does not become a safe place when we remove that which keeps us safe.

If we defied history and the military community by unilaterally weakening our superior arsenal, as some in the House have proposed, we would be placing the fate of the world in the hands of our adversaries.

That is not to say the bill shouldn't be amended. In fact, I want to bring attention to a matter that wasn't included that I believe should be. I submitted an amendment, along with a stand-alone bill, that honors the Lost 74—the 74 Vietnam veterans who died in the sinking of the USS *Frank E. Evans*, whose names are not included on the Vietnam Memorial Wall. This year marks 50 years since they were killed off the coast of Vietnam while serving our Nation.

Congress passed this legislation last year in the House NDAA, but it failed to be added in conference. This year, I moved from the House to the Senate, and so did this bill. It has received overwhelming, bipartisan support from my colleagues here and from constituents across the country; however, the bureaucrats in Washington remain firmly opposed. It is inexplicable to me that bureaucrats could determine that these sailors' ultimate sacrifice is unworthy of being memorialized simply because they were on the wrong side of an arbitrary line. Their disregard for these veterans has been a source of tremendous frustration to me throughout this process. I have had my own motives questioned. I have been told it would require too much ''work'' to change the memorial. I have even heard fears expressed of precedent being changed, as if finding more ways to honor the fallen and forgotten would somehow set a bad precedent for the future. These excuses are insufficient. The Lost 74 and the families they left behind deserve better than this, and I have no plans to quit this fight for them anytime soon.

But this and other possible inclusions aside, this NDAA contains important national security efforts, including the establishment of the U.S. Space Force. The Senate Armed Services Committee came up with a bipartisan proposal that reduces redundancy in space programs, defines clear leadership on space at the upper echelons of our military, and guarantees dedicated servicemembers to the space domain. I thank my colleagues for seeing the administration's vision and working in a bipartisan fashion to improve it.

I led two important amendments to the Space Force proposal that were adopted in the committee markup. The first requires that the commander of the Space Force report directly to the Secretary of the Air Force after the first year of establishment. The second is that the commander of the Space Force become a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, also after the first year of establishment. Both were supported by the Department of Defense and should be maintained through conference negotiations.

The first provision—reporting directly to the Secretary—ensures that the Space Force commander has direct access to the top civilian leadership of the Air Force, just like the Navy-Marine Corps model. The Commandant of the Marine Corps does not report to the Chief of Naval Operations, and neither should the Space Force commander be forced to report to the Air Force Chief of Staff.

Reporting to the Secretary will give our space forces an equal voice in the Air Force's budget development process. We all know that real authority in the Pentagon is budget authority, and unless the Space Force has a true voice in the budget process, they will never be prioritized appropriately.

When testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee, Strategic Command commander and vice chairman nominee General Hyten spoke to the challenges of the Air Force Chief of Staff making space a priority, stating:

> We have to have somebody in the Pentagon that focuses their total attention on space all the time. I have known every chief of staff of the Air Force for the last 20 or 30 years, and they've all carried space effectively into the tank. They've all cared about space. But it is a secondary issue.

Rather than automatically relegating space to a secondary issue, the Space Force commander should follow the Marine Corps model and report directly to the Secretary of the Air Force.

In addition, the Space Force commander should be a statutory member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Joint Chiefs, of course, are the primary military advisers to the President. The President makes strategic decisions on the composition and use of our national security resources based on the counsel received from the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Without a separate, equal voice at the table, the Space Force commander will inevitably be marginalized from critical decision-making and resource allocation processes.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Dunford, reiterated this point when he said that ''the key is to have individuals who are singularly focused on space and make sure we incorporate that perspective, that very healthy perspective, into the outcome, which is a joint force that can fight.'' General Dunford is exactly right. The Space Force commander should have a seat on the Joint Chiefs and bring that singular focus of space to the table.

I understand the concerns surrounding these amendments, and I agree with my colleagues that we should minimize overhead and unneeded bureaucracy, which is why both of my amendments do not take effect for a year, and the language specifically bars any new staff or additional billets in the interim.

Last week, the ranking member of the committee cited CBO estimates on the potential costs of these amendments. I would like to quote the same CBO report for additional context and reference. The CBO report says that ''the estimates in this report are for illustrative policy options; they do not represent cost estimates for any particular piece of legislation.''

With that in mind, I would ask the Department of Defense to take these concerns seriously and use the 1 year to craft and present a plan to appropriately implement these two provisions.

My colleagues' concerns are not unwarranted; however, it would be poor policy to hamstring the Space Force from the beginning rather than set it up for success.

It is worth noting that the House NDAA establishes a Space Corps and takes two concrete steps directly in line with my amendments. The leader of the Space Corps would report directly to the Secretary of the Air Force and sit on the Joint Chiefs of Staff, without the 1-year delay my amendment would require. The House, Senate, and Department of Defense are largely in line with these two provisions.

The idea of the Space Force will become a reality with this year's NDAA. The establishment process will be incremental and requires oversight, but our first step must set the conditions to ensure its success.

The importance of this NDAA is clear. Passing it is vital to my State and to our Nation. It supports our troops, bolsters our nuclear deterrence, and provides for the creation of a Space Force capable of defending the next domain of military conflict. For these and dozens of other reasons, I urge my colleagues to support it and pass it quickly to demonstrate our commitment to our highest priority.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I thought there would be people here speaking. We are right now in consideration of the most significant bill of the year, the National Defense Authorization Act. It is not just the biggest bill but the most significant one, and we know it is going to pass. It has passed for 59 years in a row, so obviously it is going to pass. But the problem is that we have many amendments to be discussed because yesterday alone, we adopted 93 amendments, and they are equally divided between Democrats and Republicans.

I have invited and encouraged all the Members who have amendments that were on the list to come down to the floor and talk about their amendments. I have a list of those individuals who have requested to be here in conjunction with that, and they are not down here.

Let me just appeal to the Members—Democrats and Republicans alike—to come in and describe your amendments and talk about this because we are going to do everything we can to get this bill passed this week.

I have to say, there is an effort right now by the leader of the Democrats to try to put this off because they want to watch their friends run for President on TV on Wednesday night and Thursday night. To me, we have the most important bill of the entire year. This is something we have to pass because of all the problems that come up. We have housing, for example. The big problem with privatization of housing came up last February. All the solutions are in this bill. They are taken care of. Modernizing our nuclear modernization is in this bill. That is going to be done, but it can't be done until the bill is passed and signed by the President.

If we wait, as suggested, in order for them to watch their friends on TV, then this is going to put it off for a week, and that is certainly going to jeopardize the possibility of getting it passed. There isn't time.

If you look at the list of things which the leader of the Senate articulated just a short while ago, all these things have to be done before the end of the fiscal year. The end of the fiscal year is looming out there. We don't have that many legislative days.

We have to do a budget. All these things have to be done, so we cannot jeopardize all of that by postponing this for a week.

I encourage our Members to come down and be heard and describe their amendments.

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.

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

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

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I rise to once again talk about the truly obscene cost of prescription drugs and the No. 1 thing we can do to lower prices. It is spelled out right here: Let Medicare negotiate. It is very simple. Let Medicare negotiate to bring down the cost of prescription drugs.

Prescription drug costs are a huge issue for people, frankly, of all ages who need medication in my State. Whether I am talking to farmers in Western Michigan, retirees in the Upper Peninsula, working families in Wayne County or Macomb County, families are feeling the effects.

When you look at the numbers between 2008 and 2016, prices on the most popular brand-name drugs went up over 208 percent. Just ask those farmers in West Michigan and those working families in Macomb; their income did not rise 208 percent.

Perhaps nobody has been hurt more than our seniors who tend to take more medications and live on fixed incomes. In 2017 alone, the average price of brand-name drugs that seniors often take rose four times faster than the rate of inflation. In 1 year, it rose faster than the rate of inflation. Again, I am absolutely certain that the vast majority of the seniors in my State did not see their incomes go up four times faster than the rate of inflation. I can tell you that seniors in the Upper Peninsula didn't see their pensions or Social Security checks increase that much.

What do families do? What do seniors do? We all know the stories. Some people are forced to cut back on other things like food and paying their bills. Some folks cut their heart pills in half or take their arthritis medication every other day instead of every day—which, by the way, is not OK to do. Some families stop filling their prescriptions altogether simply because they can't afford it. This is wrong.

I have always believed healthcare is a basic human right, and that includes prescription medications. How do we lower the cost of prescriptions so families can afford the medications they need to get healthy and to stay healthy? The No. 1 way to do that is to

let Medicare negotiate. It is very straightforward: Let Medicare negotiate. The VA is allowed to negotiate the price of prescription drugs, and the VA saves 40 percent compared to Medicare. In fact, if Medicare paid the same price as the VA, it could have saved $14.4 billion on just 50 drugs if it paid the same prices as the VA. It could have $14.4 billion in savings if Medicare could negotiate for seniors the way the VA is able to negotiate for veterans.

So what is stopping us? Republicans in Congress and pharma lobbyists are standing in the way of getting this done. In 2018, there were 1,451 lobbyists for the pharmaceutical and health product industry. That is almost 15 lobbyists for every 1 Member of the Senate. Their job is to stop competition and keep prices high, and they are doing a very good job.

Back in 2003, when Medicare Part D was signed into law, they blocked Medicare from harnessing the bargaining power of 43 million American seniors. Those 43 million American seniors together could see negotiating power, but it was blocked by language that was put into Medicare Part D. Let me just say that again. It is very simple. Take that language out and let Medicare negotiate.

Sixteen years later, pharmaceutical companies are still boosting their bottom lines on the backs of our seniors. As if putting that language in Medicare Part D wasn't enough, we constantly see efforts to look for an advantage to block competition, to do something to protect prices, to keep prices high, and they are at it again. The name-brand industry that is a huge supporter of the new trade agreement, NAFTA 2.0—some say NAFTA 1.5, some people call it the U.S.-Mexico-Canada trade agreement—but this deal with Canada and America that has been put together and negotiated by the administration has something in it to protect the pricing for Big Pharma. The provisions could stop competitors from getting cheaper generic versions of biologic drugs on the market sooner. If you stop the competition, you stop the ability for generic, no-brand names. They are the same drug most of the time but just without a brand name on it. If you stop that competition, even though that competition brings down prices, you can keep prices and profits high. Biologics are some of the most expensive drugs out there. For example, Humira, the world's top-selling prescription drug, treats conditions including Crohn's disease and rheumatoid arthritis, and it can cost up to $50,000 a year for one prescription drug. How many people do you know who can afford to pay $50,000 a year for their medication for just one drug?

At least three companies have developed generic versions of the drug, but they will not be available in the United States until at least 2023. We have at least three companies with a lower cost generic version that could bring down prices. They will not be available in the United States until at least 2023. Humira isn't a new drug. It has been around since 2002.

When we had a hearing in the Finance Committee—and I want to commend our chairman for doing that and bringing in the top drug company CEOs—the CEO that puts Humira into the marketplace indicated they have over 130 different patents that protect them from competition. Here we are, in the middle of a trade agreement, where they are wanting to put language in concerning the length of patents in order to protect their position.

By the way, shortly after the President signed the USMCA at the end of last year, the drug companies decided to begin 2019 with price increases on more than 250 prescription drugs, including Humira. So they feel more confident their position is protected; there is not going to be competition. So what happens? They raise the prices again.

Pharmaceutical companies like to argue that they need special giveaways—like they got in Medicare Part D and that they are trying to get in the new U.S.-Mexico-Canada trade agreement—because they invest so much in research and development. However, it is also true that when given the opportunity to invest in research and development, many companies chose, instead, to put more money in the pockets of CEOs and shareholders rather than using the big tax cut they received to put more into research and development.

I am a huge supporter of research and development. Most of the primary, basic research is done by all of us as taxpayers. In fact, last year, the 500 biggest U.S. companies spent $608 billion on research and development, which is great. That might sound like a lot, but they spent $806 billion buying back their own stock to keep the prices up on the stock. That also makes you wonder why pharmaceutical companies didn't use their tax giveaway to reduce the cost of prescription drugs.

The pricing of prescription drugs in this country is the ultimate example of a rigged system. It is time to come together and unrig it. That is what we should be doing. Our job is to unrig the system.

First, we need to allow Medicare to harness the bargaining power of 43 million American seniors. One recent poll found that 92 percent of voters support allowing Medicare to negotiate. Let Medicare negotiate. That is 92 percent of voters who believe in this.

Second, we need to prevent the pharmaceutical companies from receiving additional sweet deals that keep drug costs high. I think it is about time we make a deal that benefits Michigan farmers and businesses and seniors and working families. That should be our focus. We should not be in a situation where, time after time, there is special treatment, protective language that bars the pharmaceutical industry from negotiating under Medicare or that allows them to protect their patents longer so they don't have competition from generic drugs to bring down prices.

Let's unrig this system and address the highest driver, the biggest driver in raising the costs of healthcare in this country, which is the cost of prescription drugs. We can do something about that, and we need to do it soon.

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

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

Mr. TILLIS. Madam President, I come before you, first and foremost, to thank Senator INHOFE for his great leadership as the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee and a special thanks to the staff who are working very, very hard to process the hundreds of amendments to the National Defense Authorization Act that came out of the committee with broad bipartisan support.

I am here to talk specifically about some provisions that I think are pretty important that actually started in the Personnel Subcommittee. I chair the Personnel Subcommittee for Senate Armed Services. Early this year, we heard of what I consider to be absolutely unacceptable conditions in military housing across the country. In North Carolina—and, Madam President, in your great State of Tennessee—we have bases, and we have military housing. We have men and women, many of them very young. Oftentimes the spouses are deployed, so the family is back home taking care of their children, taking care of their own jobs, and living on the base.

About February, we got reports—and these are not just one-off reports; these are reports across the country of mold, mildew, damage from storms, and all kinds of conditions that I think in the private sector you would find objectionable. I think it is particularly objectionable when you are talking about people whose families are with that husband or wife who serve in the military or serve in this country.

We decided to have a number of hearings where we brought the private housing providers into the Senate and my Personnel Subcommittee and the full committee to get an explanation. Quite honestly, there wasn't a good explanation.

Back in 1996, the Federal Government decided to get out of the housing business. I am glad they did because they were doing a really bad job. For about 10 years, we had a great story to tell in terms of the quality of housing, the service to the tenants, and the satisfaction of the military families. But then something got sideways in a very, very bad way.

This is a shower. If you see this kind of mold and mildew in your shower,

would you think it is acceptable? If you go in and see children's toys—and this is actually the bottom side of a crib—mold and mildew in these folks' housing with small children in them, people with respiratory conditions living in these kinds of conditions, I expect the garrison down at the bases and I expect the private housing providers to move Heaven and Earth to eliminate these sorts of problems. We are making progress, but I feel, in order to make sure it is not progress that is being made just when they all of a sudden get the attention of this Senator and other Members of the U.S. Senate, we have to change the rules in terms of the authorities that the Department of Defense has and the expectations that we have for the private housing providers.

I have to give thanks to the Acting Secretary of Defense, formerly the Secretary of the Army, and all of the service Secretaries for stepping up. They have recreated a tenant of bill of rights. They have created a dispute process. They have demanded a more timely and more transparent method for actually solving service requests. All of those now have language in this National Defense Authorization Act that Congress needs to act quickly on so that we can make sure we put into place the right expectations in the statute, to make sure that the problems that exist today are fixed and that they don't happen again.

I will tell you that while we are making progress, when I go to Fort Bragg and Camp Lejeune, I hold what are called sensing sessions, which are basically getting a few dozen people together to hear their complaints. There is an amazing thing that happens when I go to North Carolina.

I don't know, Madam President, if you have done one of these in Tennessee yet, but if you announce that you are going to go down and hear from the tenants, there is an amazing thing that happens. You have all of these service requests that are about to here when they announce that I am coming to Jacksonville or I am coming to Fayetteville. About a day or two before I get there, magically, they have been able to solve almost all of those service requests. Then I go away for a couple of months, and I see them coming back up again.

One thing that everybody who is listening—and these are not just the private housing providers. It is the Department of Defense and Congress that I think have shifted their focus away from this problem, and we have to maintain a focus on it.

So for my part, I just spoke with my scheduling director and my State staff. I told them that I want to take the next sensing session up a level. I want a townhall. I want to be able to put 200 or 300 families with housing down in Jacksonville at Camp Lejeune and down at Ft. Bragg in Fayetteville—I want to put them in a room, and I want to make it very clear to everybody involved, whether it is the private housing provider, the garrison commanders, the Department of Defense, and put a light on us in Congress because it is our inaction that has caused the problem.

We want to know what their problems are. We are going to hear from hundreds of people. We are going to make progress on these kinds of things through the provisions in the NDAA, but we still have to continue to focus on this problem.

First, I want to thank Senator INHOFE. He did a great job in terms of casting light on this, and I know I have the commitment of the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, but I don't want these just to be words on the floor. I want them to be words that are put into action in terms of how we can help these military families today.

If you have a service request outstanding with any vendor and you do not feel like you are getting a proper response, I want you to write down ''Tillis.senate.gov.'' In my office, we will treat every single housing request you have as a request for casework, and I will have one of several dozen staff members in my office open up a case and track it until it is completed.

As for anybody else who knows a servicemember who has this problem and thinks he will not have somebody who will follow up on it, give me a chance. We have already solved a lot of them, and we are going to solve a lot more. We are not going to finish until I believe the men and women and the families at Fort Bragg, at Camp Lejeune, and at bases across this country have the safe and comfortable housing they deserve.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, in 1831, a young Frenchman who sought to understand the motivating principles behind the world's newest independent Nation mused:

> In America, the principle of the sovereignty . . . is not either barren or concealed, as it is with some other nations; it is recognized by the customs and proclaimed by the laws; it spreads freely, and arrives without impediment at its most remote consequences.

Alexis de Tocqueville had come to America on a research mission. He had had no special training in government or political science, but he had been fueled by a desire to know if the principles that had guided the early American Republic could help his fellow Frenchmen. Even as an outsider, de Tocqueville had seen freedom, not a lone figurehead or compulsory philosophy, as the foundation to build upon. Freedom had been what he had seen as an enduring foundation.

Today, however, the belief in a moral right to self-governance is more often than not portrayed as quaint and the kind of fierce independence that drove our Founders to the battlefield as outdated in comparison to modern concepts of so-called global governance and polite codependence.

Yet, when I look at the state of the world and all of its competing philosophies, I am very grateful for our bold commitment to self-defense. That is why I come to the floor today—to express my thoughts on our National Defense Authorization Act and to say a thank-you to Chairman INHOFE for his leadership in pushing the Senate Armed Services Committee to present ideas, to bring forward amendments, and to work through this process together. I am looking forward to the couple of days in front of us in this Chamber with Members from both sides of the aisle.

It cannot be understated that the importance of maintaining a regular budget for our military cannot be diminished. The failure to do so will put our troops at a disadvantage. Look no further than the ongoing tension right now between the United States and Iran and how this has magnified the part that deterrence plays—the importance of deterrence—in our defending our security without our resorting to the use of military force.

Last week, I spoke at length about two emerging warfighting domains that challenge the way we think about modern defense. These are cyber and space. That is why this year's NDAA expands beyond legacy programs to include the recognition of emerging threats and our responses to those.

The next great threat to our sovereignty may be more subtle than a bomb's being dropped on American soil. It could undermine our cyber security or slowly compromise the supply chain that provides us with needed microelectronics. It might cause us to question our position in the world or to rethink our influence in the international community. It is important to understand that these attacks aren't only meant to undermine our relationships and our infrastructure; they are coordinated and intentional attacks on the foundations that de Tocqueville recognized as being powerful, unique, and underpinning what we have in the United States.

The implications are clear: Everything we do in this Chamber must be understood in the context of defending America's sovereignty. It means believing in the supremacy of the Constitution and giving the defense community the means to protect us in order to fulfill that first responsibility of providing for the common defense. It means recognizing that freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and free assembly are just as precious as any physical thing we can put under lock and key.

Those who would threaten our freedom and safety do not look to America and see our formidable military as the single greatest threat to their destructive agendas. They are most frightened by our unwavering and ardent commitment to freedom. Our enemies are frightened of the young men and

women who willingly join the military. They volunteer for service.

They are frightened by the strength of conviction that leads men and women on our streets to protect protests even though they would never join those protests—not in a million years. They do this because they recognize that defending someone's right to speak is just as important as speaking oneself.

Our enemies are frightened by the confidence with which we defend the Constitution when well-meaning actors ask if we could set the First Amendment aside to better protect impressionable minds from dangerous ideas.

Ours is the kind of freedom that is always in danger of extinction, just as the late President Reagan repeatedly reminded us, but it is also worth protecting.

This week, I implore my friends on both sides of the aisle to do all they can to ensure that our best, first line of defense has the ability to protect and defend freedom and freedom's cause.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, we have been discussing this, and I think it is not just redundant but it is important to reemphasize that this is the most significant vote of the year. This is a $750 billion bill. This is the one that our entire military is depending on having pass. It will pass. It has passed every year for 59 years, and it is going to pass this year. I am concerned, however, that there is an effort to try to delay it for a week or two, which is something that will not work, which I will explain in a minute.

It just occurred to me that there is so much stuff in this bill. We talk about all of the equipment. We talk about the change. We talk about trying to make up and trying to catch up with Russia and with China and our adversaries, who are actually ahead of us in many areas. That is all significant, but there is one issue that not many people are aware of that I think is really significant and is addressed. It kind of lets you know how far this bill goes.

There is a problem that exists with the spouses of the military. Right now, under the Trump administration, we are seeing the best economy we have had, arguably, in my lifetime. We are clearly seeing success in tax relief, a reduction in taxes, because of this. Then, of course, there is the deregulatory effort by this administration.

Right now, we have the lowest national unemployment rate we have had in a long period of time—3.6 percent. Full employment is supposed to be 4 percent. In my State of Oklahoma, we are even doing better than that; we have 3.2 percent.

Anyway, families across the country are feeling the benefit of getting the economic engine moving again, and that is good, but there is one group that still faces extreme unemployment, that being the military spouses.

People don't think about this, but in almost every case of the members of the military's husbands or wives, whoever the spouse happens to be, they want part-time employment. Of course, many of them are skilled and have prepared for careers, but they are not able to get careers or to get employment because of the spouses' moving sometimes every 2 years or every 3 years so that they have to go into whole new environments. There are some State laws that preclude spouses from getting employment without their complying with certifications from the different States.

In 2018, there was a RAND study that found that frequent military moves result in spousal unemployment or underemployment and delays in employment among spouses who need to obtain credentials at new duty locations. We need to facilitate easier paths to both licensure and employment for military spouses.

Now, we make a correction in this policy that—as President Trump signed an Executive order last year—would work to improve employment opportunities for military spouses. Well, he did that with an Executive order, and we have gone a little further with this bill.

We have been successful in getting these results, and they are clear. Military spouses' unemployment dropped from nearly 25 percent in 2017 to 13 percent in 2019, but it is still a significant thing. It is still a form of discrimination by people because they are the spouse of a servicemember.

That is significant progress, but it also doesn't address the more than one-third of military spouses who are underemployed, working part time or outside their education or technical field.

One area where we can make an immediate impact is for approximately 35 percent of the military spouses in careers that require occupational licenses that are administered by the States. They may be different from State to State, and these individuals are not in a position to satisfy one State and then go to another State. Most of those spouses are licensed in healthcare and education, but others include attorneys and real estate agents.

For the military family moving an average of every 2 years, relicensing and transferring the license each time becomes very costly. So the solution is simple. We just have to go after more of the redtape that makes it hard for our military spouses to move their professional license, move their career. This is something we have addressed in this bill. People don't think about this, but we have done it, and so this is going to give a lot of relief to these people.

It kind of reminds me, when you look at the overwhelming issues we have dealt with in this bill, it is something that is very significant, and it is something that is, by far, the most important thing we will be doing all year.

There is a report from the National Defense Strategy Commission. The Commission has Democrats and Republicans. A year ago, this group got together, and they are the very foremost authorities in the country on military. They decided what it is we need to do.

We went through 8 years of the Obama administration, and I have to admit that he was very honest about it. He never had defending America as a top priority, and so we find ourselves in the situation where we have countries like China and like Russia who are actually ahead of us in areas like hypersonics.

Hypersonics is the most state-of-the-art thing we are doing in both defense and offense. It is a system that moves at five times the speed of sound, and we were leading all of the rest of the world in this effort until that administration, and that put us behind so that both China and Russia are ahead of us in that area.

This is something that really disappoints a lot of American people when they find out.

I go out and give talks around the country, and when I tell them that there are countries that have better equipment than we do, better artillery than we do, they are surprised to find that out. Clearly, China and Russia are doing that.

Now, a lot of times people would say: Well, wait a minute. How could they be ahead of us when we are spending so much more money than they are on our defense? The reason for that is very simple. It is something people don't think about, and that is the single largest expense item is the cost of people. Of course, in China and Russia they just tell them what to do. They don't have to have good living conditions for their troops.

Consequently, they are actually doing better than we are doing in many areas. This is more than just our conventional capabilities.

The NDAA—National Defense Authorization Act—fully funds our nuclear modernization. It looks out for our troops, giving them the largest pay raise in over a decade. We make needed reforms to our privatized military housing.

We thought things were going pretty well. A number of years ago, we decided to privatize our military housing. I was here at that time, and I thought it was a good idea. No one was opposed to it, and we did it.

The problem is the contractors who came in and won these contracts to take care of military housing worked fine for the first 2 or 3 years, then they got a little bit greedy, and time went by, and all of a sudden it all exploded last February when several people got together from military housing and talked about the deplorable conditions that we wouldn't expect anyone to live under.

Subsequently, we had a series of hearings in the committee I chair. The first one was a hearing on the victims, the individuals who are living in those

housing conditions. They told the stories about all the problems with the housing situation.

The next thing we had was a hearing on the contractors. These are the guys who came along and bid so they would be able to do it. They admitted in the public hearing that was true and that they had not been doing the job they needed to do.

That is something in this bill that we have taken care of. We now have a system set up that has pretty much resolved that problem.

So we have a lot of capabilities that are in this bill. It makes it easier and more affordable for spouses to transfer their occupational licenses. That is what I was just talking about.

I said before that this bill is going to pass, and it will, but what would keep it from passing is if the minority leader, CHUCK SCHUMER, is successful in insisting on delaying consideration until July.

This has to be done by the end of this fiscal year, and that is creeping up on us. In the event that we don't get it done this week, as we had planned to do, then very likely it is not going to be done next week or the week after that because the longer it takes something like this to do, we know the political reality of how that works.

We have to get this thing done, we have to get it passed by Thursday, and I think we will. This bill has the stuff in it that we really need. It is the most significant bill we have.

So we want to avoid any delays in the calendar. It would likely mean that we would not be able to enact the NDAA before October 1 and the start of the fiscal year. That has real impact. That would delay the fixes we are talking about in privatization of housing. The delays in MILCON money. MILCON, that is military construction. We have a lot of military construction that is proposed right now. If you put it off a week, we don't know what will happen to that military construction. There are delays in disaster recovery. We have right now—and you have heard on the floor today the problems that exist in various States: Florida, North Carolina, and some places out in the Nebraska area and around there. We have disaster recovery programs that we can't do if we delay this thing for another couple weeks. These people are going to have to be living in those conditions for that period of time. The authority for Afghanistan National Security Forces and Iraq security cooperation will expire by that time.

So there is every reason in the world that we should go ahead. I think it is pretty bad when a political decision is made to delay the consideration of this bill for another week or 2 weeks—all done for purely political reasons because the Democrats are having their big show on TV tomorrow night and the next night, and they want us to sit and watch that as opposed to finishing this bill.

It is our intention to go ahead, finish the bill, get it done, and that is what we are going to do. We are anxious to do it.

I am very proud of the committee I chair. The Senate Armed Services Committee met for a period of several months and talked about all the possible amendments that could be considered, and there is a lot of talk right now about the fact that we are not doing amendments on the floor.

Well, we wanted to do amendments on the floor. JACK REED, the Democrat who is my counterpart here, he and I have been talking about doing floor amendments for a long period of time, but under the rules of the Senate, if one person objects to bringing an amendment up, then no amendments can come up.

For that reason, we took the initiative just yesterday and passed the supplemental bill that has 93 amendments. So all of those amendments came through this process of people talking about their amendments, they just can't do it on the floor. That is what is happening right now. We have the best of intentions to continue doing that until we get the bill.

So let me just reinvite the Members down. We have, right now, a long list of the 93 amendments and the sponsors of those amendments, and we are encouraging each Member to bring his amendment down to the floor. Even though it may not be considered individually, it already passed yesterday, and people need to know what is in this bill.

So I am going to encourage our Members, invite them to come down right now and to get involved and explain to not just this U.S. Senate but to everyone else what all is in this bill.

People have a right to have pride in their own amendments, and so we are encouraging them to come down at this time and present their amendments.

With that, I will invite them down.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, while we are waiting for other Senators, let me once again encourage Members of the Senate to come down and talk about their amendments.

It is kind of an awkward situation that we have here, and we are all aware of this, but the Senate rules say that amendments can't come to the floor except by unanimous consent. That means that if there is one person who objects to having an amendment come up and be considered, then all that person has to do is object.

Frankly, that happened last year. We had a couple Members who were holding out for a nongermane amendment they wanted to consider, and they stated they would hold up all the other amendments. That happened, and it looks like it is happening again this year, but we are prepared this year because, anticipating that would be the case, yesterday we passed the 93 amendments with the bill—that we went to as the underlying bill. We now have 93 amendments in addition to the amendments we already had. We are probably now in excess of 200 amendments that we have had on this bill since its inception. Most of these amendments are bipartisan. In fact, the 93 amendments we adopted yesterday were amendments we had considered in the committee I chair, the Senate Armed Services Committee. Of those amendments, 44 were Democrats', 44 were Republicans', and the rest were bipartisan.

So this is not really that partisan of a bill.

Anyway, this includes an amendment by my colleagues, Senator GRAHAM and Senator HEINRICH, in support of plutonium pit production, which is key to maintaining our nuclear stockpile.

A lot of people are not aware of the problems we have with plutonium pit production. Consequently, we have to be competitive in this area. We have not had a nuclear modernization program in quite a long period of time. Nuclear modernization has gotten a lot of attention this year.

Traditionally, we have seen bipartisan support for these programs, and there is a good reason for that. Our nuclear force is critical to our deterrence posture and, in turn, the overall security of the Nation and really the world. This is our top priority—defending America.

Stop and think about it. The threat that is out there today—I often say I look wistfully back at the days of the Cold War when there were two superpowers. We knew what they had, they knew what we had, and mutual destruction really meant something at that time. It doesn't mean anything anymore. There are people who are run by deranged leaders in countries, and these people have the power to knock out an American city. That is the kind of threat we are faced with today, and that is why nuclear deterrence is so significant. It is such a significant part of this bill. Our nuclear force is critical for our deterrence posture and, in turn, the overall security of the Nation.

Anyway, we can't pretend that just because we take a step back, countries like Russia and China will do the same. And we did. For a period of time, in the last administration, we did step back in our efforts, and a lot of those efforts were in nuclear modernization. Consequently, while we were ahead in this area—ahead of China and Russia—they caught up and actually passed us.

Right now, they have hypersonics, as an example. Hypersonics is kind of the state-of-the-art in warfare. It is something that travels five times the speed of sound. It is something we were ahead of prior to the last administration, and we fell behind because while

we were not doing anything, China and Russia were doing things. We tried this before during the Obama administration; it just didn't work.

We know Russia and China are modernizing their nuclear forces at an alarming speed while we have been neglecting ours. And North Korea and Iran continue to pursue nuclear programs, furthering their goals of creating instability and gaining influence in their regions, and we are at a disadvantage. It poses a formidable threat to America and our allies.

If we don't provide robust support of our nuclear programs now, do it now, we will be in danger of falling behind. The National Defense Strategy acknowledged this reality. That is the thing I talked about a few minutes ago, that we have the National Defense Strategy as a blueprint for what we have been doing in our defense authorization committee, and we have been adhering to that. The NDAA takes this into account and supports all of the aspects of the triad.

The triad—recently, people have said: Well, we don't need to spend an amount of money on a triad system. ''Triad'' obviously means three approaches to our nuclear defense. When you stop and think about the three different ways a weapon can come into the United States, it can come in on an ICBM, it can come in on a submarine, or it can come in on a bomber. So that is what they mean by ''triad.'' For somebody to say ''Well, we don't need the three approaches; we need only one,'' well, if we knew in advance what that weapon was coming in on, what was going to be used for its delivery, then I would agree with that. But that can't happen, so we can't block off a leg or two of the triad or the whole thing will collapse. Each component provides a different type of protection and, combined, makes it far more challenging for adversaries to find opportunities to strike, and there are adversaries out there who want to do that.

Make no mistake—our adversaries are paying attention to their capabilities and to our capabilities. We need a strong, resilient, responsive nuclear enterprise to deter threats.

Nuclear weapons aren't just a relic of the Cold War, but currently we are treating them that way. Half of our DOE nuclear facilities are more than 40 years old, and a quarter date back to World War II. After years of neglect, the ceilings are literally falling down around the workers in nuclear complexes across the country. Fortunately, in fact, we have several people coming down here and talking about that threat because in some States, their Senators want to be sure they are doing a good job in maintaining our nuclear capability. So we need to modernize and revitalize this infrastructure if we want to maintain pace with China and Russia and if we want to preserve a credible nuclear deterrent.

I think it is important to note that the cost of modernization is not excessive. It averages about 5 percent of the DOD budget. That seems like a small price to pay to prevent a nuclear war.

The NDAA—that is what we are considering now—the National Defense Authorization Act fully funds the nuclear modernization program at or above the request, including additional funding for Columbia-class submarines and low-yield ballistic missile warheads.

The NDAA also pushes the National Nuclear Security Administration toward its goal of plutonium pit production—a requirement to meet the needs of our nuclear strategy.

These investments will increase our capabilities and bring us into the 21st century. This is what we need to be doing to implement the National Defense Strategy and assess the full range of threats our Nation faces. You know, it is a dangerous world out there, and we have a lot of people out there who don't like America—let's face it.

I was disappointed in the last administration, talking about the Obama administration. It was the first time in my memory—certainly since World War II—that we had either a Democratic or Republican administration that used something other than defending America as a primary goal of our country. Instead, that has dropped back, and we suffer the consequences. So we are in the process right now of rebuilding our military. We did it in 2018. That was the first year of the Trump administration. He increased the military spending back to where it had been before—up to $700 billion and then $716 billion the next year and then $750 billion in the bill we are considering at this very moment. So we are going to end up with a stronger America. I think that by the end of this year, if everything we are doing with this bill is fully implemented and behind us, we are going to be in good shape to do the job we are supposed to be doing in defending America.

In the meantime, we have this bill. Again, I will quit talking and encourage our Members to come down and talk about their amendments. One who is going to be coming down in just a few minutes—in fact, is due down any minute now—is Senator RICHARD BURR. He is in charge of intelligence. He chairs the Intelligence Committee, and that is a part of this bill.

It is important that people understand how far-reaching this is. This is the most significant thing we are doing, and that is probably the real reason we don't want to give in to the minority leader of the Senate, who is trying to get us to delay this for another week or longer because of the big show people are going to see on TV tomorrow and the next day of all the Democrats who are going to run for President. If I remember, the last time, we had 17 Republicans running. This time, we have 20 Democrats running. Anyway, that might be a great show, but it is not as important as the work we are doing here. And we absolutely have to get this done this week in order to fulfill the obligation we have to the American people.

Let me again encourage our Members to come down and discuss their amendments because we are going to be coming to a vote this week on all of those, and we have to make sure we have a full house of Senators who know everything that is in this bill.

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

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

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I want to thank Chairman INHOFE and Ranking Member REED for accommodating the Intelligence Committee's intelligence authorization bill for 2020 to be included in the NDAA. I want to thank Leader MCCONNELL and Senator SCHUMER for their understanding of why this is important to do.

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence is a unique committee. We uphold the secrecy and the confidentiality of intelligence programs that keep our Nation safe every day. We ensure our intelligence community has the tools and resources to protect America at home and abroad.

So I am pleased that the Senate is considering our intelligence authorization bill as part of the NDAA. Our bill is 3 fiscal years in the making. In May, the Senate Intelligence Committee unanimously passed the bill with a vote of 15 to 0. Let me say that one more time. We unanimously passed the intelligence authorization bill 15 to 0.

I appreciate Vice Chairman WARNER's work and his collaboration to achieve that unanimous support of all 15 Members of the Intelligence Committee. The bill is a genuinely bipartisan product that protects the United States, strengthens our national security, and supports the activities of the men and women who are serving in uniform around the clock and around the globe. I would remind the Presiding Officer and the Members that it is the 15 Members of the Select Committee on Intelligence who give the other 85 Members of the Senate and the American people the assurance that our intelligence activities operate within the Constitution and/or the Executive orders of the President.

The last intelligence authorization bill for fiscal year 2017 was enacted May 5, 2017. We have gone too long without critical resources and authorities that our intelligence agencies need to do their work and to keep our country safe from ever-expanding national security threats. Not only does our bill fund the U.S. intelligence activities across 17 agencies, but it enables congressional oversight of the intelligence community's classified activities. The

bill ensures financial accountability for the programs we authorize and supports development of future capabilities to stay a step ahead of our adversaries. We do not have time to waste as the threats increase in scope and scale.

All of this bipartisan oversight and accountability can exist only when we have a current, enacted intelligence authorization bill. Our intelligence agencies need the authorization, the direction, and the guidance from Congress to protect and defend America, its allies, and its partners. The agencies need these authorizations to collect, analyze, and utilize intelligence and to recruit and retain the personnel they need. Equally important, our authorization bill ensures that those activities abide by our Constitution and privacy laws.

I would like to mention some specifics in the bill. First, it deters Russian and other foreign influence in our U.S. elections. It facilitates information sharing between Federal, State, and local election officials. These activities are essential to protecting the foundation of our democracy, our U.S. elections.

Next, the bill increases oversight of Russian activities by requiring notifications of Russian Federation personnel travel in the United States, countering Russian propaganda activities within the United States, and by requiring threat assessments on Russian financial activities.

In addition, the bill improves our security clearance processes by requiring the intelligence community to take steps to reduce backlogs, improving clearance information sharing and oversight and holding the executive branch responsible for modernizing clearance policies.

The bill protects the intelligence community's supply chain from foreign counterintelligence threats from countries such as Russia and China.

Importantly, the bill increases benefits for intelligence community personnel by enhancing pay scales for certain cyber security positions and increasing paid parental leave.

Finally, it establishes increased accountability for our most sensitive programs.

The Senate Intelligence Committee has acted carefully and comprehensively to oversee our intelligence community and its resources. But the current gap in authorities is unacceptable and, frankly, dangerous. Our enemies and adversaries do not take 2 years off. Congress cannot afford to let our intelligence authorization bills lapse any longer.

I will end where I started. Without the collaboration and cooperation of the chairman and the ranking member and the entire SAS Committee, we wouldn't have this opportunity, but they recognize as well as we do that the security of America comes first. Any delay in authorizing the intelligence community bill or passing the NDAA is not what America expects us to do. They expect us to pass an authorization bill rapidly and with as much predictability as possible for the men and women in uniform and those who serve in the shadows of our intelligence community. An authorization bill that is done quickly and clearly makes their lives and futures more predictable. America's safety is too important for us to delay any longer authorizations for the military or for the intelligence community.

I once again thank the chairman for his accommodations in this bill. I urge my colleagues in this body to pass this authorization bill as quickly as we possibly can and send a signal to the men and women who serve this country and defend this country that Congress is on their side and not in opposition to them.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am pleased and honored to be on the floor with my colleague, the Senator from the great State of Rhode Island. We share a border, and we share many common views, one of them being a commitment to our environment. Senator WHITEHOUSE has been a historic champion of action against environmental degradation, as well as climate change—global warming—which brings us to the floor today.

We are here to call attention and call for action in connection with the effects of climate change on the waters off our State and the east coast of our Nation.

There is a palpable, historic consequence to the warming of those waters, among others, to drive fish populations northward in search of cooler waters. The Northeast has already experienced some of the highest levels of ocean warming and sea level rise in the United States. They are only projected to exacerbate and exceed the present levels.

There are storms our States—Rhode Island and Connecticut, and others up and down the East Coast and all around the country—have experienced. Those new superstorms are becoming the new normal in our Nation, the most recent being the unprecedented hurricane and then Superstorm Sandy.

Connecticut and Rhode Island are poised to lose land to sea level rise. Scientists predict an almost 2-foot increase in the level of Long Island Sound by 2050. My colleague Senator WHITEHOUSE has been here more times than I can count—I think more than 200 times—to call our attention to the effects and the causes of this historic and catastrophic trend of climate change in our Nation and on our planet.

What brings us here today is the very discrete and disastrous consequence of those waters warming and changing fish populations that are available to a group of our citizens and residents who have been an economic mainstay and backbone for our States. They are the fishermen who carry on a great profession and way of life, despite an outdated and Byzantine quota system that has failed to adapt to those movements of fish stock, like black sea bass, summer flounder, and scup from their waters northward and then new fish populations from the Mid-Atlantic States to our waters.

These fish quotas fail to take account of changing fish populations. The fish are smart biologically. They know when the waters are warming. They seek cooler waters further north, but the quotas fail to keep track. So the fish that are caught by our fishermen are not the same kinds as they caught before, and they are not the same kinds that are contemplated by the present quotas. They are catching fish they are required to throw back even after they are dead. So this quota system is failing at every level. It is failing environmentally if the goal is to enhance and save fish populations; it is failing economically because it is driving these fishermen out of their way of life; and it is failing in public policy by failing to provide a rational and informed way to set those quotas.

There is a solution because this whole system is governed by the Magnuson-Stevens Act, which, by the way, is under the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee, where I sit. There have been proposals to reform and change it. The current Byzantine system of quota setting is really a relic of a long-gone era, and it should be reformed. Right now, immediately, the Secretary of Commerce can intervene. The statute says the law governing the management of fisheries requires that the Department of Commerce must ensure fishery management plans adhere to several national standards, including the use of the ''best scientific information available to decide catch limits.'' It also says that any management plan ''shall not discriminate'' between residents of different States and must allow quotas that are ''fair and equitable.'' This system is failing those standards.

I agree with fishermen of Connecticut and, I believe, of Rhode Island who are saying this current system is nonsensical. It is outdated. It is irrational, and it is worthless. It fails to give them fairness and justice. It is time for action.

The Commerce Department should use its power—extraordinary as it is—to impose emergency regulations and create a more equitable system.

As Bobby Guzzo, a fisherman from Stonington told Greenwire recently:

Things have changed—the fish have moved north, but the quotas have not changed to

keep up with it. The science has to be better. They've got to get more of a handle on it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Greenwire article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[June 4, 2019]

AS FISH MOVE NORTH, 'THINGS ARE GETTING WEIRD OUT THERE'

(BY ROB HOTAKAINEN)

STONINGTON, CONN.—Here in one of New England's oldest fishing communities, there's a longing for the old days, long before climate change and the federal government's quota system got so complicated.

Convinced that Congress and NOAA will never allow them larger quotas, many fishermen want to take their grievances straight to the White House, hoping the commander in chief will intervene and allow them to catch more fish.

At his fish wholesaling business, Mike Gambardella reached for his iPhone to find one of his prized photographs: a picture showing him wearing a white T-shirt bearing the message, ''President Trump: Make Commercial Fishing Great Again!''

Bobby Guzzo, Gambardella's friend, who's been fishing here for more than 50 years, has the same sign on a bumper sticker plastered on the back window of his pickup.

''It used to be you'd go catch fish, come in and sell them,'' Guzzo said. But now the system is needlessly complicated, he said, with too much bookwork and a quota system that's hard to decipher, adding, ''Now you've got to be a lawyer.''

''If you get ahold of the president, tell him to come see us,'' Gambardella tells a visitor.

With a lack of fish, Gambardella said, it's gotten to the point where it's even difficult to get trucks to come through Stonington any more. He tells the story of a friend in the business who killed himself.

''We don't have enough fish—and it's not a Connecticut thing; it's all of us,'' Gambardella said. ''And little by little, we're all going out of business. The Lord gave us that ocean, and he put fish in that ocean for us to eat. And now we can't even get the fish.''

The struggling commercial fishermen in Stonington, a small town that was first settled in 1649, are doing all they can to get Trump's attention.

When the president showed up in nearby New London, Conn., to address the Coast Guard Academy class two years ago, they got as close as they could, parking a boat that bore a simple sign: ''Please help us.''

Gambardella even left his cellphone number on the Twitter page of Linda McMahon, a former professional wrestling executive who until recently served as the head of the Small Business Administration.

''We've been trying to get to the president,'' Gambardella said. ''We like his style. . . . He sat down with the coal miners. He sat down with the farmers. It's time to sit down with the fishermen.''

Without intervention, the fishermen only see their plight worsening as climate change forces more fish to move to cooler waters and regulators scramble to adjust quotas.

''Things have changed—the fish have moved north, but the quotas have not changed to keep up with it,'' Guzzo said. ''The science has to be better. They've got to get more of a handle on it.''

That's easier said than done, under a byzantine regulatory system that's often slow to adapt. It has also forced fishermen to learn the new language of Washington, D.C., navigating a world of catch shares and stock assessments, of fish mortality rates and maximum sustainable yields.

While they're upset with the quota system, many fishenmen and politicians are also angry that fishermen must throw away the ''bycatch,'' the fish they bring in by accident but are not licensed to catch.

Gambardella said he's particularly eager to tell the president that Americans are eating too much ''chemical shit,'' consuming imported seafood while millions of pounds of healthy wild seafood gets discarded every year.

''He's going to be shocked to know that we import over 90% of our seafood, and we have fish in our backyard here that we're throwing overboard,'' Gambardella said. ''I don't understand—we're throwing good wild seafood overboard that we could sell or have the kids eat healthy food. It's sad, really, really sad. . . . The whole thing is so screwed up.''

Lawmakers from coastal states have long argued the case on Capitol Hill, with no luck in winning any changes.

At a hearing last fall, Connecticut Sen. Richard Blumenthal (D) said ''there is something profoundly unfair and intolerable'' with a management system that forces fishermen to discard so much seafood while many people across the world go hungry.

''They are compelled to throw back perfectly good fish that they catch as a result of quotas that are based on totally obsolete, out-of-touch limits,'' he said. ''And meanwhile, fishermen from Southern states come into their waters and catch their fish,'' he said of fishermen in more northern points.

In a speech on the Senate floor last year, Sen. Sheldon Whitehouse (D–R.I.) said fishenmen in his state are now routinely sharing anecdotes of catching increasing numbers of tropical fish early in the summer season.

''As fishermen in Rhode Island have told me, 'Things are getting weird out there,''' Whitehouse said. ''As new fish move in and traditional fish move out, fishermen are left with more questions than answers.''

In Washington, members of Congress are trying to figure out how to best respond.

''Climate change is throwing some real curveballs at fisheries management,'' said Rep. Jared Huffman (D–Calif.), chairman of the House Natural Resources Subcommittee on Water, Oceans and Wildlife, adding that he intended to schedule ''some roundtables with folks who are living through this.''

The issue is sure to come up when Congress examines the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, the nation's premier fisheries law, first passed in 1976. The law created eight regional fishery management councils to develop fishery management plans, working with NOAA on ''a transparent and robust process of science, management, innovation and collaboration with the fishing industry.''

But there's disagreement over who's best equipped to change the rules: regional boards, which are dominated by state interests, or Congress, which has its own share of political pressures.

''You need some strong federal guidance,'' said Dave Monti, a charter boat captain and fishing guide who operates in Wickford Harbor in North Kingstown, R.I., and the vice president of the Rhode Island Saltwater Anglers Association.

''Local needs circumvent the needs of the people of the United States of America. I'm a firm believer that those fish in the water don't belong to me and they don't belong to Rhode Island. Someone living in Minnesota or Kentucky owns these fish as much as anyone else does.''

Chris Batsavage, who represents North Carolina on the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission and the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council, said regional boards have struggled to find the right allocations for years. But he said they're capable of doing the job.

''It's still a work in progress—no one has found a silver-bullet solution,'' Batsavage said. ''But I think we're going to get to go where we need to go. Allocations are always one of the most contentious things a management agency has to deal with.''

Huffman said regional councils remain ''part of the critical framework'' and that he's not interested in taking their power away. He said Congress' role will be to set the policy and leave implementation to regional fisheries officials.

''I don't want to undermine the councils,'' Huffman said. ''And what I don't want to do is a whole bunch of micromanaging.''

But while many fishermen and politicians complain about U.S. fishing rules, NOAA boasts that the nation has become an international leader in fisheries management.

In 2017, Chris Oliver, who heads NOAA Fisheries, told a congressional panel that the law clearly had worked and that the United States had ''effectively ended overfishing.''

NOAA Fisheries tracks 474 stocks or stock complexes in 46 fishery management plans. Of those, 91% had not exceeded their annual catch limits, known as ACLs, according to a report NOAA sent to Congress in 2017.

Under federal law, fisheries managers must specify their goals and use ''measurable criteria,'' also known as reference points, to get there. That requires a stock assessment, which is a scientific analysis of the abundance of fish stock and a measure of ''the degree of fishing intensity.''

Once an assessment is done, fisheries managers must determine if a stock is overfished, measuring the ''maximum sustainable yield.'' That's the largest long-term average catch that can be taken from a stock.

Fisheries managers then have different ways to reduce fishing, including the use of ''catch limits'' or ''catch shares.'' Catch limits measure the amount of fish that can be caught, while catch shares are an optional tool used to allocate shares to individual fishermen or groups.

KEEPING 'AN EYE ON THE BIG PICTURE'

As they adjust quotas, NOAA officials walk a fine line in making sure fishermen follow the law while cooperating with regional officials to make any changes.

The Trump administration has already shown deference for listening to local fishermen, overriding regional decisions to shorten the season for the red snapper in Gulf Coast states and to limit catches of summer flounder for New Jersey fishermen.

''It's our job in that setting to also keep an eye on the big picture, and not just all of the regional and small-scale interests,'' said Mike Fogarty, senior scientist at NOAA's Northeast Fisheries Science Center in Massachusetts.

Fogarty, who has studied climate issues since the early 1990s, said one idea under consideration is to no longer set regulations for individual fish species but to instead focus on their role in an ecosystem, such as whether they're part of a prey or a predator group.

''You could set quotas for the predator groups, prey groups and bottom-feeder groups,'' he said. ''Individual species could change over time, but their roles would remain intact. That could reduce tension between states.''

While many fishermen want NOAA to be more flexible, environmental groups want regulators to adhere to the federal law and to adjust fishing quotas as soon as populations change. A study published in the ICES Journal of Marine Science in April

showed that adapting fishing intensity to the health of fish populations would make fisheries more climate-resilient. The study suggested automatically reducing the catch percentage when managers detect decreases in biomass, allowing more immediate responses to changing conditions.

''If a catch limit is too high and too many fish are taken out of the ocean, the ecosystem suffers,'' said Jake Kritzer, senior director with the Environmental Defense Fund's oceans program and lead author of the study. ''If a limit is too low, with more fish than can be caught sustainably left in the water, fishermen suffer.''

So it is past time for an update for a system that takes advantage of science and research. We owe it to our fishing industry, but we owe it to ourselves as members of this ecosystem, as policy centers, and as legislators to keep faith with the fishermen of Rhode Island and Connecticut. Really, it is with the fishermen of America. As fish stocks shift north, fishermen from other States are going to encounter the same challenges. They will be sailing north to seek fish stocks off Connecticut's coast. Their quotas around their States are as outmoded and outdated as ours. The longer trips they will undertake will mean more carbon pollution, which will lead to more atmospheric carbon dioxide, climate shifts, and acidification of the ocean.

There is some good news amidst all of this gloom and doom in that we are already mustering the awareness and the resolve to take action. That is why we are here today. It is not only to wake up but to keep up this kind of fight.

I thank my colleague, the Senator from Rhode Island, for leading this great effort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, it is a great honor and pleasure to join the senior Senator from Connecticut on the floor today. We were both U.S. attorneys. We were attorneys general together. We now serve in the Senate together, and I consider him a friend outside of my day job as well. It is terrific to be here with him. It is also a happy coincidence that a Senator from another great fishing State, Louisiana, should be presiding while we speak about our fisheries. This is my 247th of these speeches.

Rhode Island, of course, shares a border with Connecticut, as well as a proud fishing heritage and connection to the sea. Whether you are walking the docks of Stonington and New London or of Newport and Point Judith, the story from our fishermen is the same—that these are not the waters that our grandparents, parents, and great-grandparents fished. One fishermen told me: ''Sheldon, it's getting weird out there, and it's a big economic deal that it's getting weird out there.''

In 2017, commercial fishery landings from Connecticut and Rhode Island totaled over $114 million, and that was just the landings. That was not the ancillary fishing economy around it. Carbon pollution and warming, acidifying oceans put that whole economy at risk.

Earlier this month, the National Academy of Sciences estimated that by 2100, around 17 percent of all ocean life, by biomass, will disappear. In February, the journal Science found that since 1930, we have already lost around 4 percent of our harvestable seafood due to ocean warming, and the fish that we are still able to harvest are getting smaller due to warming temperatures and depleted oxygen levels. A 2017 study warned ''the body size of fish decreases 20 to 30 percent for every 1-degree Celsius increase in water temperature,'' and the water is warming.

Oceans have absorbed more than 90 percent of the excess heat that has been trapped by our greenhouse gas emissions. Of all of the excess heat that has been trapped by greenhouse gas emissions since we began the Industrial Revolution and started burning all of these fossil fuels, 90 percent of it has gone into the oceans.

How much is that?

The Federal Government's 2017 Climate Science Special Report from NOAA, NASA, the Department of Energy, and others found that the oceans had absorbed more than 9 zettajoules of heat energy per year.

What is a zettajoule?

A zettajoule is 9 billion trillion joules. They are not jewels like your grandmother's earrings. They are joules as a measure of energy.

From 1998 to 2015, the oceans had absorbed more than 9 billion trillion joules. That is a rate of more than 12 times the total energy use of humans on the planet. If you want a more vigorous, a more kinetic description of what that heat load is like, visualize the power of a Hiroshima-style atomic bomb with its classic mushroom cloud erupting into the sky. Imagine all of that energy from that nuclear blast being captured just as heat. Now imagine four Hiroshima-sized atomic bombs exploding every second. That is the excess heat that is going into our oceans from climate change—more than four atomic bombs' worth of excess heat energy being absorbed by the oceans every second of every day of every year. That is a lot of heat energy, and adding it to the oceans has consequences.

The global average ocean surface temperature was already up around 0.8 degrees Celsius, or 1.5 degrees Fahrenheit, since before the carbon pollution of industrial times began, and the rate is accelerating. According to NOAA, ''the global land and ocean temperature departure from average has reached new record highs five times since 2000.''

The rapid rise in ocean temperatures is forcing species that were once southern New England icons to abandon our waters for cooler, deeper, northerner seas. A 2018 NOAA-funded study warned that hundreds of commercially valuable species are being forced northward as oceans warm.

For Rhode Island, squid is now king. In 2017, around 60 percent of the longfin squid and 63 percent of northern shortfin squid caught in the United States were landed in Rhode Island. According to NOAA, Rhode Island's share of the catch was valued at over $28 million. In my State, that is a big deal. Remember, that is just the landing value. That is not the surrounding economic value. Climate change is putting that—our precious calamari—at risk. Squid is Rhode Island's most valuable fishery with its having accounted for nearly 30 percent of all of our States' landings, by value, in 2017.

Rhode Island once had a booming lobster fishery. The lobster population shifted north as our waters warmed, and it left Rhode Island's lobster traps empty. NOAA reports what we already know: ''The lobster industry in New York and southern New England has nearly collapsed.'' Maine is temporarily benefiting from the northern movement of lobster, but the lobster is expected to keep moving north, into Canada, as we keep warming the oceans.

In January, the Washington Post ran this amazing piece as part of its ''Gone in a Generation'' series. It featured the stories of Rhode Island and Maine lobstermen who deal with our changing ocean.

New England's fishermen also see declining shellfish populations. The total landings for eastern oysters, northern quahogs, soft-shell clams, and northern bay scallops all declined 85 percent between 1980 and 2010. NOAA's Northeast Fisheries Science Center identified warming ocean temperatures as the culprit.

As climate change warms the oceans, all of that excess CO_2 in the atmosphere chemically acidifies the oceans as 90 percent of the heat is absorbed by the oceans and 30 percent of the CO_2 is chemically absorbed by the oceans—out of the atmosphere and into the seas. It acidifies the oceans, and for many species, that is a double whammy. Sea scallops were one of the Nation's most valuable fisheries and Connecticut's most valuable species in 2017 landings. So let's look at that one.

Ocean acidification and warming both trouble sea scallops. Scallops and other shellfish extract calcium carbonate from ocean waters around them in order to build their shells. Acidic waters decrease the chemical availability of that compound, and if you actually get it high enough, you actually dissolve the shells of living creatures. In 2018, the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution warned that ocean acidification ''could reduce the sea scallop population by more than 50 percent in the next 30 to 80 years under a worst-case scenario.''

While we in the Senate struggle to free our Chamber from the remorseless political grip of the fossil fuel industry, our fishermen pay the price. The oceans are warming too fast for us to respond to rapid changes in fish stocks. So, in our States, black sea bass and

summer flounder—both species mentioned by Senator BLUMENTHAL—are poster children for this disconnect.

He mentioned his fisherman Bobby Guzzo in the article from Greenwire, and Rhode Island's fishermen are telling me exactly the same thing. The Science Director for NOAA's Northeast Fisheries Science Center says, ''Much of our management assumes that conditions in the future will be the same as they have been in the past,'' but that is no longer true. We are already so off base from historical trends and data that we can no longer rely on that history to forecast where fish populations will be.

So black sea bass and summer flounder head north toward cooler waters from the Mid-Atlantic States, which used to be the home base. You would think, as they did, that it would make sense for the catch allocations of that fish to move northward with them. The blue is the base of where most of the black sea bass food stock existed back in the seventies. Up here is the base right now. That is the Chesapeake Bay. There is Rhode Island—there at the hook of Cape Cod in Massachusetts.

It is a big move up into our space, but did the catch limits move up with it? No. Southern States were unwilling to give up their quotas, which left our fishermen in Connecticut and Rhode Island to fish our northeast waters with an abundant catch they couldn't harvest. Imagine the frustration as Rhode Island, Connecticut, and other New England States don't have a vote on a critical fishery management council that makes this decision to put our fishermen at a severe disadvantage to fight for their right to the fish that are now settling up here in southern New England. Our fishermen have to throw back valuable fish from lobster pots and from nets because our fisheries' management rules haven't caught up with their ocean reality.

We have to update how we manage these shifting fish stocks as climate change moves fish populations around. We must speed research and catch limits to match what fishermen actually see in the water. Our fishermen and our coastal economies depend on it.

I am very grateful to Senator BLUMENTHAL, my outstanding colleague from Connecticut, for joining me today. Together, we will continue to fight for a day when our Rhode Island and Connecticut fishermen can foresee their children and grandchildren continuing their long tradition of fishing the seas.

We strive for meaningful action on climate change and ocean acidification, for updated fisheries and climate modeling, and for improvements on how we manage these stocks. To save our seas and to save our fishing economies, we must wake up to the threat of climate change and respond to these consequences that real fishermen are seeing in their real nets and boats every single day.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Connecticut and I be allowed to engage in a brief colloquy.

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

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, after that eloquence, I hesitate to even add anything, but the urgency of his plea and the need to hear the voices of these fishermen brings to mind this photograph, which was taken from the Greenwire article. In fact, it is of a boat in Stonington Harbor during a visit by President Trump in 2017 to the Coast Guard Academy in New London. The banner on this boat reads: ''Please help us.''

We need help for the fishermen of our Nation, whether they be in Louisiana or Rhode Island or Connecticut, because of this completely obsolete, obscenely outdated system that is depriving them of decent livelihoods, depriving our Nation of sufficient fish nutrition, and depriving our Nation and our world of an end to climate change.

I would ask my colleague from Rhode Island very briefly, does he believe that the administration is heeding that message, not only behalf of the fishermen of Stonington in Connecticut—please help us—but on behalf of the planet to please help us stop global warming and climate change? Is this administration acting sufficiently?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Well, clearly, when it comes to climate change, this administration is embarrassing itself and our country with the factually and scientifically preposterous claims that they make, and the nonsense denial that they continue to propagate is going to be, I think, a lasting blot on our country, as the rest of the world looks to us for leadership and sees instead more fossil-fuel-funded denial and treacherous political behavior by the industry that guides, very often, the hands of people in government. So from that point of view, it is a complete train wreck.

From the point of view of helping the fishing communities, they have actually been taking it on the chin for a while. I will say a good word for the fishing communities. I think they have really tried to do their best. When we asked the fishing community to consider moving to a catch shares type of regulatory model, a lot of them didn't like it, but a number of them tried it, and they realized they actually could make it work and it actually improved their business prospects. So that move has been one that has not been easy for them to make, but more and more they have made it, and they have been able to see how it works better for them to be able to share catches.

If somebody is out at sea having a great day, instead of having to go back in, they can get on the radio to somebody and say: I am having a great day out here. It is cheap for me to stay out here. I will keep fishing if you will give me some of your catch. You can stay home. And they work out the deal over the radio.

That has been a good thing, but, again, it is not easy for them. And they have also really stepped up, as Senator BLUMENTHAL knows so well, in our regional ocean planning, the offshore planning. The fishermen have come forward, and they have participated. They have been, I think, very fair and productive.

Unfortunately, the manner in which the Obama administration rolled out the offshore marine monument was a bit of a blow to the trust that had been developed, but they had participated in good faith. I have good things to say about what our fishing community has tried to do to keep up.

But no matter what you try to do as a fisherman, if you have an abundance of black sea bass—if it is so abundant that it is going into lobster pots to eat the bait and you are pulling up black sea bass in lobster pots, if you are pulling it up in your trawls—and you find that you can't keep this fish, you could go to the dock and you could sell it for several dollars but, no, you are obliged to throw it overboard because you can't bring it in. It has already been probably a little bit compromised, particularly if it has been caught in the trawl. So it is not likely to survive very long when you put it back in the water. So you are not really helping anybody by throwing it in. You know it is valuable. You know there are a lot of them. You know you are throwing them back injured or having difficulty surviving or, very often, dead. I have seen them just go twirling down through the water. You wonder, who is looking out for me, because this does not make sense? This does not make sense.

The science supports what they are saying. NOAA has known for a very long time that this black see bass population was moving northward. This was only 2014. It is even further north from there.

Nothing is more frustrating than not being taken seriously, and I think we need to take the concerns of our fishermen seriously. Of course, one way to do that is to take climate change seriously and not listen to this nonsense about it being a Chinese hoax and not have a bunch of really creepy eccentrics from the climate denial stooge community brought into government and actually given positions as if they were legitimate.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Rhode Island and I look forward to coming back to the floor with him and expanding on this colloquy in the future. I will be a proud partner of his in advocating for the measures, and I join him in praising our fishing community because they have stood strong in the face of adversity.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, let me conclude by thanking Senator BLUMENTHAL for his leadership on this issue. Our fishing communities have a powerful voice in Senator BLUMENTHAL. He has worked with them for many,

many years in the Senate and before, when he was attorney general. It is a great honor for me to share the floor of the Senate with him today.

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.

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 CHANSE JONES

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, today I want to recognize my deputy communications director, Chanse Jones, who is leavlng my office in early July after more than 4 years of service to the State of Nebraska and to me.

Although he is a Mississippian by birth, Chanse has become an adopted son of Nebraska. He started with me in Washington as a press assistant in 2015. I quickly learned he was someone with a big personality, big ideas, and a lot of creativity, so I promoted him to the role of deputy press secretary. He worked hard, and it wasn't long before he became my press secretary and then my deputy communications director.

As the years went by, Chanse came to love and be loved by so many communities across the State of Nebraska. He joined me for many road trips all across the Good Life. These trips took us from Omaha to Scottsbluff, to my ranch outside of Valentine, to the northeast part of the state, and many places between—the stories he could tell about our ''adventures.''

During these journeys, Chanse endeared himself to Nebraskans with his charming nature. He is a delight, and he made friends just about everywhere he went. While on the road, he also captured Nebraska's beauty in many ways, including through wonderful photographs that I will forever cherish.

When carrying out his job responsibilities whether in Nebraska or in Washington, Chanse always brought a sense of fun to every task. He has been a dear friend to me and a fierce protector. He is also an original ''Friend of Fred'' and godparent of my goldendoodle, Fred Fischer. In fact, he helped us find Fred and was with us when we rescued him a few years ago.

The three of us, Fred, my husband Bruce, and I, are certainly going to miss Chanse's company.

I want to thank Chanse for his friendship and his service to the people of Nebraska over the years. I wish him all the best in this next chapter of his career, and I am excited to see what life has in store for him.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO JOHN MANCHESTER

● Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, today I wish to recognize a friend and fellow public servant of the great State of West Virginia, John Manchester, as Friday marks his retirement from 16 years of service as the mayor of Lewisburg, WV. Under John's leadership, the city of Lewisburg has endured tough times, yet still flourishes as one of the cultural epicenters for our State, nestled deep in the rolling hills of Appalachia and the mighty Greenbrier River.

Although Mayor Manchester is not a native West Virginian, the love for this State has rooted itself deep within him. After graduating from Brown University, he packed his bags for Morgantown, WV, and became a Mountaineer as he accepted a research assistantship with West Virginia University. However, it wasn't until 1982 that these country roads called John and his wife Connie home to the Greenbrier River Valley, when they settled in the small town of Renick, WV.

John and his family began to grow into the fabric of the small town with only 200 residents. First, they started their own sawmill and entered the timber business. The harsh West Virginia winter forced John to reconsider his line of work, and he took a job as an editor with a newspaper, the Mountaineer Messenger. From there, John's desire to give back to the community that had given so much to him and his family took over, and he accepted the vacated mayor position in Renick. It would be this experience with local government that would inspire John to run for mayor of Lewisburg when his family moved in 2003.

Sixteen years later, Mayor Manchester still calls Lewisburg the best small town in West Virginia. I truly believe in John's vision and dedication for Lewisburg and can personally attest to how special of a place that this town is. One can sense a deep communal bond in this locale, which is a direct result of the strong character of its people and the examples set by its leadership.

Leadership begins and ends with service. Mayor Manchester is someone who exemplifies service, not only by his words, but by how he lives his life every day. Three years ago, Greenbrier County experienced an historic flood, and while Lewisburg experienced its share of high water, it was spared the widespread devastation that hit the nearby towns of White Sulphur Springs and Rainelle. Once Lewisburg was safe and sound, the residents, under the leadership of John Manchester, pulled together and took care of their neighbors throughout the Greenbrier Valley. I appreciate and commend the leadership Mayor Manchester showed during that difficult time and throughout his tenure as mayor.

Mayor Manchester has many accomplishments over the past 16 years of service as the mayor of Lewisburg. On a personal note, I would like to thank John for his kindness to my staff and me during our many interactions over the years. The people of Lewisburg are very fortunate John Manchester chose to live in West Virginia and serve its residents through his constant devotion, truly making this State and his city a better place to live. I wish him well in his retirement. It is truly an honor to call you friend and fellow West Virginian.●

TRIBUTE TO ANDREA ''ANDY'' PENDLETON

● Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, today I wish to honor my friend and the first woman mayor of the town of Rainelle, WV, Andrea ''Andy'' Pendleton. Mayor Andy, as her friends call her, has served the town of Rainelle and Greenbrier County for the past 8 years, standing tall in the face of adversity and some of the toughest times that the Greenbrier River Valley has ever experienced. As the first woman elected to the Senate from West Virginia, I greatly admire Andy's initiative and her desire to give back to her community through public service.

Growing up in West Virginia teaches you to be tough, it teaches you to be respectful, and it teaches you take care of those around you. I know by Mayor Andy's character and her desire to help others that she holds those same West Virginia values close to her heart. To this day, Andy credits many of the positive qualities she possesses to the time she spent growing up in her family's discount food store, working 7 days a week. Little did she know that these fundamental lessons were building her into the leader that the town of Rainelle desperately needed.

The historic floods that ripped through West Virginia in June of 2016 devastated Rainelle, with almost 90 percent of homes and businesses ravaged by the flood water. Out of the 23 West Virginians we lost on that day, five of them were members of the Rainelle community. Mayor Andy was on the scene immediately and worked tirelessly in the days and months following the flood. From moving logs and rocks, alerting first responders, and keeping the community together, she dove directly into the flood relief process and led by example. She was tireless.

The impact that Mayor Andy has had on her community will be felt for far longer than her tenure as mayor. She was the driving force in securing funds to construct a new water system that efficiently supplies clean drinking water to the people of her town. In addition, she has also worked to replace

aging sidewalks, as well as other beautification and community development projects including the Meadow River Trail. Even now, in her final days in office, Mayor Andy continues her tireless work for Rainelle and its recovery.

Mayor Andy and the people of Rainelle inspire me. I am incredibly appreciative of the selfless leadership that Mayor Andy exhibits with her actions, and I hope that it further inspires young women in her community and across our State to rise up and be leaders and influential voices in their community. The town of Rainelle's motto has never been so fitting and true, largely in part to Mayor Andy: ''A Town Built to Carry On.'' On behalf of the people of the great State of West Virginia, I thank Mayor Andy Pendleton for her service to Rainelle. It is truly an honor to call her a colleague and a friend.●

TRIBUTE TO JOHN SCHMIDT

● Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, I wish to recognize a dedicated public servant and proud West Virginian, John Schmidt, on the occasion of his retirement from the West Virginia Ecological Services Field Office, WVFO, of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, located in Elkins. I would especially like to recognize his leadership and contributions to fish and wildlife conservation. Innumerable West Virginians have benefited from his tireless efforts to improve wildlife conditions in our great State. John has been a vocal champion for creating a conservation legacy through collaboration and strong working partnerships with local stakeholders.

John has been working as a biologist for 32 years. For 25 of those, he has served the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, working with landowners and State and Federal agencies. Currently, he helps nongovernmental organizations as a project leader to help restore, enhance, and protect fish and wildlife throughout our state.

Due to his leadership, contributions, and dedication to his community, John is being awarded the Superior Service Award by the U.S. Department of Interior. John has highlighted the need for providing restoring wildlife and recreational safety for West Virginians.

Beyond the critical assistance that the WVFO provides to the wildlife in West Virginia, it also has a positive effect on the economy. John and his staff volunteered numerous hours on a project to remove three legacy dams, leading to savings of nearly $60,000 per year for the municipal water system and its ratepayers. This work helped connect over 47 miles of formerly segmented river and drastically improved the water quality in the West Fork River.

Outside of his work for the WVFO, John has played an active role in giving back to his community. Some of his volunteer work has included time spent helping community leadership and conservation organizations such as the Tygart Valley Lions Club, Ducks Unlimited, Trout Unlimited, and the Virginia Tech Monogram Club. He has also served as a swim coach and official for 30 years at all primary school levels. John has shown that he is dedicated to help all West Virginians in numerous efforts.

I would like to thank John for all his insight and advice over the years. My office has relied upon him countless times for guidance and input. On a personal level, he was kind and helpful not only to me, but to my staff as well. They often spoke highly of how attentive, patient, and kind he was to everyone with whom he worked. I wish John the very best during his well-deserved retirement, and I hope he can enjoy more time with loved ones. West Virginia owes John our gratitude, and I thank him for all his excellent work over his decades-long career.●

REMEMBERING JAMES A. ''BUD'' CODY

● Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, today, I am honored to recognize in the RECORD the life of James A. 'Bud'' Cody, who selflessly served Georgians for decades and recently passed away in Ocean Springs, MS.

Bud Cody was born in Willachoochee, GA., on November 27, 1938. From an early age, he loved being active, finding friends, and making a difference. He played on the legendary Valdosta High School football team under his mentor, Coach Wright Bazemore. He was part of the State winning 4x4 track relay team.

Bud started his career at a young age, working full time at the Boys Club in Valdosta, GA, at the age of 18. He attended college at night over the next several years while helping his wife care for their children.

After graduating and establishing Boys Club facilities from Louisiana to Texas, Bud was hired by the Georgia Sheriffs' Association as their first executive director and returned home to Georgia in 1966. His career with the sheriffs' association also included his becoming director of the Georgia Sheriffs' Youth Homes located at the Boys Ranch in Hahira, GA. Bud continued to serve in these roles for the next 46 years. As executive director, he also assumed control of the Sheriffs' Retirement Fund of Georgia, leading the organization's assets from $9 million in 1982 to more than $97 million to take care of Georgia's retired sheriffs.

Bud retired in September 2012 with many lasting accomplishments thanks to his principled leadership and values. He expanded the Georgia Sheriffs' Youth Homes to provide a safe haven and education opportunities for thousands of Georgia's abused, abandoned, and neglected children. He also led the initiative to establish the Georgia Sheriffs' Youth Homes Foundation, which provides ongoing funds for its youth homes.

Our public safety officers also have Bud to thank for the excellent training they receive to help keep them safe while protecting Georgians. Bud believed that every officer should receive the best training possible, so he helped found the Georgia Public Safety Training Center in Forsyth, GA, working with State leaders, criminal justice practitioners, and sheriffs to establish a world-class public safety training facility that trains more than 2,000 students daily. Over the course of his career, nine Georgia Governors routinely sought his advice and counsel.

Bud's reach went beyond Georgia, too. He helped establish the National Sheriff's Association Committee of Presidents and Executive Directors in 1980 to ensure the office of sheriff had a professional code and standards.

Bud joined his friend and business partner Claude Grizzard to form the company CFR. In all, they provided assistance to more than 30 States from New York to Texas to California, raising tens of millions of dollars for the purpose of helping officers and youth homes nationwide. If you ever see a car tag from a State sheriff's association, this is thanks to the efforts of Bud and Claude.

Bud was beloved by his family. He was preceded in life by his father, Homer Cody, mother, Mellie Cody, and daughter, Celena Cody, and survived by his children, James A. ''Buddy'' Cody, Jr., Derek Marchman, daughter-in-law Kel Marchman, Camille Hormell, son-in-law Rodger Hormell, and Amy Asbell. His grandchildren include Wesley Leverett, Sara Cody, Laura Cody, Bryan Cronan, Austin Hormell, Quaid Hormell, Cody Kitchens, Seth Kitchens, Sara Marchman, Jamie Cody, Maggie Cody, and Wyatt Asbell. Great-grandchildren include Abigail Kitchens, Maddox Kitchens, Lucas Kitchens, and Grayson Kitchens.

Most fittingly, a public memorial will be held at the Public Safety Training Center in Forsyth, GA, on July 13 before his ashes are spread by his family on his beloved St. Simons Island. As we remember the life and work of Bud Cody, we send prayers to his family and all those whose lives were touched by his mission.●

TRIBUTE TO SUMMER HOLTZHOWER

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, today I honor Summer Holtzhower, the Sumter County Teacher of the Year from Wildwood Elementary School in Wildwood, FL.

Summer, a 4th grade math and science teacher, just completed her second year and designs her classroom activities to challenge her students. She has a teaching activity called the Density Lab, where students experiment with placing certain liquids in measuring cups and hypothesize where they think the liquids will settle. Students then test to see if their hypothesis are correct and answer Summer's

''higher order thinking'' questions about their lab results.

Summer, who believes that one of her goals as an educator is to make her students feel valued, does this by encouraging her students to participate in days such as National Compliment Day. She believes that events like this will allow her students to feel empowered and know that they are capable of success in the future.

I offer my best wishes to Summer and look forward to hearing of her continued success in the years ahead.●

TRIBUTE TO LINDA HOWELL

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, today I honor Linda Howell, the Taylor County Teacher of the Year from Taylor County High School in Perry, FL.

Linda has a strong belief that every student can learn and succeed, but it takes an entire community to support that success. Her peers take note of her dedication to being a part of a team at her school.

A 1987 graduate from Florida State University, Linda previously worked for Proctor and Gamble, helping to develop its employee assistance program and was a member of its Foley Impact Team. She was also previously a home educator and substitute teacher.

Linda has great experience as an educator, spending many years cultivating an esteemed and diverse resume. Linda currently teaches 9th and 10th grade English, and has spent 8 years with the Taylor County Public School District. She also intermittently teaches at her local Boys and Girls Club in its afterschool and summer programs.

I offer my best wishes to Linda and look forward to hearing of her continued good work in the years to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:26 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2109. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in awarding a contract for the procurement of goods or services, to give a preference to offerers that employ veterans.

H.R. 2196. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to reduce the credit hour requirement for the Edith Nourse Rogers STEM Scholarship program of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 3:31 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 559. An act 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''.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2109. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in awarding a contract for the procurement of goods or services, to give a preference to offerors that employ veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2196. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to reduce the credit hour requirement for the Edith Nourse Rogers STEM Scholarship program of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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–1743. A communication from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of General Paul J. Selva, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1744. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Methods for Calculating W–2 Wages for Purposes of Section 199A(g)'' (Notice 2019–27) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1745. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Contributions in Exchange for State or Local Tax Credits'' (RIN1545–BO89) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1746. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of Discounting Rules for Insurance Companies'' (RIN1545–BO50) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1747. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''2019 Marginal Production Rates'' (Notice 2019–38) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1748. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Electing Small Business Trusts with Nonresident Aliens as Potential Current Beneficiaries'' (RIN1545–BO93) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1749. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Limitation on Deduction for Dividends Received from Certain Foreign Corporations and Amounts Eligible for Section 954 Look-Through Exception'' (RIN1545–BO64) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1750. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Health Reimbursement Arrangements and Other Account-Based Group Health Plans'' (RIN1545–BO46) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1751. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2019–0044 - 2019–0047); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1752. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Supplement Not Supplant Under Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as Amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act'' received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 24, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1753. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Health Reimbursement Arrangements and Other Account-Based Group Health Plans'' (RIN0938–AT90) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 14, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1754. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23–59, ''Primary Date Alteration Temporary Amendment Act of 2019''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1755. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Ohio River, Miles 90.8 to 91.4, Wheeling, WV'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2019–0364)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1756. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Ohio River, Miles 110.5 to 111.5, Moundsville, WV'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2019–0451)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1757. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Port Gibson, MS'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2019–0440)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1758. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Ohio

River, and Upper Mississippi River, Bird's Point-New Madrid Floodway'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2019–0123)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1759. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River, Mile Markers 614 to 615.5, Guttenberg, IA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2019–0285)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1760. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Corpus Christi, TX'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2019–0509)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1333. A bill to amend the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012, including making changes to the Do Not Pay Initiative, for improved detection, prevention, and recovery of improper payments to deceased individuals, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116–49).

H.R. 1079. A bill to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to issue guidance on electronic consent forms, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116–50).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. RISCH for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Eliot Pedrosa, of Florida, to be United States Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of three years.

(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. VAN HOLLEN:

S. 1950. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to return the estate, gift, and generation skipping transfer tax to 2009 levels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. HAWLEY):

S. 1951. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to promulgate regulations relating to the disclosure of certain commercial data, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1952. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to establish a program for the procurement of domestically grown unprocessed fruits and vegetables to provide healthier school meals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 1953. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to extend the jurisdiction of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to include the setting of reference prices for aluminum premiums, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1954. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the 75th anniversary of the integration of baseball; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 1955. A bill to ensure that certain materials used in carrying out Federal infrastructure aid programs are made in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1956. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the qualified contract exception to the extended low-income housing commitment rules for purposes of the low-income housing credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. REED, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1957. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an investment tax credit related to the production of electricity from offshore wind; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 1958. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit against tax for disaster mitigation expenditures; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 1959. A bill to expand and improve the Legal Assistance for Victims Grant Program to ensure legal assistance is provided for survivors in proceedings related to domestic violence and sexual assault, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1960. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to improve the quality, health outcomes, and value of maternity care under the Medicaid and CHIP programs by developing maternity care quality measures and supporting maternity care quality collaboratives; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1961. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to prohibit certain unfair credit practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. JONES):

S. 1962. A bill to prevent foreign adversaries from influencing elections by prohibiting foreign nationals from purchasing at any time a broadcast, cable, or satellite communications that mentions a clearly identified candidate for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1963. A bill to require the purchase of domestically made flags of the United States of America for use by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1964. A bill to support educational entities in fully implementing title IX and reducing and preventing sex discrimination in all areas of education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 1965. A bill to authorize actions with respect to foreign countries engaged in illicit trade in tobacco products or their precursors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. DAINES):

S. 1966. A bill to prohibit Federal funding to entities that do not certify the entities will not perform, or provide any funding to any other entity that performs, an abortion; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Ms. ERNST):

S. 1967. A bill to promote innovative approaches to outdoor recreation on Federal land and to increase opportunities for collaboration with non-Federal partners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. MORAN):

S. 1968. A bill to amend the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act to provide for necessary payments from the Spectrum Relocation Fund for costs of spectrum research and development and planning activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 1969. A bill to authorize the Fallen Journalists Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

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

S. 1970. A bill to secure the rights of public employees to organize, act concertedly, and bargain collectively, which safeguard the public interest and promote the free and unobstructed flow of commerce, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions .

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1971. A bill to require auto dealers to fix outstanding safety recalls before selling, leasing, or loaning a used motor vehicle; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BENNET:

S. 1972. A bill to create a more representative and accountable Congress by prohibiting partisan gerrymandering and ensuring that any redistricting of congressional district boundaries results in fair, effective, and accountable representation for all people; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. ROMNEY):

S. 1973. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a program under which the Administrator shall defer the designation of an area as a nonattainment area for purposes of the 8-hour ozone national ambient air quality standard if the area achieves and maintains certain standards under a voluntary early action compact plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BRAUN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. JONES):

S. Res. 263. A resolution honoring the 100th anniversary of The American Legion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COONS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BROWN, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. Res. 264. A resolution recognizing the contributions of African Americans to the musical heritage of the United States and the need for greater access to music education for African-American students, and expressing support for the designation of June as African-American Music Appreciation Month; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 170

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 170, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to limit the amount of certain qualified conservation contributions.

S. 203

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 203, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the railroad track maintenance credit, and for other purposes.

S. 206

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 206, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the female telephone operators of the Army Signal Corps, known as the ''Hello Girls''.

S. 239

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 239, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of Christa McAuliffe.

S. 377

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 377, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate prices of prescription drugs furnished under part D of the Medicare program.

S. 433

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 433, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve home health payment reforms under the Medicare program.

S. 510

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) 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. 546

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors 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.

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 546, supra.

S. 638

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) 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. 727

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 727, a bill to combat international extremism by addressing global fragility and violence and stabilizing conflict-affected areas, and for other purposes.

S. 756

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 756, a bill to modify the prohibition on recognition by United States courts of certain rights relating to certain marks, trade names, or commercial names.

S. 785

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 785, a bill to improve mental health care provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 880

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) 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. 901

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 901, a bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to support individuals with younger onset Alzheimer's disease.

S. 988

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 988, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to prohibit prescription drug plan sponsors and MA–PD organizations under the Medicare program from retroactively reducing payment on clean claims submitted by pharmacies.

S. 997

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 997, a bill to recognize and honor the service of individuals who served in the United States Cadet Nurse Corps during World War II, and for other purposes.

S. 1014

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1014, a bill to establish the Route 66 Centennial Commission, and for other purposes.

S. 1032

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1032, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of income for purposes of determining the tax-exempt status of certain corporations.

S. 1081

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1081, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide permanent, dedicated funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 1102

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr.

CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1102, a bill to promote security and energy partnerships in the Eastern Mediterranean, and for other purposes.

S. 1107

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1107, a bill to require a review of women and lung cancer, and for other purposes.

S. 1148

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1148, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to give preferential consideration to individuals who have successfully completed air traffic controller training and veterans when hiring air traffic control specialists.

S. 1539

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1539, a bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide funding to secure nonprofit facilities from terrorist attacks, and for other purposes.

S. 1564

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1564, a bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission and certain Federal agencies to carry out a study relating to accounting standards, and for other purposes.

S. 1596

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1596, a bill to impose a moratorium on large agribusiness, food and beverage manufacturing, and grocery retail mergers, and to establish a commission to review large agriculture, food and beverage manufacturing, and grocery retail mergers, concentration, and market power.

S. 1630

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1630, a bill to amend the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 to require shareholder authorization before a public company may make certain political expenditures, and for other purposes.

S. 1793

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1793, a bill to establish a grant program for the purpose of public health data system modernization.

S. 1920

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1920, a bill to establish jobs programs for long-term unemployed workers, and for other purposes.

S. 1929

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of 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.

S. 1945

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1945, a bill to amend section 36 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776) to preserve congressional review and oversight of foreign arms sales, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 34

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 34, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Governments of Burma and Bangladesh ensure the safe, dignified, voluntary, and sustainable return of the Rohingya refugees who have been displaced by the campaign of ethnic cleansing conducted by the Burmese military and to immediately release unjustly imprisoned journalists, Wa Lone and Kyaw Soe Oo.

S. RES. 120

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 120, a resolution opposing efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel and the Global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions Movement targeting Israel.

S. RES. 188

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 188, a resolution encouraging a swift transfer of power by the military to a civilian-led political authority in the Republic of the Sudan, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 252

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 252, a resolution designating September 2019 as National Democracy Month as a time to reflect on the contributions of the system of government of the United States to a more free and stable world.

S. RES. 260

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 260, a resolution recognizing the importance of sustained United States leadership to accelerating global progress against maternal and child malnutrition and supporting the commitment of the United States Agency for International Development to global nutrition through the Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Strategy.

S. RES. 261

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 261, a resolution recognizing the contributions of African Americans to the musical heritage of the United States and the need for greater access to music education for African-American students, and expressing support for the designation of June as African-American Music Appreciation Month.

AMENDMENT NO. 269

At the request of Mr. JONES, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 269 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. 297

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 297 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. 298

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 298 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. 301

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr.

KING), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) 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. 373

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 373 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. 484

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 484 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. 506

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 506 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 name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor 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. 590

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 590 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. 645

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 645 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. 693

At the request of Mr. ROMNEY, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 693 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. 725

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 725 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. 831

At the request of Mr. WARNER, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 831 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. 832

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 832 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. 852

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 852 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. 855

At the request of Mr. SASSE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 855 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. 859

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 859 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 Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1964. A bill to support educational entities in fully implementing title IX and reducing and preventing sex discrimination in all areas of education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to discuss the Patsy T. Mink and Louise M. Slaughter Gender Equity in Education Act, which I was proud to reintroduce today with several of my Senate colleagues. I also want to thank Congresswoman MATSUI, who introduced the bill in the House.

Our legislation recognizes and builds on the progress started by two gender

equity champions: Patsy Mink of Hawaii and Louise Slaughter of New York.

Patsy Mink, the first Asian American woman and woman of color to serve in Congress, was a pioneer and a strong champion for gender equity in education as one of the principal authors of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. Congresswoman Louise Slaughter's commitment to public service and fierce advocacy for women's equality and empowerment helped strengthen educational opportunities for all Americans.

The Gender Equity in Education Act (GEEA) would honor their legacies by providing more resources for K–12 schools, colleges and universities, States, school districts, and others to fully implement Title IX, also known as the ''Patsy T. Mink Equal Opportunity in Education Act,'' which has transformed the educational landscape in our country by reaffirming the fundamental principal that sex-based discrimination has no place in our nation's schools.

Since its enactment, Title IX has opened countless doors for women and girls, and created important opportunities for students across the country—whether in the classroom, on the playing field, or in the boardroom. But barriers still exist, and more work remains to make sure all students have access to safe learning environments free from bias and discrimination. We need to work to make sure schools treat students equally with regard to athletic participation opportunities, athletic scholarships, and the benefits and services provided to athletic teams.

We need to work to improve gender equity in career and technical education, in higher education, and in science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) fields while strengthening the STEM pipeline. We need to address sexual harassment and assault in our nation's schools.

We need to address discrimination based on pregnancy or parenting status by providing better accommodations and increased support for pregnant and parenting students, because currently only half of teenage mothers earn their high school diplomas before they turn 22 years old, and nearly one-in-three young mothers never get their diplomas or GEDs, which is unacceptable.

And, at a time when nearly nine-in-ten LGBTQ students reported being harassed or assaulted based on a personal characteristic, we need to address discrimination based on stereotypes of actual or perceived sex—including sexual orientation and gender identity.

GEEA provides important resources to continue this work—not only to protect the progress we have made, but also to build on that progress and create more opportunities for students.

By improving and strengthening Title IX, we uphold the great work of champions like Patsy Mink and Louise Slaughter, who fought to make sure no students are denied equal access to educational opportunities or have to worry about whether they are safe on campus. We must remain vigilant in this endeavor.

I thank my colleagues for joining me in reintroducing this important legislation as we continue our work to advance Title IX and to ensure equal access to educational opportunities for all.

I yield the floor.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Ms. ERNST):

S. 1967. A bill to promote innovative approaches to outdoor recreation on Federal land and to increase opportunities for collaboration with non-Federal partners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I am joined by my colleagues Senator JONI ERNST, Congressman ROB BISHOP, and Congresswoman DEBBIE DINGELL to introduce the bipartisan Recreation Not Red Tape (RNR) Act. In Oregon and nationwide, the outdoor recreation economy is growing. Nationally, outdoor recreation generates $887 billion in annual consumer spending and 7.6 million American jobs. As those numbers keep rising, communities across the country are benefiting from growing American interest in enjoying the great outdoors. Our bill will help grow the economic potential of the outdoor recreation economy by opening access, reducing red tape, and updating Federal recreation guidelines.

Unfortunately, getting outside often requires permits, parking passes and camping fees that are important to maintaining public lands, but too often involve confusing, complicated and lengthy processes to obtain. This bill removes barriers to outdoor recreation, making it easier for visitors from near and far to get outdoors and enjoy America's treasures. By streamlining paths for more people to get outdoors, the Recreation Not Red Tape Act will encourage outdoor recreation opportunities, giving communities an economic boost.

The RNR Act includes provisions from Senator HEINRICH's Simplifying Outdoor Access for Recreation Act. The bill improves the Federal outdoor recreation permitting process by eliminating duplicative and bureaucratic reviews, requiring time limits for processing permit applications, reducing fees, and simplifying multi-jurisdictional trips. The bill also ensures recreation permits are available for online purchases.

The RNR Act encourages all military branches to include information about outdoor recreation opportunities as part of the basic services provided to service members and veterans, and encourages all military branches to allow active-duty service members to engage in outdoor recreation or environmental stewardship activities without taking away their hard-earned leave.

For the first time, the RNR Act directs Federal land management agencies to enhance recreation opportunities when making land and water management decisions. The RNR Act ensures Federal land managers have and maintain recreation access goals. Importantly, the RNR Act highlights the recreational values of public lands across the county and encourages more National Recreation Area designations in the future by creating a system of National Recreation Areas to manage recreation lands in uniform guidelines.

Additionally, the RNR Act encourages volunteer opportunities to help agencies carry out public lands maintenance projects, such as trail maintenance on Federal lands. The bill establishes a pilot program to create uniform interagency trail management standards for trails that cross agency jurisdictional boundaries.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 1969. A bill to authorize the Fallen Journalists Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Fallen Journalists Memorial Act of 2019. I am proud to be introducing this bill with my long-time friend and colleague, the junior Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN).

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the Fallen Journalists Memorial (FJM) Foundation to establish a commemorative work—a memorial—in the District of Columbia or its environs honoring journalists, photographers, and broadcasters killed in the line of duty, defending freedom of the press. The bill directs the Federal government to make eligible Federal land available for the memorial.

The bill explicitly prohibits the use of Federal funds to design or construct the memorial, and stipulates that the memorial must be designed and built in compliance with existing federal standards for commemorative works. Furthermore, the FJM Foundation must provide the funding necessary for the National Park Service or General Services Administration to maintain the memorial. The bill conforms to the structure of other similar bills.

Across the National Capital Region, we have monuments and memorials to honor those who have helped make our Nation and our democracy stronger since its founding days. Currently missing from that honor roll, however, are journalists who have sacrificed everything to gather facts, ask questions, and report the news in the spirit of the free, open, and transparent societies and governments that Americans—and all people—deserve.

Why do we need this memorial? Well, according to the Committee to Protect Journalists:

Worldwide, at least 1,337 journalists have been killed in the line of duty since 1992;

each year, hundreds of journalists are attacked, imprisoned, and tortured;

the majority of the journalists killed are murdered in direct relation to their work as journalists; and

in 9 out of 10 cases, the killers of journalists go free.

When we think of casualties, we tend to think of war correspondents on the front lines. in battle. Intrepid reporters and photographers and cameramen and women put themselves in harm's way, and many have been killed and wounded. But then we have cases like the Saudi Government's savage dismemberment of journalist Jamal Khashoggi in its Consulate in Turkey last October. That was a state-sanctioned killing. And here at home, barely 30 miles from here, we had the horrific shooting at the Capital Gazette in Annapolis that left five people dead and two wounded. The attack at the Gazette offices occurred one year ago this Friday, on June 28th. So it is fitting that we are introducing the Fallen Journalists Memorial Act today to remember and honor the Gazette victims, Jamal Khashoggi, and all other journalists who have been killed in the line of duty, defending freedom of the press. The Fallen Journalists Memorial will be a visible symbol and reminder of what is at stake and the price people have paid.

We Americans have certain rights and responsibilities granted to us through the Constitution, which established the rule of law in this country. Freedom of the press is one of those most basic rights and it is central to our way of life. This precious freedom has often been under attack, figuratively speaking, since our Nation's founding.

Today, attacks on the American media have become more frequent and more literal, spurred on by dangerous rhetoric that is creating an ''open season'' on denigrating and harassing the media for doing its job—asking questions that need to be asked, investigating the stories that need to be uncovered, and bringing needed transparency to the halls of power.

One year ago this Friday, a 38-year-old man who had a long-standing spurious grudge against the Capital Gazette newspaper, made good on his sworn threats. He entered the newspaper offices, headed to the newsroom, and by the time he was done, he had shot and killed five employees of this community newspaper and wounded two others.

The Capital Gazette is the local paper of record in Annapolis. It is one of the oldest continuously published newspapers in the U.S. It traces its roots back to the Maryland Gazette, which began publishing in 1727 and The Capital, which dates to 1884.

This loss of life is personal to so many in Annapolis and around our State. You need to understand that the Capital Gazette is as much a part of the fabric of Annapolis as the State government that it covers better than anyone in the business.

On that day one year ago, the Anne Arundel County Police Department, the Annapolis Police Department, and the Anne Arundel County Sheriff's Office all responded to the first 9–1–1 call within two minutes, rushing into the offices and into the newsroom to apprehend the gunman and prevent further bloodshed, according to Anne Arundel Police Chief Timothy Altomare.

State and Federal law enforcement, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF), and many others agencies quickly had personnel there to support local officials in their efforts to clear the building and meticulously investigate the scene.

I want to thank, again, all law enforcement officers and other first responders—from the individuals who rushed into the newsroom not knowing what danger they might encounter to those helping get others to safety; from those gathering evidence to ensure nothing was lost in the bustle or chaos of the moment to those diverting traffic so that people could be evacuated and investigators could do their jobs in safety.

The swift law enforcement response undoubtedly saved lives but not before the gunman managed to kill five people. Among them were Gerald Fischman, 61, who was an editor with more than 25 years of service with the Capital Gazette admired at the newspaper and throughout the community for his brilliant mind and writing.

Most often, it was his voice and his insightfulness that came through on the editorial pages of the Capital Gazette. Rick Hutzell, the Capital Gazette's editor, described Fischman as ''someone whose life was committed to protecting our community by telling hard truths.''

Rob Hiaasen, 59, was a columnist, editor, teacher, and storyteller and brought compassion and humor to his community-focused reporting. Rob was a coach and a mentor to many. According to former Baltimore Sun columnist Susan Reimer, he was ''so happy working with young journalists . . . He wanted to create a newsroom where everyone was growing.''

John McNamara, 56, was a skilled writer and avid sports fan and combined these passions in his 24–year career as a sports reporter at the Capital Gazette. Former Capital Gazette sports editor Gerry Jackson, said of McNamara, or ''Mac,'' as he went by, ''He could write. He could edit. He could design pages. He was just a jack of all trades and a fantastic person.''

Rebecca Smith, 34, was a newly-hired sales assistant known for her kindness, compassion, and love for her family. A friend of her fiancé described ''Becca'' as ''the absolute most beautiful person'' with ''the biggest heart'' and called her death ''a great loss to this world.''

Wendi Winters, 65, was a talented writer who built her career as a public relations professional and journalist. She was well-known for her profound reporting on the lives and achievements of people within the community. She was a ''proud Navy Mom''—and daughter.

As we learned the details of the shooting from the survivors, it became clear that Wendi saved lives during the attack. She confronted the gunman and distracted him by throwing things at him—whatever she could find within reach. As the paper noted: ''Wendi died protecting her friends, but also in defense of her newsroom from a murderous assault. Wendi died protecting freedom of the press.''

My heartfelt condolences and prayers continue to go out to the victims and their families. The surviving staff members also deserve our prayers and praise for their resilience and dedication to their mission as journalists and respect for their fallen colleagues. During and after the attack, staff continued to report by tweet, sharing information to those outside, taking photos and documenting information as they would other crime scenes. Despite their grief, shock, anger and mourning, the surviving staff—with help from their sister publication the Baltimore Sun, Capital Gazette alumni, and other reporters who wanted to lend a hand to fellow journalists—put out a paper the following morning and they have done so every day since. This is grace under pressure.

Fittingly, the editorial page the day after the shooting was purposefully left blank, but for the few words: ''Today, we are speechless. This page is intentionally left blank to commemorate the victims of Thursday's shootings at our office.'' The staff promised that on Saturday, the page would ''return to its steady purpose of offering our readers informed opinion about the world around them, that they might be better citizens.''

I want to repeat one quote from the Capital Gazette editorial page that bears repeating: ''Wendi died protecting her friends, but also in defense of her newsroom from a murderous assault. Wendi died protecting freedom of the press.'' Wendi Winters and her colleagues died protecting freedom of the press.

Here in the United States, the Capital Gazette shooting was not an isolated incident; other journalists have been vulnerable to attack or reprisal for their work:

a freelance photojournalist was killed in the September 11, 2001, attacks on the World Trade Center;

in October 2001, a photo editor with the Sun newspaper in Boca Raton, Florida, died from inhaling anthrax, a substance that was mailed to a number of journalists across the United States;

in August 2007, a masked gunman shot and killed the editor-in-chief of

the Oakland Post, a prominent African-American newspaper; and

in August 2015, a reporter and cameraman for television station WDBJ7 were shot dead during a live broadcast in Smith Mountain Lake, Virginia.

At least 59 journalists have been murdered or killed in the United States while reporting, while covering a military conflict, or simply because of their status as a journalist.

While Annapolis and most of the Nation rallied in support of the survivors of the Capital Gazette shooting, the paper reported receiving new death threats and emails celebrating the attack. This is not right in America or anywhere else.

Journalists, like all Americans, should be free from the fear of being violently attacked while doing their job—both figuratively and literally. The right of journalists to report the news is nothing less than the right of all of us to know, to understand what is happening around us and to us. Media freedom and media pluralism are essential for the expression of, or ensuring respect for, other fundamental freedoms and safeguarding democracy, the rule of law, and a system of checks and balances.

Every one of us in this body—Democrats and Republicans—has sworn an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States of America. We bear the solemn responsibility of defending freedom of the press. It is time for us to redouble our efforts both here at home and abroad. We must lead by example. The very foundation and legitimacy of our democratic republic are at stake. One way to start is by memorializing those brave men and women who have died or been killed, as the New York Times' Adolph S. Ochs put it in 1896, ''to give the news impartially, without fear or favor, regardless of party, sect, or interests involved.''

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 263—HONORING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. BRAUN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. JONES) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 263

Whereas The American Legion was founded on March 15, 1919;

Whereas Congress chartered The American Legion on September 16, 1919;

Whereas, in 2019, The American Legion celebrates 100 years of serving veterans of the Armed Forces, their families, and communities;

Whereas The American Legion is the largest wartime veterans service organization in the United States;

Whereas The American Legion is headquartered in Indianapolis, Indiana, and has approximately 2,000,000 members of the Armed Forces and veterans in its membership;

Whereas The American Legion has counted among its members 10 Presidents of the United States;

Whereas The American Legion has played a vital role in advocating for veterans' affairs, including the passage of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (commonly known as the ''G.I. Bill'') (58 Stat. 284, chapter 268) and the creation of the Department of Veterans Affairs;

Whereas The American Legion has shown steadfast dedication to improving local communities, contributing approximately 3,700,000 volunteer community service hours annually and millions of dollars in college scholarships to students across the United States; and

Whereas the mantra of The American Legion's 100th anniversary, ''Legacy and Vision'', is an apt description of the contributions of The American Legion to life in the United States throughout 100 years of service and mutual helpfulness: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes that The American Legion has been a cornerstone of life in the United States from the local to the Federal level for 100 years and serves as a constant reminder of the inestimable contributions the members of the Armed Forces have made to enrich life in the United States during and after their service;

(2) honors the vital role The American Legion has played in the United States throughout 100 years of service;

(3) remembers the deep and lasting mark Legionnaires have made throughout 100 years of history of the United States; and

(4) celebrates the continued position of The American Legion as an inextinguishable beacon of community, responsibility, honor, and service.

SENATE RESOLUTION 264—RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF AFRICAN AMERICANS TO THE MUSICAL HERITAGE OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE NEED FOR GREATER ACCESS TO MUSIC EDUCATION FOR AFRICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS, AND EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF JUNE AS AFRICAN-AMERICAN MUSIC APPRECIATION MONTH

Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COONS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BROWN, and Ms. HARRIS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 264

Whereas spirituals, ragtime, blues, jazz, gospel, classical composition, and countless other categories of music have been created or enhanced by African Americans, and are etched into the history and culture of the United States;

Whereas the first Africans transported to the United States came from a variety of ethnic groups with a long history of distinct and cultivated musical traditions, brought musical instruments with them, and built new musical instruments in the United States;

Whereas spirituals were a distinct response to the conditions of African slavery in the United States, and expressed the longing of enslaved people for spiritual and bodily freedom, for safety from harm and evil, and for relief from the hardships of slavery;

Whereas jazz, arguably the most creative and complex music that the United States has produced, combines the musical traditions of African Americans in New Orleans with the creative flexibility of blues music;

Whereas country music is based on a combination of musical influences, including the rhythmic influences and musical instruments of African immigrants, and was performed by musicians such as DeFord Bailey, who was the first African American to star in the Grand Ole Opry;

Whereas masterful trumpeters Louis Armstrong and Miles Davis achieved national and international recognition with the success of ''West End Blues'' by Louis Armstrong in the 1920s and ''So What'' by Miles Davis in the late 1950s;

Whereas talented jazz pianist and vocalist Nathaniel Adams Coles recorded more than 150 singles and sold more than 50 million records;

Whereas the talent of Ella Fitzgerald, winner of 13 Grammys, is epitomized by a rendition of ''Summertime'', a bluesy record accompanied by melodic vocals;

Whereas Natalie Cole, the daughter of Nathaniel Adams Coles, achieved musical success in the mid-1970s as a rhythm and blues artist with the hits ''This Will Be'' and ''Unforgettable'';

Whereas in the 1940s, bebop evolved through jam sessions, which included trumpeter Dizzy Gillespie and the alto saxophonist Charlie Parker, that were held at clubs in Harlem, New York, such as Minton's Playhouse;

Whereas earlier classical singers such as Elizabeth Taylor Greenfield, one of the first widely known African-American vocalists, and other early African-American singing pioneers, including Nellie Mitchell Brown, Marie Selika Williams, Rachel Walker Turner, Marian Anderson, and Flora Batson Bergen, paved the way for female African-American concert singers who have achieved great popularity during the last 50 years;

Whereas the term ''rhythm and blues'' originated in the late 1940s as a way to describe recordings marketed to African Americans and replaced the term ''race music'';

Whereas lyrical themes in rhythm and blues often encapsulate the African-American experience of pain, the quest for freedom, joy, triumphs and failures, relationships, economics, and aspiration, and were popularized by artists such as Ruth Brown, Etta James, and Otis Redding;

Whereas soul music originated in the African-American community in the late 1950s and early 1960s and combines elements of African-American gospel music, rhythm and blues, and jazz, and was popularized by artists such as Aretha Franklin, James Brown, Ray Charles, Sam Cooke, and Jackie Wilson;

Whereas Motown, founded as a record label in 1959, evolved into a distinctive style known for the ''Motown Sound'', a blend of pop and soul musical stylings made popular by prominent Black artists such as Marvin Gaye, James Mason, and Mary Wells;

Whereas in the early 1970s, the musical style of disco emerged and was popularized by programs such as Soul Train and by artists such as Donna Summer;

Whereas reggae is a genre of music that originated in Jamaica in the late 1960s and incorporates some of the musical elements of rhythm and blues, jazz, mento, calypso, and African music, and was popularized by artists such as Bob Marley;

Whereas rock and roll was developed from African-American musical styles such as gospel and rhythm and blues, and was popularized by artists such as Chuck Berry, Bo Diddley, and Jimi Hendrix;

Whereas rap, arguably the most complex and influential form of hip-hop culture, combines elements of the African-American musical tradition (blues, jazz, and soul) with Caribbean calypso, dub, and dance hall reggae;

Whereas the development and popularity of old style rap combined confident beats with wordplay and storytelling, highlighting the struggle of African-American youth growing up in underresourced neighborhoods;

Whereas contemporary rhythm and blues, which originated in the late 1970s and combines elements of pop, rhythm and blues, soul, funk, hip hop, gospel, and electronic dance music was popularized by artists such as Whitney Houston and Aaliyah;

Whereas Prince Rogers Nelson, who was known for electric performances and wide vocal range, pioneered music that integrated a wide variety of styles, including funk, rock, contemporary rhythm and blues, new wave, soul, psychedelia, and pop;

Whereas a recent study by the Department of Education found that only 28 percent of African-American students receive any kind of arts education;

Whereas African-American students scored the lowest of all ethnicities in the most recent National Assessment for Educational Progress arts assessment;

Whereas students who are eligible for the school lunch program established under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) have significantly lower scores on the music portion of the National Assessment for Educational Progress arts assessment than students that are ineligible for that program, which suggests that students in low-income families are disadvantaged in the subject of music;

Whereas a recent study showed that nearly ⅔ of music ensemble students were White and middle class and only 15 percent were African-American;

Whereas the same study found that only 7 percent of music teacher licensure candidates were African-American; and

Whereas students of color face many barriers to accessing music education and training, especially students in large urban public schools: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate recognizes—

(1) the contributions of African Americans to the musical heritage of the United States;

(2) the wide array of talented and popular African-American musical artists, composers, songwriters, and musicians who are underrecognized for contributions to music;

(3) the achievements, talent, and hard work of African-American pioneer artists, and the obstacles that those artists overcame to gain recognition;

(4) the need for African-American students to have greater access to and participation in music education in schools across the United States; and

(5) Black History Month and African-American Music Appreciation Month as an important time—

(A) to celebrate the impact of the African-American musical heritage on the musical heritage of the United States; and

(B) to encourage greater access to music education so that the next generation may continue to greatly contribute to the musical heritage of the United States.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 875. Mr. GARDNER 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 876. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 877. Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 878. Mr. LEE (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. COLLINS, and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 879. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 880. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 881. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. JONES, and Mrs. CAPITO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 882. Ms. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 883. Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. KAINE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 884. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 885. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 886. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 887. Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Mr. ROMNEY, and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 888. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 889. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 890. 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 891. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 892. 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 893. Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 894. Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 895. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 896. 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 897. Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 898. Mr. PERDUE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 899. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 875. Mr. GARDNER 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. 108_____. SUPPORT AND ENHANCEMENT OF DEFENSE CRITICAL ELECTRIC INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the availability of funds provided in any appropriations Act enacted on or after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy may use those funds to plan and install new generation, transmission, and distribution assets and resiliency upgrades to existing distribution and transmission assets for the exclusive purpose of enhancing the power supply at military bases identified by the Secretary as containing defense critical electric infrastructure (as that term is defined in section 215A(a) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824o–1(a))) to improve the resilience of the infrastructure against physical or cyber threats.

(b) GENERATION ASSETS EXCLUDED.—The Secretary of Energy shall not take any action in carrying out subsection (a) that provides financial support to existing generation assets.

SA 876. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE 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 VIII of the amendment, add the following:

SEC. 866. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON MUNITIONS SUPPLY CHAIN DIVERSITY.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) a viable and diverse United States manufacturing base in munitions development and production is vitally important;

(2) the United States Armed Forces rely on the ability of United States manufacturers to produce bunker buster bombs; and

(3) as the Air Force develops and procures the next generation of munitions, the Secretary of the Air Force should ensure adequate capacity and a diverse supply chain for the current and future development of and manufacturing capability for these important munitions.

SA 877. Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE 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 X, add the following:

SEC. 1019. REPORT ON EXPANDING NAVAL VESSEL MAINTENANCE.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than May 1, 2020, the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the feasibility and advisability of allowing maintenance to be performed on a naval vessel at a shipyard other than a homeport shipyard of the vessel.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the ability of homeport shipyards to meet the current naval vessel maintenance demands.

(2) An assessment of the ability of homeport shipyards to meet the naval vessel maintenance demands of the force structure assessment requirement of the Navy for a 355-ship navy.

(3) An assessment of the ability of non-homeport firms to augment repair work at homeport shipyards, including an assessment of the following:

(A) The capability and proficiency of shipyards in the Great Lakes, Gulf Coast, East Coast, West Coast, and Alaska regions to perform technical repair work on naval vessels at locations other than their homeports.

(B) The improvements to the capability and capacity of shipyards in the Great Lakes, Gulf Coast, East Coast, West Coast, and Alaska regions that would be required to enable performance of technical repair work on naval vessels at locations other than their homeports.

(C) The types of naval vessels (such as noncombatant vessels or vessels that only need limited periods of time in shipyards) best suited for repair work performed by shipyards in locations other than their homeports.

(D) The potential benefits to fleet readiness of expanding shipyard repair work to include shipyards not located at the homeports of naval vessels.

(E) The ability of non-homeport firms to maintain surge capacity when homeport shipyards lack the capacity or capability to meet homeport requirements.

(4) An assessment of the potential benefits of expanding repair work for naval vessels to shipyards not eligible for short-term work in accordance with section 8669a(c) of title 10, United States Code.

(5) Such other related matters as the Secretary of the Navy considers appropriate.

(c) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO CONSTRUCTION OF COMBATANT AND ESCORT VESSELS AND ASSIGNMENT OF VESSEL PROJECTS.—Nothing in this section may be construed to override the requirements of section 8669a of title 10, United States Code.

(2) NO FUNDING FOR SHIPYARDS OF NON-HOMEPORT FIRMS.—Nothing in this section may be construed to authorize funding for shipyards of non-homeport firms.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) HOMEPORT SHIPYARD.—The term ''homeport shipyard'' means a shipyard associated with a firm capable of being awarded short-term work at the homeport of a naval vessel in accordance with section 8669a(c) of title 10, United States Code.

(2) SHORT-TERM WORK.—The term ''short-term work'' has the meaning given that term in section 8669a(c)(4) of such title.

SA 878. Mr. LEE (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. COLLINS, and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE 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. ___. PROHIBITION ON THE INDEFINITE DETENTION OF CITIZENS AND LAWFUL PERMANENT RESIDENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Due Process Guarantee Act''.

(b) LIMITATION ON DETENTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4001(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking ''No citizen'' and inserting the following:

''(1) No citizen or lawful permanent resident of the United States''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) Any Act of Congress that authorizes an imprisonment or detention described in paragraph (1) shall be consistent with the Constitution and expressly authorize such imprisonment or detention.''.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—Nothing in section 4001(a)(2) of title 18, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1)(B), may be construed to limit, narrow, abolish, or revoke any detention authority conferred by statute, declaration of war, authorization to use military force, or similar authority effective prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) RELATIONSHIP TO AN AUTHORIZATION TO USE MILITARY FORCE, DECLARATION OF WAR, OR SIMILAR AUTHORITY.—Section 4001 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by subsection (b) is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

''(b)(1) No United States citizen or lawful permanent resident who is apprehended in the United States may be imprisoned or otherwise detained without charge or trial unless such imprisonment or detention is expressly authorized by an Act of Congress.

''(2) A general authorization to use military force, a declaration of war, or any similar authority, on its own, may not be construed to authorize the imprisonment or detention without charge or trial of a citizen or lawful permanent resident of the United States apprehended in the United States.

''(3) Paragraph (2) shall apply to an authorization to use military force, a declaration of war, or any similar authority enacted before, on, or after the date of the enactment of the Due Process Guarantee Act.

''(4) This section may not be construed to authorize the imprisonment or detention of a citizen of the United States, a lawful permanent resident of the United States, or any other person who is apprehended in the United States.''.

SA 879. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE 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 3124.

SA 880. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE 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, insert the following:

SEC. _____. ENSURING SECURITY OF COMMERCIAL CLOUD SERVICES DEPLOYED IN CLASSIFIED ENVIRONMENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Cloud Security Act of 2019''.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to ensure that architectures, specifications, and deployments of commercial cloud services deployed in classified environments of the United States are not the same as those deployed in foreign countries of concern and shared with foreign military and governments adverse to the United States.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Committee on Energy and Commerce, and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

(2) CLASSIFIED ENVIRONMENT.—The term ''classified environment'' means a system which handles classified information, which, for reasons of national security, is specifically designated by a United States Government agency as ''Top Secret''.

(3) CLOUD COMPUTING SERVICE.—The term ''cloud computing service'' means an infrastructure-as-a-service (IaaS) or a platform-as-a-service (PaaS) as defined in Special Publication 800–145 of the National Institutes of Standards and Technology, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(4) COMMERCIAL CLOUD SERVICE.—The term ''commercial cloud service'' means a cloud computing service that is sold on the commercial market to customers other than the United States Government.

(5) COMMERCIAL CLOUD SERVICE PROVIDER.—The term ''commercial cloud service provider'' means a commercial business or entity that provides a commercial cloud service.

(6) FOREIGN COUNTRY OF CONCERN.—The term ''foreign country of concern'' means a country that challenges or seeks to undermine the United States or the interests of the United States, as identified in the National Defense Strategy of the United States of America.

(7) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—The term ''intelligence community'' has the meaning given such term in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003).

(8) MATERIALLY DIFFERENT.—The term ''materially different'', with respect to two cloud computing services, means if having immediate, physical access to and control over the architectures, specifications, and technology as well as the personnel used to operate one service could not yield useful information for attacking, compromising, or otherwise obtaining illicit access to the other service.

(d) POLICIES REQUIRED.—Not later than June 1, 2020, the Secretary of Defense, the Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Energy, and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall jointly establish a policy to ensure that a commercial cloud service procured from a commercial cloud service provider and deployed in a classified environment is materially different from commercial cloud service deployed in a foreign country of concern.

(e) REGULATIONS REQUIRED.—Not later than June 1, 2020, the Secretary of Defense, the Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Energy, and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall jointly promulgate such regulations as may be necessary—

(1) to implement the policy established under subsection (d) across the departments and agencies over which they have jurisdiction; and

(2) enforce penalties should a commercial cloud service provider fail to self-certify under subsection (d) or fail to comply with a provision of the policies established under subsection (d) or the regulations promulgated under this subsection.

(f) COVERED TECHNOLOGIES.—The policies established under subsection (d) and the regulations promulgated under subsection (e) shall set forth the technologies and procedures covered by such policies and regulations, including, at a minimum, the following:

(1) Nonpublic computer source code.

(2) Specifications for data centers and cloud computing service architectures.

(3) Artificial intelligence systems.

(4) Cryptographic solutions.

(g) SELF-CERTIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The policies established under subsection (d) and the regulations promulgated under subsection (e) shall prohibit the secretaries and the director described in such subsections from deploying in any classified environment any commercial cloud service from a commercial cloud service provider, and any relevant subcontractor of the commercial cloud service provider, that has not self-certified compliance with the requirements of such policies and regulations.

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each self-certification under paragraph (1) regarding a commercial cloud service shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(A) An attestation of the following:

(i) The commercial cloud service and its infrastructure or platform is materially different from any commercial cloud service and its infrastructure or platform that has been or is planned to be provided to a foreign nation of concern.

(ii) The operational processes for the data center used for the commercial cloud service is materially different than the operational processes for any data center—

(I) deployed in a foreign country of concern; or

(II) used for any commercial cloud service provided to a foreign country of concern.

(iii) Any provisioning of technical assistance to the foreign nation of concern relating to a commercial cloud service will not lead to the Commercial cloud service provider or subcontractor sharing information that would be harmful to the United States or otherwise failing to comply with the requirements of the policies established under subsection (d) and the regulations promulgated under subsection (e).

(iv) In any case in which the commercial cloud service provider or subcontractor discovers that information about a technology covered by the policies established under subsection (d) or promulgated under subsection (e) is released to a foreign country of concern, the commercial cloud service provider or subcontractor will promptly notify the Director of National Intelligence of such release, including information that is released pursuant to a mandate from a foreign entity or as a condition of operation in a foreign country.

(B) A list any foreign commercial partners that have access to information about the technologies and procedures covered pursuant to subsection (f).

(h) PENALTIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The policies established under subsection (d) and the regulations promulgated under subsection (e) shall include penalties for failure to comply with requirements set forth in such policies and regulations.

(2) DEBARMENT.—The penalties established under paragraph (1) shall include a debarment from contracting with the Federal Government or supporting a contract with the Federal Government, including the provisioning of tools, technology, and services, for a period of not less than 5 years.

(i) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, Secretary of Defense, the Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Energy, and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall jointly submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the activities of the secretaries and the Director to carry out this section.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description of the policy established under subsection (d).

(B) An list of the contracts affected by the policies established under subsection (d) and the regulations promulgated under subsection (e).

(C) An assessment of each contract listed pursuant to subparagraph (B) as to whether the parties to the contract and the goods and services provided pursuant to the contract are in compliance with such policies and regulations.

(D) A plan to ensure that parties, goods, and services described in subparagraph (C) that are not in compliance with such policies and regulations become compliant with such policies and regulations.

SA 881. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. JONES, and Mrs. CAPITO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE 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 ILLICIT 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)''; and

(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;''; and

(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 882. Ms. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE 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 of division A, add the following:

Subtitle I—Presidential Allowance Modernization

SEC. 1091. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Presidential Allowance Modernization Act of 2019''.

SEC. 1092. AMENDMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Act entitled ''An Act to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes'', approved August 25, 1958 (commonly known as the ''Former Presidents Act of 1958'') (3 U.S.C. 102 note), is amended—

(1) by striking ''That (a) each'' and inserting the following:

''SECTION 1. FORMER PRESIDENTS LEAVING OFFICE BEFORE PRESIDENTIAL ALLOWANCE MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2019.

''(a) Each'';

(2) by redesignating subsection (g) as section 3 and adjusting the margin accordingly; and

(3) by inserting after section 1, as so designated, the following:

''SEC. 2. FORMER PRESIDENTS LEAVING OFFICE AFTER PRESIDENTIAL ALLOWANCE MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2019.

''(a) ANNUITIES AND ALLOWANCES.—

''(1) ANNUITY.—Each modern former President shall be entitled for the remainder of his or her life to receive from the United States an annuity at the rate of $200,000 per year, subject to subsections (b)(2) and (c), to be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury.

''(2) ALLOWANCE.—The Administrator of General Services is authorized to provide each modern former President a monetary allowance at the rate of $200,000 per year, subject to the availability of appropriations and subsections (b)(2), (c), and (d).

''(b) DURATION; FREQUENCY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The annuity and allowance under subsection (a) shall each—

''(A) commence on the day after the date on which an individual becomes a modern former President;

''(B) terminate on the date on which the modern former President dies; and

''(C) be payable on a monthly basis.

''(2) APPOINTIVE OR ELECTIVE POSITIONS.—The annuity and allowance under subsection (a) shall not be payable for any period during which a modern former President holds an appointive or elective position in or under the Federal Government to which is attached a rate of pay other than a nominal rate.

''(c) COST-OF-LIVING INCREASES.—Effective December 1 of each year, each annuity and allowance under subsection (a) that commenced before that date shall be increased by the same percentage by which benefit amounts under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) are increased, effective as of that date, as a result of a determination under section 215(i) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)).

''(d) LIMITATION ON MONETARY ALLOWANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the monetary allowance payable under subsection (a)(2) to a modern former President for any 12-month period—

''(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), may not exceed the amount by which—

''(i) the monetary allowance that (but for this subsection) would otherwise be so payable for such 12-month period, exceeds (if at all)

''(ii) the applicable reduction amount for such 12-month period; and

''(B) shall not be less than the amount determined under paragraph (3).

''(2) DEFINITION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term 'applicable reduction amount' means, with respect to any modern former President and in connection with any 12-month period, the amount by which—

''(i) the sum of—

''(I) the adjusted gross income (as defined in section 62 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) of the modern former President for the most recent taxable year for which a tax return is available; and

''(II) any interest excluded from the gross income of the modern former President under section 103 of such Code for such taxable year, exceeds (if at all)

''(ii) $400,000, subject to subparagraph (C).

''(B) JOINT RETURNS.—In the case of a joint return, subclauses (I) and (II) of subparagraph (A)(i) shall be applied by taking into account both the amounts properly allocable to the modern former President and the amounts properly allocable to the spouse of the modern former President.

''(C) COST-OF-LIVING INCREASES.—The dollar amount specified in subparagraph (A)(ii) shall be adjusted at the same time that, and by the same percentage by which, the monetary allowance of the modern former President is increased under subsection (c) (disregarding this subsection).

''(3) INCREASED COSTS DUE TO SECURITY NEEDS.—With respect to the monetary allowance that would be payable to a modern former President under subsection (a)(2) for any 12-month period but for the limitation under paragraph (1)(A) of this subsection, the Administrator of General Services, in coordination with the Director of the United States Secret Service, shall determine the amount of the allowance that is needed to pay the increased cost of doing business that is attributable to the security needs of the modern former President.

''(e) WIDOWS AND WIDOWERS.—The widow or widower of each modern former President shall be entitled to receive from the United States a monetary allowance at a rate of $100,000 per year (subject to paragraph (4)), payable monthly by the Secretary of the Treasury, if such widow or widower shall waive the right to each other annuity or pension to which she or he is entitled under any other Act of Congress. The monetary allowance of such widow or widower—

''(1) commences on the day after the modern former President dies;

''(2) terminates on the last day of the month before such widow or widower dies;

''(3) is not payable for any period during which such widow or widower holds an appointive or elective office or position in or under the Federal Government to which is attached a rate of pay other than a nominal rate; and

''(4) shall, after its commencement date, be increased at the same time that, and by the same percentage by which, annuities of modern former Presidents are increased under subsection (c).

''(f) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'modern former President' means a person—

''(1) who shall have held the office of President of the United States of America;

''(2) whose service in such office shall have terminated—

''(A) other than by removal pursuant to section 4 of article II of the Constitution of the United States of America; and

''(B) after the date of enactment of the Presidential Allowance Modernization Act of 2019; and

''(3) who does not then currently hold such office.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Former Presidents Act of 1958 is amended—

(1) in section 1(f)(2), as designated by this section—

(A) by striking ''terminated other than'' and inserting the following: ''terminated—

''(A) other than''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) on or before the date of enactment of the Presidential Allowance Modernization Act of 2019; and''; and

(2) in section 3, as redesignated by this section—

(A) by inserting after the section enumerator the following: ''**AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**''; and

(B) by inserting ''or modern former President'' after ''former President'' each place that term appears.

SEC. 1093. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this subtitle or an amendment made by this subtitle shall be construed to affect—

(1) any provision of law relating to the security or protection of a former President or modern former President, or a member of the family of a former President or modern former President; or

(2) funding, under the Former Presidents Act of 1958 or any other law, to carry out any provision of law described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 1094. APPLICABILITY.

Section 2 of the Former Presidents Act of 1958, as added by section 1092(a)(3) of this subtitle, shall not apply to—

(1) any individual who is a former President on the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) the widow or widower of an individual described in paragraph (1).

SA 883. Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. KAINE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE 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 XII of the amendment, add the following:

SEC. 1226. PROHIBITION OF UNAUTHORIZED MILITARY OPERATIONS AGAINST IRAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No funds authorized by this Act may be used to conduct hostilities against the Government of Iran, against the Armed Forces of Iran, or in the territory of Iran.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed—

(1) to restrict the use of the United States Armed Forces to defend against an attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or its Armed Forces;

(2) to limit the obligations under the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.); or

(3) to affect the provisions of an Act or a joint resolution of Congress specifically authorizing such hostilities that is enacted after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 884. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE 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 B of title II, add the following new section:

SEC. 2___. MICROELECTRONICS CYBERSECURITY CENTER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a microelectronics cybersecurity center (referred to in this section as the ''Center'').

(b) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Center shall be responsible for providing the defense industrial base with access to manufacturing resources to support anti-tamper manufacturing, system integration, advanced packaging, and technical training capabilities for the development, prototyping, and low-volume production of secured integrated microelectronics in support of Department of Defense system commands and laboratories to improve the security of Federal Government systems and critical infrastructure.

(c) PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall seek to enter into an agreement with a qualified public-private partnership under which the partnership will carry out the responsibilities of the Center under this section.

(2) QUALIFIED PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''qualified public-private partnership'' means a partnership between the Department of Defense and one or more private sector entities that is in effect as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 885. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE 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. ASSESSMENT OF HEALTH OF CERTAIN BIOLOGICAL DEPENDENTS IN CONNECTION WITH PERIODIC HEALTH ASSESSMENTS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND VETERANS.

(a) ASSESSMENT OF HEALTH OF CERTAIN DEPENDENTS REQUIRED.—The Secretary concerned shall ensure that any periodic health assessment of a member of the Armed Forces or a veteran provided by or for purposes of the Department of Defense or the Department of Veterans Affairs, as applicable, includes an evaluation of the health of any biological descendants of the member or veteran, as the case may be.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the evaluations of the health of descendants under subsection (a) shall be to facilitate the tracking and identification of health conditions in such descendants that may be causally related to the exposure of the member or veteran concerned to toxins during service in the Armed Forces.

(c) ELEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The evaluations of the health of descendants under subsection (a) shall include questions of the member or veteran concerned on the following:

(A) Whether such member or veteran has experienced infertility or an adverse birth outcome, and, if so and if known, the cause of or diagnosis for such infertility or birth outcome.

(B) The health of each biological descendant of such member or veteran, including any current medical diagnosis, and any current mental health diagnosis, with respect to any such descendant.

(2) PRESERVATION AND COMPILATION.—The information derived from answers to questions of a member or veteran in evaluations of the health of descendants of the member or veteran under subsection (a) shall be preserved and compiled in a manner designed to facilitate the use of such information for the purpose specified in subsection (b) in connection with the member or veteran.

(d) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly enter into a memorandum of understanding that provides for the following:

(A) The sharing of information between the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs on trends identified through evaluations of the health of descendants under subsection (a).

(B) The analysis of data collected through periodic health assessments of members and veterans, and through evaluations of the health of descendants under subsection (a), in order to identify potential causal relationships between the exposure of members and veterans to toxins during service in the Armed Forces and the generational effects of such exposure on the biological descendants of members and veterans.

(2) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on activities undertaken under the memorandum of understanding entered into under paragraph (1) during the one-year period ending on the date of such report.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) The term ''Secretary concerned'' means the following:

(A) The Secretary of Defense with respect to members of the Armed Forces.

(B) The Secretary of Veterans Affairs with respect to veterans.

(3) The term ''biological descendant'', in the case of a member or veteran, means a biological child or grandchild of the member or veteran.

(4) The term ''periodic health assessment'' includes a physical examination.

SA 886. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE 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 X, add the following:

SEC. 1045. INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM—ARMY.

(a) INCREASED AMOUNT FOR OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 101 for fiscal year 2020 is hereby increased by $18,674,000, with the amount of the increase to be available for Other Procurement, Army, for Electrical Equipment—C2 Systems as specified in the funding table in section 4101 for Integrated Personnel and Pay System—Army.

(b) INCREASED AMOUNT FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201 for fiscal year 2020 is hereby increased by 142,773,000, with the amount of the increase to be available for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army, for Systems Development and Demonstration as specified in the funding table in section 4201 for Integrated Personnel and Pay System—Army.

SA 887. Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Mr. ROMNEY, and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE 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. ____. MODIFICATION OF PERIOD AFTER RETIREMENT FOR AUTHORITY OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO APPOINT RETIRED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES TO POSITIONS WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT AFTER RETIREMENT.

Section 3326 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b)(1) A retired member of the armed forces may be appointed to a position in the civil service in or under the Department of Defense (including a nonappropriated fund instrumentality under the jurisdiction of the armed forces) immediately after the retirement of the member only if the proposed appointment is authorized by the Secretary concerned or a designee of the Secretary concerned, after a determination that—

''(A) the position has not been held open pending the retirement of the retired member;

''(B) qualification requirements for the position have not been written in a manner designed to give advantage to the retired member; and

''(C) the retired member was considered and selected in accordance with the applicable law (including regulations) governing the appointing authority used to appoint the retired member.

''(2) The Secretary concerned or a designee of the Secretary concerned shall determine the duration under which the provisions of this subsection apply.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(d)(1) Not later than February 15 each year, the Secretary of Defense and the Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall jointly submit to Congress a report on the appointments made during the preceding year using the authority in subsection (b)(1).

''(2) Each report under this subsection shall set forth, for the year covered by such report, the following:

''(A) The number of appointments made using the authority in subsection (b)(1).

''(B) The grades at retirement from the armed forces of the individuals subject to such appointments.

''(C) The job titles, pay grades, and locations of employment at appointment of the individuals subject to such appointments.''.

SA 888. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE 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:

On page 1663 of the amendment, strike lines 1 through 26, and insert the following:

(e) RESTRICTION ON ISSUANCE OF IRAN SANCTIONS WAIVERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Director assesses, in the report required by subsection (b), that the Government of Iran is supporting proxy forces in Syria and Lebanon, the President may not—

(A) issue any waiver of the application of sanctions under—

(i) the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note);

(ii) the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.);

(iii) section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8513a);

(iv) the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8701 et seq.); or

(v) the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8801 et seq.); or

(B) remove any Iranian person from the SDN list.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) IRANIAN PERSON.—The term ''Iranian person'' has the meaning given that term in section 1242 of the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8801).

(B) SDN LIST.—The term ''SDN list'' means the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury.

SEC. 10708. ANNUAL REPORT ON IRANIAN EXPENDITURES SUPPORTING FOREIGN MILITARY AND TERRORIST ACTIVITIES.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and not less frequently than once each year thereafter, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to Congress a report describing Iranian expenditures in the previous calendar year on military and terrorist activities outside the country, including each of the following:

(1) The amount spent in such calendar year on activities by the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, including activities providing support for—

(A) Hizballah;

(B) Houthi rebels in Yemen;

(C) Hamas;

(D) proxy forces in Iraq and Syria; or

(E) any other entity or country the Director determines to be relevant.

(2) The amount spent in such calendar year for ballistic missile research and testing or other activities that the Director determines are destabilizing to the Middle East region.

(b) FORM.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(c) RESTRICTION ON ISSUANCE OF IRAN SANCTIONS WAIVERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Director assesses, in the report required by subsection (a), that the Government of Iran has expended funds for activities described in paragraph (1) or (2) of that subsection, the President may not—

(A) issue any waiver of the application of sanctions under—

(i) the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note);

(ii) the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.);

(iii) section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8513a);

(iv) the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8701 et seq.); or

(v) the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8801 et seq.); or

(B) remove any Iranian person from the SDN list.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) IRANIAN PERSON.—The term ''Iranian person'' has the meaning given that term in section 1242 of the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8801).

(B) SDN LIST.—The term ''SDN list'' means the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury.

SA 889. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE 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:

On page 1663 of the amendment, strike lines 1 through 26, and insert the following:

(e) RESTRICTION ON ISSUANCE OF IRAN SANCTIONS WAIVERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Director assesses, in the report required by subsection (b), that the Government of Iran is supporting proxy

forces in Syria and Lebanon, the President may not—

(A) issue any waiver of the application of sanctions under—

(i) the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note);

(ii) the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.);

(iii) section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8513a);

(iv) the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8701 et seq.); or

(v) the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8801 et seq.); or

(B) remove any Iranian person from the SDN list.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) IRANIAN PERSON.—The term ''Iranian person'' has the meaning given that term in section 1242 of the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8801).

(B) SDN LIST.—The term ''SDN list'' means the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury.

SEC. 10708. ANNUAL REPORT ON IRANIAN EXPENDITURES SUPPORTING FOREIGN MILITARY AND TERRORIST ACTIVITIES.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and not less frequently than once each year thereafter, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to Congress a report describing Iranian expenditures in the previous calendar year on military and terrorist activities outside the country, including each of the following:

(1) The amount spent in such calendar year on activities by the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, including activities providing support for—

(A) Hizballah;

(B) Houthi rebels in Yemen;

(C) Hamas;

(D) proxy forces in Iraq and Syria; or

(E) any other entity or country the Director determines to be relevant.

(2) The amount spent in such calendar year for ballistic missile research and testing or other activities that the Director determines are destabilizing to the Middle East region.

(b) FORM.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(c) RESTRICTION ON ISSUANCE OF IRAN SANCTIONS WAIVERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may not issue a waiver described in paragraph (2) or remove any Iranian person from the SDN list—

(A) unless there is enacted into law a joint resolution approving the issuance of the waiver or the removal of the person from that list, as the case may be; or

(B) if the Director assesses, in the report required by subsection (a), that the Government of Iran has expended funds for activities described in paragraph (1) or (2) of that subsection.

(2) WAIVERS DESCRIBED.—A waiver described in this paragraph is any waiver of the application of sanctions under—

(A) the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note);

(B) the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.);

(C) section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8513a);

(D) the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8701 et seq.); or

(E) the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8801 et seq.).

(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) IRANIAN PERSON.—The term ''Iranian person'' has the meaning given that term in section 1242 of the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8801).

(B) SDN LIST.—The term ''SDN list'' means the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury.

SA 890. 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 appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. LIMITATIONS ON CERTAIN TERMINATION AND WAIVER PROVISIONS RELATING TO IRAN SANCTIONS.

(a) REPEAL OF SUNSET PROVISION OF IRAN SANCTIONS ACT OF 1996.—Section 13(b) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is repealed.

(b) MODIFICATION OF APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN SANCTIONS TO PETROLEUM TRANSACTIONS.—Section 1245(d)(4) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8513a(d)(4)) is amended to read as follows:

''(4) APPLICABILITY OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO PETROLEUM TRANSACTIONS.—Sanctions imposed under paragraph (1)(A) shall apply with respect to a financial transaction conducted or facilitated by a foreign financial institution on or after the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 for the purchase of petroleum or petroleum products from Iran.''.

(c) LIMITATION ON CERTAIN WAIVERS OF SANCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Until the date on which the conditions specified in paragraph (2) are met, the President may not—

(A) issue any waiver of the application of sanctions under—

(i) the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note);

(ii) the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.);

(iii) section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8513a);

(iv) the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8701 et seq.); or

(v) the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8801 et seq.); or

(B) remove any Iranian person from the SDN list.

(2) CONDITIONS.—The conditions specified in this paragraph are met if—

(A) the President certifies to Congress that—

(i) the Government of Iran has—

(I) ceased supporting acts of international terrorism; and

(II) has released all hostages who are United States citizens or aliens lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence; and

(ii) the International Atomic Energy Agency has verified that Iran's nuclear program is exclusively peaceful in nature; and

(B) there is enacted into law a joint resolution approving the issuance of the waiver described in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) or the removal of the Iranian person from the SDN list, as the case may be.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) IRANIAN PERSON.—The term ''Iranian person'' has the meaning given that term in section 1242 of the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8801).

(B) SDN LIST.—The term ''SDN list'' means the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury.

SA 891. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE 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:

In section 1224(c)(2), add at the end the following:

(H) An evaluation of the contributions made by partner countries within the Global Coalition to Defeat ISIS to the repatriation and prosecution of ISIS detainees.

SA 892. 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:

Strike section 3051 and insert the following:

SEC. 3051. LEAD CONTAMINATION TESTING AND REPORTING.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE POLICY ON LEAD TESTING ON MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than February 1, 2020, the Secretary of Defense shall establish a policy under which—

(A) a qualified individual may access a military installation for the purpose of conducting lead testing on the installation, subject to the approval of the Secretary; and

(B) the results of any lead testing conducted on a military installation shall be transmitted—

(i) in the case of a military installation located inside the United States, to—

(I) the civil engineer of the installation;

(II) the housing management office of the installation;

(III) the major subordinate command of the Armed Force with jurisdiction over the installation; and

(IV) if required by law, any relevant Federal, State, and local agencies; and

(ii) in the case of a military installation located outside the United States, to the civil engineer or commander of the installation who shall transmit those results to the major subordinate command of the Armed Force with jurisdiction over the installation.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) QUALIFIED INDIVIDUAL.—The term ''qualified individual'' means—

(i) an individual who is certified by the Environmental Protection Agency or by a State as—

(I) a lead-based paint inspector; or

(II) a lead-based paint risk assessor; or

(ii) an employee of a laboratory certified by the Environmental Protection Agency or by a State to test for lead contamination in drinking water who is authorized to conduct such tests.

(B) UNITED STATES.—The term ''United States'' has the meaning given such term in section 101(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code.

(b) ANNUAL REPORTING ON LEAD-BASED PAINT IN MILITARY HOUSING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter III of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 2869a. Annual reporting on lead-based paint in military housing

''(a) ANNUAL REPORTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than February 1 of each year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that sets forth, with respect to military housing under the jurisdiction of each Secretary of a military department for the calendar year preceding the year in which the report is submitted, the following:

''(A) A certification that indicates whether the military housing under the jurisdiction of the Secretary concerned is in compliance with the requirements respecting lead-based paint, lead-based paint activities, and lead-based paint hazards described in section 408 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2688).

''(B) A detailed summary of the data, disaggregated by military department, used in making the certification under subparagraph (A).

''(C) The total number of military housing units under the jurisdiction of the Secretary concerned that were inspected for lead-based paint in accordance with the requirements described in subparagraph (A).

''(D) The total number of military housing units under the jurisdiction of the Secretary concerned that were not inspected for lead-based paint.

''(E) The total number of military housing units that were found to contain lead-based paint in the course of the inspections described in subparagraph (C).

''(F) A description of any abatement efforts with respect to lead-based paint conducted regarding the military housing units described in subparagraph (E).

''(2) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall publish each report submitted under paragraph (1) on a publicly available website of the Department of Defense.

''(b) MILITARY HOUSING DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'military housing' includes military family housing and military unaccompanied housing (as such term is defined in section 2871 of this title).''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such subchapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''2869a. Annual reporting on lead-based paint in military housing.''.

SA 893. Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE 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. TRANSFER AUTHORITY FOR EBOLA RESPONSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense may transfer amounts of authorizations made available to the Department of Defense for overseas humanitarian disaster and civic aid to any other authorization to support efforts of the United States Agency for International Development and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to address the Ebola outbreak in the Democratic Republic of Congo and surrounding countries.

(b) NOTIFICATION OF CONGRESS.—Not later than 15 days before the date on which a transfer under subsection (a) is carried out, the Secretary shall notify the appropriate committees of Congress of such transfer.

(c) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of House of Representatives.

SA 894. Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Ms. CANTWELL) 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 in subtitle H of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10___. COUNTRY OF ORIGIN LABELING FOR KING CRAB AND TANNER CRAB.

Section 281(7)(B) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1638(7)(B)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''includes a fillet'' and inserting ''includes—

''(i) a fillet'';

(2) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) whole cooked king crab and tanner crab and cooked king crab and tanner crab sections.''.

SA 895. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE 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. ___. COVERED INFRINGEMENT ACTIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''affected proceeding'' means an action for patent infringement under title 35, United States Code, an investigation under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1337), or any other administrative or judicial proceeding in which—

(A) a patent issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office is a subject of the proceeding; and

(B) a designated entity—

(i) is the owner or exclusive licensee of the patent described in subparagraph (A);

(ii) has a financial interest in the outcome of the proceeding; or

(iii) has direct or indirect control over the conduct of the litigation of the matter by the holder of the patent described in subparagraph (A);

(2) the term ''covered regulations'' means the Export Administration Regulations under subchapter C of chapter VII of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations; and

(3) the term ''designated entity'' means—

(A) an entity on the entity list maintained by the Bureau of Industry and Security of the Department of Commerce and set forth in Supplement No. 4 to part 744 of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations; or

(B) any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of an entity described in subparagraph (A).

(b) CONDUCT OF AFFECTED PROCEEDINGS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, the following requirements shall apply with respect to an affected proceeding:

(1) The pleadings alleging patent infringement shall, with respect to any patent in which a designated entity has an interest—

(A) state with particularity the facts and circumstances constituting that infringement, including—

(i) all patent claims alleged to be infringed; and

(ii) all products and services alleged to be infringed;

(B) provide a detailed identification of the specific elements of each patent claim that is found in each product and service identified under subparagraph (A)(ii); and

(C) state with particularity all damages or other remedies sought in the proceeding.

(2) Excluding legal counsel for the designated entity, neither the designated entity nor the agents or representatives of the designated entity may obtain through discovery, or by other means, any non-public information of any entity or person related to any technical features or operation of a product or service.

(3) Upon the filing of the affected proceeding, the designated entity shall provide notice of the proceeding to the Department of Justice and the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

(4) The United States shall have the unconditional right to intervene as a party in the proceeding under rule 24(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

(c) RESTRICTIONS ON CERTAIN PATENT TRANSACTIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, the following requirements shall apply with respect to the sale or exclusive license of a patent issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office:

(1) The sale or license is prohibited if the sale or license is to a designated entity and the entity has not undergone review under section 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 4565).

(2) The sale or license is prohibited if the sale or license is to or by a designated entity and the manufacture, sale, use, import, or export of a product or service that is subject to the covered regulations would infringe the patent, unless an appropriate license is granted under the covered regulations.

(3) With respect to a patent not involving a drug or biological product, the sale or license of the patent to or by a designated entity to any foreign entity or affiliate shall require notification pursuant to rules under subsection (d)(1) and the waiting period described in subsection (b)(1) of section 7A of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 18a), notwithstanding any other provision of that Act.

(d) LIST.—The Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office shall maintain a publicly available list of all designated entities.

SA 896. 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 end of subtitle E of title III, add the following:

SEC. 360. STUDY ON FEASIBILITY OF INCLUDING ANALYTICAL MODEL OF WIND TURBINES INTO EXISTING CLEARINGHOUSE PROCESS.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Transportation and the heads of such other Federal agencies as the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate, shall conduct a study on the feasibility of including an analytical model of wind turbines into the existing clearinghouse process of the Department of Defense.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The study required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An analysis of the following:

(i) The height and blade dimension of wind turbine structures, the energy generated by such structures, and other factors relating to such structures as the Secretary of Defense determines appropriate.

(ii) Topographical and environmental considerations associated with the location of wind turbine projects.

(iii) The impact of individual wind turbine structures and the combined impact of proposed and existing wind turbine structures within a 50-mile radius of commercial or military airfields or military training routes.

(iv) The proximity of wind turbine structures to general aviation, commercial or military training routes, installations of the Department of Defense, and special use airspace.

(v) The impact of wind turbine structure operation, individually or collectively, on—

(I) approach and departure corridors;

(II) established military training routes;

(III)

(IV) radar for air traffic control;

(V) instrumented landing systems; and

(VI) other factors, as determined by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration and the Secretary of Defense.

(B) An assessment of whether including an analytical model of wind turbines into the existing clearinghouse process of the Department of Defense is practical, necessary, or cost-beneficial as compared to the current process of the Department.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than July 31, 2020, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the results of the study conducted under subsection (a).

SA 897. Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE 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. ASSESSMENT OF HEALTH OF CERTAIN BIOLOGICAL DEPENDENTS IN CONNECTION WITH PERIODIC HEALTH ASSESSMENTS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND VETERANS.

(a) ASSESSMENT OF HEALTH OF CERTAIN DEPENDENTS REQUIRED.—The Secretary concerned shall ensure that any periodic health assessment or physical of a member of the Armed Forces or a veteran provided by or for purposes of the Department of Defense or the Department of Veterans Affairs, as applicable, includes a recording of the health conditions of any biological descendants of the member or veteran, as the case may be.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the recording of the health conditions of descendants under subsection (a) shall be to facilitate the tracking and identification of health conditions in such descendants that may be causally related to the exposure of the member or veteran concerned to toxins during service in the Armed Forces.

(c) ELEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The recording of the health conditions of descendants under subsection (a) shall include questions of the member or veteran concerned on the following:

(A) Whether such member or veteran has experienced infertility or an adverse birth outcome, and, if so and if known, the cause of or diagnosis for such infertility or birth outcome.

(B) The health conditions of each biological descendant of such member or veteran, including any current medical diagnosis, and any current mental health diagnosis, with respect to any such descendant.

(2) PRESERVATION AND COMPILATION.—The information derived from answers to questions of a member or veteran during their periodic health assessments or physicals on the health conditions of descendants of the member or veteran under subsection (a) shall be preserved and compiled in a manner designed to facilitate the use of such information for the purpose specified in subsection (b) in connection with the member or veteran.

(d) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly enter into a memorandum of understanding that provides for the following:

(A) The sharing of information between the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs on trends identified through evaluations of the health of descendants under subsection (a).

(B) The analysis of data collected through periodic health assessments and physicals of members and veterans on the health conditions of descendants under subsection (a), in order to identify potential causal relationships between the exposure of members and veterans to toxins during service in the Armed Forces and the generational effects of such exposure on the biological descendants of members and veterans.

(2) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on activities undertaken under the memorandum of understanding entered into under paragraph (1) during the one-year period ending on the date of such report.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) The term ''Secretary concerned'' means the following:

(A) The Secretary of Defense with respect to members of the Armed Forces.

(B) The Secretary of Veterans Affairs with respect to veterans.

(3) The term ''biological descendant'', in the case of a member or veteran, means a biological child or grandchild of the member or veteran.

(4) The term ''periodic health assessment'' includes a physical examination.

SA 898. Mr. PERDUE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE 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 V, add the following:

SEC. 508. FUNCTIONAL BADGE OR INSIGNIA UPON COMMISSION FOR CHAPLAINS.

A military chaplain shall receive a functional badge or insignia upon commission.

SA 899. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 proposed by Mr. INHOFE 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 III, add the following:

SEC. 360. STUDY ON FEASIBILITY OF INCLUDING ANALYTICAL MODEL OF WIND TURBINES INTO EXISTING CLEARINGHOUSE PROCESS.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Transportation and the heads of such other Federal agencies as the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate, shall conduct a study on the feasibility of including an analytical model of wind turbines into the existing clearinghouse process of the Department of Defense.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The study required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An analysis of the following:

(i) The height and blade dimension of wind turbine structures, the energy generated by

such structures, and other factors relating to such structures as the Secretary of Defense determines appropriate.

(ii) Topographical and environmental considerations associated with the location of wind turbine projects.

(iii) The impact of individual wind turbine structures and the combined impact of proposed and existing wind turbine structures within a 50-mile radius of commercial or military airfields or military training routes.

(iv) The proximity of wind turbine structures to general aviation, commercial or military training routes, installations of the Department of Defense, and special use airspace.

(v) The impact of wind turbine structure operation, individually or collectively, on—

(I) approach and departure corridors;

(II) established military training routes;

(III) radar for air traffic control;

(IV) instrumented landing systems; and

(V) other factors, as determined by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration and the Secretary of Defense.

(B) An assessment of whether including an analytical model of wind turbines into the existing clearinghouse process of the Department of Defense is practical, necessary, or cost-beneficial as compared to the current process of the Department.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than July 31, 2020, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the results of the study conducted under subsection (a).

(2) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. THUNE. 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 AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 25, 2019, at 9:45 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 25, 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 Tuesday, June 25, 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 Tuesday, June 25, 2019, at 2: 15 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 25, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed roundtable.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATION, TECHNOLOGY, INNOVATION, AND THE INTERNET

The Subcommittee on Communication, Technology, Innovation, and The Internet of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 25, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY

The Subcommittee on Transportation and Safety of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 25, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 26, 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Wednesday, June 26; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, morning business be closed, and the Senate resume consideration of S. 1790; finally, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture motions filed during Monday's session ripen at 12 noon tomorrow.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order following the remarks of Senators FISCHER, RISCH, and BROWN.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on the fiscal year 2020 Defense authorization bill. I want to begin by thanking the chairman and the ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee for their leadership and for their hard work in crafting this bill and managing it on the floor.

The bill before us today is the worthy successor to last year's John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act. Like its immediate predecessor, this bill's overarching objective is to reorient the Department of Defense toward the great power competition that our Nation faces today.

Overall, the bill supports a total of $750 billion in defense spending, which includes $642 billion for the Department of Defense's base budget, $23 billion for the Department of Energy's defense activities, and another $76 billion for overseas contingency operations. This meets the level of spending requested by the President and provides the Department of Defense with real growth above the rate of the inflation in recognition of increasing threats our Nation faces.

The bill also supports the All-Volunteer Force, providing a 3.1-percent pay raise for our men and women in uniform. It meets the President's request with respect to end strength for an Active-Duty force of 1,339,500 soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines.

I serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, which has jurisdiction over nuclear forces, missile defense, and national security space programs, and the U.S. Strategic Command, to which Nebraska is home.

I am fond of quoting the statement of former President Obama's Secretary of Defense, Ash Carter, that ''Nuclear deterrence is the bedrock of our security and the highest priority mission of the Department of Defense.''

That was true in 2016 when he said it, and it is even truer today as Russia and China continue to expand their nuclear arsenals and deterring great power conflict becomes the central focus of our military.

With this changing security environment in mind, this bill fully funds the nuclear mission of the men and women of USSTRATCOM, including the sustainment of our nuclear forces, as well as the modernization of our triad, our nuclear command and control systems, and the Department of Energy's nuclear complex.

This legislation builds upon last year's support for the supplemental systems announced in the President's Nuclear Posture Review by authorizing funds for the deployment of low-yield ballistic missile warhead. Numerous senior military leaders have testified that this is what is necessary to address gaps in our current deterrence posture.

The fiscal year 2020 Senate NDAA also supports the Navy's ongoing study of restoring a sea-launched cruise missile capability in order to further enhance deterrence and also to reassure allies.

Moreover, the legislation includes a requirement for the administration to submit a report assessing four major categories of nuclear arms that are currently not captured by the New START Treaty. As many of my colleagues are aware, the administration

has announced its intent to pursue a more comprehensive approach to arms control beyond the traditional bilateral limitations of land-based ICBMs, submarine-launched ballistic missiles, and our heavy bombers.

The administration's logic is simple: Threats are shifting. As Russia invests in new and novel nuclear systems that are not captured by the New START Treaty and China's arsenal expands, a new approach is needed that accounts for these new dynamics. In support of this effort, this provision would require that the administration provide a comprehensive assessment of these factors.

Additionally, the Strategic Forces Subcommittee authorized resources for a number of key unfunded priorities for our warfighters. This includes an additional $113 million for the development of the next generation of GPS receivers to ensure the U.S. military continues to have access to resilient position, navigation, and timing capabilities, and an additional $108 million for the Missile Defense Agency to continue the development of space-based sensors to track advanced threats, including hypersonic weapons. Finally, it fully authorized critical bilateral US-Israel cooperative missile defense programs.

The critical resources this bill provides will be appreciated by our strategic partners and our men and women in uniform around the globe, as well as those in each and every State here at home.

I am honored to represent the men and women of Offutt Air Force Base, the 55th Wing, and the Nebraska National Guard, and I am proud to say that this legislation authorizes several critical investments that not only support our uniformed men and women in Nebraska; it better enables them to fulfill their roles in defending this Nation.

By passing the fiscal year 2020 NDAA, we keep the ''fighting 55th'' Wing flying. The bill authorizes full funding for the Air Force budget request to support the C–135 family of aircraft. It supports significant upgrades to the capabilities of the RC–135 Rivet Joint, the continued conversion of KC–135 tankers to WC–135R nuclear detection aircraft, and enables the ongoing OC–135 Open Skies recapitalization.

Just as critically, the bill helps the Air Force to evolve its ISR capability and move toward a more survivable, networked environment, with manned, unmanned, and sensors all acting as key components to give battlefield commanders the best information possible. To achieve this, the bill includes two amendments I authored that will direct the Air Force to examine the integration and dissemination of data from surveillance platforms like the RC–135 to the warfighter.

While the bill authorizes these important new investments, it also provides funding to address ongoing disaster recovery efforts, which are essential to restoring military installations that were affected by the recent flooding in Nebraska. Rebuilding Offutt Air Force Base and the Nebraska National Guard's Camp Ashland are top priorities, and I am happy to report that the bill authorizes millions of dollars in funding to aid in the continued process of cleanup, design, and construction for the facilities that were destroyed.

Because I believe Nebraska's bases are a core component of the Nation's defense, I was also proud to offer two amendments that further support the process of rebuilding. These measures increase the cap on minor military construction for recovery at bases impacted by recent disasters and encourage the military services to work quickly to rebuild Offutt Air Force Base and Camp Ashland.

I strongly urge all of my colleagues to work together to support this disaster recovery effort. Many key military installations have been affected across several States, and the work to rebuild these bases must be a collaborative effort. We owe it to our men and women in uniform to do this together.

For 58 years, the NDAA has been the subject of a bipartisan consensus in Congress. Despite other disagreements that may arise and the significant debates we face, this bill has long been a unifying subject of agreement on Capitol Hill. There is good reason for that, and a record that spans a half century does not happen by accident. The fact is that no matter what other issues arise, an area where we must forge agreement is in supporting our servicemembers and enabling the defense of the Nation.

This year, we had a productive markup, with substantive debate on the issues in this bill. The process worked the way it was intended, and we emerged with a strong bipartisan consensus on the bill before us. I encourage all of my colleagues to support this legislation so that we can continue our tradition of authorizing full funding for the military and ensure that this legislation is signed into law on time.

In that same spirit, it is essential that we take the next step and work to secure a budget agreement that not only supports a robust top line for national defense, but that we do so swiftly to give the Department of Defense the predictable funding they need to plan and budget for the coming year.

Passing NDAA is only half of the job. Yes, we must authorize full funding for our military, but if we are truly committed to our military men and women, we must also vote on the defense appropriations bill to fund what we do here this week on NDAA. As we continue to debate the fiscal year 2020 NDAA, we should all remember the reason we have this debate every year. One of the primary responsibilities of Congress is to provide for the common defense. That responsibility is written in the Constitution, and it is an oath each of us swore to uphold. I am reminded of that oath frequently when I am back home in Nebraska. Each time I shake hands with a Nebraskan in uniform or meet a family member with a loved one overseas, I think about the responsibility we have and the debt we owe the ones who serve.

Over the years, countless sons and daughters of the heartland have answered that call to service. They are regular men and women from every background and every walk of life, united by their desire to safeguard their homeland and protect the cause of freedom. Yes, they are regular men and women, but they are also exceptional Americans, and their spirit and their sacrifice are examples that we should remember every day.

I hope we can come together in the spirit of service and work together to swiftly pass the fiscal year 2020 National Defense Authorization Act.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MCSALLY). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. RISCH. Madam President, I rise today to discuss the proposed Udall amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act. It is not pending, but it has been filed, and thus I do want to talk about it for a few minutes.

First, let me be clear: The United States is not responsible for Iran's reckless activity and its violent ways. It is time once again to thrust Iran's long, shameful record of malign behavior back into the spotlight.

For the past 40 years, Iran has refused to behave as a responsible member of the international community. Indeed, the magnitude of the Iranian regime's caustic behavior both at home and abroad is overwhelming. Responsible nations do not threaten the sovereignty of their neighbors by funding terrorists. Responsible nations do not catalyze sectarian identities and provoke violence in the region. Responsible nations do not prop up the murderous regime of Bashar al-Assad in Syria. Responsible nations do not carelessly spread dangerous missile technology to violent extremist groups that threaten the lives of civilians. Responsible nations do not attack embassies and hold hostages. Yet the Iranian regime has done all of these things and persists.

Make no mistake. The Iranian regime has American blood on its hands. We all recall the dark days in Iraq and the Iranian roadside bombs that took the lives and maimed our servicemen and women.

Today, America's sons and daughters deployed abroad are again at risk. The amendment in front of this body will tie the hands of our commanders and prevent our troops from even acting in self-defense. Additionally, this amendment unnecessarily takes options off

the table, telegraphs our foreign policy to our adversaries, and emboldens those who wish us harm.

No one seeks a conflict with Iran—not the President of the United States, not this body, and not the American people. The U.S. Government has made clear our willingness to negotiate with Iran.

The Iranian people are a proud people. They have a proud history. They are the descendants of the Persian culture, one of the greatest cultures on the face of the earth. The Iranian people deserve better than what they are getting from the regime in power now in Iran.

The fact remains that the Iranian regime is faced with a sharp choice. The regime must choose between continued terrorist activity and behaving as a responsible member of the international community. The Iranian regime should sit down and think about the road that they are pursuing.

Like all countries, they want national security for their people. Is the road to national security trying to develop a nuclear weapon that the world has told them they can't develop? Is it continuing funding terrorists? Is it continuing the malign activities that it continues within Syria? None of these things gives them the national security they want.

They should take a lesson from North Korea. North Korea pursued this for generations. But in the last 18 months, North Korea sat down and said: Do you know what? Our national security is better served by picking door No. 2 instead of door No. 1. As a result of that, the threat that North Korea has been under has been greatly lifted.

This particular amendment is an amendment that has a place in the debate, but it has no place in this particular bill. First of all, it is not within the jurisdiction of the committee that has this bill in front of them. It is within the jurisdiction of our committee, the Foreign Relations Committee. These issues on war powers and the President's ability to use military force deserve thoughtful and reasoned debate. It is not a cavalier amendment like this that takes away the ability of our men and women to actually defend themselves.

I urge my colleagues to cast a ''no'' vote on this amendment and get on with the serious business and the important business of passing the National Defense Authorization Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the chairman and the vice chairman of the Intelligence Committee regarding the referral of S. 1879 be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,
Washington, DC, June 25, 2019.

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

DEAR SENATOR MCCONNELL: Pursuant to section 3(b) of S. Res. 400 of the 94th Congress, as amended by S. Res. 445 of the 108th Congress, we request that S. 1879, the Protect our Universities Act of 2019, be sequentially referred to the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence for a period not to exceed ten days.

Sincerely,

RICHARD BURR,
Chairman.
MARK R. WARNER,
Vice Chairman.

MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, this month, we surpassed the record for the longest period in American history without an increase in the minimum wage. It has been nearly a decade since minimum wage workers last got a raise—literally a decade. Because of inflation, the salary of a minimum wage worker today is worth $3,000 less than it was in 2009. Think about that. It is not like minimum wage workers are making a lot of money. A minimum wage worker's salary today is equivalent to $3,000 less than it was a decade ago because of inflation.

President Trump and Republicans in Congress don't have a plan and don't even propose to have a plan. In fact, they block any plans the rest of us have. They don't have a plan to give millions of workers a raise. Why? Because the corporate lobbyists going in and out of the office of the Senate majority leader don't want them to.

We know it is not just minimum wage workers who are losing out on money in their pockets because the President and the Members of this body always stand on the side of corporate interests, always put their thumb on the scale supporting corporations over workers. Look at the priorities Democrats fight for every day in this body, and then look at what this administration does. It is pretty clear who is on the side of American workers.

Democrats have plans to raise the minimum wage to $15 an hour. President Trump is against it. He wants to do nothing to raise wages.

Democrats have a plan to strengthen collective bargaining rights to give workers more power in the workplace—the PRO Act. President Trump nominates judge after judge who puts their thumb on the scale for Wall Street over consumers and workers.

Democrats have a plan to put more money back in the pockets of 114 million American workers—the Working Families Tax Relief Act. It means if you are making $25,000 or $30,000 and if you have children or if you don't have children, through the earned-income tax credit, you get more money in your pocket. Again, President Trump and the special interest Republicans in this town show their hostility to workers by opposing it.

President Trump, though, did sign a tax cut for corporations that led to record stock buybacks. The tax cut that President Trump pushed through this Senate, with the majority leader doing his groundwork for him—the bill he pushed, the tax cut he pushed through the Senate, over time, more than 75 percent of that tax cut will go to the richest 1 percent of the people. Think about that. There was $1½ trillion in tax cuts. Who benefits? Seventy-five percent of the benefits go to the richest 1 percent of the people in this country.

Democrats also have a plan to give American workers more control over their lives and their schedules—the Schedules that Work Act, which we will be introducing soon.

We have a plan to protect workers from companies that steal their hard-earned money by refusing to pay them for the hours they have worked—the Wage Theft Protection Act. Think about how that works. You work at a salary. Say you are making $35,000 a year. You are a night manager at a fast-food restaurant. The company decides to list you as a manager, so you are making a $35,000-a-year salary. The company can work you 42, 45, 50 hours a week and pay you not a cent for the hours above 40 because you earn that salary and because the company declared you manager. I call it wage theft.

We used to have laws in this country that we enacted many years ago, updated with President Ford, President Nixon, and then President Obama, but President Trump has said no and scaled that back. His administration rolled back rule after rule that protects workers from companies that cheat them out of the wages they have earned.

Again, whose side are you on when you have a President who is hostile to workers and who betrays workers while talking a good game but is clearly on the side of corporate interests every single time?

Democrats are united in demanding that any new North America Free Trade Agreement—any new NAFTA have strong labor standards so we don't end up with another race to the bottom on workers' rights and benefits. So far, President Trump hasn't produced a deal that protects workers from corporations that want to move to Mexico so they can pay the workers less. In fact, the Trump tax cut bill that Senator MCCONNELL—down the hall—fought for and rammed through this Senate by only a couple of votes gave corporations a 21-percent tax rate.

You shut down the Lordstown GM plant in Youngstown, OH. You are paying a 21-percent tax rate. When you move to Mexico, you pay half that tax rate. You pay 10.5 percent. That is

what has happened as the President has failed to renegotiate NAFTA to help workers.

Let me give you an example. Let me give a real quick story. After NAFTA passed, 5 months later, I went to the Mexican border with a friend. I went across the border and visited a Mexican auto plant. That auto plant looked just like an auto plant in Cleveland or just like an auto plant in Cincinnati and just like the Jeep plant in Toledo.

There was one difference. The workers were working hard. The floors were clean. The technology was up-to-date. There was one difference between the auto plant in Mexico and the auto plant in Toledo. The difference was the Mexican auto plant didn't have a parking lot because the workers who work there can't afford to buy the cars they make.

Yet President Trump's renegotiation of NAFTA left those workers' wages out so the workers will continue to be far, far underpaid in Mexico, will have weaker environmental laws—especially with the Trump tax plan—encouraging more American companies to move to Mexico.

On another issue so important to so many in this country, especially elderly people, Democrats have a plan to lower the price of prescription drugs. One news outlet said it combines just about every policy idea that drug lobbyists hate. Yet President Trump and Members of this Senate, all with good healthcare paid for by taxpayers—don't ever forget that. All of us who represent people in this country have good healthcare paid for by taxpayers. They are all trying to take away the protections for Americans with preexisting conditions.

Let me go back to the overtime issue for a minute. Three years ago, I stood in Columbus to announce the Obama administration was going to raise the salary threshold to earn overtime pay and make millions of more workers eligible. That would have meant 4 million Americans and 130,000 Ohioans were going to get a raise. As I explained earlier, when you make $35,000 or $40,000 and are paid a salary, they call you management. So when you work more than 40 hours, you don't get paid a nickel for any time you work over 40 hours. So what President Obama's rule did was give a raise to 130,000 Ohioans, 4 million workers, but workers didn't get that raise because attorneys general—far-right and extremely conservative attorneys general—around the country first sued to stop it, and then when President Trump won the election, he came up with a new rule that leaves most of those workers behind.

We are talking about people making $38,000 or $40,000 a year—middle managers at banks, restaurants, and grocery stores. They are often required to work 60 to 70 hours a week without getting a cent of overtime. It is an American value and what we stand for as a nation. It is how we should govern, through the eyes of workers, through the dignity of work. If people work 50 or 60 hours—obviously, Senators and bank presidents and CEO's and doctors and lawyers shouldn't get paid overtime, but people making $35,000 or $40,000, if you work more than 40 hours a week, you should get overtime. That is what we used to do in this country, but we don't do it all the time now because of President Trump's opposition.

Democrats have a bill to fix this, the Restoring Overtime Pay Act, that would allow 4.6 million Americans to be newly eligible for overtime pay.

The President clearly doesn't understand how somebody living on $35,000 or $40,000 a year—what that person's challenges are. The President thinks it is fine to leave those workers behind. So much for fighting for American workers. That was his campaign promise. He would put them back to work. He would have good manufacturing wages for them. He would pay them. He would make sure they made good wages. It is all part of Donald Trump's phony populism. He divides to distract from the fact that his administration looks like a Wall Street retreat.

True populism is never racist; it is never anti-Semitic. True populists don't pass tax cuts for rich people and leave out workers with children. Populists don't choose Wall Street over consumers. Populists don't choose corporations over workers. Populists don't choose health insurance companies over sick people.

It all comes down to whose side you are on. Are you going to fight for the dignity of work or are you going to fight for the privilege of the wealthy?

The President promised to fight for American workers. He breaks that promise every day. He has broken that promise for more than 2 years. If you love this country, you fight for the people who make it work. I wish President Trump would remember that.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow morning.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:04 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, June 26, 2019, at 10 a.m.