The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

**PRAYER**

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

Let us pray.

Eternal Lord, the center of our joy, we come to You, drawn by Your unconditional love. Lord, give us reverential awe as You open our eyes to see Your power and majesty.

Help our lawmakers become aware of Your presence, giving them Your peace and illuminating their paths. May they rejoice because You are their refuge. Lord, bless their families, surrounding them with the shield of Your favor. Draw our Senators close to You and to one another in humility and service.

And, Lord, we thank You for the faithfulness of the 2019 U.S. Senate summer pages as they prepare to leave us. We pray that You would bless and keep them. 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 (Mr. TILLIS). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 90 seconds as in morning business.

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

**ALZHEIMER'S AND BRAIN AWARENESS MONTH**

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, June is Alzheimer’s and Brain Awareness Month.

It is important to recognize the impact Alzheimer’s has on families in Iowa and across the country and to recognize the cost to taxpayers because of the care it takes in the last years of their lives. This disease robs Americans of their memories and impacts their ability to speak, pay attention, and exercise judgment.

The best way for Congress to help with Alzheimer’s disease is to ensure adequate research funding to find treatments. As Congress considers appropriations for next year, we should continue to fund research and work toward curing this disease.

**FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT**

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, on another point, the Supreme Court made a decision this week that I very much disagree with. I am an advocate for the Freedom of Information Act and for the public’s business being public, and this Supreme Court decision inhibited that.

In a self-governed society, the people ought to know what their government is up to. Transparency laws, like the Freedom of Information Act, help to provide access to information in the face of an opaque and obstinate government. Unfortunately, a recent Supreme Court ruling and new regulations at the EPA and the Department of the Interior are undermining access to there being public information.

In other words, the public’s business ought to be public. So I am working on legislation to address these developments and to promote access to government records. Americans deserve an accountable government, and transparency leads to accountability.

**TRIBUTE TO NICK NURSE**

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, on a little lighter note, I am proud to say that the NBA season concluded with a championship for Kuemper Catholic High School in Carroll, IA. He is a class act. Congratulations to Nick.

The Toronto Raptors’ head coach, Nick Nurse, graduated from my alma mater. He played for the University of Northern Iowa Panthers from 1985 to 1989. Nick went on to coach numerous teams, including for Grand View University in Des Moines. Nick knows how to reignite hometown pride. He led the first and only boys’ Class 3-A championship for Kuemper Catholic High School in Carroll, IA. He is a class act. Congratulations to Nick.
THE SHELBY-LeAHY AGREEMENT

The Senate advanced a clean, simple humanitarian funding bill yesterday by a huge margin. Thanks to Chairman SHELBY and Senator LEAHY, this bipartisan bill passed through the Appropriations Committee 30 to 1. It passed the full Senate yesterday—now listen to this—84 to 8. We sent that clean bill over to the House by a vote of 84 to 8. The Shelby-Leahy legislation has unified the Appropriations Committee, and it has unified the Administration. The administration would sign it into law.

So all that our House colleagues need to do to help the men, women, and children on the border this week is to pass this unifying bipartisan bill and send it to the President. For weeks, we have heard our House Democratic colleagues speaking a lot about the poor conditions, the overstretched facilities, the insufficient supplies. Our bill gives them the chance today to actually do something about it.

Now, I understand that instead of moving forward with this bipartisan bill, the Speaker is signaling she may choose to drag out the process even more and might persist in some variety of the leftwing demands that caused the House bill to fail dramatically in the Senate yesterday. I understand that some of the further changes the House Democrats are discussing may be unobjectionable things the Trump administration may be able to help to secure for them administratively.

Yet it is crystal clear that some of these new demands would drag this bipartisan bill way back to the left and jeopardize the Shelby-Leahy consensus product that unified the Senate and that is so close to becoming law—this close.

For example, I understand that the House Democrats may ask the Speaker to introduce legislation along with my colleague from Virginia, Senator Kaine, to address a serious and growing public health issue. As Senator Kaine and I laid out in May, the growing popularity and accessibility of tobacco products to 21 nationwide. We want to put a huge dent in these pathways to childhood addiction and help get these products out of high schools altogether.

Now, as a Virginian and a Kentuckian, neither Senator Kaine nor I lack an appreciation for the history of tobacco in America. For generations, this hugely important cash crop helped to build our States and, indeed, the whole Nation’s early prosperity. Yet new doors are open today to Kentucky’s growers and producers, and parents back home are rightly worried that e-cigarettes and vapor products pose new threats to the young people at a critical stage in their developments.

So I was proud to take the lead on this, and I am proud my colleague from Virginia has joined me in leading this effort to give this cause the strong bipartisan momentum it richly deserves. Our measure cleared an important milestone yesterday. The HELP Committee approved our Tobacco-Free Youth Act and advanced it here, to the floor, among many other amendments.

I thank Chairman Alexander, Ranking Member Murray, and all of our colleagues on the committee for including this important measure in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues across the Capitol to take up the clean, bipartisan bill that the Senate passed 84 to 8 and, without any more unnecessary delays, send it on to President Trump for his signature.

TOBACCO-FREE YOUTH ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter, just last month, I introduced legislation, along with my colleague from Virginia, Senator Kaine, to address a serious and growing public health issue. As Senator Kaine and I laid out in May, the growing popularity and accessibility of tobacco products to 21 nationwide. We want to put a huge dent in these pathways to childhood addiction and help get these products out of high schools altogether.

Now, as a Virginian and a Kentuckian, neither Senator Kaine nor I lack an appreciation for the history of tobacco in America. For generations, this hugely important cash crop helped to build our States and, indeed, the whole Nation’s early prosperity. Yet new doors are open today to Kentucky’s growers and producers, and parents back home are rightly worried that e-cigarettes and vapor products pose new threats to the young people at a critical stage in their developments.

So I was proud to take the lead on this, and I am proud my colleague from Virginia has joined me in leading this effort to give this cause the strong bipartisan momentum it richly deserves. Our measure cleared an important milestone yesterday. The HELP Committee approved our Tobacco-Free Youth Act and advanced it here, to the floor, among many other amendments.

I thank Chairman Alexander, Ranking Member Murray, and all of our colleagues on the committee for including this important measure in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues across the Capitol to take up the clean, bipartisan bill that the Senate passed 84 to 8 and, without any more unnecessary delays, send it on to President Trump for his signature.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter entirely, later today, the Senate will vote to fulfill a solemn responsibility. For the 59th consecutive year, we will pass the National Defense Authorization Act. I hope and expect we will do it by a wide, bipartisan margin.

It would be difficult to overstate the importance of this legislation to the ongoing missions of our Nation’s men and women in uniform. The NDAA is simultaneously a target to guide the modernization of our all-volunteer force; a supply line to restore readiness and keep U.S. personnel equipped with the most cutting-edge lethality capabilities; a promise of critical support services to military families; and a declaration to both our allies and adversaries of America’s strategic resolve.

This year’s bill authorizes the investments that will support all these bills and a major pay raise for military personnel to boot.

I am especially proud that it supports the ongoing missions of Kentucky’s installations and the many military families who call my State home.

The NDAA is a product of a robust, bipartisan process that has consumed our colleagues on the Armed Services Committee for weeks. Nearly 300 amendments were adopted during markup. So today, once again, I would like to thank Chairman Inhofe and Ranking Member Reed for their leadership throughout this process. They produced legislation that each Member of this body should be proud of. Particularly in these troubled times, this is exactly—exactly—the message the Senate needs to send. I look forward to passing it today.

Passing the NDAA itself is not the only important message the Senate will send this week on national security. On Friday morning, we will vote on a badly ill-conceived amendment that would literally make our Nation less secure and make American servicemembers less safe. I respect my colleagues, but this amendment from Senator Udall and others is a half-baked and dangerous measure—about as half-baked and dangerous as we have seen on the floor in quite some time. It should be soundly rejected.

We know that our Democratic colleagues have political differences with President Trump—I think the whole country has gotten that message pretty loud and clear—but they have chosen a terrible time and a completely incorrect time and manner to press themselves. Rather than work with the President, who shares the goal of avoiding war with Iran, they have gratuitously chosen to make him the enemy.

I urge my colleagues to reject these amendments. Rather than work with the President to deter our actual enemies, they have chosen to make him the enemy.

At the very moment that Iran has been stepping up its aggression throughout the Middle East, these Senators are proposing radical new restrictions on the administration’s ability to defend U.S. interests and our partners.
The Udall amendment would require the administration to secure explicit authorization from Congress before our forces would be able to respond to all kinds of potential Iranian attacks. That would include attacks on American civilians.

Let me say that again. Some of our colleagues want us to go out of our way and create a brandnew obstacle that would block the President from swiftly responding if Iran attacks American civilians, our U.S. diplomatic facilities, or Israeli military forces either ally or partner, or if Iran closes the Strait of Hormuz. In all of these scenarios, the Udall amendment would hamstring the executive branch from reacting quickly. In modern warfare, time is of the essence. The War Powers Resolution explicitly recognizes the reality that administrations may need to respond quickly and with flexibility.

This amendment could even constrain our military from acting to prevent imminent attack. As written, it appears to suggest they must absorb the attack, take the attack first before defending themselves. And even then, for how long would they be allowed to conduct retaliatory strikes? Complete absurdity. Totally dangerous.

Let’s take an example: Iran attacks Israel. No timely response from the United States, especially if Congress happens to be on recess. Iran attacks American citizens. The President’s hands would be tied. This is never how the American Presidency has worked, for a very good reason.

So I would ask my colleagues to stop obsessing about Donald Trump for a moment and think about a scenario involving a future or past President. Hypothetically, then, would it be appropriate for Congress to tie a President’s hands with legislation preventing military action to defend NATO allies from a Russian attack without explicit congressional authorization? If conflict came in August and the United States and its NATO allies didn’t act decisively, frontline states could be gobbled up before Congress could even convene to consider an AUMF.

The Udall amendment would represent a huge departure from the basic flexibility that Presidents in both parties have always had to take immediate military steps, short of a fullscale war, to respond to immediate crises.

This ploy is being advertised as some kind of courageous reassertion by Congress of our constitutional authority, but it is nothing of the sort. It is a departure from our constitutional traditions and norms.

No, this is talking about a fullscale war with Iran—not the President; not the administration. Heaven forbid, if that situation were to arrive, consultation with Congress and widespread public support are needed of courseforces of an emergency. The Udall amendment is something completely different. It defines selfdefense in a laughably narrow way and then in all other situations poses that President Trump should be stripped of the basic powers of his office unless Democrats in Congress write him a permission slip. I don’t think so.

This would be a terrible idea at any moment, but especially as Iran is escalating its violence and searching for any sign of American weakness.

So I would ask my colleagues: Do not embolden Iran. Do not weaken our deterrence. Do not undermine our diplomacy. Do not tie the hands of our military commanders. Reject this dangerous mistake when we vote on the Udall amendment tomorrow.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020—Resumed

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

The 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.

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.

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.

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

The PRESIDENT OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDENT OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
Even though it is plainly written in the Constitution that the legislature alone, not the executive, has the power to declare war, the Trump administration is already signaling that it doesn’t need Congress. The President and his team are playing up links between al-Qaeda and Iran and building the case for military action. The stage is set for Congress to finally assert its constitutional power to declare war without executive approval.

The President himself asked if he believes he has the authority to initiate military action against Iran without first going to Congress, replied, “I do.” He continued, “I do like keeping Congress abreast, but I don’t have to do it legally.”

So when it comes to a potential war with Iran, Mr. President Trump, yes, you do. You do. You do.

The Founding Fathers—our greatest wisdom in this country—worried about how to balance power in the executive branch for precisely this reason. As James Madison wrote to Jefferson, who was not there when they were writing the Constitution—he was plenipotentiary to France—here is what Madison wrote to Jefferson:

The constitution supposes, what the History of all Governments demonstrates, that the Executive is the branch of power most interested in war, and most prone to it. It has accordingly, with studied care, vested the question of war to the Legislature.

Is Madison, who put more into this Constitution than anyone else. Let me read it again. It is clear as a bell. Madison wrote to Jefferson:

The constitution supposes, what the History of all Governments demonstrates, that the Executive is the branch of power most interested in war, and most prone to it. It has accordingly, with studied care, vested the question of war to the Legislature.

There were ever a President who fits that description, it is Donald Trump.

The framers worried about an overreaching executive waging unilateral war. My colleagues know well that we haven’t had an overreaching Executive like the one we have now for quite some time, if ever. So if it comes to it, we should expect the President to challenge Congress’s war powers. He has basically already told us that he would.

So my colleagues should vote to strengthen our ability to oversee this President’s strategy with Iran. That is what the bipartisan Udall amendment would do. Nothing more. There has been some fearmongering about how the amendment might tie the hands of our military. It would not. It is explicitly written that in no way should it be construed to prevent the U.S. military from responding to an act of aggression or from acting in self-defense.

It is high time that Congress reestablish itself as this Nation’s decider of war and peace. We have been content to let the Executive take all of the initiatives and responsibility for military action, period. The American people are weary of the endless conflicts in the Middle East and the loss of American lives and American treasure.

The Udall amendment would mark the beginning of Congress reasserting its constitutional powers. I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote yes tomorrow.

Second, China and President Xi. Now that trade negotiations between our countries seemed to have stalled, there is a chance to put them back on track. For that to happen, the President must remain strong. He cannot go soft now and accept a bad deal that falls short of reforming China’s rapacious economic policies—cyber espionage, forced technology transfers, state-sponsored, and worst of all, denial of market access.

President Trump, you know it. We have talked about it. You have a once-in-a-generation opportunity to reform China’s economic relations with the world and put American businesses and American workers on a level playing field. Stay tough. Don’t give in. Make sure Huawei cannot come to the United States and we cannot supply it. Enough with the criticism for our allies. Aim it at our adversaries, China and Russia, and you will have a much better chance of making the G20 a success for American interests.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. Hyde-Smith). The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, tomorrow morning the Senate will vote on whether to disarm our troops as they face a growing campaign of Iranian aggression in the Middle East. Tomorrow morning the Senate will vote on whether to empower the Ayatollahs as they continue to rampage across the Middle East, attacking U.S. aircraft, attacking ships in the high seas, threatening our troops in Iraq, Syria, Afghanistan, Bahrain, Qatar, and elsewhere. That is because we will be voting tomorrow morning on an amendment that says, very simply: “No funds may be used to conduct hostilities against the Government of Iran, against the Armed Forces of Iran, or in the territory of Iran, except pursuant to an Act or a joint resolution of Congress specifically authorizing such hostilities.”

That amendment is simple—I would say simple-minded—but it is simply an adherence to the principles of the Aya-
tollahs who are currently conducting attacks against the United States and our interests on a regular and growing basis.

Let’s just take a case in point. The earlier version of this amendment included no exception—no exception whatsoever—for our troops to defend themselves against an attack by Iran. You might say that is a careless omission. I would, however, say that even the fact that it was changed after I pointed out that omission just goes to show you that the root of this amendment is Trump derangement syndrome. It does have an exception now. Let’s look at that: “Nothing can be construed to restrict the use of the United States Armed Forces to defend”—to defend—“against an attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or its Armed Forces.”

What does that mean? What does it mean to defend against an attack? I don’t know. I am not sure. If an F-15 pilot is shot upon in international airspace, I guess he can deploy countermeasures—chaff—to disrupt the missile. Can he shoot back? Can he shoot back at the Iranian missile battery that shot at him?

Let’s say our troops who are garrisoned in places like Iraq and Syria have incoming mortar fire by an Iraqi or Iranian proxy militia. I guess they can defend and cover in a concrete bunker. I guess that is defense. Can they use counterbattery fire to shoot back at that mortar firing position? I don’t know. I don’t know. Can they? Beats me.

We have thousands of troops stationed at Al Udeid Air Base, the main airbase from which we conducted operations against the Islamic State. Let’s say they have a missile coming in. I guess they can defend and cover in a concrete bunker. I guess that is defense. Can they use counterbattery fire to shoot back at that missile defensive system to stop that missile down? Can they fire back at the missile battery that shot that missile, which has many more to fire? I don’t know. Can they? It seems like offense to me. Maybe it is defense.

Let’s take a page from history. In 1988, Ronald Reagan authorized one of the largest naval engagements since World War II in response to the exact kinds of attacks against commercial shipping and the U.S. Navy on the high seas that we have seen from Iran in the last two weeks. However, that operation didn’t commence for 4 days; it was 4 days after a U.S. Navy frigate hit one of the Iranian mines before we struck...
back. Is that in defense against an Iranian attack? It doesn’t seem that it
would be, to me. I don’t know.

What we are debating here is how many lawyers can dance on a head of a
pin when our soldiers are in harm’s way. I don’t know that when
they are shot upon, they can fire back, and they can eliminate that threat
without any politician in Washington or any lawyer at the Department of De-
fense looking over their shoulders and second-guessing them. That is not
what they get from this amendment, though.

Consider also the consequences. Many of the speakers today will say
this is about deescalating tension in the Middle East—deescalating. Who is
escalating it? Who is the one firing on American aircraft? Not Donald Trump.
Who is interfering with the freedom of navigation on the high seas? It is not
Donald Trump; it is the Ayatollahs. They are the ones who have manufac-
tured this crisis because they know that the United States is on the stra-
tegic offensive and that we have the initiative against Iran for the first
time in 40 years.

This amendment, though, would only embolden them to continue the cam-
paign of the last 2 months of gradually marching up the escalatory ladder. It
started with threats. Then it was an at-
tack on foreign vessels at port. Then it
was an attack on foreign vessels on the
high seas. Then it was an attack on an
unmanned American aircraft. Next it
might be an attack on a manned Amer-
ican aircraft or a U.S. ship. And the
message we are going to send is this:
Well, the Congress thinks that the
Commander in Chief and, for that mat-
ter, battalion commanders on the
ground don’t have the authority and
the flexibility they need to take the
appropriate response, as opposed to
covering inside bunkers and using
some defensive measures.

Let’s also think about the language
of this amendment. A lot of people are
going to come here and say that this is
about our constitutional authority, and we need to reclaim our authority, and
we have given up too much author-
ity to the executive branch. In a lot of
instances I would agree with that. But
this amendment is only about Iran. It
is not about China; it is not about Rus-
sia—even though this President has
forced our Democratic friends to fi-
nally recognize the inner cold war. It
is not about American lives that are
being lost in the Middle East. It is not
about the use of force to respond to
that kind of provocateur. Please.

There is a reason we have one Com-
mander in Chief, not 535 commanders in
chief—or, I say again, 535 battalion
commanders, the level at which some
of these decisions ought to be made.

Think about the kind of debates we have, the know-nothings we have seen
here in Washington over the last cou-
ples of weeks who would say: Oh, it
wasn’t Iran that made the attack. OK,
it was Iran, but maybe it wasn’t au-
thorized by the senior leadership of
Iran. OK, it was authorized, but it
didn’t really do that much damage. It
is kind of like the old line of: It is not
my dog. He didn’t bite you. You kicked
him first. That is what that debate
did: we did not want to devolve into
while our troops are
at

This is a terrible amendment. It will
do nothing but put more American
lives at risk and imperil our interests
and our partners throughout the re-
gle.

I know that the minority leader said
earlier that he is worried about the
President bumbling into war. He said
last week on TV too. Nations don’t
bumble into war.

He and others have raised the pros-
pect of endless wars, the wars we have
been fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan.
They are long, and we have made lots
of twists and turns on the way. But
let’s not forget that many of the Demo-
plicans in Congress who support
these wars didn’t bumble into those.
They were considered, deliberate
decisions.

President Trump said just a couple
days ago that he is not talking about
that kind of operation. He is talking
about the exact kind of thing that Ron-
al Reagan did in response to Iranian
aggression on the high seas. That
didn’t start a war. Ronald Reagan
didn’t start a war when he retaliated
against Libya for acts of terrorism
against the United States. Donald
Trump didn’t start a war when he
struck Syria in 2017 and 2018 for gas-
sing its own people. If you want a
Democratic example, Bill Clinton
didn’t start a war when he struck Iraq

This amendment purports to tie the
hands of the Commander in Chief rela-
tive only to a single nation, which is
just shot down an American aircraft.
The only result that will come of this
amendment passing will be to em-
bolden the Ayatollahs and make more
likely that which its proponents wish
to avoid.

I urge all of my colleagues to see the
reality of this amendment and to vote
no tomorrow morning.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sen-
ator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I rise
to speak in favor of the Udall amend-
ment, a bipartisan amendment. I am a
proud Virginian. The Commonwealth of
Virginia is more connected to the Na-
tional Guard and military service, by
the installations in Virginia, and by
personnel than any other State, and I
am the proud father of a U.S. marine.
I love serving with my colleagues on
the Foreign Relations and Armed Serv-
ces Committees.

Tomorrow we are going to vote on a
question that cannot be more funda-
mental: Can President Trump take us
to war with Iran without coming to
Congress for authorization? That is the
question. Can President Trump take us
to war with Iran without coming to
Congress for authorization? This is a
matter of the utmost importance for
this body, for the American public, and
for our troops. Americans, especially
those who have family serving in the
military—and many of those families
have seen their loved ones deployed
multiple times since 2001—want to
know what each Senator thinks about
this important question.

The Udall amendment to the NDAA,
which has bipartisan sponsorship, is
very simple. It states that no funds
will be expended in a war with Iran or
on Iranian soil, except in self-defense,
unless Congress takes the affirmative
step of specifically authorizing those
hostilities.

My colleague from Arkansas talked
about lawyers dancing on the head of a
pin, as he tried to suggest that “self-
defense” was not a clearly defined
term. I think most of my colleagues
would readily accept the language will believe it is
incredibly clear; the President has the
power to defend the Nation from an im-
minent attack or ongoing attack with-
out asking anyone for permission. That
is specifically stated in our resolution.
There is no confusion about it. There is
no war with Iran without a President’s
power to defend the Nation, but if the
President decides that we need to go on
an offensive war against a sovereign
country, this amendment would sug-
gest he could not do so unless he came
to Congress.

Those voting for this amendment will
say clearly that no war should be start-
ed unless Congress votes for it. Those
opposing the amendment will say clearly that it is OK for the President to go to war against Iran whenever and for whatever reason on his own.

Those who vote against this amendment, in my view, are essentially giving the President a green light to wage war in a manner that he must act on his own. That is not a power we should give to this President or any President. I believe, in my 6 1/2 years in the Senate, there has only been one vote as serious as the vote we will cast tomorrow morning.

Why do I believe war should not be started without a vote of Congress? The Democratic leader outlined the clear constitutional history in this regard. It is Congress that declares war.

The history and context of that provision in article I is very plain. At that time in the world, in 1787, war was for the Executive. It was for the King, the Emperor, the Monarch, the Sultan, the Pope, but the drafters of the American Constitution had dramatically changed history in this Nation and say that war for the United States of America should be a matter not for the Executive to declare but, instead, for the peoples’ elected legislative body to declare.

Once declared, the President, as Commander in Chief, needs to be that commander. I agree with my colleague from Arkansas. You don’t need 535 commanders, but it is not up to the President to initiate or declare war constitutionally; it is clearly up to Congress.

The reason we should vote for this is not just because of the constitutional provision. It is the value that underlies the constitutional provision. Why did the Framers put the question of war as a matter for the legislature? A congressional debate and vote is what is necessary for the American public and Congress to fully understand the stakes, to explain to the public and educate them why war is necessary—and especially, and most importantly, the debate and the vote by the legislative body is the evidence of support for the mission that American troops deserve if they are going to be sent into harm’s way where they could be killed or injured or see their friends killed or injured.

I believe it is the height of public immorality. There could be nothing more immoral in the public space than to order our troops into harm’s way, where they would risk injury and death if Congress is unwilling to consider and debate and vote on whether a war is in the national interest.

You have to go risk your life, you have to go be with others and potentially be injured or killed, but we don’t want to have to vote on it. Could anything be more immoral than that? What this provision does is say that if we are going to go to war at Iran and, in fact, with any nation, Congress should have the guts and backbone to come and cast a vote before we order our troops into harm’s way.

Why is this debate important right now? We are in the middle of discussing the National Defense Authorizing Act, but I also want to point out two very important things, one an event and one a statement that may have occurred in the last week, since many of us took the floor there.

On Thursday, a week ago today, President Trump ordered and then called off a missile strike against Iranian territory that would have been the start of a shooting war with Iran. I wonder if we will ever have a statement in this body and the administration who have argued that a war with Iran would be a good thing or a necessary thing. Some have even suggested it would be an easy win. Let them come to the floor of the Senate and make that argument in full view of the American public and let Congress debate and vote and then be held accountable for decisions we make about war.

I conclude, I thank the majority leader for scheduling this vote, and I especially thank the Democratic leader for firmly insisting it must be held. Tomorrow we will all speak to a fundamental question about war but also, to the President: Can President Trump take us to war with Iran without even coming to Congress?

I hope my colleagues will stand for the Constitution. We must provide assurance to our citizens, and we especially must provide assurance to our troops, that war is not based on the whim of this President or the whim of any President, but it must be based instead on a clear vote, following public debate by the peoples’ elected legislature.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Madam President, I very much appreciate being joined on the floor by Senator Senator Kaine, Senator Merkley. I appreciate Senator Kain’s very wise words. I think all of us are here standing up to hold the President accountable. We believe he should follow and obey the Constitution.

I rise to call upon this body to do its duty, to assume its constitutional responsibility, and to make it clear that the President cannot wage war against Iran without congressional authorization. Whether you are in favor of giving the President power or whether, like me, you are opposed, everyone in this Chamber should vote in favor of our bipartisan amendment because a vote in favor is a vote to fulfill our sworn oath to uphold the Constitution. I appreciate that at long last the Senate will finish this debate; that we will finally take this vote because these matters of war and peace are among the most consequential responsibilities that fall to Congress. These are the hard votes, and we must stand up to take them.

I am proud to partner with Senators Kaine, Paul, Merkley, Durbin, Murphy, and Lee in this effort and to call
upon Congress to meet its constitutional responsibilities. After years of abdicating our responsibilities on matters of war, this entire body must stand up and show that we will not roll over for an unauthorized, unconstitutional war. I will support this amendment.

This dangerous course with Iran began last May when the President unilaterally withdrew from the Iran nuclear agreement. This hard-fought diplomatic achievement denied Iran the nuclear material required to even begin work on a nuclear weapon. Since this administration turned away from diplomacy and resorted to a maximum pressure campaign to box in Iran, the risk of war has steadily risen.

Just last week, we were 30 minutes away from a strike on Iran, 10 minutes from a nightmare of escalation in the Gulf. This week, the President threatened Iran. I am quoting his words here—these are pretty strong words—he said to Iran: I threaten them with "great and overwhelming force," and he used the word "obliteration." That is not diplomacy; that is a drumbeat toward war without congressional approval.

Tensions are the highest they have been in many years, and the risk of a costly miscalculation grows day by day. Just days ago, the President falsely claimed he does not need congressional approval to launch strikes against Iran. Article I, section 8 of the Constitution could not be clearer: It vests power in the Congress and Congress alone that has the authority to "declare war." This is not a close call; the Founders placed this responsibility squarely on our shoulders. The consequences of going to war are profound, so this decision rests with the people's representatives, not one person—not even one President. It is time that Congress confront the administration's rejection of diplomacy.

Our amendment prohibits funding for military action against Iran without congressional authorization. It does not prohibit war altogether; it prohibits an unconstitutional war, a war that has not been authorized by Congress.

We must be accountable to the American people and to our men and women in uniform whose lives would be on the line. Our soldiers are brave enough to face the danger of war. If my friends in this Chamber believe they should, we should be brave enough to hold accountable for that decision.

Some have claimed that this amendment would prohibit the President from defending the United States against attack. That is wrong. It is completely false. This amendment and the War Powers Act incorporated as part of it allow the United States to act in self-defense. I am going to quote from our amendment. The amendment clearly states that it shall not be interpreted 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." It is explicit. The United States may defend itself against an attack by Iran. The claim that the military's hands would be tied in the event of an emergency has no basis and cannot be used as an excuse to vote against the amendment.

I am heartened as Senator Kaine was and as I am sure Senator Merkley will also say, that Senator McConnell and the Republican leadership will finally allow debate and a vote on this amendment. This is what the American people want and deserve.

Over the years, Democratic and Republican Presidents alike have steadfastly encroached upon Congress's war powers, and Congress has tacitly allowed that encroachment.

I stood up to President Obama when he threatened to attack Syria without authorization, and so did many of my colleagues. I am standing up again now because the administration's reckless actions have brought us to the precipice of our nation's military involvement.

Mr. Bolton and Secretary Pompeo's failed strategy has led directly to these heightened tensions, to the brink of war, with no benefits to show for their tactics.

The administration has reimposed and tightened sanctions on Iran three times—sanctions we agreed not to impose if Iran agreed not to develop nuclear capabilities.

Secretary Pompeo placed a dozen conditions on negotiations and then withdrew them.

Just this week, at the same time that Advisor Bolton claims we will talk with Iran anytime, the President sanctioned the lead diplomat in Iran and tweets out his threat of obliteration, shutting the door on any diplomatic overtures.

This ping-pong diplomacy, manufactured crisis, and go-it-alone posture further diminish our world's standing and erode the signatories to the Iran nuclear agreement, including our closest allies, backs us in what we are doing.

This reckless diplomacy is dangerously reminiscent of the run-up to war with Iraq. But any war with Iran, with its military capability, proxy forces, and a population of 80 million living in a geographically perilous region, would be more disastrous and more costly than Iraq. Yet we continue to miscalculate the risk of war.

According to the President's tweet last week, he stopped a strike against Iran that he had already ordered because he learned at the last minute that 150 lives were at stake. I know I am not alone in being deeply alarmed at this decisionmaking—national security decisionmaking process. I know Members on both sides of the aisle share my concerns.

We must assert our constitutional authority. We must tell the President and the American people that we will assume our constitutional responsibility. And we must do so now before, through miscalculation, misjudgment, or misadventure, our Nation finds itself in yet another endless war.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. Merkley. Madam President, our Founders recognized that this decision carries more consequences than the decision of whether to go to war. They were well familiar with the carnage of human lives and blood, injuries, and treasure that our initial war, the War of Independence, brought.

As we stand here several hundred years later, we recognize the wars in between; that more than 400,000 Americans died in World War II, that more than 50,000 Americans died in the Vietnam war, and that more than 4,000 Americans died in the war in Iraq. Those are just some indications of the enormous impacts and consequences of a decision to go to war.

It was an issue that the Founders struggled with in a republic: Where should the power to declare war rest? Should it rest with one individual—the President—or are the consequences too great to have the judgment of a single person carry the decision to its completion?

After intense debate, after many arguments, the Founders became very clear that this power should never rest in the hands of a single person; that it should not just be one body but two bodies—the House and the Senate—that should weigh in on the issue of war. The consequences being so profound, they could not leave it to the idiosyncrasies or the biases or the misjudgment of a single individual.

It was in fact one of the defining arguments about the difference between a King and a President. A King could make that decision, with often horrific consequences for the people of the kingdom, but not in the United States of America. This is why it is so deeply embedded in our Constitution. In Article I, section 8, under the enumerated powers of Congress, are simply the words "to declare war."

That power is vested in Congress, not the President.

The Founders weighed in time and again about this. Turning to James Madison, the father of the Constitution, he commented:

The constitution supposes, what the History of all Governments demonstrates, that the Executive is the branch of power most in danger in war, and most prone to it. It has accordingly with studied care vested the question of war to the Legislature.

He went on:

The power to declare war, including the power of judging the causes of war, is fully and exclusively vested to the legislature.

Madison continues:

The executive has no right, in any case, to decide the question, whether there is or not cause for declaring war.

He was the father of our Constitution. That led to this document that vests the power to declare war with Congress, not the President.

George Washington, the father of our Nation, said: "The constitution vests
the power of declaring war in Congress; therefore no offensive expedition of importance can be undertaken until they shall have deliberated upon the subject and authorized such a measure."

This was the Commander in Chief speaking, the hero of the American Revolution. This was the man most trusted to be the first President of the United States, who was to steer the course and make sure the Presidency did not become a kingship. Here is his conclusion: "[T]herefore, no offensive expedition of importance can be undertaken until after they shall have . . . authorized such a measure."

This is enormously at odds with the vision our colleague from Arkansas presented on the floor—dismissing the role of Congress, dismissing the Constitution, and instead saying let the President, as Commander in Chief, do what he will. That was not the vision. George Washington was the first President. Did he have such power? Did he think the Constitution was not the executive? No. Jefferson became President. Did he have such power? Did he think the Constitution was not the executive? No. If you want to change the Constitution, there is no going to the floor of the House, and then the Senate, to authorize war with Iran. The Constitution speaks clearly. The President has preplaced a squadron of B-52 bombers to be ready to bomb Iran. Why are we so concerned—when we have a National Security Advisor who has said that no agreement can ever be reached with Iran and we have to bomb them, and when we have Secretary of State who says that no one has ever stood up to Iran and we have to teach them a lesson, or words to that effect, and we have a President who has proceeded to say that any attack will be met by great and overwhelming force? So envision these preplaced forces. And, in fact, the President has declared that a section of the Iranian military, the Revolutionary Guard is a terrorist force. Add all of that up, and the President is talking about looking for a trigger to apply great and overwhelming force. That is why we are here. A response in proportion to defend a direct attack on the United States is authorized by the War Powers Act. That is honored by the resolution that is before us, the Udall-Paul-Kain amendment that is before us. That is honored. But as for the use of great and overwhelming force the President is threatening, that is war. That has to come before this body.

The President went on and said: "In some areas, overwhelming will mean obliteration." So for any attack? And we have heard the Secretary of State say if there is a Shiite force in Iraq that we can tie to Shiites in Iran, and some communication, we will consider that an attack by Iran—looking for a trigger to go to war. And the President has said any act will be met with overwhelming force.

Not under our Constitution. You want that authority? You come here. You want to change the Constitution? Then, come here. I say this to my fellow Senators: Do you want to change the Constitution? Bring your amendment to the floor of the Senate to change the Constitution. The Constitution speaks clearly. The President has no authority to apply overwhelming force or obliterating force and conduct a war against Iran. Make your case here or honor the Constitution.

We are in a troubling and difficult time, and I would like to see every Member of the Senate down here talking to each other about this. That is the beauty of the body of the Senators. It is not a few Members who are here to stand up for our Constitution and the vision of wisdom in our Constitution. This is the time, before there is that trigger in which the President responds with great and overwhelming force and before he responds with obliterating force. Now is the time to pass this amendment put together in a bipartisan fashion that lays out the fundamental requirements of our Constitution and the fundamental requirements that are put together by the Constitution. Make your case here or honor the Constitution.
Let us not allow the vision of our Constitution to be shredded. Let us honor our responsibility when we took an oath in office to defend it, and let us honor the wisdom of holding that debate on the floor, should the President ever ask us for such authorization to go to war in Iran.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

MILITARY WIDOW’S TAX ELIMINATION ACT

Mr. JONES. Madam President, I approach to say how much I appreciate my colleagues, Senator MERKLEY and Senator Kaine, for their eloquent thoughts on an important issue of our time.

Let me also now rise in total frustration on a completely different issue—but total frustration, bafflement, and, quite frankly, just angry and disappointed in this body. I am angry because we have turned our back for over 40 years on military families. We have turned our back on the widows of the very men and women who have given their lives to protect this country, to uphold our democratic ideals, and to make possible the very work that we are doing in the Senate and the very work that we, as Members of the Senate and as Members of Congress, are charged to do every day on behalf of the American people and, particularly, on behalf of veterans and their families.

I am talking about this body’s refusal to bring up the Military Widow’s Tax Elimination Act—the refusal to bring it up for a single floor vote—despite the fact that we have 75 cosponsors—75 cosponsors of this bill. It is the most bipartisan legislation, except for the robocall bill, which everybody has been able to get across the finish line. For some reason, even though the bill has historic levels of cosponsorship, but for some reason it just hasn’t been able to get across the finish line. Frankly, that is the frustration.

If we can’t do the right thing on this, with 75 cosponsors, how can we possibly tackle immigration reform? How can we possibly tackle healthcare reform or education in this country if we can’t get in some agreement and one simple vote when we have 75 cosponsors?

How can we not fight for people like Cathy Milford, a retired schoolteacher from Mobile, AL, whose husband passed away from a service-connected illness just months after his retirement from the Coast Guard? Instead of a long and happy retirement together, Cathy has been fighting to right this wrong for all of the service-connected spouses who are hurt by the current law.

During a recent visit here to Capitol Hill, she said: “Every time I talk about this”—and she is up here a lot talking about elimination of the military widow’s tax—and “every husband and bury him all over again.”

Just think about that. Let that just sink in a minute: a military widow, one of many of thousands, who had to return to lobby Congress year after year at their own expense, saying she feels like she is digging up and burying her husband all over again when she has to talk about this issue. That is not only sad, it is shameful.

We have tried to pass this legislation. The Senate has, in some form or education in this country if we can’t be fixed on the streets. It can’t be fixed at the Department of Defense or the VA. It can’t be fixed by the legislature, the Congress of the United States, is the only one that can do it, and we are the ones who should be fighting for these military spouses, the widows and widowers whose loved ones go on with their lives for this country, the widows and widowers whose lives are forever changed because of their family’s selfless service to this country.

Caring for military families has long been part of the foundation of our government. In President Abraham Lincoln’s second inaugural address, he spoke in no uncertain terms on this obligation. In the midst of the Civil War, he addressed a nation that had sustained unimaginable loss—imagining loss—in order to preserve the Union we so cherish.

The country was then even more divided than it ever had been, and God help us if it ever gets that divided again, but the values Lincoln asserted during that speech were so fundamental that, even at war with itself, it could agree on the importance.

He said this:

With malice toward none, with charity for all, in sincerity, the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive to finish the work we are in, to bind up the nation’s wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow, and his orphan.”

This is the promise we have made to those who raise their hand in service to our Nation. This is the contract, the solemn contract, that we have made to those who served in our nation’s military service to this Nation; that we will honor and support them and care for their families if tragedy occurs.
President Lincoln was assassinated just over a month after he issued this appeal, but the weight of his words still resonate today. In some ways, on this issue, they resonate more because in those days you could count on the fact that the legislative body, the Congress of the United States, heeded the words and took care of those families.

It has been 154 years since President Lincoln spoke those words; yet the Government of the United States, the Members of this body, the Members of the Far West—yet to fulfill that promise. It has been 154 years, and we still get caught up in the deals that are made as to what gets on the floor and what does not get on the floor, the political deals that have to be jockeyed, where we give and take, and it is one over the other. We need to fix that today.

We need to fix it in a broader sense and let this body get back to its real work and be the great deliberative body it is supposed to be. We are not doing that, but that is a different issue for a different time.

Let’s start today and stand up and exhibit just a fraction, a small fraction—a small, small fraction—of the courage and the commitment in Collinsville, OK, that Chris died in action. Chris died in action. I was the one who had to call on and share that with his wife, Jane Horton.

In fact, after that, we hired Jane to go around and help us with the widows’ benefits. Starting at that time, I was the leader and continued to be a leader long before the Senator from Alabama was into this, and he will agree that I was actively working on this issue. I supported and will continue to support the permanent fix. It is going to happen. We are going to do it. In fact, I am the first Senate Armed Services chairman to cosponsor this legislation.

Mr. Jones mentioned there were 75 people who confirmed it. That is 1. I was on there on the initial legislation and will continue to be and will always be, and that reflects my commitment to the permanent fix.

Here is the problem we have. There has to be a fix, but it can’t be on this bill. The reason it can’t be on this bill is because it has a mandatory spending that has no offset, and there is not an exception to this on the bill. This is part of the agreement in bringing the bill up.

Now, what we can do is go ahead and do what is necessary with this very popular cause, and I will be standing with the Senator from Alabama to make sure this happens.

Let’s assume it is not true, that we couldn’t do it under the rules. Under the rules, there is another rule that, if there is an objection to any amendments coming up, then I, as the chairman of the committee, if the party objecting is not here, I have to offer his objection.

There is an objection to this, and I will therefore object and be in the strongest position of helping this to become a reality. I owe it not just to the many people I know but also to the family whom I just referred to from Collinsville.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. JONES. I thank my friend and colleague, the Chairman INHOFE, and let me say I know where he has been on this issue. I have seen his speeches from years past on this issue, and I do appreciate that, and I appreciate the fact that he is committed.

I also know that has been put on an NDAA before in this body without a pay-for, without an offset, in order to have a sense of the Senate and to go on record, and that is what I think we should do. I understand we are not there this year for whatever reason. I still believe, in part, that it is a procedural issue that ought to be put aside for this, but that is an argument for another day.

I do so very much appreciate the chairman’s remarks. I have enjoyed working with him, Senator REED, and others on the NDAA. That has been an effort. I told folks back home and across the country where I have spoken that I wish people could actually see what happened in that markup behind closed doors and the bipartisan-ship that the chairman showed and the other Senators showed. I wish people could have seen it because we don’t get to see it. I don’t think if we opened it up that we would have seen it, but it was remarkable.

So we are where we are in the Senate. I understand that, and I knew that coming in here. I will simply say this. The House of Representatives is also going to take up the NDAA, and I hope my colleagues on the other side of the wonderful Capitol are listening. Put it in. It is not in the committee bill. Put it in. Bring it to conference because, if it doesn’t confer, I am certain I will continue to have this in this NDAA, and let’s get this done, once and for all.

Thank you, Chairman INHOFE, and thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILLS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, if I might, let me describe where things are in the state of play with respect to the supplemental appropriations bill that deals with the border.

I know the situation at our border has been at a crisis point for weeks now. Our agencies are stretched to the breaking point, and we are seeing the overwhelming flow of migrants; yet we have House Democrats continuing to play politics with the border funding bill.

Again, to describe the state of play, we had a request from the President 7 weeks ago for $4.5 billion to address this humanitarian crisis we are having at our southern border, and the Democrats didn’t act on it. They described it as a manufactured crisis. When I say the Democrats, I am talking about the House Democrats, which is where most spending bills originate.

After the House failed to act and failed to respond to the President’s request for emergency funding, the Senate decided to act. So the Senate Appropriations Committee took up and passed a bipartisan bill out of the Appropriations Committee by a vote of 30 to 1—not a vote that you see all that often around here these days.

So that bill was reported out to the floor. In the meantime, the House Democrats decided that maybe it wasn’t, after all, a manufactured crisis and perhaps they needed to act. So
Mr. President, I think 2019 is going to go down in history for the Democratic Party. It has been a notable year. While the Democratic Party has obviously always been left of center, I see that the Democratic Party running so far to the left of the American people or wholeheartedly embracing socialism and a government takeover of a large part of the economy. The socialist fantasies are rapidly piling up: a government takeover of healthcare, a government takeover of the energy sector, government-funded college, a government writeoff of all student loan debts, guaranteed income, government-guaranteed housing, and on and on. So what is wrong with that? After all, those proposals sound really nice—free healthcare, free college, the government guaranteeing you an income. Here is the problem: Providing all that stuff is going to cost a lot of money, and there isn’t an affordable amount of money. Somebody is going to have to pay. You might say that obviously the government is going to pay, but the government has to get its money from somewhere. Here is the catch: The government gets its money from the taxpayers. Can’t we just take that money from rich taxpayers? If you talk to some of the socialist Democrats offering these proposals, they will talk about making the rich pay. The rich are their favorite funding mechanism. Want free college? We just get the rich to pay for it. Want free healthcare? We can just get the rich to pay for it. There is just one big problem with that: There aren’t enough rich people in America to even come close to paying for Democrats’ socialist fantasies. Deep down, Democrats know it, which is why they tend to get very foggy when pressed on the details of how they are going to pay for some of these plans. Take the junior Senator from Vermont’s proposal of a government takeover of America’s health insurance, the so-called Medicare for All plan. A conservative estimate puts the cost of that plan at $32 trillion over 10 years. The current cost is likely much higher since the Senator from Vermont didn’t give Americans health insurance—no choice. If the government doesn’t want to pay for a particular cancer treatment, for example, as has happened in other countries with socialized medicine, you will be forced to pay. Of course, as staggering as the costs of Medicare for All would be—more money than the Federal Government spent in the last 8 years combined on everything—they pale in comparison to the cost of the so-called Green New Deal. An initial estimate found that the Green New Deal would cost somewhere between $51 trillion and $93 trillion over 10 years—$53 trillion. That is more money than the 2017 gross domestic product for the entire world. That is right. You could take the entire economic output of every country in the world in 2017, and it still might not pay for the Democrats’ socialist fantasy. Once you realize that, it is pretty obvious that the Green New Deal is not a plan that could be paid for by taxing the rich. How about taxing every household making more than $200,000 a year at a 100-percent rate for 10 years? That wouldn’t even get you close to $93 trillion. How about taxing every household making more than $100,000 at a 100-percent rate for 10 years? That wouldn’t get you anywhere close to $93 trillion. Like Medicare for All, the Green New Deal would be paid for on the backs of working families. I have talked a lot about the money aspect of Democrats’ socialist proposals, and that is major problems with these proposals—they sound nice until you realize that actually nothing is really free. Working Americans are still going to be paying for the cost of all those programs through new and much higher taxes. But that is far from the only problem with some of the Democrats’ socialist fantasies. Leaving aside the fact that the Federal Government is not exactly known for its efficiency or bringing down the cost, there is the tremendous cost Americans will pay in the loss of their freedom, the loss of their autonomy. Americans are used to choices and being able to make their own decisions. It is part of our heritage. Those are freedoms we cherish. That is not the way things work under socialism. Nowhere is this more obvious than with Medicare for All. Medicare for All doesn’t give Americans health insurance options; it takes them. Are you part of the majority of Americans who are happy with their current healthcare? Too bad. Medicare for All eliminates all private insurance plans and replaces them with a single, government-run, one-size-fits-all plan. Under Medicare for All, private health insurance plans as we know them would actually be illegal. If you are not happy with the government-run plan, too bad; you won’t have any other choices. The treatment options would also be limited by what the government decides. If the government doesn’t want to pay for a particular cancer treatment, for example, as has happened in other countries with socialized medicine, you will be forced to pay. Then, of course, there are the long wait times that are the hallmark of socialized medicine. Imagine having to wait months for diagnostic imagining or needed surgery or having to stand by while your spouse or child is forced to wait months for care. That is the kind of thing Americans would have to look forward to under Medicare for All.
Margaret Thatcher once said that the problem with socialism is that eventually you run out of other people's money. Once Democrats have taken every dollar they can from the rich to pay for their socialist fantasies, they will come after the paychecks of ordinary workers to provide higher education and higher taxes for fewer and fewer benefits and greatly reduced choices. Democrats' socialist dreams would quickly trap the American people in a nightmare.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, before I deliver comments on a bill that I am introducing, let me express my disappointment that the Senate will not be voting today on the amendment that Senator JONES and I have filed to eliminate the military widow's tax. This is a tremendous inequity, as is recognized by the fact that 75 of our colleagues have cosponsored our free-standing bill.

Nevertheless, I am heartened by the commitment and the compassion of the Senate Armed Services Committee chairman, Senator INHOFE, who has in the Senate Armed Services Committee expressed his receptivity to dealing with this issue but in a different way on a different bill. I hope that today is just a temporary setback and that we can see this bill taken up as a free-standing bill by the entire Senate.

Mr. President, I send a bill to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be received and appropriately referred.

The remarks of Ms. COLLINS pertaining to the introduction of S. 2008 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions."

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

(The remarks of Mrs. MURRAY pertaining to the introduction of S. 2008 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to explain the context in which I will vote for the Romney amendment.

First, I am grateful for Senator Romney's substantive contributions and his collegiality as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

The plain text of the amendment states the obvious—that funds authorized by the NDAA may be used to defend themselves and U.S. citizens. I believe every Member of this body certainly shares the fundamental understanding that our Armed Forces must have the ability to defend themselves and our citizens against foreign enemies. Indeed, the purpose of the NDAA is to provide the authorities that are necessary to ensure the Department of Defense is in a position to defend the United States and our citizens.

In my opinion, in that respect, this amendment is not necessary. For anyone who argues that the Romney language is somehow necessary because of the facts before the Senate will be voting on tomorrow, I say reread the Udall amendment. It includes an explicit exception for self-defense.

I am concerned that this administration will seek to twist the Romney amendment into something that is completely unrecognizable, something that we are not voting on today, and something that has no basis in law. As a legal matter, the amendment does nothing more than to explicitly provide the authority to use funds under the act to ensure this ability.

Let me be clear. This amendment does nothing more than that. Either implicitly or explicitly, it does not authorize the use of military force. Let me repeat: The AUMF. An explicit authority would have to come to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee following serious and substantive engagement by the executive branch.

It is no secret that there are some in this administration who are eager to engage militarily with Iran. This week, the President himself argued that he does not have to go to Congress to seek authorization. But those who don't want to completely bypass our congressional prerogative will be grasping at any purported source of authority that could justify, in their minds, that Congress has authorized these actions.

Look no further than the Secretary of State, who is purportedly pushing the bogus legal theory that the 2001 AUMF, which Congress passed in the wake of 9/11, somehow provides authority to use force against Iran. Apparently, Secretary Pompeo is not dissuaded by the facts. The plain language of the 2001 AUMF does not extend to Iran. Congress did not intend for the 2001 AUMF to cover Iran, and neither Republican nor Democratic Presidents who have operated pursuant to this AUMF have claimed such authority.

Against this backdrop and a President who has evaded Congress in unprecedented and unlawful ways, we must make crystal clear that the Romney amendment cannot be abused by those in this administration who appear to be desperate to build a case that the President has all of the authority he needs to take us into war with Iran.

We cannot leave anything up to chance when it comes to the choice of whether we send our sons and daughters into war. I believe we should be having a serious conversation about our use of military force and about what constitutes self-defense and attacks on our allies.

I am pleased that the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has previously committed to holding these hearings, and I believe we should come forward with hearings with multiple stakeholders, including the administration itself. Previous administrations have sent up representatives to explain to Congress their rationale for war or to explain the type of authorizations they are seeking. We should demand nothing less from the executive branch.

I support the amendment, and I look forward to continuing appropriate oversight over the executive branch's pursuit of military action around the world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks before the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. President, I thank my esteemed friend and ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee for his kind words in support of my amendment.

As we debate the Defense Authorization Act today, one of our most pressing concerns is how we deter Iran from escalating its threat. The decisions we make on this bill will have a direct bearing on the options the President and the military have available to keep our military, our citizens, and our friends and allies safe.

The Senate is poised to vote soon on my amendment, No. 861. It would reaffirm what has long been American policy. Our military is authorized to defend itself and to protect our citizens. Enacting this amendment makes it clear to our military, as well as to any potential adversary, that America does not shrink in the face of attack. This is not an authorization to use military force against Iran or anyone else; it is a statement of continued commitment to our national defense.

Under the Constitution, only Congress may declare war, but also under the Constitution, the President can defend against attacks and can respond in an appropriate manner to an attack that has been made.

As we all know, my esteemed colleague from New Mexico, Senator UDALL, has proposed an amendment on a related topic which I wish to briefly address.

We do not need the Udall amendment to tell us what the administration already demands—that Congress alone can declare war. His amendment is clearly intended to limit the President in some other ways that he has not yet explained to this body.

As it is written, the Udall amendment would dramatically limit the existing authority that the Constitution provides to the President to respond to Iran. It would prevent the President...
from defending U.S. citizens, U.S. interests, and our allies. This is not only my opinion; it is the carefully considered conclusion of the U.S. Department of Defense.

In its letter on June 26 to Chairman Inhofe, I state this, referring to the Udall amendment:

"The Department strongly opposes this amendment... At a time when Iran is engaging in escalating military provocation... this amendment could embolden Iran to further provocations."

Tying the President's hands in some undefined way in the midst of the current crisis is misguided, dangerous, and surely sends the wrong message to both Iran and to our allies.

Last week, the Iranians continued their provocative escalation in the Middle East. After weeks of buildup in which Iran attacked six commercial ships, and its proxies bomed an oil pipeline and launched a rocket into a commercial Saudi Arabian airport, Iran shot down an American drone over international waters.

The Udall amendment raises serious questions about how the military could respond to these attacks after the fact. Could the President fire on one of their missiles launchers that downed our drone? Could we think one of their small, outboard motor vessels that attacked the mines to the ships that were attacked?

Imagine for a moment that in the future, another American aircraft, perhaps one that is manned by an American pilot, were to be shot down by an Iranian rocket. It is possible that the Udall amendment would limit our military's options to subsequently respond to such an outrage. I don't pretend to know whether Iran will continue its pattern of aggression, but I do know that when bad actors think they can escape consequence for malevolent acts, such acts are more likely to occur in the future.

I am glad that Senator Udall's revised amendment concedes the broad point that our military has the inherent right of self-defense. But in the case of a rocket hitting one of our planes, the President should not have his hands tied in responding after such an attack in an appropriate manner.

Note also that while the Udall amendment provides for the military to defend itself from attack, it does not provide for the defense of our citizens. Iran has taken this as an invitation to attack Americans abroad.

Further, it would prohibit our military from defending or responding to an attack by Iran on our Iraqi partners so long as it didn't directly hit American troops. Passing the Udall amendment would effectively give a green light to Iranian forces to carry out attacks in Iraq so long as they don't attack U.S. forces.

If Iran were to attack Israel, one of our NATO allies, the Udall amendment would not allow the President to respond.

Finally, by carving out Iranian territory, the Udall amendment would potentially prevent us from pursuing and taking out terrorists who seek refuge in Iran.

I oppose the Udall amendment not because I want to go to war with Iran or rush to respond without carefully evaluating our long-term strategy but because I do not want to rush to vote in some undefined way to restrict military consequence. That is simply unthinkable.

My amendment is not about Iran. It does not even mention Iran. My amendment is about affirming the constitutional authorities that any President must have to properly protect and defend this Nation.

As the Department of Defense maintains, the President of the United States must always have the option of responding to attacks by Iran or anyone else at a time and place of our choosing—today and in the future.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

### CLOTURE MOTION

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

**The bill clerk read as follows:**

**CLOTURE MOTION**
We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on amendment No. 861, because it does nothing to restrict military consequence. That is simply unthinkable.

**Alexander** Feinstein  Peters
**Baldu**nisch  Porter
**Barasso**  Reed
**Blackburn**  Bisch
**Bingaman**  Roberts
**Bingaman**  Russ
**Brown**  Sasse
**Burr**  Schatz
**Cochrane**  Schumers
**Capito**  Scott (FL)
**Cardin**  Scott (RC)
**Carder**  Shadens
**Casey**  Shely
**Cassidy**  Sinemus
**Colbert**  Smarts
**Coons**  Stanen
**Corbyn**  Lankford
**Cooch**  Tester
**Cotton**  Thune
**Cramer**  Titis
**Crosby**  Toone
**Cruz**  Udale
**Daines**  Van Holes
**Duckworth**  Warner
**Durbin**  Whitehouse
**Duni**  Wicker
**Ennis**  Young

**NAYS—7**

**Booker** Wyden
**Klobuchar** Merkley
**Lee** Paul

**NOT VOTING—6**

**Benett** Sanders
**Gillibrand** Warren

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** On this vote, the yeas are 87, the nays are 7.

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

**AMENDMENT NOS. 864, 863, AND 862 WITHDRAWN**

Under the previous order, amendment Nos. 864, 863, and 862 are withdrawn.

**The Democratic leader.**

**AMENDMENT NO. 861**

**Mr. SCHUMER.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 minutes, equally divided.

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

**Mr. SCHUMER.** Mr. President, I am voting in favor of the Romney amendment, No. 861, because it does nothing more than restate the longstanding principle that the Armed Forces of the United States have the ability to defend themselves and citizens of the United States from foreign attack. The
amendment does not constitute an authorization to use military force, nor is there anything in the amendment that confers any new authority on the President.

As Senator ROMNEY, the author of the amendment, stated on the floor a half-hour ago: this amendment is not an authorization to use military force against Iran or anyone else. . . . Under the Constitution, only Congress may declare war."

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. President, I will reassert the same thing I just heard from the minority leader. I appreciate his words.

This amendment would reaffirm a basic principle. The United States has the right to defend itself and our citizens when attacked. It asserts what has always been a bedrock constitutional principle. This is not an AUMF. It is not an authorization for the use of military force.

Passing my amendment today would send a strong signal to our adversaries that we will defend ourselves if our interests, our people, our military, our allies are threatened and attacked.

My amendment is something that I believe everyone in this body can and should support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Cloture having been invoked, the motion to recommit and the amendments pending thereon fall.

The postcloture time is expired.

The question is on agreeing to amendment (No. 861), offered by the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MCCONNELL, on behalf of the Senator from Utah, Mr. ROMNEY.

The yeas and nays were previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 90, nays 4, as follows:

YEAS—90

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the importance of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 legislation that authorizes $750 billion for defense, consistent with the administration’s budget request and the National Defense Strategy Commission report.

The NDAA is a critical piece of legislation. It supports our Armed Forces, our men and women in uniform, and provides for the defense of our Nation. Among its notable provisions, the bill supports a 3.1-percent pay increase for the members of our armed services, the largest in nearly a decade and very much deserved by the men and women in uniform who protect us.

It establishes a Space Force and ensures that America retains its leadership in this critical domain. It opens the way for significant investments in defense weapons systems, such as hypersonic missiles and directed energy weapons along with missile defense and cyber security capabilities. It also responds to concerns about family housing across the Department of Defense.

Importantly, the bill continues to provide for the modernization of our nuclear forces. This legislation fully authorizes fiscal year 2020 spending on our nuclear deterrent, including support for all three legs of the Nation’s nuclear triad. One of the amendments that has been included requires that the Air Force and the National Nuclear Security Administration report to Congress on the development of the next intercontinental ballistic missile and the W87-1, which is a modified warhead that will be placed on the new ICBM for decades to come.

It is vital that the Air Force’s missile defense development program, known as the Ground-Based Strategic Deterrent, GBSD, be synchronized with the W87-1 warhead so that a decade from now, we have a complete new weapons system that is ready for deployment. My amendment will help ensure that the deployment will happen on schedule and avoid unnecessary delays in that development.

The other amendment highlights the imperative of our nation’s ICBM force and demonstrates how ICBMs enhance deterrence as a part of the triad. ICBMs provide the most prompt and most dispersed segment of our nuclear forces, and they magnify the deterrent power of our nuclear triad.

I commend my colleagues for their support of these amendments, which is a strong statement of the continuing importance of the ICBM and the need to ensure that it is modernized along with the rest of our nuclear forces in order to keep us safe.

The bill is also critically important for military activities in my home State of North Dakota. Specifically, we worked to secure a number of provisions to support the missions at the Minot Air Force Base, which is home to two of the three legs of the nuclear triad. Importantly, the NDAA authorizes funding for B-52s, including the procurement of new engines. As a member of the Senate Defense Appropriations Committee, I have worked to authorize and appropriate money for new engines which will help modernize the B-52 and extend its life for years to come.

The NDAA also advances replacement of the Vietnam-era Huey helicopters that provide security for the missile fields, and it supports the construction of a new helicopter facility at Minot to house the equipment. It also makes a strong commitment to the Long-Range Stand Off, LRSO, Program that will provide a new nuclear cruise missile for the B-52, as well as continuing to advance the investments in GBSD.

The bill also supports priorities at Grand Forks Air Force Base, which is home to the Global Hawk, which provides important intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities for the Air Force. In fact, it was the Navy version of the Global Hawk which was recently shot down in the Strait of Hormuz by Iran.

This bill authorizes more than $240 million for the Global Hawk Program and more than $115 million for the Battlefield Airborne Communications Node that is carried on the Global Hawk Block 20 aircraft. These investments in the Global Hawk have been a priority because the Global Hawk BACN system is urgently needed to provide communications support for operations around the world.

Hassan
Hawley
Heinrich
Hyde-Smith
Inhofe
Johnston
Jones
Kennedy
Klobuchar
Lankford
Lee
Manchin
Markley
Mcaleety
Mcsally

NAYs—4

Booker
Duckworth
Leahy

Not Voting—6

Bennet
Gilibrand
Harris
Rounds
Sanders
Warren

The amendment (No. 861) was agreed to.
Finally, I would like to emphasize support for items that some of my colleagues put forward that I think are critically important both for my State and for the Nation as a whole.

I am pleased to cosponsor an amendment from Senator Graham that commits us over the next decade to building our capacity to produce plutonium pits. We must build up this capacity so we can extend the life of our nuclear stockpile and preserve our nuclear deterrent in the future.

I also cosponsored an amendment from Senator Murkowski that requires the Defense Department to report on Russian and Chinese activities in the Arctic, which is an area of the world where we need to build up our capabilities in the coming years.

I would similarly express my support for Senator Hawley’s amendment that requires a report from our military commanders on their ability to deter aggressive actions from Russia and China. This amendment can be included on this legislation as well.

The bill also includes an important provision from Senator Klobuchar that I cosponsored to help ensure that the children of National Guard and Reserve members have access to additional support services in schools.

I cosponsored a provision from Senator Baldwin, who joins me in the floor today, that will protect veterans’ benefits if and when they have to file for bankruptcy. I am pleased to cosponsor her amendment.

All of these items demonstrate just what a large undertaking the National Defense Authorization Act really is. It includes thousands of provisions and represents a lot of work from many Members in support of our military servicemembers and their families.

I look forward to passing the legislation today and moving it to conference and getting it enacted into law for our men and women in uniform.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

FOURTH OF JULY

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I am so grateful we had the opportunity to be on the floor this week and to have a discussion about our Nation’s security and how we protect and preserve freedom. I have just a couple of thoughts that I wanted to bring forward.

I think about July 4th and Independence Day and how we commemorate that day and do honor to the heritage and the tradition of that day and of the freedoms that we enjoy.

I came across something this week that I think is just so pertinent to our discussions of this week as we focus on freedom. In 1826, a very feeble and old John Adams received a group of Quinncy, MA, town leaders. They were seeking his help in planning an anniversary celebration of the Declaration of Independence. They wanted the former President to pen a toast that would be read at the event. Imagine their surprise when what they got from John Adams was two words. The toast that he penned for them was simply this: “Independence forever.” It is what we had fought for, what had been won, what people had desired, and their passion—indeed, their patriotism.

Keeping that independence is indeed the task. I am certain they wanted something much more ambitious and eloquent, but they simply got the nugget of what centered him and what should center us.

In the Founding Nation, our Founding Fathers recognized that “Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes,” but that true liberty could not thrive in the grasp of tyranny.

Today, freedom reveals itself in the lives and actions of every American, and it is our responsibility to preserve it on the battlefield and through our actions each and every single day.

With every confirmation of a district or a circuit court judge, we must preserve an essential right guaranteed by the First Amendment—the right to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

Earlier this month, I introduced a resolution supporting free speech on campuses because it is beyond distressing to hear students and their professors argue that encouraging the open exchange of ideas amounts to an act of violence. Our Founding Fathers probably never dreamed they would hear any person, much less a student, accuse another of harboring hostility toward diversity of thought should serve as a reminder that questions of freedom rarely remain settled.

Last week, famed economist Dr. Art Laffer, who is a beloved Tennessean, was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom. The “father of supply-side economics” only became so because he was free to learn and apply the knowledge that he gained to his own groundbreaking work that led to the Laffer curve.

Looking beyond Washington, it is easy to see many more examples of freedom in action each and every day. Every Tuesday, my friend and fellow Senator, Lamar Alexander, hosts “Tennessee Tuesday.” This gives us an opportunity to meet with Tennesseans who have come to Washington. They are students, small businessmen, writers, and teachers. They have a host of talents that they share, and they have been lucky enough to get a break from the manacles of the rest of the world. We should make sure they have the opportunity to shine and grow.

Back home in Nashville, we enjoy the artistry of some of the world’s most talented songwriters, singers, and producers. Guess what. In the United States of America, they do not have to go seek permission from any government official to write a song about a broken heart or any other act of injustice that they want to write that song about, sing that song about, or write that screenplay about.

The connection is very clear with each other—whether it be through art, song, or a conversation at a cash register—all run deep. The thoughts and emotions we experience when confronted with provocative ideas are just as much a celebration of freedom as is a flag-raising ceremony or a fireworks display. This is why the very idea of censorship or a global standard of speech and association rouses immediate opposition.

We know that these collective understandings regarding a particular type of speech or behavior inevitably lead to collective insistence that the problems of the world could be resolved if only we could agree to compromise on the finer points of freedom. Those understandings assume that the intellectual comfort of the many simply must, just this once, override the ideas of the vocal minority.

As we prepare to leave Washington in anticipation of Independence Day, I would encourage my friends in Congress to challenge their own ideas of what freedom looks like. How do they exercise it and enjoy it every day? While John Adams probably never imagined the world ofatable news and the comments sections, he provided us with the only context we need when confronted with the choice of preserving freedom or allowing it to slip away—his admonition: “Independence forever.”

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE STONEWALL UPRISING

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise today to mark the 50th anniversary of a critical milestone in our Nation’s march toward equality—the Stonewall uprising of June 28, 1969.

The Stonewall Inn, which opened in 1967 on Christopher Street in Greenwich Village in New York City, was one of many establishments in cities across this country that served as sanctuaries for members of the LGBTQ community from persecution by police and by society at large. In the late 1960s, every State in America, save one, criminalized same-sex relationships. Many State and local governments also had harsh laws that restricted the ability of transgender people to express their identities, and LGBTQ people were prohibited from gathering socially. As a result, LGBTQ individuals in places like Stonewall Inn, where they gathered, were targeted frequently by law enforcement, including the New York City Police Department.

The struggle of LGBTQ individuals had already begun to stand up to police harassment, including at places like Cooper Do-nuts in Los Angeles in 1959, Compton’s Cafeteria in San Francisco in 1966, and the Black Cat Tavern in Los Angeles in 1967.

In the early morning hours of June 28, 1969, the NYPD raided the Stonewall Inn and arrested several people, just as it had done repeatedly over the days, weeks, months, and years prior. But this night was different. A few brave individuals—particularly transgender women of color, like Marsha P. Johnson and Sylvia Rivera—stood up and
fought back against this injustice. That night, they sparked an uprising against the NYPD with confrontations and protests at the Stonewall Inn and the surrounding area that lasted over the course of 6 days, until July 3, 1969. The Stonewall uprising empowered thousands of LGBTQ individuals to emerge from shadows and to come out publicly as they stood up for their community the night of June 28, 1969, and beyond, putting their lives and their safety at risk.

Alarmed by public protests in Chicago, Los Angeles, New York, Philadelphia, San Francisco, Washington, DC, and elsewhere, the Stonewall uprising became a catalyst for the LGBTQ civil rights movement to secure social and political equality and inspired the formation of many advocacy organizations. A year later, members of the LGBTQ community commemorated the first anniversary of Stonewall and reaffirmed the solidarity of the community by organizing the first Pride marches and events in New York City, San Francisco, Chicago, and Los Angeles.

Now, we remember and celebrate the Stonewall uprising every year in June as Pride Month. Three years ago, President Obama declared the Stonewall Inn and its surrounding area a national monument, becoming the first national monument to commemorate the LGBTQ civil rights movement.

Last month, New York City announced that it would dedicate a monument honoring pioneering transgender activists and key leaders in the Stonewall uprising, including Marsha P. Johnson and Sylvia Riviera. It would be the first public monument in the world honoring transgender women.

Just a few weeks ago, the NYPD Commission released an official apology on behalf of the department stating: “The actions taken by the NYPD were wrong—plain and simple.” I was just a kid when the Stonewall uprising happened. I didn’t hear about Stonewall on the news or even learn about it later in my history class. It wasn’t until I was in college when, as a part of my own coming out process, I began to research the history of the gay rights movement and I learned more about the events at Stonewall, the people involved, and the movement that it created.

Five years after Stonewall, in 1974, Kathy Kozachenko became the first openly gay person elected to political office in the United States, winning a seat on the Ann Arbor City Council in Michigan. Three years later, in 1977, Harvey Milk was elected to the San Francisco City Council.

In 1986, I had the honor of winning election to County Board in Madison, WI. It was my first role in elected office, but I wasn’t the first. In fact, I was the third openly gay person to serve on the Dane County Board. I was really fortunate to have role models who had come before me.

In 1998, I became the first openly gay person elected to the U.S. House of Representatives as a nonincumbent, and in 2012, I became the first out member of the LGBTQ community to be elected to the U.S. Senate in its history.

I remember my early years in public office when there were only about two dozen or so activists who were out across the country. We would meet on an annual basis to discuss how we could work together to exchange ideas about legislation that would advance equality, and we talked about how we would help to expand our numbers at the local, State, and national levels. I am proud to say that, today, there are more than 700 out LGBT people who are serving in elected office across the United States.

All of these public servants bring their first-hand life experiences to the job, and they give the LGBTQ community a seat at the table of our local, State, and Federal Governmental bodies. Perhaps just as importantly, each of these public servants is a role model for the next generation. This is important progress, but we are not there yet. We have more work to do, and we must keep fighting to move our country forward.

Members of the LGBTQ community continue to experience bias in policing and are still at significant risk of violence and discrimination. According to the annual hate crimes report, which is published by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, LGBTQ individuals and, particularly, LGBT individuals of color continue to be the target of bias-motivated violence, but efforts to address this violence may be hindered by a continued lack of trust in law enforcement. At least 100 transgender people, including 37 black women of color, have been murdered in the United States since the beginning of 2015.

No LGBT person in the United States should have to live in fear of being the target of violence. In a majority of States in this country, LGBT Americans can still be fired, evicted from their homes, or denied services because of who they are or whom they love. Because there is no explicit, uniform Federal law protecting LGBT people from discrimination, both past and present, we are living in a world where too many Americans are at the mercy of an inadequate patchwork of State and local laws.

The House took a historic step forward last month when it passed the Equality Act. It is time for the Senate to do the same so that all LGBT Americans, no matter where they live, can finally have the freedom of full equality.

This week, I introduced a Senate resolution to honor the 50th anniversary of the Stonewall uprising. It is the first resolution in the U.S. Senate to recognize the story of Stonewall. This resolution commends the bravery, solidarity, and resiliency of the LGBTQ community in the face of violence and discrimination, both past and present. It also condemns violence and discrimination against members of the LGBTQ community and recommits to securing equality for LGBT people in our country. Stonewall is the story of those who came before us and let their voices be heard—of those who bravely stood up and spoke out so that others would not feel compelled to live in silence or invisibly or in secrecy.

When we look back at the Stonewall uprising and the activism that grew out of that moment, even the most basic progress seems as if it would take a revolution to achieve—so we had one. We should be proud of the enormous progress that we have made over the last 50 years. Let us remain inspired by the courage of this story, the story of Stonewall.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, Congress has no greater responsibility than providing for our national defense and keeping American citizens safe.

The National Defense Authorization Act is one of the most important pieces of legislation to be considered by the United States. It authorizes defense programs, systems, and resources that support the men and women who serve our country in the Armed Forces. For decades, it has been approved with strong, bipartisan support.

In my home State of Colorado, our military installations, including Fort Carson, the Air Force Academy, and Buckley, Peterson, and Schriever Air Force Bases, are on the cutting edge of readiness in protecting our national security. This legislation is foundational to our mission, their work, and our show of support for the military.

I thank Chairman INHOFE and Ranking Member REED for their bipartisan leadership on the Senate Armed Services Committee and on the floor. The tremendous responsibility of providing for our national defense cannot be overstated, and they have handled the process with respect and the seriousness that it deserves. The security of the United States should always be more important than any partisan politics, and I appreciate their commitment that they have placed on national defense above all else.

I also thank my colleagues for their bipartisan work on the National Defense Authorization Act. In working with them, I was able to achieve a number of great victories in amendments for Colorado and the Nation as well.

Senator SCHATZ and I have a bipartisan amendment that will improve the public alert system and allow military communities access to clean and safe drinking water, which was another
amendment that we were able to work on. I was able to work with Senator Toomey and Senator Van Hollen—Senators from both sides of the aisle—to impose sanctions on the murderous North Korean regime.

We will also vote today to support a bipartisan effort that I authored that will encourage the U.S. Congress to stand with the people of Hong Kong and their democratic values while we urge Hong Kong’s authorities to permanently withdraw their flawed extradition bill and support human rights in Hong Kong.

When one family member serves our country in uniform, the entire family serves. This legislation supports military families in Colorado and all over the world. It provides the largest pay increase in a decade for troops, and it continues to support military spouses. The NDAA addresses the challenges that service members and their families face when they live in privatized housing, and it expands resources to address the PFAS water contamination in many of our military communities. This is an issue of life and health, and it matters greatly to the people of Colorado and work to ensure that these base installations that are essential to both national security and Colorado communities, remain strong. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to vitiate the yeas and nays on the substitute amendment. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I and Senator Jack Reed be given such time as we shall consume prior to the vote that will take place.

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

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, in just a few minutes, the Senate will vote on the final passage of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2020.

Throughout the last week and a half, we have debated the legislation here on the Senate floor in a fair process. I thank my colleagues who have supported this bill and have helped to make sure that the amendment process. While I would have liked to have had more open amendments— and Senator Reed and I both wanted to have more amendments on the floor—we knew that there was a problem and that we could not just let it happen.

We are pleased that we will at least be able to clear the 93 amendments that we added on yesterday as part of the bipartisan substitute amendment in the manager’s package. These include the annual Intelligence Authorization Act, the Maritime Administration Authorization and Enhancement Act, and the Fentanyl Sanctions Act.

Ultimately, the job of the NDAA is to make tough choices about where we want to invest our resources. We put our resources where they matter—in taking care of our people, in implementing the national defense strategy, and in applying recommendations from the NDS Strategy Commission Report. This is something we have used as a blueprint, and it has been very successful in taking us through this process.

Everyone agrees there are things that are going to have to happen in order to rebuild our military. That is why our top line is $750 billion. Without that, we can’t achieve the goals that we all know are necessary. It also must happen as soon as possible. We can’t delay on this bill.

We still have more work to be done on the NDAA. We need to conference it. The Conference Committee can sometimes take a little bit of time. We know that is going to be done for us. We know that we want to get this thing done by our deadline, which would be October 1.

In the month of July, we have to do a lot of other things. We have to do annual appropriations bills. We have to do the budget deal. So these are some of our most important responsibilities.

We have to get them done, and here is why: Things are happening right now. Two days ago, MSG Michael B. Riley of Heilbronn, Germany, and SGT James G. Johnston of Trumburg, NY, lost their lives in Afghanistan while engaged in combat operations. It was tragic. Their service and sacrifice is a reminder of why this bill is so important. We have to make sure our troops have the very best of everything, and we are in the process of getting there with this bill.

Our prayers are with Master Sergeant Riley’s and Sergeant Johnston’s families and loved ones. We will never forget their service or their sacrifice that they made, reminding us that freedom is not free.

There is no doubt in my mind that the NDAA are about to pass will give our troops what they need, make American families safer, and enable to us stand up for democratic values around the world.

Let me single out and thank publicly the next speaker, the ranking member, Senator Reed, for being a partner in this. We stayed together on this. We had areas where we disagreed, but we got around those, we got things done, and the end result is a very good one.

I know Senator Reed is going to want to recognize, as I do, the significance of the staff we worked with and why that is so important. Of course, we want to make sure people know—you know, Senator Reed and I get a lot of credit for doing a lot of stuff that other people do. We truly appreciate these people.

Let me list some of them. First of all, John Bonsell and Liz King from my staff and from Senator Reed’s staff. They are the ones who really got involved in this, and, without them, it would have been almost impossible—along with other people.

We had John Wason, Tom Goffus, Stephanie Barna, Diem Salmon, Greg Laut, Markie Hornendes, Jared Wright, Adam Barker, Augusta Binns-Berkey, Al Edwards, Jackie Kerber, Sean O’Keefe, Tony Pankuch, Brad Patout, Jason Potter, J.R. Riordan, Katie Sut- ton, Eric Trager, Dustin Walker, Otis Winkler, Gwyneth Woolwine, Katie Magnus, Arthur Tellis, Leah Brewer, Debbie Chiarello, Gary Howard, Tyler Wilkinson, John Bryant, Patty-Jane Geller, Baher Iskander, Keri-Lynn Michalke, Jacqueline Modesett, and Soli Sykes. I have a few more so just relax for a minute.

I think the others are actually from the minority side, and I am sure Senator Reed is going to be recognizing them.

From my personal staff, Luke Holland, Andrew Forbes, Leacy Burke, Don Archer, Kyle Stewart, and Bryan Brody.

Lastly, from the floor staff, that is Laura Dove, Robert Duncan, Chris Tuck, Tony Hanagan, Katherine Kilroy, Brian Canfield, Abigail Baker, and Megan Mercer.
All these people worked hard. They are all a part of this team, and it certainly goes far beyond just Senator Reed and myself. I yield the floor to Senator Reed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to join Chairman INHOFE in support of the fiscal year 2020 Defense authorization bill. I thank the chairman for his great bipartisan leadership, thoughtful, sensible, and delivering what I think is an excellent piece of legislation.

It was based on thorough hearings, discussions, and debate on both sides of the aisle, and it came out of the committee with strong bipartisan support. I hope it enjoys that support on final passage.

As the chairman indicated, the bill provides for many different aspects that are necessary to our national defense. It provides a pay raise for the men and women of our Armed Forces who do so much for us. It includes over 30 provisions to address the privatized military housing crisis. It authorizes military construction in almost every State in this country. It provides funding and authorities for our military personnel on the frontlines and for those who are back in the United States building the ships and the tanks and advancing the technologies we need for the future fight.

This bill also contains numerous amendments from many of my colleagues, again, on both sides of the aisle, on other issues of great importance.

I urge all of my colleagues to join the chairman and me in supporting this excellent legislation.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 764

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 764, as modified and amended.

The amendment (No. 764), as modified, as amended, as agreed to, the PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title for the third time.

The bill (S. 1790), as amended, was ordered to be reported to the third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the cloture motion is withdrawn.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll. The roll is closed. The yeas and nays are agreed to, the question is on final passage.

I hope it enjoys that support on final passage.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in a future edition of the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for 10 minutes each.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. 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.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the escalating tensions between the United States and Iran, my concern about the administration’s current approach—a path that I am worried will lead us to war—and my support for the Udall amendment to the NDAA, which will be voted on tomorrow.

I believe that diplomatic efforts, in concert with our international partners, should be pursued immediately to avoid another unnecessary armed conflict in the Middle East.

Let me be clear. Iran is a dangerous and destabilizing force in the region. It supports terrorist proxies and meddles in the internal affairs of other states. Iran continues to pursue missile capabilities in violation of international norms and abuses the rights of its own people. Unfortunately, the administration’s chosen course of action with respect to Iran has isolated the United States from the international community and made it more difficult to collectively address these issues.

The administration’s actions and rhetoric related to Iran have created a credibility deficit. This is a fast-changing, dangerous situation, and it is clear that there is not a consensus within the international community with respect to Iran’s plans and intentions.

Given these disconnects, it is imperative for the administration to provide Congress with current, unvarnished intelligence so that we may reach substantiated conclusions.

Taking a step back, it is important to recount the actions that have precipitated the current state of affairs. Current tensions are an entirely predictable outcome of the administration’s ill-conceived approach to Iran.
Despite then-Candidate Trump's campaign rhetoric, I and others hoped that he would heed the advice of the advisers with respect to the Iran nuclear agreement, also known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, or the JCPOA.

For example, despite personal concerns about the JCPOA before it was signed, former Secretary of Defense Mattis told the Armed Services Committee that he believed it was in our national interest to remain in the JCPOA. General Dunford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, echoed these sentiments at the time and cautioned that, in his words, "the U.S. will incur damage vis-a-vis our allies if we unilaterally withdraw from the JCPOA. Our allies would be less likely to cooperate with us on future military action to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon and less likely to cooperate with us on countering other destabilizing aspects of Iranian behavior that collectively implicate our security."

The administration should have sought to work with the international community to address the challenges posed by Iran by building upon the foundation of the JCPOA rather than squandering that opportunity in favor of "putting Iran on notice" and other inflammatory rhetoric.

Just over a year ago, President Trump made the disastrous decision to unilaterally withdraw from the JCPOA and reimpose nuclear-related sanctions, in violation of previous U.S. commitments under the deal. Since withdrawing from the deal, the Trump administration has taken a series of additional escalatory actions, including the imposition of new sanctions on various aspects of the Iranian economy; cancellation of waivers that previously allowed importation of Iranian oil by China, India, Japan, South Korea, and Turkey; and the designation of the Iranian Revolutionary Guards Corps—often referred to as the IRGC—as a foreign terrorist organization.

The designation of a foreign government entity as a foreign terrorist organization is unprecedented, and it is not clear what purpose it served other than to unnecessarily raise tensions with Iran. As I learned during a recent visit to Iraq and Afghanistan, the IRGC designation has significantly complicated our relationships with foreign partners who described the action as provocative and destabilizing.

While the JCPOA was not a perfect deal, it was a necessary deal. It is important to remember that when the JCPOA was signed, Iran’s “breakout” timeline—the amount of time Iran would need to produce enough fissile material for a nuclear weapon—was only 2 to 3 months. Even by the most conservative estimates, the JCPOA stretched that timeline to more than a year.

By all accounts, the JCPOA has worked as intended. The JCPOA commits Iran to never seeking to develop a nuclear weapon, and effectively cuts off all pathways for Iran to achieve a nuclear weapon until at least 2030. The agreement dramatically reduced Iran's stockpile of enriched uranium and the number of installed centrifuges. It also prevented Iran from producing weapons-grade uranium and has subjected Iran to the most intrusive monitoring regime in the world to ensure it is living up to its commitments.

The JCPOA was appropriately built upon the concept of “distrust and verify,” and I support efforts by our European partners, as well as Russia and China, to preserve the JCPOA despite challenges the Trump administration has put in their way.

"I told the Armed Services Committee, "What General Dunford, in the absence of the JCPOA, Iran would likely resume its nuclear weapons program, and, in his words, “a nuclear-armed Iran would likely be more aggressive in its actions and more dangerous in its behavior.”"

Unfortunately, the administration’s withdrawal from the agreement and re-imposition of sanctions has left us isolated from our allies and partners while emboldening the hardliners in Iran.

In May of last year, subsequent to the decision to withdraw from the JCPOA, Secretary of State Pompeo articulated a set of 12 “demands” and indicated that “major changes” would need to be made by Iran before sanctions relief would be provided. The administration has sent mixed messages on whether its demands should be viewed as a set of preconditions for discussions on sanctions relief. The demands outlined by Secretary Pompeo are widely viewed as maximalist and leave little room for negotiation, especially given that the administration has already reneged on previous diplomatic commitments related to Iran’s nuclear program.

Without greater certainty by the administration on what specific actions would need to be taken by Iran to re-engage, I fear that Iran has little incentive to engage in negotiations.

Indeed, the administration has followed that initial set of 12 demands with a succession of orchestrated steps to force Iran into an ever-smaller corner that only serves to increase the odds of miscalculation and reduce diplomatic opportunities. The economic sanctions by the United States have left the Iranian economy reeling, with its gross domestic product shrinking by 5 percent and the inflation rate rising by 56 percent.

As part of this so-called “Maximum Pressure” campaign, the administration has just announced personal sanctions against Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei and other Iranian leadership. The Iranians have responded by indicating that these sanctions mean “the permanent closure of the doors of diplomacy.”

Rather than modifying its behavior, Iran has responded with threats and subsequent escalatory actions by increasing its malign activities in the region, including in Yemen and Syria, and announcing that it would stop complying with certain aspects of the JCPOA. If Iran follows through on these actions, as I fear it will, it is clear that the JCPOA and resume nuclear weapons development activities, the United States and the international community will be in a much less unified and therefore weaker negotiating position than we had leading up to the JCPOA.

As I assess the current state of affairs, I see four potential outcomes of the current approach being pursued by the administration.

First, Iran could bend to the will of the administration and announce its compliance with the so-called 12 demands laid out by Secretary Pompeo. However, Iran has a long history of struggle against outside forces. A notable example is the Iran-Iraq war of the 1980s. Additionally, Iranian capitulation would likely threaten its top priority: regime survival, so clearly this is an unrealistic outcome.

Second, Iran could remain in the JCPOA despite seeing little of the economic benefits promised by the deal and hope that a future U.S. administration would return to the agreement. Iran’s recent announcement that it would stop complying with aspects of the JCPOA is a signal that it views the current arrangement as unsustainable and is willing to abandon the JCPOA completely if its economic situation does not improve in the near term.

Third, Iran could agree to return to the negotiating table, seeking a reduction in sanctions and easing of sanctions. However, both the administration and Iranian leaders have made clear that they are not interested in such an approach.

In announcing the administration’s strategy for Iran last May, Secretary Pompeo stated that President Trump is “ready, willing, and able to negotiate a new deal” but also made clear that “we will not renegotiate the JCPOA itself.” On May 8, Iranian President Rouhani stated:

We are ready to negotiate, within the boundaries of JCPOA. . . . It is not us who left the negotiation table.

These seem to be irreconcilable positions, especially after the latest round of sanctions directed at the Iranian leadership.

Lastly and most significant, I believe, the current approach could result in a military conflict between the United States and Iran. The destruction of an American unmanned drone flying in international airspace by a missile fired from Iran is an example of the potential for widespread conflict. Only at the last minute did President
Trump call off a strike against the Iranian missile sites in retaliation. He concluded correctly that such a strike would be disproportionate. But the incident underscores the precarious position we are in after months of the misguided “Maximum Pressure” campaign is to prompt Iran to leave the JCPOA either officially or by gradually increasing its stock of highly enriched uranium or other aspects of its nuclear program. This could give advocates for a military strike on Iran increased leverage, with such a scenario of involvement in key strategic interests, military actions should be pursued only as a last resort and as part of a comprehensive strategy, thereby requiring the intervention of the international community. If such a scenario comes to pass, our recent efforts to deter Iran through the deployment of additional military capabilities to the region will have failed, and even a limited conflict would be very difficult to manage or to bring to a conclusion.

The President and others in the administration have consistently downplayed the potential costs of conflict with Iran. In fact, just yesterday, the President said that “if something should happen [with Iran], we’re in a very strong position. It wouldn’t last very long.” The President’s assessment is undercut by his own Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats, who told Congress earlier this year: Iran continues to develop and approve a range of new military capabilities to target U.S. and allied military assets in the region, including a ballistic missile capability, advanced naval mines, unmanned explosive boats, submarines and advanced torpedoes, and antiship and land-attack cruise missiles.

In this context, the President’s demonstrated willingness not just to bend the facts but to indulge, in certain cases, in fabrications is particularly concerning and unacceptable when it may come to deploying our troops into harm’s way. Congress has the responsibility to demand and, if necessary, challenge the basis for unsupported assertions of Iranian aggression and provocation that could be used to take this country to war.

Echelon—one of the themes used in the Bush administration’s justification for the 2003 Iraq war, Secretary of State Powell testified to the Senate in April that “there’s no doubt there is a connection between the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Sunni leadership of al-Qaeda, the al-Qaeda, Full stop.” And he refused to rule out the use of the 2001 AUMF as a means to conduct military action against Iran. While Iran is a state sponsor of terror, I am not aware of compelling evidence to suggest Iran or Iranian affiliated groups are an “associated force” of al-Qaeda for the purposes of the 2001 AUMF.

In fact, such an arrangement is hard to fathom, given the deep religious and ideological differences between the Shia leadership of Iran and the Sunni leadership of al-Qaeda. The administration must come to Congress if it seeks to pursue a military strike on Iran.

Likewise, any consideration of military action against Iran must fully account for the likely cost of such an engagement—in lives, resources, potential negative impact on the global economy, disruption of U.S.-Iranian relationships, and other unintended consequences. The administration must provide the American people with a clear-eyed assessment of what those costs may be in advance of any contemplated military engagement.

The Trump administration’s escalatory attacks may soon place Iran in an untenable position. As a result, Iran may seek to change the status quo by initiating a limited military conflict with U.S. forces, thereby requiring the intervention of the international community. If such a scenario comes to pass, our recent efforts to deter Iran through the deployment of additional military capabilities to the region will have failed, and even a limited conflict would be very difficult to manage or to bring to a conclusion.

The President and others in the administration have consistently downplayed the potential costs of conflict with Iran. In fact, just yesterday, the President said that “if something should happen [with Iran], we’re in a very strong position. It wouldn’t last very long.” The President’s assessment is undercut by his own Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats, who told Congress earlier this year: Iran continues to develop and approve a range of new military capabilities to target U.S. and allied military assets in the region, including a ballistic missile capability, advanced naval mines, unmanned explosive boats, submarines and advanced torpedoes, and antiship and land-attack cruise missiles.

In this context, the President’s demonstrated willingness not just to bend the facts but to indulge, in certain cases, in fabrications is particularly concerning and unacceptable when it may come to deploying our troops into harm’s way. Congress has the responsibility to demand and, if necessary, challenge the basis for unsupported assertions of Iranian aggression and provocation that could be used to take this country to war.

Echelon—one of the themes used in the Bush administration’s justification for the 2003 Iraq war, Secretary of State Powell testified to the Senate in April that “there’s no doubt there is a connection between the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Sunni leadership of al-Qaeda, the al-Qaeda, Full stop.” And he refused to rule out the use of the 2001 AUMF as a means to conduct military action against Iran. While Iran is a state sponsor of terror, I am not aware of compelling evidence to suggest Iran or Iranian affiliated groups are an “associated force” of al-Qaeda for the purposes of the 2001 AUMF. The combination of Iran’s known conventional and asymmetric capabilities should dispel any notion that conflict with Iran would be quick or could be won only through the use of U.S. air power. As former Secretary of Defense Robert Gates reportedly said in a recent speech: “If you think the war in Iraq was hard, an attack on Iran would, in my opinion, be a catastrophe. It’s become a facile to wage a series of terror attacks across the Middle East aimed at us and our friends, and dramatically worsen the situation in Iraq, Afghanistan, Lebanon, and elsewhere is hard to overestimate.”

All of the compliant military analysts I have engaged with believe that we cannot conduct a effective land campaign in Iran, and an extended air and sea campaign will undercut the priorities laid out in the national defense strategy, which places not on the Middle East but on Russia and China.

Absent the full mobilization of our Armed Forces and those of our allies, ground operations in Iran are simply beyond our capacity. The last ground war involving Iran, the Iran-Iraq war of the 1980s, resulted in the death of nearly 1 million troops, the majority of whom were Iranians who died fighting a superior Iraqi military during a brutal and prolonged conflict. There is clearly no widespread U.S. or international support for another such military engagement in the Middle East.

Considering the costs associated with ground operations, a more limited conflict involving a series of tit-for-tat actions is far more likely, with Iran utilizing its asymmetric advantages and proxies in response to U.S. precision and standoff strikes.

It is unlikely that U.S. deterrence could be quickly reestablished under such a scenario, and Iran may use the time to restart and expand its nuclear weapons efforts, thereby increasing its negotiating leverage and also making the situation much more volatile.

With war with Iran is inevitable. To date, the administration has tried to use every instrument of national power to get Iran to change its behavior—except diplomacy and negotiations. The administration’s ill-conceived approach has not worked, and the time has come to try real and sustained diplomacy, rather than relying on coercion.

I urge the President and those in the administration to take this moment of high tension to engage with our allies and partners with the goal of seeking a diplomatic solution to the current situation. In that context and in that spirit, I will support the Udall amendment tomorrow.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.
Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, the 116th Congress, so far, has just talked about the humanitarian crisis at the border. Most of our Democratic colleagues have claimed up to this point that there is no crisis or emergency at the border.

We will recall that we started out the year with a government shutdown because of the battle over border security, and our Democratic friends made one thing perfectly clear: They would oppose any effort to fund our security mission at the border. That resulted in the 35-day shutdown.

The Speaker of the House at the time called the situation a "fakely legal, in other words, no orderly immigration system at all—a free-for-all, where it is easier for human traffickers and drug smugglers to come and go as they please. And, of course, there is this: no consideration given for those who would-be immigrants who are trying to wait patiently in line and do things exactly the right way and no consideration of the unfairness of those who would jump ahead of the line and enter the country illegally—indeed, we are seeing migrants making this humanitarian crisis worse.

The House bill stands in stark contrast to the bipartisan agreement we passed here in the Senate, which funds a range of programs at the Federal departments and agencies working to manage the crisis, and, importantly, it is the only bill in town that has the support of the President. It is, after all, important to get the President’s signature on legislation for it to become law.

The Senate Appropriations Committee overwhelmingly supported this bill, and it passed the committee by a vote of 30 to 1. When the full Senate voted on it yesterday, only eight Members of the Senate voted no.

We have simply waited long enough. We waited too long, in my view, for Democrats to acknowledge this real humanitarian crisis. The House bill is inadequate and mostly a partisan effort.

Our Democratic colleagues have resisted acting for too long already, making this humanitarian crisis worse. They circulate the very tragic pictures of a father with his young child face down in the waters of the Rio Grande River, and they somehow fail to acknowledge their own complicity in failing to act to provide the sorts of fixes to our asylum laws that would deter, if not prevent, that sort of thing from occurring. And there really do need to look in the mirror.

We need to take action now, and I hope we don’t have to wait any longer for our colleagues in the House to pass the Senate’s bipartisan bill.
we saw the details of that deal in 2015, it quickly became clear that it was not much of a deal at all. If the goal is to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon—well, it obviously failed in that goal.

As the majority leader said at the time, it “appears to fall well short of the goal we all thought was trying to be achieved, which was that Iran would not be a nuclear state.”

Despite the restrictions it would impose, the AIPAC would leave Iran with a vast nuclear program and allow it to continue to conduct research and development on advanced centrifuges and building intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Perhaps worse, the nuclear deal would lift those restrictions in a decade. In other words, it was 2015 when the JCPOA was signed by the relevant parties. So by postponing Iran’s ability to develop a nuclear weapon, we are already waiting there almost to let it go. It is no wonder that then-Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu delivered an address to Congress in March of 2015 and said the JCPOA “doesn’t block Iran’s path to the bomb; it paves Iran’s path to the bomb.” That certainly seemed to be the way things were going to go.

We have seen that they are violating the nuclear deal and U.N. resolutions time after time, and it is clear that their resolve to create nuclear weapons remains their highest priority.

Just a year ago, President Trump announced the United States would pull out of the nuclear deal, a decision I strongly supported. Even at the time Secretary Kerry, the Secretary of State, admitted that the tens of billions of dollars the United States released to go to Iran would be used to fund their terrorist activities, he supported it nonetheless. He supported it even though it paved the way for Iran to get a nuclear weapon 10 years after the JCPOA was signed.

Since the Trump administration has withdrawn from the JCPOA, it has taken resolute action against Iran, including stronger sanctions on entities and individuals and the designation of the IRGC as a foreign terrorist organization, which it clearly is. Somehow, though, despite the unprompted attacks, flagrant violations of international agreements, and human rights violations, some of our friends on the left have turned against President Trump for his hard-line approach against Iran.

The President has opted for hard-hitting sanctions that I think are a good start. Those sanctions announced by the administration earlier this week represent an appropriate response to the Iranian escalation consistent with President Trump’s maximum pressure strategy on Iran. These sanctions will deny the Supreme Leader, the Supreme Leader’s office, and close affiliates access to resources they need to finance their rogue regime. There is no benefit—in the interest of peace—to applying weaker sanctions. The point of applying maximum pressure on Iran to change their behavior. The tentacles of the IRGC run deep into their economy, and these sanctions will prevent them from amassing even greater power to develop sophisticated weapons.

We have seen reports that the economic challenges they are encountering as a result of the sanctions already in place are making it harder for them to finance their terrorist operations through their proxies. The sanctions taken by Iran show that they are feeling the squeeze of these sanctions, and they know exactly what they need to do before they can get relief. As Secretary of State Pompeo said, “When the Iranian regime decides to forgo violence and meet our diplomacy with diplomacy, it knows how to reach us.”

I sincerely hope to see the day when the Iranian people can live without fear, when their government respects their citizens and international allies and lives by international norms and finally decides to forgo its nuclear weapons. Until that day comes, I hope our allies will stand with us in confronting the tyrants in Iran and doing everything in our power to push back against the world’s largest state sponsor of terror.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore of the Senate from Connecticut.

S. 1790

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, tomorrow this body faces an opportunity, in fact, an obligation to reassert its proper constitutional role in wakemaking.

I urge my colleagues to support the Udall-Kaine amendment, a provision to prohibit funding for unauthorized and unapproved military operations against Iran. No vote will be more important during this session than the one we are about to consider. The American people have already given us too much authority to the executive branch; that we are implicitly, if not directly and explicitly, approving an imperial presence. This amendment puts us to the test before the American people.

The Congress has a job to do. We should do that job tomorrow. We should insist that we have the authority and we have the obligation to consider whether there are military operations against Iran.

We can talk about policy. There is no question that Iran is a malign and treacherously bad actor in that part of the world. There is no doubt that it poses a clear and present danger to the world community. Iran may well have installed mines on the two tankers that were severely damaged recently and may well be the culprit in shooting down an American drone in the last few days, but the United States is on a perilous course. We are on a dangerous course toward continued escalation and possible miscalculation that may create a spiral of uncontrollable military responses.

It isn’t that we have a dangerous policy, it is that we have no policy, no strategy, no endgame articulated by the President of the United States or anyone in this administration. To resort to military action rather than reliance on diplomatic approaches is a recipe for potential disaster.

This unintended escalation could result from mere miscalculation or it could result from purposeful desire on one side or both sides among a small number of advisers or military leaders that there be a resort to kinetic activity, but we have, in the meantime, an opportunity to resort to diplomacy, to enlist our allies and partners. This situation is the result of our putting our country and our allies in an extraordinarily difficult position.

The current tensions with Iran today are the direct result of President
Trump’s ill-conceived policy toward Iran ever since he carelessly and recklessly discarded the Iran nuclear deal last year. His approach to foreign policy has been indecisive and chaotic, and that is partly the reason why tensions have escalated with an adversary rather than with a partner. The United States has not made it clear to Iran that the nuclear agreement is overdue and will prioritize families, ensure long-term quality assurance, and enhance accountability.

In the hearings held by the Armed Services Committee with military families who have experienced adverse health effects and financial burden from residing in hazardous housing, one point was absolutely clear: Our Nation is failing military families who already sacrifice so much and who have struggled to secure safe and livable conditions. The conditions, widespread and prevalent, are entirely unacceptable. I was heartbroken to hear much of this testimony from military families who already sacrifice so much and who have struggled to secure safe and livable conditions.

I visited some of the homes at the New London base, and I was struck by the mold, the repairs that were needed, the defects in appliances, and the complaints about lack of proper air-conditioning and heating. We owe our military families much better, and we owe law enforcement the support they need to crack down on fraudulent private contractors.

Let me be perfectly clear. A failure of the prohibition funding amendment we will consider tomorrow is not itself an authorization for the President to wage war with Iran. The Constitution trumps any statute. The Constitution requires action by Congress. Without congressional authorization and anything short of specific authority for declaration of war from Congress, starting or waging a war with Iran would be unconstitutional.

But the NDAA on the floor this week is an opportunity—in fact, a perfect opportunity—for Congress to reassert its constitutional authority over the role of the declaration of war. We must seize this moment. We can’t simply allow or rely on the outdated 2001 authorization for the use of military force. We cannot allow it to be so distorted and stretched and our constitutionality and authority to be disregarded. We have an obligation to conduct oversight continually and push back on an administration that makes false claims to advance its war-mongering agenda.

The NDAA we passed today gives us the authority to undertake our defense of the Nation.

S. 1790

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Let me begin by thanking Ranking Member JACK REED of Rhode Island and Chairman INHOFE of Oklahoma, as well as my other colleagues on the committee and my staff, who have worked tirelessly on this to include key elements of my proposal that are important to our military, as well as to our Nation.

This NDAA includes comprehensive reforms to the Military Housing Privatization Initiative. It changes military housing management from one that is overdue and will prioritize families, ensure long-term quality assurance, and enhance accountability.

In considering floor amendments to the NDAA, I want to highlight an amendment that I offered to improve equity in the post-9/11 GI bill benefit. Last July, the Pentagon issued a new policy on servicemembers’ ability to transfer unused education benefits to their family members. These new policies prevent servicemembers with more than 16 years of military service from transferring education benefits at the time that military servicemembers opt to transfer rather than when they become eligible. The Pentagon argues that these changes were made to ensure that the GI bill is ‘a key retention tool—all while breaking our promise to military families by moving the goalpost of transfer eligibility and exacerbating inequities in transferring educational benefits. Most notably, disqualifying servicemembers with more than 16 years of military services counterintuitively penalizes the men and women who have served this country in uniform.

My amendment would make the post-9/11 GI bill an earned benefit rather than a retention tool and ensure that all servicemembers who have completed 10 years of service in the armed services and Armed Forces are eligible to transfer their benefits to dependents at any time, both while serving on Active Duty and as a veteran.

Despite the passage of the NDAA and the need for this amendment continuing, I will continue to champion equitable education benefits for our military families.

This year’s NDAA makes important, unprecedented investments in the submarines, helicopters, and aircraft built in Connecticut. They are not only manned by Americans—a majority from my State—employing thousands of skilled workers vital to our defense industrial base—but they are also critical to our national security. They keep our country safe, and they make sure our Nation and our military have a fair fight.

I was proud to lead the fight for increased investment in those Virginia-class submarines. They are not only vital to our defense industrial base thanks to the unparalleled skills and unstinting dedication of our manufacturing workforce. Because of that workforce, we are able to build the best submarines and the best F-35s engines and other aircraft engines and helicopters in the world—not only through that skilled workforce and those major contractors but the workers at suppliers and contractors, who are equally vital.

Last year, we built two submarines. This year, there will be two more, with procurement for another major part of a submarine. As we begin accelerating production of those Virginia-class submarines, the New London Base must have the capacity to support increased submarine output. That is why I fought for $72.3 million to replace Pier 32 at Sub Base New London, ensuring a modern landing to accommodate multiple Virginia-class submarines.

Today’s efforts is a tribute to the leadership and the bipartisan efforts in...
this Congress. I thank and applaud my colleagues for coming together on behalf of our Nation’s defense, which is especially important in a time of disillusionment and seeming dysfunction for the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

REMEMBERING WILLIAM MODEN

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I rise today to honor an officer of the Colorado State Patrol whose watch tragically came to an end earlier this month when he was killed in the line of duty.

On June 14, 2019, Trooper William Moden was responding to an accident that occurred on I-70 in Deer Trail, CO. He was doing what he did every day—responding to an incident and giving a helping hand to Coloradans in need. He was assisting the passengers of a vehicle who were involved in a crash—one of whom was an 18-month-old child—when he was struck by a passing vehicle.

Like too many of our Nation’s law enforcement officers, Trooper Moden gave his life while protecting and serving others.

William Moden was 37 years old and had served in the Colorado State Patrol for 12 years. His fellow troopers remember him as someone whose uniform was always perfect and whose boots were always polished. There is no doubt for any of them that he was meant to serve and that he did so with the utmost honor and dignity.

While Trooper Moden carried out his duties with seriousness, his friends and loved ones remember him as someone with a tremendous sense of humor. At a memorial service held last week, he was described as having an infectious laugh—a laugh that was usually the loudest in the room. Many of the service remembered the time he put on a dog’s shock collar just to see how it looked in the eyes of the malnourished girl who was on the brink of death in Yemen—one of more than 85,000 children to have succumbed to hunger during Saudi Arabia’s disastrous bombing campaign. Yet the photo I have brought to the floor today has shaken me to the core as a father, as a grandfather, as a son of immigrants, and above all else, as an American.

Like the other photographs I mentioned, this one tells a story too. This one speaks an ugly truth, and that truth is that President Trump’s cruel, inhumane, and un-American border policies have failed. They have failed to make us safer. They have failed to reduce migration to our border. They have also failed to live up to the American values that define our leadership around the world.

We will never forget this heartbreaking photo. More importantly, we will not forget the names of Oscar Alberto Martinez and his 23-month-old daughter, Valeria. They drowned in a desperate attempt to claim asylum in the United States.

We will never forget this heartrending photo. More importantly, we will not forget the names of Oscar Alberto Martinez and his 23-month-old daughter, Valeria. They drowned in a desperate attempt to claim asylum in the United States.

Oscar, Valeria, and Tania, her mother, fled El Salvador in the hopes of seeking asylum in the United States. The Washington Post reported:

They traveled more than 1,000 miles seeking it... But the farthest the family got was an international bridge in Matamoros, Mexico. On Sunday, they were told the bridge was closed and that they should return Monday. Aid workers told The Post the line to get across the bridge was hundreds long.

The young family was desperate. Standing on the Mexican side of the Rio Grande, America looked within reach. Martinez and Valeria waded in. But before they all made it to the other side, the river waters pulled the 25-year-old and his daughter under and swept them away.

Later, when Mexican authorities recovered their bodies, Oscar and Valeria were still clinging to each other.

Here in the United States, it is hard to imagine what kind of desperate conditions would propel you to flee your home and embark on a perilous journey in search of protection from a foreign nation.

Most of these families who arrive at our border come from Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras—three countries that are collectively known as the Northern Triangle. It is a region that is plagued by transnational gang violence, weak institutions, and poverty. Young boys are forced into servitude by gangs. Young girls are beaten and raped if they refuse to become their girlfriends. Parents who try to protect their children end up being killed. These countries are among the most dangerous in the world. In El Salvador, a woman is murdered every 19 hours, and in Honduras—the country with the highest homicide rate in the world for women—a woman is killed every 16 hours.

To be blunt, these families face an impossible choice. It is either stay and die or flee for a chance to live. For them, if this horrific and tragic photograph does anything, I hope it dispels us of the ludicrous notion that you can deter desperate families from fleeing their homes in search of safety. That is how the Trump administration describes its cruel policies at the border—deterrence.

In the name of deterrence, it is tearing children and babies away from their mothers and fathers. In the name of deterrence, it is shutting down ports of entry encouraging migrant families to seek more dangerous methods of getting into the United States, like crossing the Rio Grande. In the name of deterrence, children are being housed in unsanitary conditions, which leaves infants in dirty diapers and children without soap or toothpaste.

Let me share with our colleagues just a few of the statements that the children who have been kept in these abhorrent conditions have made:

Said one 8-year-old boy:

They took us away from our grandmother, and now we are all alone. They have not
given us to our mother. We have been here for a long time. I have to take care of my little sister. She is very sad because she misses our mother and grandmother very much. . . . We slept on the floor. There were two mats in the room, but the big kids sleep on the mats, so we have to sleep on the cement bench.

Consider the words of a 16-year-old girl:

We slept on mats on the floor, and they gave us aluminum blankets. They took our baby’s diapers, baby formula, and all of our belongings. Our clothes were still wet, and we were cold, so we got sick. . . . I have been in the U.S. for 6 days, and I have never been offered a shower or been able to brush my teeth. There is no soap, and our clothes are dirty. They have never been washed.

Finally, here are the words of a 17-year-old mother:

I was given a blanket and a mattress, but then, at 3 a.m., the guards took the blanket and mattress. My baby was left sleeping on the floor. In fact, almost every night, the guards wake us at 3 a.m. and take away our sleeping mattresses and blankets. . . . They leave babies, even little babies of 2 or 3 months, sleeping on the cold floor. For me, because I am so pregnant, sleeping on the floor is very painful for my back and hips. I think the guards act this way to punish us.

This is not the America I knew. President Trump wants us to forget who we are. This administration wants us to believe that if the Government of the United States is cruel enough, that if it denies those who seek asylum all semblances of humanity, that if we ignore basic standards of child welfare, and that if we abandon fundamental American values like respect for human rights, then desperate families who flee Central America will stop coming here.

It is not true. The entire doctrine of deterrence is grounded in hideous lies, beginning with the lie the President has fed the people from the moment he launched his campaign in 2015—the lie that immigrants are a threat to our security. President Trump has cast immigrants as criminals and rapists and drug dealers when the truth is that these migrants are the ones who are fleeing the criminals, the rapists, and the drug dealers.

I am sick and tired of these lies, like when the President repeatedly says he inherited the policy of family separation from the Obama administration. That is a lie. The Trump administration masterminded this despicable policy, pure and simple.

These policies are not working. They have done nothing to stem the tide of families who seek asylum in the United States. They have done nothing to stabilize Central America and to alleviate the conditions that force families to flee for their lives.

It is time to turn the page. There are so many alternatives to detention that are available to the DHS that are far more humane and far less costly to the taxpayers.

Consider the Obama administration’s pilot program known as the family case management system. It established procedures to treat migrant families humanely as their cases moved forward. Pregnant women, nursing mothers, or mothers with young children were given caseworkers who helped to educate them on their rights and their responsibilities. They were connected to community resources or to family in the country who could help them.

According to an inspector general’s report, the program was an enormous success. Of the cases tracked, 99 percent showed up for their hearings, oh, no. Evidently, that was not good enough for the Trump administration, for it was far more humane and far less costly to the taxpayers.

Beyond exercising alternatives to mass detention, we must ramp up humanitarian assistance at the border. That is why I voted yesterday for the House’s emergency supplemental bill, which would provide desperately needed support to organizations and would better ensure the humane treatment of children who are in CBP custody.

The House bill included strong guardrails to prevent this White House from using these funds to pursue its draconian detention practices and mass deportation agenda. While the Senate bill fell short in these areas, I hope the administration uses whatever money it receives in this bill to improve the conditions that are driving families to flee Central America in the first place. Instead, he has cut off aid to the Northern Triangle and has undermined critical U.S. efforts to work with Central American governments to crack down on gang violence, strengthen the rule of law, and alleviate poverty.

These programs were working, and the Trump administration knows it. Why do I say that? In recent years, Congress has not only increased funding for foreign assistance to Central America, but it has required these governments to meet clear benchmarks in exchange for additional funding. It has sent Congress not one, not two, but nine different reports that have certified these benchmarks have been met.

Here is just one of them that has been signed by Secretary of State Mike Pompeo:

I hereby certify that the central government of El Salvador is informing its citizens of the dangers of the journey to the southern border of the United States; combating human smuggling and trafficking; improving border security, including preventing illegal migration, human smuggling and trafficking, and trafficking of illicit drugs and other contraband; and cooperating with the United States Government agencies and other governments in the region to facilitate the repatriation of illegal migrants arriving at the southwest border of the United States who do not qualify for asylum consistent with international law.

This one is dated August 11, 2018. There are nine certifications by the Secretary of State saying that the programs we had going on and working in Central America were, in fact, working.

But we all know this President has no respect for facts or evidence-based reality. His decision to punish Central American governments for the migration crisis by slashing aid is only making the crisis worse. It absolutely makes no sense.

If we want to reduce migration from Central America, we need a bold strategy to address the root causes driving families in fear from their home. That is why my colleagues and I have introduced the Central America Reform and Enforcement Act. Our bill would dramatically expand U.S. engagement in Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala through proven programs that help strengthen the rule of law, combat violence, and build prosperity. Our bill would also minimize border crossings by expanding refugee processing centers in the region in an effort to reduce demand at the border, and, finally, it includes several measures to protect the welfare of children and ensure efficient, fair, and timely processing of asylum seekers.

Now, this administration may wish the Northern Triangle’s serious problems would just go away, but the longer we let these conditions fester, the greater this migration crisis will become.

There is a very real possibility that President Trump views a growing crisis at the border as an asset in his path to reelection in 2020. The President believes his best shot at winning elections is to stoke fear of migrant children who pose no threat but desperately need the safe embrace of Lady Liberty.

After all, President Trump cannot claim he is solving the student loan debt crisis or providing Americans with better, cheaper healthcare, or making sure that big corporations pay their fair share. He has failed on all these fronts and more. The only play left in the Trump playbook is to blame immigration, instead of solving America’s problems.

That is what I call the politics of hate. The politics of hate is what led
President Trump to attempt to ban Muslims from traveling to the United States. The politics of hate is what led President Trump to end DACA and threaten 800,000 Dreamers with deportation to countries they have never called home. The politics of hate is what led people through no choice of their own were brought to the United States, the only country they have ever pledged allegiance to is the United States and to the flag of the United States. The only nation they know is the Star Spangled Banner. The only place they have ever called home is America.

The politics of hate is what led President Trump to attack TPS holders and jealously guard the doors of paradise to American-born children. The politics of hate is what led the administration to forcibly separate nearly 2,800 children from their parents—and maybe thousands more, because they don’t even have a record-keeping system of where all of these children are. That is a policy that will forever be a stain on our history.

The politics of hate is what led President Trump to try to get his plan to send ICE agents into our communities to terrorize our towns and cities with mass arrests and mass deportations. It is a plan that would leave millions of U.S.-born American citizen children wondering if they would ever come to pick me up at school or why dad never made it home for dinner. It is a plan that would inflict traumatic and irreparable harm on American children who would not only have to reckon with the loss of a parent but the loss of the income provided by that parent. The politics of hate led to the remain-in-Mexico policy, which forces asylum seekers to remain in Mexico amid dangerous conditions.

Indeed, just yesterday, U.S. asylum officers requested that the courts block the Trump administration from requiring migrants to stay in Mexico, stating it is “fundamentally contrary to the moral fabric of our Nation and our international domestic legal obligations.”

Now, in the latest action, I fear it is the politics of hate that explain the awful press reports we heard today suggesting that President Trump plans to end a program that protects undocumented members of U.S. military families from deportation. Imagine that—someone who wears the uniform of the United States, who may serve halfway around the world in service to the Nation, who risks their lives, and now you are going to take the one program that put their mind at ease—that their spouse or child, who may be undocumented in the country and had the ability to stay because of that member’s service, and now you are going to say you are going to deport their children, their spouse.

Well, if someone is willing to wear the uniform of the United States, pledge allegiance to our flag, and risk their life to defend this Nation in battle, the last thing we ought to do is to deport their loved ones.

The Trump administration’s policies at our border have brought us nothing but chaos, despair, and shame. We cannot let the politics of fear and hate degrade the values that make America great.

We cannot walk off our country from the strife gripping Central America. We cannot tweet our way out of this problem. We must lead our way out of this problem with real solutions and strategies that bring sanity, dignity, and order back to our border and prevent the kind of human rights abuses we saw earlier this week on the banks of the Rio Grande. We are just better than this. We are just better than this.

If my colleagues do not raise their voices, then, they are complicit to this. History will judge us poorly.

I hope we will have bipartisan voices who say: This is not who we are; this is not what we stand for. And we can work toward making sure this tragic photograph never happens again.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I was coming to floor today to talk about legislation we just got passed in the last week in the Homeland Security Appropriations Committee. I can convince some of my colleagues to join us in this effort, and I will talk about that bill in a moment. But first let me, if I could, address the photograph and the comments from my colleague from New Jersey.

He showed a tragic photograph that so many of my constituents and all Americans have seen—Oscar Alberto Martinez Ramirez and his daughter Valeria, facedown in the Rio Grande.

This man came from El Salvador. We don’t know all the details yet, but clearly he was interested in coming to the United States and applying for asylum, as so many others have come—hundreds a day, thousands a week, hundreds of thousands a month now, overwhelming the infrastructure at the border, pulling 40 to 60 percent of our Border Patrol off the border to deal with the humanitarian crisis that has occurred.

That tragic photograph—and it is a horrific photo of a daughter clinging to her father’s neck, having drowned in the Rio Grande coming over from Mexico—should be a wake-up call. I agree with that, but it should not be a wake-up call to have us continue to point fingers around the at the other side and blame someone else for the problem. It should instead be a wake-up call for solutions—for bipartisan solutions—because that is all that works to be able to resolve these issues.

I hope that first step will be taken today, because I just learned, as I came to the floor, that the House of Representatives is now considering taking up the legislation we passed here in the Senate just yesterday. It provides immediate emergency funds for humanitarian assistance at the border that is needed right now. We passed it with over 80 votes here in the Senate—82 votes, with 9 of our Members absent. I believe. Over 82 votes is very unusual for anything to happen here, particularly something so substantial.

It is bipartisan. It came out of the Appropriations Committee with a 30-to-1 vote to get these funds and these resources down to the border now to help with this true humanitarian crisis that we are facing. Everyone must acknowledge that.

The House was balking at that. They were sending us another bill that had some partisan elements to it that no Republican could support in the House—not a single one.

Finally, I think they have decided to pick up our bipartisan bill and pass it, and thank God, because now the President can sign it and that aid can go down to our border immediately where it is needed.

But I have to be frank with you. That humanitarian aid going down to the border is not enough because I don’t think it would have had an impact on the tragic photograph that was talked about on the floor earlier.

That incident did not occur because of the lack of humanitarian aid that is badly needed. That incident occurred because there is this pull factor to come to our country, particularly from these Northern Triangle countries—Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador. This particular gentleman, Oscar Alberto Martinez Ramirez, came from El Salvador.

Then, there are push factors from those countries. And, again, this is causing so many families to come here, so many unaccompanied children to come here from these three countries in Central America.

The traffickers are telling them: If you come to America and you ask for asylum, you will be let in.

Let’s be frank. These countries are countries that have real challenges and real problems.

My colleague from New Jersey is right. We have sent a lot of American taxpayer dollars down to those countries, and he noted that the reports back from the administration and others are positive, saying it is beginning to make a difference to take away this funding that is now being reduced or even eliminated in some cases, but it was during the time when that funding was there that the people started coming.

So, yes, we should have more funding that is effective for those countries. I agree with that. The Millennium Challenge Corporation funding is the new way we send that funding. It is more effective because it says: What are you doing in Central America to improve your infrastructure, your education, your judicial system, your rule of law, and to fight corruption? We need to do all those things.
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But let’s be frank. Let’s be honest. We have been doing that, and yet the push factor is still there.

So I believe it is part of the answer, but I don’t think logic applied to this situation means that you could say that is all of the answer because we have been doing that.

My taxpayers and other taxpayers, I think, around this country are willing to do more, but they also want to deal with the pull factor, and the pull factor is very simple. If you come to America and you apply for asylum right now, with the system being overwhelmed and with certain laws in place, including a court decision, you are released into the community, meaning you come into America. Most of the court cases that deal with whether you are successful or not in your asylum claim take over 2 years now. It takes over 2 years until you are before a judge for a hearing.

When those court cases occur, we are told in the Homeland Security Committee, that about 15 percent of those individuals are granted asylum—15 percent.

Now, in America, our wages are 10 to 20 times higher than they are in these Northern Triangle countries—El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras. Is it any wonder that they come here seeking a better way of life? No, you would too. But we have to have a system of laws here in this country where, yes, we accept people who have claims of asylum that are granted, but we don’t have open borders.

We have a system here, a system of laws, and it has clearly broken down now. Again, thousands come in every week; hundreds of thousands every month—mostly families, mostly children because of the way our laws work. I don’t think we should be separating families, by the way. So, if you have a child and you are a child, under a court decision you could be held only for a short period of time, 20 days maximum, in emergency situations. What happens is that people are released into the community.

I will be frank with you. From what we have heard from Customs and Border Protection and from the Department of Health and Human Services, which are responsible for many of these detention facilities, they are so overwhelmed, they don’t even have room for 20 days, so people are allowed to come into the community. Again, the court cases happen a long time after that, and people are granted work permits. That is why people are coming. It is a pull. They are saying: If you get to America, we will get you in.

These traffickers are charging a lot of money. It is horrible. They are taking mortgages on people’s homes. They are saying “We will take half your pay for the next year,” promising things that are frankly beyond what can be accomplished.

A situation in Ohio occurred a couple years ago with kids from Guatemala. Unaccompanied kids coming from Guatemala were told: You can get in. It is good. We will take care of you. In this case, the traffickers took mortgages on the parents’ homes. They brought these kids to the United States, to the Department of Health and Human Services, the Office of Refugee Resettlement. They were then sent out to sponsor families, which is what they do. They take these minor children, underaged, and send them to sponsor families. Sometimes they can find families; sometimes they cannot. If the government cannot send these kids back to the traffickers because the traffickers applied for asylum, the kids had brought up from Guatemala.

Despite claims and promises to their parents that they would get a good education with a family taking care of these kids, do you know what they did with these kids? They put them in an egg farm in Ohio—underage kids—and exploited them. They took their property. I think this is what we would find acceptable for any member of our family. They had them living in trailers, some of them under trailers, on mattresses without sheets, working 12 hours a day. Some of these kids worked 6 days, some 7 days a week. This is not America. Yet this was happening. Again, our system is broken. These traffickers were exploiting these children.

Finally, in this case, law enforcement and the Office of Refugee Resettlement have been able to indict and convict the traffickers. Thank goodness. But this is not a situation that can or should continue.

In the tragic photo of the story I just told, the answer is not politically pointing fingers. Blaming Donald Trump isn’t going to solve this problem. We need as a body to change the laws. We need as a body to provide more effective aid to those countries. That is true. The push factors and the pull factors both need to be addressed.

But if we just play politics with this on both sides, we will have more unnecessary deaths. We will have more tragic situations.

Again, I had planned to come and talk about something else, and I will, briefly. But I must say, with regard to this immigration challenge we face as a country, I hope the tragedy we have now all seen online and on TV serves as a wake-up call to get to bipartisan solutions, that we can or should continue. But if we just play politics with this on both sides, we will have more unnecessary deaths. We will have more tragic situations.

Today there is a start. Today there is a start with the humanitarian aid package. Thank goodness.

Tomorrow we need to get to work to talk about these bigger problems. I will say, I have worked on this with some of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I read the words today from my colleague from New Jersey about refugee processing centers. I think that is part of the answer. In the Obama administration, you could apply for refugee status from your country—El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras—and not come to the border. The refugee criteria is almost identical to the criteria for asylum. The United Nations does this all over the world. I agree, that is a better and more humanitarian way.

Let’s have these processing centers in the Northern Triangle countries. Let’s have one in Mexico, maybe one in Mexico at the southern border with Guatemala, maybe one at the northern border of the United States. Let’s have that deal with this processing problem. Let’s determine who is qualified, who has a legitimate fear of persecution. Again, 15 percent of them are now being granted. The other 85 percent are not. For the others, we have to say: You can apply to come to the United States as everybody else does, from Mexico, from the Philippines, from India, from countries in Africa, and we need to continue to be a generous country with regard to immigration. But we have to have a system of laws, and we have to stop these tragedies where people are being told by traffickers: You can make this journey to the north. It will be fine.

It is not fine. It is arduous, it is dangerous, and you see the results.

The trafficking that is going on of girls and women is all part of this too. It is not going to stop unless we as a group here in Congress, on a bipartisan basis, deal not just with the push factors but also the pull factors and deal with them realistically.

NONPROFIT SECURITY GRANT

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, the legislation I came to the floor to talk about today passed in the Homeland Security Committee last week to help make our synagogues, our churches, our mosques, and other nonprofit institutions safer.

Sadly, we have seen a troubling pattern in recent years. Hate-fueled attacks at houses of worship and religious institutions, not just in our country but around the world, are becoming more and more common. A couple of months ago, a shooting at a synagogue outside San Diego took the life of Lori Gilbert Kaye, who heroically sacrificed herself to save her rabbi. Exactly 6 months to the day prior to that, the shooting at the Tree of Life synagogue outside Pittsburgh, PA, claimed 11 lives, the worst act of anti-Semitic violence in U.S. history.

Sometimes this hate is manifested in other ways: bomb threats at the Jewish Community Center in Columbus, OH, and anti-Semitic graffiti sprayed on the Hebrew Union College walls in my hometown of Cincinnati, OH.

Right after the attacks on the synagogue in Pittsburgh last year, I went to the Jewish Community Center in Youngstown, OH, only 60 miles away from Pittsburgh. I met with Jewish community leaders. An attack on one is an attack on all. We must all stand up.
In Youngstown that somber day, we talked about where we go from here to stop anti-Semitism and hatred. I asked them for input about what the Federal Government can do to help keep the Jewish community safe. Part of the input I got was that we need more help on best practices and more resources to protect our community centers, our schools, our churches, our synagogues, our mosques.

The resurgence of this anti-Semitism must be confronted and defeated with all the tools we can bring to bear. But sadly, it is not just related to the Jewish community, which has known it for over the centuries. Hate seldom stops at one religion or one country.

Hundreds of Christians in Sri Lanka were massacred in churches and hotels on Easter Sunday. In New Zealand, the shooting at the mosques in Christchurch killed at least 49 people. We will never forget the 2015 tragic killings of African-American parishioners at the AME Church in Charleston, SC, where I have visited and prayed, or the 2017 attacks on the First Baptist Church in Sutherland Springs, TX.

While I have highlighted unconscionable mass murders, there are so many other examples of vandalism and harassment. We saw this in my home State of Ohio this February, where a man holding a gun smashed the windows of a mosque in Dayton while worshipers prayed inside. We saw it in Louisiana this April when three historically Black churches were deliberately burned down within the same parish. This violence is senseless and contrary to our values as Americans.

Our first obligation as Americans and certainly as public officials is to stand up and say this must stop. Stop the hate—not just partisan finger-pointing but a single, unified message. Targeted communities cannot stop it on their own. We must remind all of our fellow citizens that we are all made in the image of God, and the anti-Semitism, the hatred, and the violence are not acceptable in this country.

Sadly, if these trends are any indication, we also have to recognize these attacks are likely to continue, and I think Congress can and should do more to provide synagogues, mosques, churches, and other faith-based organizations with best practices and more resources to secure their facilities and to train personnel.

Based in part on the input I received in Youngstown that sad day, I have been the leading supporter of the Nonprofit Security Grant Program. This grant program allows nonprofits, including synagogues and other faith-based organizations, to apply for funds they can use to access best practices to secure their facilities and to train personnel.

Some good news came out recently. Under the new Department of Homeland Security rules, nonprofits are now permitted to hire armed security personnel with these funds. That is something I had promoted. I think it is a good idea because it is needed. Last year, I led a bipartisan letter with Senator CASEY to push for a total of $60 million for the program nationwide. I am happy to say that funding level was incorporated in our final Homeland Security Appropriations bill.

This year, I am working with my colleagues to actually authorize this program to be sure it will be there in the future and to increase the amount of funding to $75 million so that nonprofits outside of the largest urban areas—which are currently being served through the initial program—also have access to this funding. Unfortunately, in a lot of instances I talked about earlier, it was not in major urban centers. So it is being spread well beyond our big cities.

To support that effort, my colleague Senator GARY PETERS and I have introduced bipartisan legislation called the Nonprofit Security Grant Program from Terrorism Act to provide best practices and more funding for hardening vulnerable nonprofits and faith-based institutions and for training resources for those congregations.

The bill authorizes $75 million annually for the next 5 years, $50 million to be used by nonprofits located within high-risk, large urban areas, and the rest will be available for nonprofits in other areas.

I am pleased to report that the Homeland Security Committee unanimously approved this bill last week. I look forward to the floor, where I hope it can be passed on a bipartisan basis. While our bill is pending, I hope my colleagues in the Appropriations Committee will once again be receptive to the letter and spirit of our bill to make those resources available to urban and nonurban alike.

I will continue to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ensure that the thousands of religious and other nonprofit institutions in Ohio and everywhere are safe and welcoming places. I pray we will see the day when such security grants are not necessary because we will abide by the admonition to love our neighbors as ourselves. But in the meantime, let’s do whatever we can to give our communities the know-how, the resources, and the best practices so they can be safer and more secure.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

FISCAL CHALLENGES

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio for his outstanding comments on faith-based security and the immigration crisis that we are facing and the solutions he suggested. We have a lot of work to do there.

Now you get to hear from the accountant.

I come to the floor today to call attention to the Federal Government’s unsustainable fiscal outlook.

Yesterday in the Senate Budget Committee we had a hearing on fixing our broken budget and spending process, with a focus on securing our country’s fiscal future. Our witness was the Comptroller General of the United States, the head of the Government Accountability Office.

In April of this year, GAO issued its third annual update on the nation’s fiscal health. The report concluded that the Federal Government is on an unsustainable fiscal path.

A Congressional Budget Office report released this week on the long-term budget outlook painted a similarly bleak picture, noting that our surging Federal debt is putting our Nation at risk of a “fiscal crisis.” This is one of the charts we got to see. I know it is pretty hard for people to read. We are figuring out a way to make this bigger.

The impact will be tremendous. It shows that, in 2019, Social Security spending will pass the $1 trillion mark for the first time. In 2021, the highway trust fund will be unable to meet all obligations. In 2022, the discretionary spending caps will expire, allowing unlimited spending. In 2025, the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation multiemployer fund will be depleted. It will be insufficient to pay full benefits to insolvent pension plans. In 2025, CBO projects the net interest spending will surpass the spending on national defense. In 2026, the Medicare hospital insurance trust fund will be depleted. With some incoming revenue, it will be sufficient to pay 91 percent of hospital-related Medicare spending, which is already forced to be low.

In 2030, the net interest spending will exceed $1 trillion annually. The interest will exceed $1 trillion annually. In 2031, mandatory spending and interest will consume all Federal revenue. It means we will not get to make any decisions on anything that isn’t mandatory, which we don’t get to make decisions on right now.

In 2032, the Social Security trust fund will be depleted. The amount of money coming in that will be paid out right away will only pay 77 percent of the scheduled benefits. I will cover that more later.

Those are a few of the fiscal cliffs we are facing that could be solved now, that have to be solved now. If they are solved now, they have simpler, less painful problems than if we wait until the cliff gets here.

The Federal Government is swimming in a sea of red ink that threatens to drown America’s future generations. If current laws don’t change, debt as a percentage of GDP will soar to unprecedented levels over the next 30 years.

Let me repeat that. If current laws don’t change, debt as a percentage of GDP—that is production—will soar to unprecedented levels over the next 30 years. By 2030, our debt-to-GDP ratio—this is debt-to-production—will surpass the historical records set in the aftermath of World War II. By 2049, debt will stand at 144 percent of GDP.
That is how bond investors determine the likelihood of getting their money back. Interest rates reflect that fact and go up as risk increases. As that percentage goes up, the risk increases.

The amount we have to pay to borrow any money will go up, if people still loan us money, which gets us to what is on the chart.

In 2030, net interest will exceed $1 trillion a year annually. That is not buying anything; that is paying the interest.

In most of the Nation’s history, we have only seen periods of high spending and debt during wars and other emergencies, and the increase has been temporary, but today’s fiscal situation is different.

We are facing a demographic fiscal storm. For decades, nonpartisan experts, including the Congressional Budget Office and the Government Accountability Office, have warned of the budget pressures that we would face as baby boomers aged and began to retire. We heard yesterday from the GAO that, on average, more than 10,000 people per day turn 65 years of age, and in the next few years, that number will rise to more than 11,000. Here is a little chart of how those thousands per day grow.

Some of us were under the impression, I think, that the baby boomers eventually would die. That is kind of an inevitable sort of thing. What we didn’t count on was the extra longevity that everybody will have and the fact that there are other generations coming up. So the chart does not tail off here on the end. The chart continues to grow, even though the birth rate is down.

The combination of aging population, longer lifespans, and rising per-beneficiary costs has put enormous pressure on our spending.

According to the CBO, the projected explosion in debt we will see over the next few decades and beyond occurs because of mandatory spending—particularly Social Security and Medicare—plus health care costs, which increases pressure on our health care.

This autospent money—spending that is never looked at—has already grown from about 36 percent of the Federal budget 50 years ago to 70 percent today. If left unchecked, CBO projects more than 80 cents of every dollar the government spends will be on mandatory spending, guaranteed to be spent without further approval, not to mention the interest by the Treasury.

Because mandatory spending operates on autopilot, not subject to the annual appropriations process, it often escapes congressional scrutiny and proper oversight. It would be one thing if mandatory spending programs by-passed the appropriations process because they were fully funded through their own dedicated source of revenue, but that is not the case.

As this chart shows, many of the largest mandatory programs, such as Medicaid and food stamps, don’t have their own source of funding and instead rely entirely on money from the Treasury’s general fund. You can see the blue here. That is money that will be spent on those programs that has to be spent to meet the obligations. On some of these, you will note that there is no blue at all. That means this is coming out of the general fund, which is where we expect to be able to make the deficit reductions that allow us to do other things we do. So there is enough spent right here on excess that doesn’t have a source of revenue that forces everything else we do to be borrowed, and I already mentioned the problems of borrowing.

Even though some of these programs do collect some revenue—and a few of them do collect their own revenue—they often spend more than they take in. It didn’t used to be the case. We used to think that the Congress funded these programs and paying into Social Security than were receiving Social Security, and there used to be a huge surplus, which we spent and then put as bonds in the drawer. We are now drawing down on those bonds, even though there is no real money to back them up, but that is about to be depleted as well.

Over the next 10 years, CBO projects that Social Security spending will total $14.4 trillion, but the program’s dedicated tax revenues will only cover $11.8 trillion of that. That is $14.4 trillion going out and $11.8 trillion coming in. You can’t do that very long.

CBO projects that under current law, Social Security’s combined trust funds would be exhausted through 2022. You may say: That is a long time into the future, 2032. Yes, that is 3 years earlier than the Social Security trustees estimated just earlier this year. How many times can we have that acceleration by 3 years before we are at the cliff?

Total Medicare spending will amount to $11.5 trillion over the next 10 years, but the program just collects $6 trillion in dedicated taxes and premiums—again, $11.5 trillion going out and $6 trillion coming in.

CBO and the Medicare trustees both projected Medicare’s Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, which covers inpatient hospital services, hospice care, emergency services, and skilled nursing home services, will be depleted in 2026. Spending on military and civilian retirement programs will total nearly $2 trillion, but Federal employees’ contributions toward their pension will only be $70 billion. I don’t like that word “trillion.” It is kind of hard to wrap your head around it. Billions are tough enough, but $2 trillion is $2,000 billion. That is what is going out, $2,000 billion. What is coming in is $70 billion. There is a little bit of a gap. Just as federal programs, this difference will be made up with general fund revenues, which today are all borrowed funds.

Social Security and Medicare are supposed to be different though. Under current law, once their respective trust funds are exhausted, those programs will still pay out money, but they will only be able to pay out as much in benefits as they have coming in. At that point, the Government Accountability Office that, for Medicare, that means only being able to pay 91 cents on the dollar for hospital-related Medicare spending. How long do you think doctors will put up with that? How many hospitals will that put out of business? For Social Security, revenue is projected to be sufficient to cover only 77 percent of scheduled benefits. Who on Social Security will be able to afford a cut of 23 percent? That is the fiscal cliff.

Of course, this shouldn’t be news to lawmakers. For years, the warnings that these programs are on an unsustainable fiscal course have gone largely unheeded, hoping that the next Congress or the next President will deal with this imbalance. Well, that next generation would be more willing to deal with the problem.

To be clear, I want to make sure Social Security and Medicare are able to continue providing benefits to current beneficiaries, as well as those who may need these programs in the future. That will require us to work together in a bipartisan manner to ensure these programs’ solvency. If we don’t make changes to the way these programs currently operate, on the current trajectory the future will just be out of luck. There are levers that can be pulled on these. If any one is pulled, it would be a tragedy to whomsoever it affects. If they are all pulled, it is less noticeable but still noticeable based on how long it is before we ever reach a solution on these problems.

Ignoring the problem will not make it go away and, in this case, the opposite is true. The longer we wait to address this imbalance, the more severe the changes will need to be, and we will have fewer options.

We need to change the way we do things around here. Too often we wait to make the difficult decisions that everyone knows has to be made until we have a crisis on our hands. In the Budget Committee, we are focused on trying to put together bipartisan budget process reform proposals that will help us confront these thorny fiscal issues in a more reasoned, timely, and responsible way.

I am hopeful we will get there. I am encouraged with the conversations we have had that we will get there. These issues are too important to ignore, and we are going to need to work together if we are to put our people in a more sustainable fiscal course. We owe it to future generations to try.

We have handled some crises around here. Recently, we handled one of national disasters. The national disasters don’t have a crisis on our hands—they should be a part of the budget caps, but they don’t have to be a part of the budget
is somewhere around six to seven times the size of Walmart and runs its business by the seat of its pants, in the sense that we have not done a budget that we have appropriated in nearly 20 years.

If you listened closely, you know we have some hard deadlines. The chairman referred to it as cliffs. Well, sometimes that is so figurative that you don't believe it is going to happen or that it is going to be real. These are things we are going to have to contend with.

When the Medicare fund is depleted fully in 2026, benefits get cut immediately. Social Security is farther down the trail, and there are going to be all kinds of issues. We are lucky, currently, that other countries and our own citizens will lend us money when we run trillion-dollar deficits routinely.

He mentioned the "Penny Plan." In any business, if you were charged with fixing your company's problems by cutting back by either freezing expenses by a 1-percent cut or a 2-percent cut, that would be done easily because you have hard accountability. If you would perform in a business or a State government the same way we do here, I can guarantee you there wouldn't be a lender that would let you perpetuate and keep doing it. The fact that we have a credit card that we can put it on year after year eliminates the accountability that you have there.

I was on a school board for 10 years. I was in State government in Indiana, where we always have a cash balance and operate in the black and have a balanced budget. Even though we do that so routinely there, we passed a balanced budget amendment to our State constitution simply because government, even in a place like Indiana, oftentimes views how they spend the people's money different, and this place does it better than any other place in the country.

So do we want to get to the point where we deplete the Medicare trust fund and where we run out of funds to pay pensioners or do we want to make the hard decisions?

It is funny. When I got here, I looked at the budget process. Budgets, even though they are not adhered to, might be a resolution, and it is not the law. Always, even if they do incorporate something you have anywhere else, that is qualified.

Well, again, in the real world, if you are running at a 20-percent loss on your P&L, you do not have the luxury to wait 6, 7, 8, 9, or 10 years to fix it.

I ask the American public to hold their Senators accountable and their congressmen, because this time, unlike in 2008, which we all know was bad enough, the main people holding the bag will be retirees and the elderly who depend on government for healthcare, and individuals who depend on healthcare who are not well to do, and on the government for healthcare, and individuals who depend on the government for their Senators accountable and their servicemen and service women in the Armed Forces.

Senator Brownback, which talks about fiscal conservatism—got on that bill. I would hope that the American public hold their representative so that we don't hit the cliff and go over it and pay the consequences, which will be dear.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks while seated.

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

TRIBUTE TO GARY WOODLAND

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, while my remarks in front of me say "I rise today," I sit today on this Senate floor to congratulate a Topeka, KS, native, a 2019 U.S. Open champion, Gary Woodland.

Gary Woodland grew up in Topeka and attended Shawnee Heights High School. After high school, he attended Washburn University on a full basketball scholarship before transferring to the University of Kansas to join the golf team. This U.S. Open was the first major championship victory of Gary Woodland's career and Gary made history by becoming the first graduate of the University of Kansas to ever win a PGA major tournament.

Gary's performance at Pebble Beach was truly elite. He scored under par in all four rounds, including an impressive 6-under-par 65 in the second round. On Sunday's final round, Gary battled the elements and a late surge by last year's U.S. Open champion, Brooks Koepka. On hole 16, Gary sunk a long birdie putt to solidify his win at 13 strokes under par, 1 stroke better than Tiger Woods' historic 2000 U.S. Open victory at Pebble Beach.

I congratulate Gary on this historic win, but I also recognize his actions off the course. Gary is an advocate for Special Olympics and also partners with Folds of Honor, a nonprofit organization that grants scholarships to family members of U.S. servicemen. Gary even wore patriotic golf gear to honor our troops and Folds of Honor.

The final round also coincides with Father's Day, and this undoubtedly made this championship even more significant as Gary's father watched him sink the final putt on 18. Gary said, after his win, that his dad worked nights so he could pursue his love of sports and spend time with him during the day.

I recognize Gary, but I also want to recognize the entire Woodland family—
his parents, Dana and Linda; his wife, Gabby; his son, Jaxson; and the twin girls they are expecting. This is a tremendous achievement.

Kansans are extremely proud of you, Gary. We wish you and your family the best of luck moving forward, and we will continue to pray for your success.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks on the floor, Senator Brown resume his remarks.

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

PUBLIC SERVICE FREEDOM TO NEGOTIATE ACT

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, conservative, right-wing forces in our country are engaged in an all-out assault on working people. Their target? Private and public sector workers and the unions who fight on their behalf. While private sector unions at least have some protections under the National Labor Relations Act, public employees have been historically forced to rely on Supreme Court precedent to protect their basic rights.

That is why the Court’s decision last year in Janus was so damaging. In one fell swoop, the Court overturned more than 40 years of precedent from the Abood decision and barred public sector unions from collecting fair share fees from employees who opted out of the union but whom the union is still legally required to represent.

The Supreme Court’s decision in Janus was not unexpected. Its decision was the culmination of decades-long efforts by groups like the Federalist Society and the Heritage Foundation to undermine settled precedent in Abood in order to weaken public sector unions. These groups worked methodically to achieve their goals.

First, they all but invited a challenge to Abood when he wrote his decision in Knox v. SEIU Local 100 and Harris v. Quinn. He called the justification for allowing a union to collect fair share fees “an anomaly.” He said “the Abood Court’s analysis is questionable on several grounds” and laid out the grounds as he saw them for someone to bring a case to overturn Abood.

This was an open invitation to conservative groups to then go looking for a plaintiff to do just that—to create an opportunity for the Supreme Court to overturn Abood. They funded Friedrichs v. California Teachers Association, which was fast-tracked to the Supreme Court in 2016, where “the signaler,” Justice Alito, awaited the case. Public employee unions received a temporary reprieve in a deadlock 4-to-4 decision because of Justice Antonin Scalia’s unexpected death.

The west coast interest then saw a huge opportunity to fill the vacancy with a Justice to their liking. From applauding Senator McConnell’s single-handedly blocking the nomination of Merrick Garland to spending millions to confirm Neil Gorsuch, they wanted a Justice who was on their side.

They got it in Neil Gorsuch, who delivered the decisive fifth vote in Janus, torpedoing 41 years of precedent under the pretext of protecting “fundamental free speech rights.” Justice Elena Kagan saw right through this argument. In a strong dissent, she said: “The majority overthrows a decision entrenched in this Nation’s law... for over 40 years... and it does so by weakly ramming it down the throat of the American people, in a way that unleashes judges, now and in the future, to intervene in economic and regulatory policy.”

Undermining public employee unions, and, in fact, all unions has gained momentum because of the narrow conservative majority on the Supreme Court. With this narrow majority, we are likely to see a lot more 5-to-4 decisions on ideological, partisan lines. This is not good for the country and not good for the credibility of the Court. We need a Supreme Court that strives to achieve consensus as often as possible, not one pursuing a hard-right ideological agenda.

In the face of these onslaughts from the Supreme Court and conservative interests, unions are fighting back. We have seen tens of thousands of teachers taking to the streets in cities and States across the country demanding and in many cases securing more in-class sizes, class sizes, and a living wage for teachers.

In the year since Janus, public sector employee unions like AFSCME are adding thousands of new dues-paying members energized to fight back against the conservative assault on unions even more.

Our public employee unions are doing their job to stay in the fight and Congress needs to do its part. That is why I joined 35 of my Senate colleagues and 27 of my House colleagues this week to introduce the Public Service Freedom to Negotiate Act of 2019.

This legislation affirms to all 17.3 million public sector workers nationwide that we value their service to the public and that we are fighting to protect their voice in the workplace.

Our bill codifies the right of public employees to organize, act concertedly, and bargain collectively in States that currently do not afford these basic rights.

Under our legislation, States have wide flexibility to write and administer their own labor laws, provided they meet the standards established in this legislation, and it will not preempt laws in States that substantially meet or exceed this standard.

The right to organize shouldn’t depend on whether or not your State has robust worker protections, like the State of Hawaii, and workers shouldn’t be held captive to the pro-union bent of the Roberts Five on the Supreme Court.

The fight to protect the right to organize is not an abstract issue. Unions have lifted people into the middle class, especially women and people of color. I speak from personal experience. When I was a young child, my mother worked for years in low-wage jobs that provided no job security, no healthcare, and no stability. We lived paycheck to paycheck. That all changed when my mother and her coworkers organized and formed a union. That union happens to be the CWA.

Unionization brought job and economic security to their family. Our public employee unions are fighting on behalf of millions of people across our country who are serving our communities. They are our teachers, our firefighters, social workers, EMTs, and our police officers. They are us.

These are not normal times. We all need to come together to fight back against an all-out assault on working people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I want to first of all thank Senator Hirono for introducing one of the most important bills this session. It is all about collective bargaining rights. It is all about workers’ voices being heard and all about the dignity of work.

Just last week I was with Senator Hirono with a number of her constituents from her State, and they talked to me about the support for manufacturing or especially her support for workers. I was particularly pleased when she mentioned the Communications Workers of America. I have staff with me on the floor—some of my Ohio staff, including my State director, who came out of the CWA. I know how important workers’ rights are. So I thank Senator Hirono for introducing this bill. If we did nothing this session but pass that legislation, it would be a huge victory for workers.

Unfortunately, we have a Supreme Court that puts its thumb on the scales of justice in every case, choosing corporations over workers, choosing Wall Street over consumers, choosing, in far too many cases, health insurance companies over sick people. And today’s Supreme Court case is aimed at targeting directly at States like mine, Ohio, a State that is a swing State and has 12 Republican House Members, 4 Democratic House Members, and has had that same configuration of 12 and 4 for 4 State elections because of redistricting. But it is no surprise, with the Supreme Court deciding that they were
going to put their thumb on the scale of justice again, against voting rights, against civil rights. That is what has happened in support of corporate money.

So dark money has affected the special-interest Supreme Court. We have never seen a Supreme Court in my lifetime that is this beholden to corporate interests, that is this beholden to billionaire contributors, that is this beholden to special interests. We have never seen a Court like this.

What does this mean? It means that instead of citizens choosing their elected officials, it is politicians choosing whom they represent. That is why you get these districts that will stay 12-to-4 Republican, where voters have no real say in these elections because of the way it is lined up.

We have a Supreme Court that is hostile to voting rights, hostile to worker rights, hostile to women’s rights, hostile to LGBTQ rights. That is what this Supreme Court has given us, as Senator McConnell, in his office down the hall, continues to push judges like this who don’t look toward the public interest. They are always looking toward rewarding their billionaire contributors.

Again, I thank Senator Hirono for her work.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 386

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act, an important and bipartisan piece of legislation on which I have been a proud sponsor and on which I have been proud to work with Senator Harris to bring this bill to fruition.

It has been many years in the making, and I am pleased to stand behind this legislation and to push it forward. There is no question that immigration is one of the most important and also politically fraught and politically charged issues in front of Congress right now. More often than not, we can’t even seem to agree on what the problems in our immigration system are, let alone come to an agreement about how best to solve them.

That makes it all the more important for us at least to come together to get something done in those areas where we can find common ground and do so across party lines on issues that are neither Republican or Democratic, neither liberal or conservative, but that are simply American issues that are central to who we are.

We are great as a country not because of who we are but because of what we do, because of the fact that we choose freedom, we choose to be welcoming, and choose to be that shining city on the hill, where anyone can come into this country, be born or immigrate into this country as a poor person, and hope and have the reasonable expectation that one day, if they work hard and play by the rules, they might have the opportunity to retire comfortably, in some cases wealthy.

We have to find common ground in these areas. The Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act is an important point of common ground.

Employment-based immigration visas—the one significant area of our immigration system based on skills and based on merit—are currently issued in accordance with rigid, arbitrary, antiquated, and outdated per-country quotas. This means that in a given year, immigrants from any one given country cannot, in most cases, be given more than 7 percent of the total number of visas allocated. As a result of this, immigrants from nations with large populations have significantly longer wait times to get a green card than do immigrants from smaller countries. In some cases, they could be stuck in a backlog of green card petitions for decades.

This makes no sense. This is arbitrary. It is capricious. It is unfair. It is un-American. It is not what we do. This is one of the many features of our current immigration code that are outdated and that need to be cast into the dustbin of history. These per-country visa caps cause serious problems for good people, for American businesses and American workers alike, and they cause unfair, undue, and immense hardship for the immigrants who happen to be unfortunate enough to be stuck in that very backlog.

While employment-based green cards are supposed to go to immigrants with high skills who will help grow the American economy, the per-country caps distort this system by causing some immigrants to wait years before receiving a green card for a reason that may be entirely arbitrary and completely detached from their qualifications. This undermines our ability to bring the best and the brightest individuals to our country. It is to our harm, and it is to our own shame.

Further, the per-country caps force the immigrants that are stuck in this backlog—95 percent of whom are already inside the United States—to make the difficult choice between, on the one hand, starting a brand new life and waiting decades for a green card, or on the other hand, leaving and taking their talents to a country that provides a fairer process for allocating legal immigrant status as a worker.

The Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act would accomplish, and that is exactly what this bill is all about.

Without the per-country caps, our skills-based green card system would operate on a first-come, first-serve basis, ensuring that immigrants are admitted into the United States purely based on merit rather than on the arbitrary, outdated, unreasonable basis of their country of origin. This, after all, is what the American dream has often been about. It is about who we are as a people rather than where our parents came from, who they were, what they looked like, and what language they might have spoken.

This reform would also ensure that the hardships caused by decades-long wait times would be eliminated.

Importantly, the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act also contains critical safeguards to ensure that the transition from the per-country cap system to a first-come, first-served system would occur smoothly and without unduly disrupting existing immigration flows. Specifically, this bill includes a 3-year set-aside of green cards for immigrants who are not in the backlog to ensure that they can continue to enter the country as we process backlog petitions.

In addition, the bill contains an important “do no harm” provision to make certain that green card applicants who are at the front of the line now will stay at the front of the line and not be faced with new delays as we work through the backlog during this transition process. These provisions will ensure that we are truly treating all immigrants in the employment-based system fairly.
For many years, this critical legislation was stalled because of the concerns of some Members that any reform to the employment-based visa system should be accompanied by new protections against fraud and abuse in the H–1B program. To address those concerns, this Congress, I negotiated an amendment to the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act with Senator Grassley to include new protections for American workers in how we process applications for H–1B visas.

The amendment negotiated with Senator Grassley does three things: First, the Grassley amendment would strengthen the Department of Labor's ability to investigate and enforce labor condition application requirements. In addition, it would reform the labor condition application process to ensure complete and adequate disclosure of information regarding the employer's H–1B hiring practices. Finally, it would close loopholes by which employers could evade the law and undermine the annual cap on H–1B workers.

Importantly, the Grassley amendment—like the underlying bill itself—consists of provisions that have long enjoyed support from Members of this body and from every point along the ideological spectrum. They are drawn from an H–1B reform bill that has been championed by Senator Grassley and by Senator Durbin. I am grateful that Senator Grassley was willing to come to the table and work in good faith on achieving a reasonable compromise on this bill. I believe the deal we have struck is a fair and evenhanded way to address longstanding concerns about our H–1B system while eliminating country-of-origin discrimination in how we allocate skills-based green cards.

The reason the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act enjoys such broad support is that it enjoys bipartisan support. It is because it does not include any of the typical partisan poison pills and other controversial provisions that so often undermine and in many cases doom other immigration reform efforts. This is a narrow, surgical reform—one that is necessary, one that is palatable, and one that is long overdue.

I would like to conclude by thanking Senator Harris, who has been an indefatigable partner with me on this bill. I have been proud to work side by side with her to eliminate the country-of-origin discrimination and bring about a system of fairness in how we allocate employment-based green cards.

This is an important and, indeed, essential immigration law and one that has been a long time coming.

Mr. President, I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary is discharged from further consideration of S. 386 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I ask unanimous consent that the Grassley amendment at the desk be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. Paul. Reserving the right to object, I have offered a modest compromise amendment to this legislation. I stand ready and open to negotiate and discuss this. We have often discussed it in private and in public. I will object until we can get to negotiating terms, and we can hopefully pass this bill once we enter into a dialogue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. Lee. Mr. President, I approach with great sadness and disappointment the response just brought about by my distinguished colleague, my friend, the junior Senator from Kentucky, who has a great deal of respect for him. The fact that he and I have worked on so many issues side by side together in order to improve government makes this not easier but makes it more difficult.

The junior Senator from Kentucky, refers themselves born of a genuine desire to improve our immigration system. But alas, the reforms he has proposed are not, in my view, consistent in any way with the scope of this bill, nor are they compatible with something that can reasonably pass through this body. That is one of the reasons I have introduced the legislation as I have.

I worked on this nearly the entirety of the 8½ years I have had the opportunity and great privilege to serve the people of Utah in the Senate. This is by far the closest we have ever come to having a deal, and we achieved that deal by keeping this bill focused on the very things this legislation deals with. The suggestions that Senator Paul has made, while born of great concern for our country and a noble degree of commitment to serving the people of his State, are not themselves compatible with the scope of this legislation, nor are they compatible with what would likely be passed by this body.

We have an opportunity right now to pass this. This could pass this body right now. I find it greatly distressing to my colleague and my friend has chosen not to allow this to pass this body today. This is something that could and should and otherwise would pass this body today without that objection.

I would respectfully but with all the urgency I am capable of communicating implore my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, to reconsider his objection and allow this to pass.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 883 TO S. 1790

Mr. Udall. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up Udall amendment No. 883.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico (Mr. Udall), for himself and others, proposes an amendment numbered 883 to S. 1790, as amended.

Mr. Udall. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment, as amended, is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit unauthorized military operations in or against Iran)

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.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. Udall. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak on my amendment.

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

Mr. Udall. Mr. President, I rise to respond to some of the criticisms of the Udall amendment that I believe are misleading and deserve a response.

To start, I want to point out an area of agreement. The opposition says our amendment is simple, and it agrees on its intent—that this amendment would prohibit a war with Iran without there being congressional approval, and that is what the vote is about. The arguments from those in the opposition mislead to avoid that simple truth.

They are trying to create excuses for why we should ignore the Constitution and open the door to war with Iran without having a vote. President
Trump has said he was 10 minutes away from doing just that. Here is some of what we have heard. Critics say we only have one Commander in Chief, not 535, and so we should not pass this amendment.

We only have one Commander in Chief, but the Commander in Chief executes wars. Only Congress can declare them. Our Founders made that decision for good reason. Dictators and Kings and dictators and democracies don’t. In our democracy, the people decide whether we go to war or whether we don’t go to war through their elected representatives. Congress is the most direct voice of the people.

Once war has been declared, then it is up to one Commander in Chief to execute that war. The people of New Mexico did not send me here to be a battalion commander or a general, and I have no intention of acting like one. The people of New Mexico sent me here to do my constitutional duty, and article I, section 8 vests the power of the purse in Congress.

As former Governor of New Mexico, I was most directly responsible for the people of New Mexico, and I have no intention of acting like a Governor. The people of New Mexico did not send me here to do my constitutional duty, and article I, section 8 vests the power of the purse in Congress.

I am confused as to what he is referring to. Our amendment does not include a separate definition of “self-defense.” Our amendment expressly states that it does not restrict the use of United States Armed Forces to defend against attack.” This language does not mention change the Department of Defense’s rules of engagement that guide how to exercise our inherent right of self-defense. The DOD does not require a unit to absorb an attack before it can defend itself, and neither does it provide a full debate and vote on military action.

The only restriction in the amendment is that the President cannot enter into hostilities without having congressional approval. It is a restriction on the President in order to limit his power. If the Republicans are proposing to do away with that restriction, I agree with my colleague Senator MERKLEY that they must come to the floor and propose a constitutional amendment to do so.

Our forces in Iraq, Bahrain, and other locations in the Middle East are fully capable and empowered to defend themselves, and this amendment does not affect that. Unfortunately, the opposition is just repeating itself, trying to get Congress to abdicate its own constitutional duty.

We have also heard criticism that this amendment is “appeasing the Ayatollahs” and represents “weakness” and that we must allow the President to act in order to protect our nation. We have heard these kinds of arguments before. They were very common in the run up to the disastrous Iraq War. Do not question the arguments for war. To do so is to be weak. I could not disagree more.

Our Constitution is our strength, and this amendment simply reaffirms our Constitution in the face of a President who is threatening to flout it. Our Nation is strong when we are united. We do not need to give up congressional authority over war and peace to one man, the President, in order to be strong.

Congress has authorized military action before, and when majorities believe that the circumstances warrant it, Congress will do so again. If we fear Iran so much that we are willing to walk away from the constitutional requirements to authorize military action, that would be the real sign of weakness.

We have also heard that we cannot rely on Congress to authorize force if we need it to. We heard that Congress can barely name a post office. So how can we trust it with this kind of decision? What if Congress is out of town and cannot vote?

First, it is disappointing to hear Members of the Senate speak so cynically about our duty during a debate as important as this. The Congress does not function perfectly. That is very true. Yet history is clear that Congress has authorized military force many times in the past. I have supported some of its decisions, and we had debates and votes. Only recently has the 2001 authorization been so abused to authorize military action all over the globe—far beyond the al-Qaida and Afghanistan mission that Congress thought it was voting on.

Congress, though, has had these debates and has voted, and those decisions represent our national decisions. I see no reason to turn our back on our Constitution just because Iran is a regional threat and this administration has manufactured a crisis to exacerbate that threat.

If there is a national security crisis that requires Congress to vote on military force, we have to come to Washington and do our jobs. Maybe we will even have a vote on Friday. Congress voted after Pearl Harbor, and Congress voted after 9/11. Both were in the middle of national crises. Our troops will be the ones making real sacrifices. We can bear the cost of some inconvenient recess travel. Our job is to debate and vote on matters of war and peace—period, end of story.

We have also heard that the Department of Defense is opposed to our amendment.

Yesterday, Mr. John Rood, the Under Secretary for Policy at the Department of Defense, sent a letter to the leaders of the Armed Services Committee in its opposition to our amendment. The letter is short, and while it contains speculation and rhetoric, it includes no legal analysis and fails to address the plain language of the amendment or longstanding DOD authority or rules of engagement.

I am disappointed in the letter, but it should not be a surprise from a political appointee from the Trump administration, not when the President is openly declaring that he needs no authority from Congress to launch a war against Iran. The letter reads that the amendment “purports to limit the President’s authority in discharging his responsibility as Commander in Chief,” which is simply false.

The amendment straightforwardly affirms the constitutional authority of Congress to authorize military action—authority that the President is openly flouting in his public comments.

Congress authorizes military action against Iran, the Commander in Chief would be free to execute it.

The letter asserts, without evidence, that our amendment will embolden Iran. I hope we are not so weak that we think our Constitution emboldens Iran.

Overall, the letter cites nothing—the Constitution, no law, no DOD policy, no legal analysis, nothing—in support of its claims.

This letter from DOD, which lacks a competent Secretary, is a disingenuous disingenuous proposition, but it should not be read as any authoritative take on this amendment, its intent, or its effect.

Some have said that this amendment would block the United States from helping Israel defend itself from an Iranian attack. I support Israel’s right to defend itself, and this argument does not hold up.

First, this amendment has no impact on our ongoing security assistance and cooperation with Israel, including the recent MOU signed with Israel by President Obama.

Second, if Israel is attacked, there is nothing in this amendment that would prohibit the United States from coming to its aid with defensive measures.

Third, if Israel is attacked and the United States wants to send our military to engage in direct hostilities, we are going to need to debate and authorize any response in Congress. That is simply what the Constitution says.

If Congress authorizes military attacks on Israel, according to one Israeli Cabinet Minister last month, is the escalating tension between the United States and Iran.

The best thing we can do to protect Israel is diplomacy to stop a broader regional war in the Middle East. If the United States does go to war with Iran, Israel is likely to face very serious threats, and that is something we should take seriously if we consider the use of force.

Israel’s Energy Minister Yuval Steinitz said in May that “things are heating up” in the Persian Gulf. He said:

If there’s some sort of confrontation between Iran and the United States, between Iran and its neighbors, I’m not ruling out the possibility of a regional war in the Middle East. If the United States goes to war with Iran, Israel is likely to face very serious threats, and that is something we should take seriously if we consider the use of force.

So the threats to Israel from Iran only make it more important that we have a full debate and vote on military action, not less important.
Again, the purpose of our amendment is simple: The President is threatening to launch military action against Iran without authorization, publicly flouting Congress. This amendment says that we are not going to go into an unauthorized war with Iran.

If the President and Members of this body think we need to take military action against Iran, then let’s have that debate and let’s vote.

The Udall amendment ensures we follow the constitutional process. To do otherwise is to be in dereliction of our constitutional duty.

Mr. ROMNEY. Will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a question?

Mr. UDALL. The Senator from New Mexico yields the floor.

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the perspective and sincere thoughts and ideas coming from my good friend from New Mexico.

The Senator indicated that those who are running for office are trying to create excuses for why we should ignore the Constitution.

I would note that in my remarks this morning I noted specifically that this is not an authorization to use military force against Iran or anyone else. It is a statement of continued commitment to our national defense, and, precisely, it is saying that under the Constitution only Congress may declare war. That is something I said specifically.

But the Senator goes on to note—he says that the only Congress—specifically, his words are ‘‘ignore the Constitution, open the door to war with Iran without a vote.’’

President Trump has said he was 10 minutes away from doing just that. Is the Senator saying that if the President were to do what he was contemplating, and that is to take out missile batteries with the potential of the loss of life of as many as 150, but also it could be with a prewarning, with no loss of life, that taking out missile batteries that have fired upon an American aircraft—unnamed American aircraft—if he were to have done that in response to their shooting down an aircraft in international airspace, that constitutes going to war and would have required a vote of Congress to authorize shooting down or attacking missile batteries that have fired rockets at an American airship?

I am referring to the Senator’s comment accurately, and I will read the entire point.

The Senator said: ‘‘They are trying to create excuses for why we should ignore the Constitution and open the door to war with Iran without a vote.’’

President Trump has said that he was 10 minutes away from doing just that. So in the Senator’s view, is responding in a very limited manner, as he was contemplating, taking out missile batteries potentially—which would have constituted going to war and required the vote of Congress?

That is my question, because I believe that is not the case. I believe the President has the constitutional authority and duty to respond, if necessary, in an appropriate way to return fire on the very batteries that have shot down an American aircraft.

I yield the floor.

TRIBUTE TO BLAIR BREITTSCHNEIDER

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to tell you about two young women from Chicago.

They made together that has helped to transform the lives of hundreds of other young women.

Domitira Nahishakilye moved with her family from the African nation of Burundi to Chicago in 2007. Three years later, she found herself overwhelmed. At 18, she was attending high school, trying to prepare for college, and caring for her three younger siblings.

The Senator said: ‘‘They are trying to create excuses for why we should ignore the Constitution.’’

I am referring to the Senator’s comment accurately, and I will read the entire point.

The processes of assimilating language and culture were lifted as these amazing young women came together and shared their struggles and joys.

In helping young women refugees to thrive in their new home, Blair Brettschneider is following in the footsteps of another great Chicagoan. In 1889, Jane Addams founded Hull House on the Near West Side of Chicago. It was one of America’s first settlement houses, where new citizens could acquire domestic and job skills and learn about American Government and customs. For her work with Hull House and other social justice causes, Jane Addams became the first American woman ever to receive the Nobel Peace Prize.

GirlForward is a new version of Hull House.

In July, Blair will be leaving GirlForward. Fortunately, she leaves the GirlForward programs in Chicagoland and in Austin in strong shape.

On behalf of the hundreds of young women whose lives GirlForward has helped enrich and transform and the hundreds of young women who will follow them, I want to thank Blair Brettschneider for her remarkable work and wish her all the best in her new efforts.

Again, the purpose of our amendment is simple: The President is threatening to launch military action against Iran without authorization, publicly flouting Congress. This amendment says that we are not going to go into an unauthorized war with Iran.

If the President and Members of this body think we need to take military action against Iran, then let’s have that debate and let’s vote.

On behalf of the hundreds of young women whose lives GirlForward has helped enrich and transform and the hundreds of young women who will follow them, I want to thank Blair Brettschneider for her remarkable work and wish her all the best in her new efforts.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss Senate amendment No. 861, offered by our colleague from Utah.

The author of the amendment, Senator ROMNEY, and others have made clear that this language does not constitute an authorization of the use of military force, or AUMF. I agree with their assessment.

While this amendment appears to restate existing Presidential authority to defend the country in the event of an attack, it includes other language that could be interpreted to provide more authority to the President. That concerns me, which is why I voted against this amendment.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, amendment No. 861 fully captures the utter failure of the modern Congress to assert and defend congressional war powers that the U.S. Constitution solely vests in the legislative branch. It treats matters of life and death as mere fodder for political ‘‘gotcha’’
votes and represents an approach to legislating that is ultimately as simplistic as it is dangerous.

If one asked 10 attorneys to analyze the text of amendment No. 861, one might very well receive 10 wildly different interpretations of what undefined terms in the amendment mean, from the use of the term “attack” by the government, military forces, or proxies of a foreign nation or by other hostile forces” to the phrase “used to fend itself and our citizens against attack by a foreign nation or other hostile force.” As supporters argue, the amendment is needed to avoid the specific phrase “authorization for use of military force,” and thus one may argue that it is technically not an “AUMF.”

Yet adopting such an interpretation requires ignoring years of executive branch overreach when it comes to taking unilateral military action without seeking an authorization for use of military force or a declaration of war from Congress.

It requires willfully forgetting the behavior of our current President and past Presidents of both parties, who have chosen to define the concept of Commander in Chief under Article II of the U.S. Constitution to be less a commander and more an emperor while the legislative branch has sat idly by as its war powers were rapidly seized by the modern imperial Presidency.

Congress is a coequal branch of government. It is time we started acting like it. We cannot trust any President to take a blank check and fill in a reasonable number. I must oppose amendment No. 861 because, in my reading, any President of any party would adopt the broadest possible interpretation possible in defining what constitutes an “other hostile force” or an “attack” or what it means to “ensure the ability of the Armed Forces of the United States to defend themselves.”

This language risks unintentionally authorizing President Trump to order all types of military strikes against any number of potential entities that the President deems to be a threat. How does the Trump administration determine the precise baseline that defines the term “ability” of the military to defend itself? Would allowing the degradation of any platform or capability qualify as failing to “ensure the ability” of the Armed Forces to defend itself? If so, that would authorize the use of funds in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 to take unilateral, preemptive action again a foreign nation or hostile force to preserve the current capabilities of the U.S. military.

I am confident the author of this amendment would disagree with this interpretation of his legislative language. However, would the sponsor argue that such an interpretation is unreasonable or not possible? Would a Federal Court not defer to the Federal Agency’s interpretation of a vague and ambiguous statute? I do not know the answer to this, but I do know this: I am not willing to take that risk.

We are living with the consequences of a previous Congress that rushed to pass a concise authorization for use of military force that was intended to target ISIS and was limited at first. We have watched as Republican and Democratic administrations alike subsequently employed creative and broad legal interpretations of that authorization to continually expand which parties were connected with the horrific terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.

To this very day, the Trump administration cites this authorization for use of military force as legal justification to unilaterally deploy Americans all across the world. It was authorized in response to an event that took place before some of these troops were even born. To be clear, I am not asserting that I oppose the premise or substantive motivation of every military action that has happened under the recent Presidential administrations. I am simply stating that such actions must be debated and voted on by Congress.

I deployed to fight in a war I personally opposed because it was ordered by the Commander in Chief, and these orders were pursuant to an authorization for use of military force that was publicly debated and passed by a majority of our Nation’s elected representatives. Opposing a vaguely worded amendment whose own author and proponents assert is duplicative and unnecessary and which I believe may unintentionally open the door to unlimited unilateral military action, ultimately is a vote to make America less accountable, and a more perfect union in living out the principles contained in our founding document.

Critics may falsely allege that opposing amendment No. 861 is voting against our national defense and military. I will strongly reject any such ridiculous claim that slanders me with the accusation that I would ever risk the security and safety of the Nation I have proudly served in uniform. In voting against amendment No. 861, I am not safeguarding our military from excessive use without congressional oversight. I am simply making clear that we, in Congress, must begin exercising the same care and attention in doing our job as our troops do when executing their missions downrange.

One of my primary motivations for serving the great State of Illinois in the U.S. Senate is to help restore congressional war powers. To remind my colleagues that whether one favors military action or opposes it, the use of military force, every Member of Congress should agree that such matters deserve to be debated and carefully considered by our Nation’s duly elected representatives in the broad light of day. To remind my colleagues that we must always demand the Commander in Chief clearly outline our desired strategic end state before authorizing military action that puts our troops in harm’s way.

The bottom line is that only Congress has the power to declare war. We are the ones tasked with deciding when and how we send Americans into combat. We are the ones that the Constitution charges with that most solemn duty.

For too long, too many elected officials have avoided the responsibility and burden of declaring war. Fearing electoral risks and staring down coming elections, multiple Congresses have shirked their constitutional responsibility to our troops by refusing to repeal the existing authorization for use of military force, while avoiding consideration any new authorizations for use of military force. Enough—enough. We have moved too slowly and been too worried about political consequences that we fail to do our own jobs, even as we expect our troops to do theirs without complaint every day.

We need to do better by our servicemembers. We owe it to them to honor their sacrifices and to ensure that no American sheds blood in a war Congress has not authorized, or unintentionally authorized by passing vague language such as in amendment No. 861 that can be twisted to be read as empowering President Trump to take preemptive military action.

We should be disciplined in forcing any President who wishes to go to war to bring their case to Congress and give the American people a vote through their elected representatives. That is how we truly respect our servicemembers and military families: by demanding debate that is honest and clear-eyed about the likely loss of life and the risks of escalation that accompany any use of force. It is our duty, and it is the least we can do for those willing to risk their lives in safeguarding our democracy, our way of life, and our Constitution.

So with the drums of war beating louder and louder by the day, I must oppose amendment No. 861 and keep my promise to all who served or are serving now in defense of this country we love. I must continue seeking to hold all of us who have the honor of serving in Congress accountable for taking back congressional war powers.

Moving forward, I urge the leadership of the Senate and House Armed Services Committees to work with me to strike or significantly restrict this language during the conference negotiations that will take place over the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020.

LOWER HEALTH CARE COSTS ACT

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my opening statement at the Senate
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Health Education, Labor and Pensions Committee be printed in the RECORD.

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

LOW ONCE HEALTH CARE COSTS ACT

Mr. ALEXANDER. Today we are voting on three proposals:

First, the Poison Center Network Enhancement Act, offered by Senators Murray and Burr, to reauthorize and update the national network of poison control centers.

Second, the Emergency Medical Services for Children Program Reauthorization Act, offered by Senator Casey and me, to require that, from the ambulance to the emergency room, emergency health care providers are fully prepared to treat children, who typically require smaller equipment and different doses of medicine.

Third, the Lower Health Care Costs Act—a package of 54 proposals from 65 senators—29 Republican and 36 Democrat, including nearly every member of this Committee—that will reduce what Americans pay out of their own pockets for health care.

The Lower Health Care Costs Act will reduce what Americans pay out of their pockets for health care in three major ways: First, it ends surprise billing. Second, it creates mandatory arbitration contracts, designate a non-profit entity to underwrite claims for emergency services, and require that, from the ambulance to the emergency room, emergency health care providers are fully prepared to treat children, who typically require smaller equipment and different doses of medicine.

Last Wednesday, Senator Murray and I formally introduced the Lower Health Care Costs Act, which is a bipartisan package of 54 proposals from 65 senators that will reduce what Americans pay out of their own pockets for health care.

At our hearing on this legislation last week, Ben Ippolito, an economist and health fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, said: "Together, the provisions in this bill would substantially delay competition, lower the cost of prescription drugs, and transparency in health care markets. If enacted, this legislation would lower insurance premiums and drug prices for consumers. These proposals are no longer exposed to surprise medical bills. By lowering costs, this bill would also improve access to health care."

we also heard from Fredrick Isasi, Executive Director of Families USA, at our hearings, who said: "The Reducing Lower Health Care Costs Act is an ambitious piece of legislation—particularly so as a bipartisan bill in these most contentious of times."

And Avik Roy recently wrote in Forbes: "Overall, its provisions could be thought of as invisible surgery. Some, especially those around transparency—could have a significant impact."

Here are a few of the ways this legislation will lower health care costs:

Ensures that patients do not receive a surprise medical bill—which is when you unexpectedly receive a $3,000 bill, two months after our surgery, because one of your doctors was outside of your insurance network.

Senators Casey, Hassan, and Murkowski have done valuable work to solve surprise medical billing by proposing a solution last fall and again this spring, and lighting a fire under Congress to begin to talk about this issue. I thank them for their dedication to this issue, and for working with Senator Murray and me to reach a result that protects patients.

Senator Murray and I have agreed on a recommendation to our colleagues that the best solution to protect patients from surprise medical bills is a solution to get some form of arbitration, which can unnecessarily delay drug approvals, and delay less costly alternatives from coming to market—just by making small tweaks to an old drug, a company can get exclusivity—and delay less costly alternatives from coming to market—just by making small tweaks to an old drug, a company can get exclusivity and get away from the system."

This legislation creates more transparency by:

Banning gag clauses that prevent employers and patients from knowing the true price and quality of health care services. This proposal from Senators Cassidy and Bennet would allow an employer to know that a knee replacement might cost $15,000 in one hospital and $35,000 at another hospital.

Requiring health care facilities to provide a list of costs of services. A patient is discharged from a hospital to make it easier to track bills, and requires hospitals to send all bills within 45 calendar days to protect patients from receiving any unexpected bills many months after care. A provision worked on by Senators Enzi and Casey, and

Requiring doctors and insurers to provide patients with price quotes on their expected out-of-pocket costs for care, so patients are able to shop around, a proposal from Senators Cassidy, Young, Murkowski, Ernst, Grassley, Sullivan, Cramer, Braun, Carper, Bennet, Brown, Cardin, Casey, Whitehouse, and Rosen.

It will support state and local efforts to increase investment in rural, and will help prevent disease outbreaks, through two proposals worked on by Senators Peters, and Duckworth.

There is a provision to help communities prevent and reduce obesity, offered by Senator Scott and Jones.

A provision from Senators Schatz, Capito, Cassidy, Collins, Heinrich, Hyde-Smith, Kaine, King, Murkowski, and Udall will expand the use of technology-based health care services, helping patients in rural and underserved areas access specialized health care.

And there is a proposal to improve access to mental health care led by Senators Cas- sidy, Young, Murphy, and Smith.

I thank them for their dedication to this issue, and for working with Senator Murray and me to reach a result that protects patients.

This legislation creates more transparency by:

Banning gag clauses that prevent employers and patients from knowing the true price and quality of health care services. This proposal from Senators Cassidy and Bennet would allow an employer to know that a knee replacement might cost $15,000 in one hospital and $35,000 at another hospital.

Requiring health care facilities to provide a list of costs of services. A patient is discharged from a hospital to make it easier to track bills, and requires hospitals to send all bills within 45 calendar days to protect patients from receiving any unexpected bills many months after care. A provision worked on by Senators Enzi and Casey, and

Requiring doctors and insurers to provide patients with price quotes on their expected out-of-pocket costs for care, so patients are able to shop around, a proposal from Senators Cassidy, Young, Murkowski, Ernst, Grassley, Sullivan, Cramer, Braun, Carper, Bennet, Brown, Cardin, Casey, Whitehouse, and Rosen.

It will support state and local efforts to increase investment in rural, and will help prevent disease outbreaks, through two proposals worked on by Senators Peters, and Duckworth.

There is a provision to help communities prevent and reduce obesity, offered by Senator Scott and Jones.

A provision from Senators Schatz, Capito, Cassidy, Collins, Heinrich, Hyde-Smith, Kaine, King, Murkowski, and Udall will expand the use of technology-based health care services, helping patients in rural and underserved areas access specialized health care.

And there is a proposal to improve access to mental health care led by Senators Cas- sidy, Young, Murphy, and Smith.

I thank them for their dedication to this issue, and for working with Senator Murray and me to reach a result that protects patients.

This legislation creates more transparency by:

Banning gag clauses that prevent employers and patients from knowing the true price and quality of health care services. This proposal from Senators Cassidy and Bennet would allow an employer to know that a knee replacement might cost $15,000 in one hospital and $35,000 at another hospital.

Requiring health care facilities to provide a list of costs of services. A patient is discharged from a hospital to make it easier to track bills, and requires hospitals to send all bills within 45 calendar days to protect patients from receiving any unexpected bills many months after care. A provision worked on by Senators Enzi and Casey, and

Requiring doctors and insurers to provide patients with price quotes on their expected out-of-pocket costs for care, so patients are able to shop around, a proposal from Senators Cassidy, Young, Murkowski, Ernst, Grassley, Sullivan, Cramer, Braun, Carper, Bennet, Brown, Cardin, Casey, Whitehouse, and Rosen.

It will support state and local efforts to increase investment in rural, and will help prevent disease outbreaks, through two proposals worked on by Senators Peters, and Duckworth.

There is a provision to help communities prevent and reduce obesity, offered by Senator Scott and Jones.

A provision from Senators Schatz, Capito, Cassidy, Collins, Heinrich, Hyde-Smith, Kaine, King, Murkowski, and Udall will expand the use of technology-based health care services, helping patients in rural and underserved areas access specialized health care.

And there is a proposal to improve access to mental health care led by Senators Cas- sidy, Young, Murphy, and Smith.

I thank them for their dedication to this issue, and for working with Senator Murray and me to reach a result that protects patients.
There are other proposals:

For example, banning anti-competitive terms in health insurance contracts that prevent patients from seeing other, lower-cost, providers. The Wall Street Journal identified dozens of cases where anti-competitive terms in contracts between health insurers and hospital systems increase premiums and reduce patient choice.

Banning Pharmacy Benefit Managers, or PBMs, from charging employers, health insurance plans, and patients more for a drug than the PBM paid to acquire the drug, which is known as “spread pricing.”

Eliminating a loophole allowing the first generic drug to submit an application to the FDA and block other generic drugs from being approved.

Provisions to improve care for expectant and new moms and their babies.

Provisions to make it as easy to get your personal medical records as it is to book an airplane flight.

And provisions to incentivize health care organizations to use the best cybersecurity practices to protect your privacy and health information.

I hope we will today vote to approve this legislative package so we can present it to Majority Leader McConnell and Minority Leader Reid, and the full Senate to consider next month and would expect that other committees will have their own contributions.

Since January, Senator Murray and I have been working in parallel with Senator Grassley and Senator Wyden, who lead the Finance Committee.

They are working on their own bipartisan bill, with the goal of marking up this summer. The Senate Judiciary Committee is marking up bipartisan legislation on prescription drug costs tomorrow. And in the House, the Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Judiciary Committees have all reported out bipartisan bills to lower the cost of prescription drugs.

Secretary Azar and the Department of Health and Human Services have been extremely helpful in reviewing and providing technical advice on the various proposals to reduce health care costs.

And the president has called for ending surprise billing and reducing the cost of prescription drugs. The Administration has also taken steps to increase transparency in health insurance so that the public and employers can better understand their health care costs. The Lower Health Care Costs Act is just one example of this Committee reaching a result on a difficult issue.

We did that with fixing No Child Left Behind, with the 21st Century Cures Act, with user fee funding for the Food and Drug Administration, and most recently, with our response to the opioid crisis that included input from 72 senators of both political parties.

We reached those results in the midst of the argument Congress has been locked in for the last decade about where six percent of Americans get their health insurance.

Especially for Americans without subsidies, health insurance can quickly add up to be too much for many families and for many employers.

That is why I am especially glad that 65 Senators, including nearly every member of this Committee, have worked together on the Lower Health Care Costs Act which takes significant steps to virtually bring down the cost of health care that Americans pay for out of their own pockets.

**ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS**

**TRIBUTE TO TREN'T CLARK**

- Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, along with my colleagues Senator JAMES L. INHOEFEN, Representative SPEIGHT, Senator BURKHARDT, and Representative RUSSELL FULCHER, I congratulate Trent Clark on his upcoming retirement from the Bayer Corporation after 26 years of service. We have greatly enjoyed working with Trent and thank him for the service he has provided to the people of Idaho in both his official and individual capacities.

On behalf of Bayer, Trent has provided steadfast dedication to his responsibilities inherent as public and government affairs director. In that role, he has provided invaluable assistance to Bayer’s operations in Soda Springs, which are an integral part of the southeastern Idaho economy. Most notably, Trent has played a critical role in the development of the sustainably owned and operated new phosphate mine, Caldwell Canyon, which has 40 years of estimated reserves and will be one of the world’s most environmentally sustainable mining operations, particularly in its approach to sustaining environments. Trent has also helped to further important company efforts to support our local communities, particularly their school systems, and to protect our environment. Additionally, for many years, Trent has worked in a collaborative, manner with key stakeholders with a genuine humility and desire to achieve a positive outcome.

As an individual citizen, Trent has also provided excellent service to the people of Idaho in his capacity as chairman of the Idaho Workforce Development Council and as a member of the boards of the Idaho Humanities Council, Idaho Community Foundation, and the Idaho Association of Commerce and Industry. Trent’s prior public service includes 2 years as the state executive director of the Farm Services Administration, 3 years as chairman of the Idaho Republican Party, a year as staff to the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, and 8 years as staff to former U.S. Senator Steve D. Symms.

Prior to joining Bayer, Trent graduated with honors from Brigham Young University, where he majored in political science and botany. He also earned an associate of arts degree from Ricks College in Rexburg, ID. After college, Trent worked as a botany instructor for the Yellowstone Institute, as well as an executive vice president for the Fox Creek Pack Station. In addition, Trent’s strong record of leadership and service to the community, Trent has served his family and church well. Trent has been married to the former Rebecca Lee since May 23, 1986, and together, they have four children: military (deceased), Kathleen, Christin, and Alexander. Trent and his family enjoy horseback riding and backcountry hiking and camping. It is our sincere wish that Trent be blessed with many years of retirement with his family.

**TRIBUTE TO TROY WITT**

- Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the distinct honor of recognizing Troy Witt, of Garfield County, for his selfless actions in helping those in need.

Troy is a rancher and commercial trucker of Sand Springs, spearheaded an effort to send much needed donations to farmers and ranchers impacted by record flooding in Columbus, NE, in March of 2019. He was inspired by Montanans who came together following the Lodgepole Complex fire, Montana’s largest fire of the 2017 wildfire season. After losing 85 percent of his ranch, Witt was overwhelmed by the outpouring of support and supplies he received from those he had never met.

When the opportunity presented itself, Witt decided to pay it forward. He planned to load up his 53-foot trailer with as much hay, fencing material, and other supplies as he could and drive the 700 miles to the drop-off site in Columbus. After the Garfield County Disaster and Emergency Services echoed Witt’s plans, farmers from around Montana offered to donate supplies. His efforts helped bring hope to a region where hundreds had lost homes and businesses.

Witt’s act exemplifies the spirit of compassion and selflessness that Montanans embody. I and many others thank Mr. Witt for his good deed.

**TRIBUTE TO CLYDE TERRY**

- Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, today I wish to salute Clyde Terry for his many years of dedicated service and staunch advocacy on behalf of people with disabilities. Clyde is retiring from his longtime role as CEO of Granite State Independent Living, and he leaves behind a legacy worthy of our praise and our gratitude.

Granite State Independent Living—GSIL—is a nonprofit that breaks down barriers for seniors and people with disabilities and expands the training and support services available to them. Its mission is grounded in a firm belief that all people have a right to define their own level of independence. Under Clyde’s leadership, GSIL has blossomed into an essential statewide organization with a $17 million budget and several awards and accolades to its name, including Non-Profit of the Year Awards from Business NH Magazine, NH Business Review, and the Greater Concord Chamber of Commerce. Services echo Witt’s plans, farmers from around Montana offered to donate supplies. His efforts helped bring hope to a region where hundreds had lost homes and businesses.

Witt’s act exemplifies the spirit of compassion and selflessness that Montanans embody. I and many others thank Mr. Witt for his good deed.

Clyde has tapped into a wealth of experience to build GSIL into an expansive and developing organization that remains committed to its founding principles of personal choice and direction. Before his tenure at GSIL, he was
the executive director of the New Hampshire Developmental Disabilities Council, a State agency tasked with protecting the rights of our State’s most vulnerable citizens. While affiliated with the council, he authored a report on the accessibility of polling locations in the United States and established himself as a national expert on election reform. He was also an administrative hearings officer in the State’s service systems, and before that, he helped to create and implement New Hampshire’s Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program. Throughout his career, Clyde has shown an unrivaled passion for improving the lives of the disabled, the aged, and the impoverished.

I was honored to recommend Clyde when a vacancy arose on the National Council on Disability in 2009. As a member of the council, he became a sought-after voice on the potential of autonomous vehicles to broaden a sense of independence among people with disabilities. He was also a force in fighting for fair pay and equal treatment in the workplace. Clyde was eventually named chairperson of the council, a testament to his leadership and communication skills and his fluency on the broad set of issues in the disability community.

I have known Clyde for decades. We worked together on Gary Hart’s 1984 Presidential race. Though the campaign eventually ended in heartbreak, Clyde stayed in the race and eventually met Susan, who would become his beloved wife of many years. As Governor of New Hampshire and U.S. Senator, I always appreciated Clyde’s guidance and counsel.

On behalf of the people of New Hampshire, I ask my colleagues and all Americans to join me in thanking Clyde Terry for his years of service and advocacy and wishing him all the best in the years ahead.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:32 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the approval of the Senate:

H.R. 3351. An act making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 6:06 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 3401. An act making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

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

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documentation, and were referred as indicated:

EC–1783. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Ethiprole; Pesticide Tolerances” (FRL No. 9984–41–OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 5, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1784. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Flupyrad; Pesticide Tolerances” (FRL No. 9994–36–OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1785. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Mefentrifluconazole; Pesticide Tolerances” (FRL No. 9994–31–OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 5, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1786. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of four (4) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1787. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Availability to the Public of Defense Nuclear Agency (DNA) Instructions and Changes Thereof” (FRL No. 9994–19–ACSP) received on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1788. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “General Procedures and Regulations of the Board of Regents, Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences” (RIN0790–AK37) received on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1789. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Public Meeting Procedures of the Board of Regents, Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences” (RIN0790–AK36) received on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1790. A communication from the Chair of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 106th Annual Report of the Federal Reserve Board covering operations for calendar year 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1791. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Division of Trading and Markets, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Addition of Entities to the Entity List” (RIN0694–AH83) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1792. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Division of Trading and Markets, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Addition of Entities to the Entity List” (RIN0694–AH86) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1793. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Division of Trading and Markets, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Addition of Entities to the Entity List” (RIN0694–AH87) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1794. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Capital, Margin, and Segregation Requirements for Security-Based Swap Dealers and Major Security-Based Swap Participants and Capital Requirements for Broker-Dealers” (RIN3235–AL12) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1795. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approvals; California, Montana, Oregon, and Washington” (RIN0790–AH93) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1796. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approvals; California, Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District” (FRL No. 9994–20–Region 9) received in
the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1798. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ‘‘Air Quality Improvement；Indoor Air Quality；Emission Limitations for United States Steel-Gary Works’’ (FRL No. 9995–59-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1799. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ‘‘Air Plan Approval；KY；Attainment Plan for Jefferson County SO2 Nonattainment Area’’ (FRL No. 9995–58-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1800. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ‘‘Air Plan Approval；New Mexico；Albuquerque/Bernalillo County；Minor New Source Review (NSR) Preconstruction Permitting Program for Region 3-44 Region 6’’ received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1801. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ‘‘Change of Address for Region 1 Reports；Technical Correction’’ (FRL No. 9995–50-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1802. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ‘‘Repeal of the Clean Power Plan；Emission Standards for Greenhouse Gas Emissions for Existing Electric Utility Generating Units；Revisions to Emission Guidance for Power Plants’’ (FRL No. 9995–70–OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1803. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ‘‘Repeal of the Clean Power Plan；Emission Standards for Greenhouse Gas Emissions for Existing Electric Utility Generating Units；Revisions to Emission Guidance for Power Plants’’ (FRL No. 9995–28–OW) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1804. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the designation of a group as a Foreign Terrorist Organization by the Secretary of State (OS–2019–0731); to the Committee on Relations with the Far East.

EC-1805. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the designation of a group as a Foreign Terrorist Organization by the Secretary of State (OS–2019–0731); to the Committee on Relations with the Far East.

EC-1806. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ‘‘International Fisheries；Pacific Tuna Fishery；2017 Fishing Restrictions for Tropical Tuna in the Eastern Pacific Ocean’’ (RIN0648-BH12) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1815. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ‘‘Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone of Malaysia；Gulf of Alaska；2019 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish’’ (RIN0648-XF63) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1816. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ‘‘Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone of Malaysia；Gulf of Alaska；Allow the Use of Longline Pot Gear in the Gulf of Alaska Sabrefish Individual Fishing Quota Fishery；Amendment 11’’ (RIN0648-BF42) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Montana urging the United States Congress to pass a federal country-of-origin labeling (COOL) law for beef and pork products that meets World Trade Organization requirements; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 16

Whereas, in 2002, Congress reauthorized the Farm Bill, which included country-of-origin labeling for beef, lamb, pork, farm-raised and wild fish, peanuts, and other edible commodities.

Whereas, in 2008, the United States Congress passed the Country of Origin Placing Act until “funding and full implementation of federal mandatory country of origin labeling;” and

Whereas, in 2009, Montana’s country-of-origin labeling (COOL) laws were voided, as the federal act was implemented; and

Whereas, in 2015, federal COOL rules ceased being enforced for beef and pork products only due mainly to a World Trade Organization ruling; and

Whereas, consumers want to know the origin of their food; and

Whereas, American and Montana farmers and ranchers want consumers to know the origin of their food; and

Whereas, Congress should pass laws and the U.S. Department of Agriculture should administer rules and regulations for COOL certification for beef and pork products that do not impose undue compliance costs, liability, recordkeeping, or verification requirements on farmers and ranchers.

NOW, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Montana:

1. That the Senate and the House of Representatives of the 66th Montana Legislature urges Congress to pass a federal COOL law
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for beef and pork products that meets World Trade Organization requirements; and be it further
Resolved, That the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources short-acknowledging the United States House of Representatives of the United States Senate.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 28
Whereas, the American Prairie Reserve (APR) controls private properties tied to 18 Bureau of Land Management (BLM) grazing allotments in Fergus, Petroleum, Phillips, and Valley counties; and
Whereas, the APR has requested that the BLM fundamentally shift long-established grazing practices on the 18 BLM allotments, which encompass 250,000 acres of public property; and
Whereas, APR has petitioned to change the allotments from seasonal or rotational grazing to year-round grazing and remove the interior fencing on those allotments; and
Whereas, the APR proposes to allow the year-round, continuous grazing of public land by bison, which would impact the future grazing viability of the allotments; and
Whereas, the existing BLM designation for managed grazing is what science dictates the rangeland can support; and
Whereas, it is the responsibility of the BLM to ensure the future vitality of these public parcels is protected; and
Whereas, the removal of interior fences will eliminate the ability of BLM to control the access of bison to certain parcels to shorten grazing permits in response to drought or fire to protect the rangeland.
Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Montana:
(1) That it is essential for the preservation of the future viability of Montana's rangeland that the BLM deny the petition by the APR to alter grazing permits on the 18 allotments under the control of APR.
(2) That the denial of the proposed APR grazing permit change is critical for the health of Montana’s livestock and wildlife.
(3) That the livestock landowners and communities should not be subject to the cost of damages incurred by the lack of integrated bison management in the APR’s grazing proposal.
(4) That the APR grazing proposal would protect Montana farmers, ranchers, and communities.
(5) That the BLM should deny the APR grazing proposal.
(6) That the Secretary of State send a copy of this resolution to the United States Congress, the Department of the Interior, and the Bureau of Land Management.

POM-98. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Montana memorializing its opposition to the bison grazing proposal by the American Prairie Reserve; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 13
Whereas, the United States and Canada have one of the largest trading relationships in the world, and Canada is the United States' largest export market, valued at $320 billion (411 billion Canadian) in goods and services; and
Whereas, the United States is Canada's largest export market, valued at $306 billion (396 billion Canadian) in 2017 goods and services; and
Whereas, the United States trade supports 9 million jobs in the United States and 2.1 million jobs in Canada; and
Whereas, in the more than 20 years since the United States, Canada, and Mexico entered into the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), trade among these countries tripled from $440 billion in 1993 to $1.2 trillion in 2016; and
Whereas, North American integration of trade under NAFTA has helped to make the region more competitive in the world economy by providing highly integrated and valuable supply chains, as well as common rules and harmonized regulations that increase the speed and global competitiveness of one another's businesses, and by driving investment and imbedding value in each others' economic success, including by providing jobs in North America; and
Whereas, Canada and Mexico are the first-ranked and third-ranked markets, respectively, for agriculture exports from the United States at an estimated $30.6 billion sent to Canada and $31.6 billion sent to Mexico, up from $8.7 billion in 1992, the year that NAFTA was signed; and
Whereas, of particular interest to Montana because Canada is its largest trade partner, Canada has agreed to grade imports of wheat from the United States in a manner no less favorable than that accorded to wheat in its own country and not to require a country of origin statement on its quality grade or inspection certification; and
Whereas, in signing the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement, the three countries have agreed to make targeted improvements to NAFTA and promote successful partnership and a shared competitiveness in the global marketplace in which free, fair, open, and mutually beneficial trade helps to strengthen the economies of all countries.
Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Montana:
That the Montana Legislature supports the ratification of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement on trade by all countries as soon as possible; and be it further
Resolved, That the Montana Secretary of State send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Majority Leader of the United States Senate, the United States House of Representatives Ways and Means Committee, the United States Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations, the United States Trade Representative, the United States Secretary of Commerce, the United States Secretary of Labor, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and the Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator.

POM-100. A petition from a citizen of the State of Texas relative to the naturalization procedures of non-_tmation to the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES
The following reports of committees were submitted:
By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:
S. 580. A bill to amend the Act of August 25, 1938, commonly known as the "Former Presidents Act of 1938", with respect to the monetary allowance payable to a former President, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-53).
the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself and Mr. CRAMER): S. 2025. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish insulin assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM): S. 2005. A bill to establish the IMPACT for Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Ms. BALKOWITZ): S. 2006. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit certain conduct relating to the use of horses for human consumption; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MARKET, Ms. CORTIZ MASTO, Mr. VAN HOLLON, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. REED, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. WARRREN, and Ms. RUBIO): S. 2007. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development from implementing a proposed rule regarding requirements under Community Planning and Development housing programs; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERRICK, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STADENOW, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARRREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN): S. 2008. A bill to prohibit, as an unfair or deceptive act or practice, commercial sexual orientation conversion therapy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH): S. 2009. A bill to prohibit, as an unfair or deceptive act or practice, commercial sexual orientation conversion therapy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH): S. 2010. A bill to increase research, education, and treatment for cerebral cavernous malformations; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. MANCHIN, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. CRUZ): S. 2011. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reduce the credit hour requirements for the establishment of a small business voucher program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BENNET, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. ROS-LeYARD: S. 2012. A bill to provide that certain regulatory actions by the Federal Communications Commission shall have no force or effect; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. RUBIO): S. 2013. A bill to protect the right of individuals to bear arms at water resources development projects; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MARKKEY: S. 2014. A bill to provide grants to States to establish programs to encourage and maintain firing ranges licensing requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN): S. 2015. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to direct the Secretary of Education to develop a plain language disclosure form for borrowers of Federal student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. RUBIO): S. 2016. A bill to help individuals receiving disability insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act obtain rehabilitative services and return to the workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Ms. EINSTEIN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Ms. MCMAHON, Mrs. CAPPIT, and Mrs. FISCHER): S. 2017. A bill to amend section 116 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. JONES): S. 2018. A bill to provide Federal matching funding for State-level broadband programs; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. VAN HOLLON): S. 2019. A bill to ensure Members of Congress have access to Federal facilities in order to exercise their Constitutional oversight responsibilities; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY): S. 2020. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand the use of telehealth services for remote imaging for chronic eye disease; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOOKER: S. 2021. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act by striking marijuana use, possession, and distribution as grounds of inadmissibility and removal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Ms. SINEMA): S. 2022. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for improvements to the specialty adapted housing program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HOVEN, Mr. CAPPIT, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. KENNEDY): S. 2023. A bill to codify the Federal and State Technology Partnership Program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. COONS): S. 2024. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve the American History for Freedom grant program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PERDUE (for himself, Mr. MERRICK, Mr. CASSIDY, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. SCOTT): S. 2025. A bill to amend the Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Act of 1999 to modify the definition of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. PELOSI, Mr. BROWN, and Ms. COLLINS): S. 2026. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to reauthorize the farm to school program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. MARKET, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KAIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR): S. 2027. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the scope of the Advancing Opportunities for Youth in Our Armed Service Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. WARNE, Mr. CAIN, and Mr. CAPPIT): S. 2028. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for new markets tax credit investments in the Rural Jobs Zone; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DAINES: S. 2029. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the Indian coal production tax credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. BROOKS of Texas (for herself and Mr. WYDEN): S. 2030. A bill to prevent Federal agencies from interfering with the marijuana policy of States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRASSO: S. 2031. A bill to amend the FAST Act to allow States to issue or transfer registration on small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans in reporting under the disadvantaged business enterprises program of the Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. KAIN, Ms. EINSTEIN, and Mr. CRAMER): S. 2032. A bill to expand the use of cannabidiol and marijuana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mr. RUBIO): S. 2033. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to promulgate standards and regulations requiring all new commercial motor vehicles to be equipped with technology to limit maximum operating speed, to require existing speed-limiting technologies already installed in certain commercial motor vehicles to be used while in operation, and to require that maximum safe operating speed of commercial motor vehicles shall not exceed 65 miles per hour; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. Bunning): S. 2034. A bill to authorize small business development centers to provide cybersecurity assistance to small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. YOUNG): S. 2035. A bill to require the Transportation Security Administration to develop a strategic plan to expand eligibility for the PreCheck Program; to individuals with Transportation Worker Identification Credentials or Hazardous Materials Endorsements; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLON): S. 2036. A bill to authorize the treatment of greenhouse gases as a tax base under the Revenue Act of 1984; to the Committee on Finance.
S. 2036. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to provide grants to States for summer employment programs for youth; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pension.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SCHATZ)

S. 2037. A bill to amend the STEM education program for American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian students under the Higher Education Act of 1965, to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pension.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Ms. SMITH, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND).

S. 2041. A bill to establish the Space and Sunlight, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. SMITH, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. MERKLEY).

S. 2042. A bill to establish the Green Spaces, Green Vehicles Initiative to facilitate the installation of zero-emissions vehicles infrastructure on National Forest System land, National Park System land, and certain related land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR).

S. 2043. A bill to provide incentives for hate crime reporting, provide grants for State-run hate crime hotlines, and establish alternative sentencing for individuals convicted under the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MCMICHAEL (for herself and Ms. SINEMA).

S. 2044. A bill to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to establish an Appalachian Basin Infrastructure Account, to amend the Reclamation Safety of Dam Act of 1978 to provide additional funds under that Act, to establish a review of flood control rule curves pilot project within the Bureau of Reclamation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. CARDIN).

S. 2045. A bill to reauthorize the SBIR and STTR programs and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. PETERS.

S. 2046. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to protect the health care benefits of retired public safety officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER.

S. 2047. A bill to provide for a 2-week extension of the Medicaid community mental health services demonstration program, and for other purposes; considered and passed.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

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

S. Res. 267. A resolution recognizing the September 11th National Memorial Trail as an important trail and greenway all individuals should enjoy in honor of the heroes of September 11th; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. COTTON.

S. Res. 268. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Federal Government should not bail out any State; to the Committee on Finance.

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

S. Res. 269. A resolution commemorating the life of Lieutenant ‘Alex’ Villamayor and calling for justice and accountability; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CASEY, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BENCET, Mr. DURbin, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BURKET, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. HASAN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN): 

S. Res. 270. A resolution recognizing the 50th Anniversary of the Stonewall uprising; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. Tester).

S. Res. 271. A resolution designating July 12, 2019, as “Collector Car Appreciation Day” and recognizing that the collection and restoration of historic and classic cars is an important part of preserving the technological achievements and cultural heritage of the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Ms. BLACKBURN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. Con. Res. 21. A concurrent resolution strongly condemning human rights violations, violence against civilians, and cooperation with Iran by the Houthi movement and its allies in Yemen; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 110. At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 110, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a permanent extension of the lower income threshold for the medical expense deduction.

S. 210. At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 210, a bill to amend the Tribal Law and Order Act of 2010 and the Indian Law Enforcement Reform Act to provide for advancements in public safety services to Indian communities, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 235, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants to establish teacher leader development programs.

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. CANTWELL) 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. 367. At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 367, a bill to provide for the administration of certain national monuments, to establish a National Monument Enhancement Fund, and to establish certain wilderness areas in the States of New Mexico and Nevada.

S. 546. At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 546, a bill to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund, from 2010 through fiscal year 2090, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Cramer) was added as a cosponsor of S. 546, supra.

S. 560. At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 560, a bill to amend the Patient Health and Retirement Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide coverage for treatment of a congenital anomaly or birth defect.

S. 578. At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the five-month waiting period for disability insurance benefits under such title for individuals with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis.

S. 668. At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 668, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of
whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.
S. 678

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 678, a bill to declare English as the official language of the United States, to establish a uniform English language rule for naturalization, and to avoid misconstructions of the English language texts of the laws of the United States, pursuant to Congress' powers to provide for the general welfare of the United States and to establish a uniform rule of naturalization under article I, section 8, of the Constitution.
S. 681

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 684, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on high-cost employer-sponsored health coverage.
S. 727

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAACSON) was added as a cosponsor 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. 803

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 803, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore incentives for investments in qualified improvement property.
S. 851

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 851, a bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to issue an occupational safety and health standard that requires covered employers within the health care and industry sectors to develop and implement a comprehensive workplace violence prevention plan, and for other purposes.
S. 872

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 872, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to redesign $20 Federal reserve notes so as to include a likeness of Harriet Tubman, and for other purposes.
S. 876

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 876, a bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a program to prepare veterans for careers in the energy industry, including the solar, wind, cybersecurity, and other low-carbon emissions sectors or zero-emissions sectors of the energy industry, and for other purposes.
S. 1071

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1071, a bill to support empowerment, economic security, and educational opportunities for adolescent girls around the world, and for other purposes.
S. 1227

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1227, a bill to require the Federal Trade Commission to study the role of intermediaries in the pharmaceutical supply chain and provide Congress with appropriate policy recommendations, and for other purposes.
S. 1241

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRANO) were added as co-sponsors of S. 1243, a bill to provide standards for facilities at which aliens in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security are detained, and for other purposes.
S. 1392

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1392, a bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an assessment of the responsibilities, workload, and vacancy rates of suicide prevention coordinators of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.
S. 1428

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1428, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit treatment of student loan payments as elective deferrals for purposes of employer matching contributions, and for other purposes.
S. 1457

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1457, a bill to provide for interagency coordination on risk mitigation in the communications equipment and services marketplace and the supply chain thereof, and for other purposes.
S. 1498

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1488, a bill to improve the integrity and safety of interstate horseracing, and for other purposes.
S. 1531

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1531, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide protections for health insurance consumers from surprise billing.
S. 1625

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1625, a bill to promote the deployment of commercial fifth-generation mobile networks and the sharing of information with communications providers in the United States regarding security risks to the networks of those providers, and for other purposes.
S. 1737

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1737, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Army Rangers Veterans of World War II in recognition of their extraordinary service during World War II.
S. 1768

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1768, a bill to clarify that noncommercial species found entirely within the borders of a single State are not interstate commerce or subject to regulation under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 or any other provision of law enacted as an exercise of the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce.
S. 1847

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1847, a bill to require group health plans that group or individual health insurance coverage to provide coverage for over-the-counter contraceptives.
S. 1863

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1863, a bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the sites associated with the life and legacy of the noted American philanthropist and business executive James Rosenwald, with a special focus on the Rosenwald Schools, and for other purposes.
S. 1986

At the request of Mr. Kaine, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1986, a bill to amend the Fair Housing Act to prohibit discrimination based on source of income, veteran status, or military status.
S. RES. 252

At the request of Mr. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors 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.
AMENDMENT NO. 556

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from
Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 556 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 703

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 703 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. 742

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 742 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. 883

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BROWN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 883 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 Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CASEY, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SINOVA, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 2008. A bill to prohibit, as an unfair or deceptive act or practice, commercial sexual orientation conversion therapy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, half a century ago, members of the LGBTQIA+ community, who were tired of being accosted and abused and assaulted just because of who they were or whom they loved, took a stand to say “enough is enough” and pushed back against the forces of history that said they were anything less than mark the centenarian birth of freedom fighters like Marsha P. Johnson, Sylvia Rivera, and so many others both named and unnamed who dared that day to live their entire truth, countless others today have been set free. Now, 50 years later, through dogged persistence and sacrifice, we have been able to pass laws and create policies that respect and protect members of the LGBTQIA+ community—from challenging hateful bans against lesbian and gay relationships, to securing land-mark court victories against hate crimes, to, finally, making marriage equality the law of our land.

This year, as we commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Stonewall protests that sparked the modern movement for LGBTQ equality, I am very proud to stand here on the floor of the Senate as an unapologetic ally for this vibrant community.

As we close out this month’s annual celebration of Pride, I come to the floor today to reintroduce legislation to further protect gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, queer, Intersex, asexual, and gender nonconforming individuals from the dogma of our Nation’s homophobic and transphobic past because, even as we reflect on the progress we have made, we have a lot more to do to achieve equality.

In the Senate, I have been very proud to stand shoulder to shoulder with the community in Washington State and around the country to continue our progress and work to expand protections to help members of the community thrive, from our efforts to reduce bullying and harassment at colleges and universities through legislation named after Tyler Clementi—a student who tragically died by suicide in college—to reducing the epidemic of harassment and discrimination in workplaces through the Be HEARD Act, which is a bill I recently introduced that would hold businesses accountable and accountable for any forms of discriminations, give workers the resources and support they need to seek justice, and clarify that discriminating on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity are unlawful under the Civil Rights Act.

I am very grateful to my colleague Senator BOOKER and our friend Representative LIEU for joining me today in reintroducing the Therapeutic Fraud Prevention Act—the first Federal ban on so-called conversion therapy—because, in 2019, we know that being a member of the LGBTQIA+ community is often a chronic condition that requires medical treatment; rather, the politicians who say it is are on the wrong side of history.

In fact, we know that conversion therapy is a painful and discriminatory practice. The American Psychological Association has said it “is unlikely to be successful in changing someone’s sexual orientation” and would “involve some risk of harm” contrary to the facts that provide us with solid data. It is also a practice that is especially harmful to LGBTQIA+ children, who we already know are vulnerable to increased harassment and discrimination because of who they are.

It’s also incredible to note that the home State of Washington has already banned conversion therapy, but that is not enough so long as any child or any person in our country can be harmed by this sham practice. That is why I am proud to be here to reintroduce the Therapeutic Fraud Prevention Act and to remind all of our friends that we stand with them throughout history and throughout the future to make sure that they are protected with their rights.

The Therapeutic Fraud Prevention Act is legislation that would classify conversion therapy as the fraudulent practice our communities and science know it is. It would clarify in our Nation, we have come to know that love is love and that love wins. How-ever, after 50 years of struggle, as a cause, after 50 years of struggle, as a nation, we have come to know that love is love and that love wins. However, after 50 years, we also know it gets better but only if we work to make it so.

From the horrors of the Pulse massacre, to the ever-climbing number of murdered African-American and Latinx transgender women, to President Trump’s transgender military ban and his administration’s assault on LGBTQIA+ rights, so many of the challenges that face the community today mirror the critical struggles they faced all those years ago at the Stonewall Inn. Like then, too many in the community are still threatened by even greater danger because they are also women, transgender, people of color, poor, and the list goes on.
That is why this legislation and recognitions like Pride Month are so important. All month, I have been thrilled to see the photos from Pride celebrations back in Washington State—from Spokane, to Yakima, to Olympia—filled with so much cheer, resilience, and strength, only strengthened my resolve to come back here to Washington and argue in this Chamber about why we shouldn’t confirm people to judicial or executive posts who don’t believe in the full humanity and equality of so many of our family members, friends, neighbors, and coworkers.

It is obvious that this work is still very important, and we have it cut out for us, but I remain hopeful because I have seen how far we have come in just 50 years. By continuing to honor the righteous tradition of Marsha, Sylvia, and so many others by raising our voices against injustice and taking key steps like this legislation to make life easier for the next generation of LGBTQIA+ Americans, I know we will see even more progress in the next 50 years.

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

S. 2018. A bill to provide Federal matching funding for State-level broadband programs; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the American Broadband Buildout Act of 2019, or ABBA. This legislation would help ensure that rural Americans have access to broadband programs; to the Committee matching funding for State-level broadband threshold, while one in four Americans subscribe to broadband service if they have access to it. According to the Pew Research Center survey last year, 22 percent of rural Americans don’t use the internet at home, compared to just 8 percent of urban Americans.

The bipartisan bill that we are introducing would help close the digital divide between urban and rural America by directing the FCC to provide up to $5 billion to assist in building ‘last-mile’ infrastructure to bring high-speed broadband directly to homes and businesses in areas that lack it. Let me briefly discuss a few key points about the bill that I would like to highlight.

First, projects that receive funding must be located in unserved areas where broadband is unavailable at speeds that meet the FCC standards. Water, Lisa Harvey-McPherson will agree, ensures that the money goes where it is needed most and will also protect against overbuilding where broadband infrastructure is already in place.

Second—and this is important—the bill requires that projects be matched through public-private partnerships between the broadband service provider and the State in which the last-mile infrastructure project will be built. This means that States and their private sector partners will have “skin in the game” to balance the Federal commitment, ensuring that projects will be well thought out and designed to be sustainable.

Third, the bill requires that projects be designed to be “future proof,” meaning that the infrastructure installed must be capable of delivering higher speeds as broadband accelerates in the future. This will ensure that Federal tax dollars are used to help build a network that serves Americans now and in the future without having to rebuild it every time technology advances.

Furthermore, the bill directs the FCC to prioritize the funding of projects in States that have traditionally lagged behind the national average in terms of broadband subscribers and are at risk of falling further behind as broadband speeds increase.

Finally, the bill provides grants for states and specially designated entities for digital literacy and public awareness campaigns, highlighting the benefits and possibilities of broadband service and helping to attract employers to rural parts of our country in which broadband services are lacking and yet are essential for a business’s success. The key reason to do this is to address the disparity in the adoption rates I have already mentioned, which will help drive down the costs of the service and make it more affordable for everyone.

One broadband application that holds special promise for rural America is telemedicine. As a native of Aroostook County—the largest county by land area east of the Mississippi, with fewer than 70,000 residents—I know how important healthcare is to the vitality and even to the survival of rural communities. Often, these communities struggle to attract and retain the physicians they need to ensure their having access to quality care for their citizens. Broadband can help to bridge this gap by enabling innovative healthcare delivery in these rural communities.

In an example described recently in a recent letter, hospice workers at Northern Light Home Care and Hospice were able to use the internet and video technology to help support a patient who was living on an island off the coast of Maine—not as far as the seagull flies but hours away in travel time. Although the connection was very poor, the video enabled the hospice nurses to monitor the patient’s symptoms and provide emotional support to her family. As the author of this letter, Lisa Harvey-McPherson, put it, “Our hospice team could be doing so much more with video and telemonitoring technologies if Maine had better connectivity.”

I ask unanimous consent that immediately following my remarks, this letter from Lisa Harvey-McPherson be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, in closing, rural Americans deserve to enjoy the benefits of high-speed internet in the same way that urban Americans do, but a digital divide has arisen due to the simple fact that rural areas are more sparsely populated than urban ones and are therefore more expensive to serve. The bill that Senator JONES and I are introducing today would help to bridge this digital divide by funding future-proof broadband where it is needed most and giving a real boost to job creation in rural America.

I urge my colleagues to support our bill.

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


Senator SUSAN COLLINS, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: On behalf of Northern Light Health member organizations and the patients we serve, I want to thank you for your support for the need to advance health care in Maine. Technology is an essential strategy to increase access to health care services in rural Maine. Northern Light Health is a technology leader in Maine in the delivery of telehealth services including cardiology, stroke, psychiatry, trauma, pediatric intensive care and in-home telemonitoring services state wide. As we work to expand opportunities for patients to receive health care services through technology we consistently encounter the challenge of inadequate or absent broadband capacity. Northern Light Health member organizations compete nationally to recruit specialists to Maine, technology is often the only option to expand access to specialists in rural Maine.

The following Northern Light Health examples highlight technology opportunities
and the need to increase broadband speed and capacity in rural Maine. Our hospice program cared for a patient on an island off Hancock County. Staff placed a tablet at the patient's home and one with the hospice nurse. Because of the challenges of Island travel, it took hours to get to the home to manage and support the patient and her family. Broadband connection was very poor we were able to help with symptoms and emotional support using video technology. Our hospice team could be doing so much more with video and telementoring technologies if Maine had better connectivity.

At Northern Light AR Gould in Presque Isle, they are a pilot site for the telehealth virtual walk-in clinic. Those using the system within the pilot are amazed at the ease of access to a provider to ask those easy questions that keep patients out of the ED. If successful, in a broader roll-out, patients in local communities will have access to walk-in care level care (colds, rashes, general health questions) without leaving their home via technology. This is important given the average age of the population and the difficulty of traveling roads during the winter months in Aroostook County. The fully expanding the telehealth virtual clinic is broadband capacity.

Broadband access is also a professional recruitment issue. Provider spouses have difficulty finding meaningful employment. Addressing rural broadband capacity will support remanent physicians.

In Aroostook County we are also evaluating telepsychiatry services for the regional nursing homes. This will significantly increase access to psychiatric services which is in clinical demand. Connectivity is a foundational component of offering this service.

Our electronic health record has expanded access to individualized health information for our patients, connectivity is a barrier to patients accessing this important resource in rural Maine.

As we increase our electronic health record capacity providers are reliant on this technology as much as they are reliant on clinical tools like a stethoscope. In areas with broadband capacity challenges the providers spend time looking at buffering symbols on their screens for long periods of time in the day.

We appreciate the opportunity to share these examples with you and your staff as you explore Congressional solutions to Maine’s broadband challenge.

Sincerely,

LISA HARVY-McPHerson RN, MBA, MPPM, Vice President Government Relations.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. BROWN, and Ms. COX):

S. 2026. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to reauthorize the farm to school program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

In 2010, Congress passed the Healthy and Hunger-Free Kids Act, which reauthorized child nutrition programs and made healthy meal choices a reality to children nationwide. Far too many children and adolescents in the United States experience obesity, which places them at risk for developing chronic health conditions later in life. One of the best ways to help students make healthy choices is to teach them about their food and how it is grown. Making that connection makes a difference. That is why I championed the inclusion of funding for a farm to school grant program, which was included in the Healthy and Hunger-Free Kids Act.

The program’s tremendous success and interest nationwide, and has awarded grants in all 50 states and the District of Columbia to support programs in more than 33,000 schools. Building upon this success of this program, I am glad to be joined today by Senators PERDUE, BROWN, and COLLINS in introducing the Farm to School Act of 2019. In years past, I have championed this important farm to school legislative effort with one of my dearst friends, Thad Cochran, who sadly passed away last month.

We all know that hungry children cannot learn. Studies have shown that healthy nutrition in a young person’s diet is crucial to cognitive ability and learning. Good nutrition is one of the foundational components of this program.

 USDA has received more than 1,900 applications, but has only been able to fund 437 projects. The Farm to School Act of 2019 would build upon the success of the program and expand its reach by increasing the funding for the program to $15 million per year. The Farm to School program empowers children and their families to make healthy choices now and in the future. As the Senate begins considering reauthorizing the child nutrition bill this year, I look forward to including these improvements in the Farm to School program.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. THUNE, Mr. KAIN, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 2026. A bill to expand research on the cannabinoids and marijuana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Cannabidiol and Marijuana Research Expansion Act with my colleagues.

Anecdotal evidence suggests that marijuana and its derivatives, like cannabidiol, commonly known as CBD, may be helpful in treating serious medical conditions. However, anecdotal evidence alone cannot be the basis for developing new medications. Rather, medication development must be based on science.

Unfortunately, marijuana research is subject to burdensome regulations which may unintentionally inhibit research and medication development. The Cannabidiol and Marijuana Research Expansion Act will reduce these barriers without sacrificing security or enabling diversion. It will ensure that marijuana-derived medications are developed using strong scientific evidence, and provide a pathway for the manufacture and distribution of FDA-approved drugs that are based on this research.

First, the bill streamlines the regulatory process for marijuana research. Specifically, it requires the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) to quickly approve or deny applications to manufacture CBD or marijuana and establishes a process by which applicants may submit supplemental information, if necessary.
It also improves regulations dealing with changes to approved quantities of marijuana needed for research and approved research protocols. These improvements will eliminate lengthy delays that researchers encounter under current regulations. Second, this legislation seeks to increase medical research on CBD.

It does so by explicitly authorizing medical and osteopathic schools, research universities, practitioners and pharmaceutical companies to produce the marijuana they need for approved medical research. This will ensure that researchers have access to the material they need to develop proven, effective medicines. Once the FDA approves these medications, pharmaceutical companies are permitted to manufacture and distribute them.

Third, the bill fosters increased communication between doctors and patients. Because it is a Schedule I drug, some doctors are hesitant to talk to their patients about the potential harms and benefits of using marijuana, CBD, or other marijuana derivatives as a treatment, for fear that they will lose their DEA registrations. Yet, if patients are using marijuana, doctors will need to treat patients without their doctors’ knowledge, it could impact the effectiveness of the care they receive. That is why our bill authorizes these discussions to occur.

Finally, because existing Federal research is lacking, the bill directs the Secretary of Health and Human Services to expand and coordinate research to determine the potential medical benefits of CBD or other marijuana-derived medications on serious medical conditions.

I have heard from many parents who have turned to CBD as a last resort to treat their children who have intractable epilepsy. Anecdotally, CBD has produced positive results. I have heard similar stories from people who use marijuana to treat various other medical conditions.

But a common concern echoed in many of these conversations is that there is a lack of understanding about the proper delivery mechanism, dosing, or potential interactions that CBD or marijuana may have with other medications. Some also worry because these products aren’t well regulated or factory sealed, and often are labeled incorrectly.

Without additional research, our ability to adequately address these concerns is limited and uninformed.

The need for additional research, along with the need to increase the supply of CBD and marijuana for research, is lacking, which was highlighted in the National Academy of Sciences report, titled “The Health Effects of Cannabis and Cannabinoids: The Current State of Evidence and Recommendations for Research.”

I firmly believe that we should reduce the regulatory barriers associated with researching marijuana and CBD. If and when science shows that these substances are effective in treating serious medical illnesses, we should enable products to be brought to the market with FDA approval. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this important piece of legislation.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

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

S. 2036. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to provide grants to States for summer employment programs for youth; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I would like to call the Senate’s attention to the Youth Summer Jobs and Public Service Act of 2019 that I am introducing today with my colleague from Maryland, Senator VAN HOLLEN. This legislation authorizes the Department of Labor to award Summer Employment for Youth grants to connect youth with jobs that serve their local communities and private businesses over the summer months.

Since the mid-1990s, my home city of Baltimore has organized the Youth Works program out of the Mayor’s Office of Employment Development. The Youth Works program provides individuals between the ages of 14 to 21 with a summer job with employers ranging from private, local community nonprofit organizations, to city and State government agencies throughout the City. At these summer jobs, participants are provided with meaningful work experiences, are able to learn to develop the attitudes and grit necessary to compete in the workforce, gain exposure to a variety of career fields, and have a safe, stable environment over the summer months during the day.

For the 2019 Youth Works session that begins next week, Baltimore City has enrolled in the program will have a job for five days a week, five hours per day from July 1st through August 2nd and be paid a minimum of $10.10 per hour for their service.

This program has grown to be one of the largest youth summer employment programs in the Nation. After the unrest in my home city in April 2015, the Federal Department of Labor provided the Maryland Department of Labor, Licensing, and Regulation and the Baltimore City’s Mayor’s Office of Employment with a $5 million grant to develop innovative job training strategies and work opportunities for youth and young adults across Baltimore. This Federal investment, coupled with the number of individuals able to be served by the Youth Works program from an historic average of 5,000 participants to the more than 8,000 served today. Last year, Youth Works provided 8,600 Baltimore City youth jobs at more than 900 different worksites across my home city. I am proud to say that some of those individuals who participated in the Youth Works program over the course of multiple summers while in high school have recently graduated and were hired by State agencies such as the Maryland Department of Natural Resources. Baltimore youth and their families clearly see the value of this program, with more than 14,000 individuals applying for Youth Works slots this upcoming summer.

Unfortunately, due to the lack of funding between the partnership between the City, State, private business, and philanthropic ventures, more than Baltimore City youth who sought summer employment will be denied the opportunity to gain experience in the workplace, foster confidence that they are capable of being successful in a new environment, and lose the security of a safe environment over the summer. We can and must do more to help individuals willing and eager to start their careers.

The Youth Summer Jobs and Public Service Act would seek to eliminate those inequities facing students seeking to participate in Youth Works or other summer employment programs around the Nation. If enacted, my legislation would allow States to compete for Summer Employment for Youth grants to serve communities like Baltimore that have high concentrations of eligible, low-income youth. The grants would be utilized by local communities to carry out programs like the Youth Works program that provide meaningful employment opportunities that are directly linked to academic and occupations learning by providing meaningful work experiences. States competing for grants would be required to partner with private businesses to the extent feasible and to prioritize jobs and work opportunities that directly serve their communities, such as through summer employment with local community nonprofit organizations and city and State government agencies. This legislation authorizes these grants to programs such as Youth Works and allow other communities across Maryland to establish their own programs and develop Maryland’s next generation of workforce.

I am proud to lead this Senate effort with my colleague from Maryland and appreciate the work of Representative CEDRIC RICHMOND of Louisiana who initially led this effort in the U.S. House of Representatives and will shortly introduce companion legislation this Congress. I urge my Senate colleagues to join with me in this effort to connect youth with summer employment opportunities and start their journey towards fulfilling, successful careers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objections, so ordered.

S. 2036

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,
SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Youth Summer Jobs and Public Service Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. GRANTS TO STATES FOR SUMMER EMPLOYMENT FOR YOUTH.

Section 129 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3164) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) GRANTS TO STATES FOR SUMMER EMPLOYMENT FOR YOUTH.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, from the amount appropriated under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall provide grants to States to provide assistance to local areas that have high concentrations of eligible youth to enable such local areas to carry out programs described in subsection (b) that provide summer employment opportunities for eligible youth, which are directly linked to academic and occupational learning, as described in subsection (c)(2)(C). In awarding grants under this subsection, a State shall—

“(A) partner with private businesses to the extent feasible to provide employment opportunities at such businesses; and

“(B) prioritize jobs and work opportunities that directly serve the community.

“(2) AMOUNT.—The amount provided under paragraph (1) shall be—

“(A) $100,000,000 to carry out this subsection for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2024.”

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 2042. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins commemorating the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

"There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2042

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “National Purple Heart Hall of Honor Commemorative Coin Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) The mission of the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor is—

(A) to commemorate the extraordinary sacrifices of all members of the United States who were killed or wounded by enemy action; and

(B) to collect and preserve the stories of Purple Heart recipients from all branches of service and across generations to ensure that all recipients are represented.

(2) The National Purple Heart Hall of Honor (hereafter in this Act referred to as the “Secretary”) shall mint and issue the following coins:

(1) $5 GOLD COINS.—Not more than 50,000 $5 coins, which shall—

(A) weigh 26.73 grams;

(B) have a diameter of 1.150 inches; and

(C) contain 90 percent gold and 10 percent alloy.

(2) $1 SILVER COINS.—Not more than 400,000 $1 coins, which shall—

(A) weigh 26.73 grams;

(B) have a diameter of 1.150 inches; and

(C) contain 90 percent silver.

(3) DOLLAR CLAD COINS.—Not more than 750,000 half-dollar coins which shall—

(A) weigh 11.34 grams;

(B) have a diameter of 0.850 inches; and

(C) be minted to the specifications for half-dollar coins contained in section 5112(b) of title 31, United States Code.

(4) HALF-DOLLAR CLAD COINS.—Not more than 750,000 half-dollar coins which shall—

(A) weigh 11.34 grams;

(B) have a diameter of 0.850 inches; and

(C) contain 90 percent silver.

(5) $10 COINS.—Not more than 50,000 $10 coins, which shall—

(A) weigh 33.40 grams;

(B) have a diameter of 2.25 inches; and

(C) contain 90 percent gold and 10 percent alloy.

(6) $50 COINS.—Not more than 1,000 $50 coins, which shall—

(A) weigh 113.40 grams;

(B) have a diameter of 2.95 inches; and

(C) contain 90 percent gold and 10 percent alloy.

(7) $100 COINS.—Not more than 1,000 $100 coins, which shall—

(A) weigh 226.80 grams;

(B) have a diameter of 4.50 inches; and

(C) contain 90 percent gold and 10 percent alloy.

(8) $500 COINS.—Not more than 500 $500 coins, which shall—

(A) weigh 1,134.00 grams;

(B) have a diameter of 9.50 inches; and

(C) contain 90 percent gold and 10 percent alloy.

(9) $1,000 COINS.—Not more than 100 $1,000 coins, which shall—

(A) weigh 2,268.00 grams;

(B) have a diameter of 19.00 inches; and

(C) contain 90 percent gold and 10 percent alloy.

(10) $5,000 COINS.—Not more than 20 $5,000 coins, which shall—

(A) weigh 11,340.00 grams;

(B) have a diameter of 38.00 inches; and

(C) contain 90 percent gold and 10 percent alloy.

(11) $10,000 COINS.—Not more than 10 $10,000 coins, which shall—

(A) weigh 22,680.00 grams;

(B) have a diameter of 38.00 inches; and

(C) contain 90 percent gold and 10 percent alloy.

(12) $25,000 COINS.—Not more than 4 $25,000 coins, which shall—

(A) weigh 90,720.00 grams;

(B) have a diameter of 76.00 inches; and

(C) contain 90 percent gold and 10 percent alloy.

(13) $50,000 COINS.—Not more than 2 $50,000 coins, which shall—

(A) weigh 181,440.00 grams;

(B) have a diameter of 152.00 inches; and

(C) contain 90 percent gold and 10 percent alloy.

(14) $100,000 COINS.—Not more than 1 $100,000 coin, which shall—

(A) weigh 907,200.00 grams;

(B) have a diameter of 304.00 inches; and

(C) contain 90 percent gold and 10 percent alloy.

SEC. 3. COIN SPECIFICATIONS.

(a) DENOMINATIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall designate as legal tender the following denominations:

(1) $1 coin;

(2) $5 coin;

(3) $10 coin;

(4) $25 coin;

(5) $50 coin;

(6) $100 coin;

(7) $500 coin;

(8) $1,000 coin;

(9) $5,000 coin;

(10) $10,000 coin;

(11) $25,000 coin;

(12) $50,000 coin.

(b) DESIGNS.—The Secretary shall select from designs submitted to the Secretary by the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor, Inc. a design for each of the coins designated under paragraph (a).

(c) DESCRIPTION AND DESIGN.—On each coin minted under this Act there shall be—

(A) a designation of the value of the coin;

(B) an inscription of the year “2021”;

(C) an inscription of the words “Liberty”, “In God We Trust”, “United States of America”, and “E Pluribus Unum”.

(d) PROOF AND UNCIRCULATED.—The Secretary may mint any amount of any of the coins described in paragraph (a) in proof and uncirculated quality.

(e) BULK SALES.—The Secretary shall make bulk sales of the coins issued under this Act at a reasonable discount.

(f) SALE PRICE.—The coins issued under this Act shall be sold by the Secretary at a price equal to the sum of—

(1) the face value of the coins;

(2) the surcharge provided in section 7(a) with respect to such coins; and

(3) the cost of design and issuing the coins (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, marketing, and shipping).

(g) DETAILED CIRCULATION PLAN.—Notwithstanding section 301 of title 31, United States Code, at the time of sale of any coin under this Act, the Secretary shall provide the detailed circulation plan that shall include the quantity of each denomination to be minted and distributed for each year, the sales price of each denomination, the marketing and distribution plan, and the expected use of such coins.

(h) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), no surcharge may be included with respect to the issuance under this Act of any coin during a calendar year if, as of the time of such issuance, the issuance of such coin would result in the number of commemorative coin programs issued during such year to exceed the annual 2 commemorative coin program issuance limitation under section 5112(m)(1) of title 31, United States Code (as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act). The Secretary of the Treasury may issue guidance to carry out this subsection.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 2047. A bill to provide for a 2-week extension of the Medicaid community mental health services demonstration program, and for other purposes; considered and passed.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2047

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF THE MEDICAID COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

Section 223(d)(3) of the Protecting Access to Medicare Act of 2014 (42 U.S.C. 1396w-42 note) is amended by striking “June 30, 2019” and inserting “July 14, 2019”.

SEC. 2. MEDICAID IMPROVEMENT FUND.

Section 1914(b)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396w-1(b)(1)) is amended by striking “$6,000,000” and inserting “$1,000,000”.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 267—RECOGNIZING THE SEPTEMBER 11TH NATIONAL MEMORIAL TRAIL AS AN IMPORTANT TRAIL AND GREENWAY ALL INDIVIDUALS SHOULD ENJOY IN HONOR OF THE HEROES OF SEPTEMBER 11TH

Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. WARNER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

S. Res. 267

Whereas September 11, 2001, is the date of one of the worst terrorist attacks on United States soil, claiming nearly 3,000 lives at the
World Trade Center in New York City, the Pentagon in Virginia, and the Flight 93 crash site near Shanksville, Pennsylvania;

Whereas the United States came together to honor and remember the individuals who lost their lives in the attack and the heroes of September 11th, including the first responders, in the days, weeks, and months after the attack by erecting the 9/11 National Memorial and Museum, the Pentagon Memorial, and the Flight 93 National Memorial;

Whereas, as a further tribute to first responders and the individuals who lost their lives in the September 11th attacks, the September 11th National Memorial Trail Alliance, in partnership with State and local governments and other nonprofit organizations, has developed a world-class memorial trail and greenway to connect the 3 memorials;

Whereas the September 11th National Memorial Trail serves as an important recreational and transportation venue for states, local communities, and the private sector; and

Whereas recognition by the Senate of the September 11th National Memorial Trail as an important trail and greenway all individuals should enjoy in honor of the heroes of September 11th;

SENATE RESOLUTION 268—EXPRESSING THESense of the Senate That the Federal Government Should Not Bail Out Any State

Mr. COTTON submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. Res. 268

Whereas every State in the United States is a sovereign entity with a constitution and the authority to issue sovereign debt;

Whereas the legislature of every State in the United States has the authority to reduce spending or raise taxes to pay the obligations owed by the State;

Whereas officials in every State in the United States have the legal obligation to fully disclose the financial condition of the State to investors who purchase the debt of the State;

Whereas Congress has rejected prior requests from creditors of a State for payment of the defaulted debt of a State; and

Whereas, during the crisis in 1842, the Senate requested that the Secretary of the Treasury report to the Senate with respect to any negotiations with any creditor of a State relating to assuming or guaranteeing a debt, it was done to ensure that promises of support by the Federal Government were not proffered: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Federal Government should take no action to redeem, assume, or guarantee any debt, including pension obligations, of a State; and

(2) the Secretary of the Treasury should report to Congress any negotiations to engage in actions that would result in an outlay of Federal funds on behalf of creditors of a State.

SENATE RESOLUTION 269—COMMORATING THE LIFE OF LUIS ALFREDO "ALEX" VILLAMAYOR AND CALLING FOR JUSTICE AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. Res. 269

Whereas United States citizen Luis Alejandro "Alex" Villamayor was born on July 3, 1998, to parents Puning Luén Villamayor and Luis Felipe Villamayor in Rockville, Maryland;

Whereas Alex Villamayor is remembered by his family as a smart, loving, and compassionate young man with a good sense of humor, who was committed to his parents, siblings, and community;

Whereas Alex Villamayor moved with his family at the age of six to Paraguay, where he was a devoted member of his church and always had attention for those less fortunate;

Whereas Alex Villamayor graduated with honors from Paraguay's Pan American International University (UPIA) and was accepted to attend Montgomery College in Maryland in the Fall of 2015;

Whereas Alex Villamayor aspired to study business and economics and go to Paraguay to pursue a career that would help and support the Paraguayan people;

Whereas Alex Villamayor was murdered on June 27, 2015, in the City of Encarnación in Paraguay;

Whereas Alex Villamayor's death was wrongfully ruled a suicide by Paraguayan authorities before a comprehensive investigation was carried out;

Whereas, in the initial weeks of the investigation, Paraguayan authorities failed to collect blood and DNA samples from individuals present at the scene of the crime, conduct gunshot residue analysis on individuals present at the crime scene, and collect cellular phone records and data from individuals present at the crime scene;

Whereas, in August 2015, Alex Villamayor's brother, Alain Jacks Díaz de Bedoya, was sentenced to 12 years in prison in Paraguay, charged with crimes in relation to Alex Villamayor's murder;

Whereas, in October 2015, Paraguayan authorities opened a formal investigation of Alain Jacks Díaz de Bedoya for his role in Alex Villamayor's murder;

Whereas, in November 2015, Paraguayan authorities dropped the charges against Alain Jacks Díaz de Bedoya related to Alex Villamayor's murder;

Whereas Members of the United States Congress have urged the Government of Paraguay to invite the United States Federal Bureau of Investigation to provide technical assistance for the investigation into Alex Villamayor's death and the United States Embassy in Asunción, Paraguay, has offered such assistance to Paraguayan authorities;

Whereas, to date, the Government of Paraguay has not invited the United States Federal Bureau of Investigation to provide technical assistance for the investigation into Alex Villamayor's death;

Whereas the United States embassy in Asunción, Paraguay, and the Department of State have not issued any formal public statements about Alex Villamayor's murder and the many irregularities in the investigation into his death;

Whereas, in February 2017, outgoing United States Ambassador Leslie A. Basset told media outlets that Alex Villamayor “died under dark circumstances” and that “the investigation and the handling of this case has been worrisome”; and

Whereas, in April 2018, Rene Hofstetter was convicted of homicide and sentenced to 12 years in prison in Paraguay and Mathias Wilbs was sentenced to two years and 10 months on obstruction of justice;

Whereas, in spite of these convictions, media outlets report that others implicated in the murder and cover-up have not been charged; and

Whereas, members of Alex Villamayor's immediate family continue to face grave physical threats in Paraguay for their pursuit of justice; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates the life of United States citizen Luis Alejandro “Alex” Villamayor...
and offers condolences to his family and friends;

(2) expresses profound concern about the delays in achieving justice in Alex Villamayor’s case;

(3) urges Paraguayan authorities to invite the Federal Bureau of Investigation to provide technical assistance to properly investigate the circumstances surrounding Alex Villamayor’s death and assess whether other individuals may have had a role in the crime or cover-up;

(4) requests the Government of Paraguay to provide for the physical security of Alex Villamayor’s family and others seeking justice in this case and to properly investigate recent reports of threats to their lives, charging those implicated in such threats;

(5) calls on the Department of State to prioritize justice for Alex Villamayor in its diplomatic engagement with the Government of Paraguay; and

(6) calls on the Department of State to review its procedures for providing services to the families of United States citizens slain or assaulted abroad.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I rise to pay tribute to an exemplary young Marylander whose life was tragically cut short four years ago today. Senator VAN HOLLEN and I have just introduced a resolution which pays tribute to Alex’s life, calls for justice and accountability in his murder, and procedures to ensure other families do not suffer this same tragedy.

Luis Alejandro “Alex” Villamayor was born on July 3, 1998, to parents Puning Luk Villamayor and Luis Felipe Villamayor in Rockville, Maryland. Those who knew him revere the him as a smart, loving, and compassionate young man with a good sense of humor. Alex was committed to his parents, siblings, and friends. He was a devoted member of his church and always sought to help those less fortunate.

Alex Villamayor moved with his family to Paraguay at the age of six. He attended high school there and graduated with honors from the Pan American International School and was accepted to study in Maryland in the fall of 2015 to study computer science at Montgomery College before accepting to attend Montgomery College to study computer science at the University of Maryland. Alex applied to Paraguay to help those less fortunate.

Alex’s death was wrongly ruled a suicide by Paraguayan authorities, who had not properly investigated the death at that point and failed to collect blood and DNA samples from individuals present at the crime scene. In the fall of 2015, Alex’s death was ruled a homicide. Police found that Alex’s body was exhumed for additional forensic examination, which found that he had been raped and physically assaulted prior to his death. Finally, in September 2015, Alex’s death was ruled a homicide. Police found that Alex’s body was exhumed for additional forensic examination, which found that he had been raped and physically assaulted prior to his death. Finally, in September 2015, Alex’s death was ruled a homicide. Police found that Alex’s body was exhumed for additional forensic examination, which found that he had been raped and physically assaulted prior to his death. Finally, in September 2015, Alex’s death was ruled a homicide. Police found that Alex’s body was exhumed for additional forensic examination, which found that he had been raped and physically assaulted prior to his death.

In spite of these convictions, I remain concerned about the handling of this case. The New York Police Department has resisted assisting the Government of Paraguay never allowed the FBI to provide technical assistance for the investigation. Our Ambassador at the time told media outlets that the investigation and the handling of this case has been ‘worthless.’ Of even greater concern, members of Alex’s immediate family continue to face grave physical threats in Paraguay for their pursuit of justice.

Senators VAN HOLLEN and I continue to offer our deepest condolences to the Villamayor family and, through this resolution, call on Paraguayan authorities to finally allow the FBI to assist in this case and provide the necessary protections to Alex’s family. We similarly ask the Department of State to prioritize justice for Alex Villamayor in its diplomatic engagement with the Government of Paraguay and to review its procedures for providing services to the families of United States citizens slain or assaulted abroad.

On this sad anniversary, we remain committed to honoring the life of Alex Villamayor and working to ensure this tragic story does not repeat itself.

SENATE RESOLUTION 270—RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STONEWALL UPRISING

Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CASEY, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BARRON, Ms. RAYHURST, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. KLOBUCHER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CARPER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. HASSAN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 270

Whereas the Stonewall Inn opened on or around March 18, 1967, at 53 Christopher Street near MacDougal Street in the Village neighborhood of New York City:

Whereas the neighborhood of Greenwich Village, and establishments like the Stonewall Inn, served as a sanctuary for members of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (referred to in this preamble as ‘LGBTQ’) community from persecution by police and society at large:

Whereas during the time around the opening of the Stonewall Inn, many State and local governments, including New York City, criminally prosecuted LGBTQ individuals expressing their identities and relationships, which resulted in LGBTQ individuals frequently being harassed by law enforcement, including the New York Police Department (referred to in this preamble as the “NYPD”);

Whereas LGBTQ individuals had begun to stand up to such police harassment, including at Cooper Do-nuts in Los Angeles in 1969, Compton’s Cafeteria in San Francisco in 1966, and Black Cat Tavern in Los Angeles in 1967;

Whereas, in the early morning hours of June 28, 1969, the NYPD raided the Stonewall Inn, arresting approximately 200 individuals;

Whereas brave individuals, particularly transgender women of color, stood up to injustice the night of June 28, 1969, which sparked an uprising against the NYPD, with confrontations and protests at the Stonewall Inn and the surrounding area lasting until July 3, 1969;

Whereas the Stonewall uprising empowered thousands of LGBTQ individuals to emerge from the shadows and come out publicly as they stood up for their rights on the night of June 28, 1969 and beyond, putting their lives and safety at risk;

Whereas, along with public protests in Chicago, Los Angeles, New York, Philadelphia, San Francisco, Washington, D.C., and elsewhere, the Stonewall Uprising became a catalyst for the LGBTQ civil rights movement to secure social and political equality and inspired the formation of many advocacy organizations;

Whereas, on June 27-28, 1979, members of the LGBTQ community commemorated the first anniversary of Stonewall and reaffirmed the solidarity of the LGBTQ community by organizing the first World Pride celebration;

Whereas, on June 8, 2019, the NYC Pride Parade, or March, was held in New York City, San Francisco, Chicago, and Los Angeles;

Whereas the Stonewall uprising is remembered and celebrated every year in June during “LGBTQ Pride Month”;

Whereas in 2016 the Stonewall Inn and its surrounding area was declared a national monument, becoming the first national monument to commemorate the LGBTQ civil rights movement;

Whereas WorldPride will be held in June 2019 for the first time in the United States in New York City to commemorate the Stonewall uprising, bringing representatives of the global LGBTQ community to recognize these historic events;

Whereas on May 30, 2019, New York City announced that it would dedicate a monument honoring pioneering transgender activists and allies. The key leaders in the Stonewall uprising, Marsha P. Johnson and Sylvia Rivera, the first permanent public monument in the world honoring transgender individuals;

Whereas on June 6, 2019, the NYPD officially apologized for the raid on the Stonewall Inn;

Whereas, despite the progress made since the Stonewall uprising, members of the LGBTQ community have experienced biased policing and are still at significant risk of violence and discrimination;

Whereas, according to the annual hate crimes report published by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, LGBTQ individuals, particularly people of color, continue to be the target of bias-motivated violence, and efforts to address this violence may be hindered by a continued lack of trust in law enforcement;

Whereas not less than 100 transgender individuals, primarily women of color, have been murdered in the United States since the beginning of 2019;

Whereas no individual in the United States should have to fear being the target of violence because of who they are or who they love;

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the 50th Anniversary of the Stonewall uprising;

(2) expresses concern and discrimination against members of the LGBTQ community and recommit itself to securing justice,
equality, and well-being for LGBTQ individuals; and
(3) commends the bravery, solidarity, and resiliency of the LGBTQ community in the face of violence and discrimination, both past and present.

SENATE RESOLUTION 271—DESIGNATING JULY 12, 2019, AS “COLLECTOR CAR APPRECIATION DAY” AND RECOGNIZING THAT THE COLLECTION AND RESTORATION OF HISTORIC AND CLASSIC CARS IS AN IMPORTANT PART OF PRESERVING THE TECHNOLOGICAL ACHIEVEMENTS AND CULTURAL HERITAGE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. TESTER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

WHEREAS, many people in the United States maintain classic automobiles as a pastime and do so with great passion and as a means of individual expression;

WHEREAS the Senate recognizes the effect that the more than 100-year history of the automobile has had on the economic programs and enterprises worldwide; and

WHEREAS, the collection, restoration, and preservation of automobiles is an activity shared across generations and across all segments of society;

WHEREAS, thousands of local car clubs and related businesses have been instrumental in preserving a historic part of the heritage of the United States by encouraging the restoration and exhibition of classic automobiles;

WHEREAS, the collection, restoration, and preservation of automobiles is an activity shared across generations and across all segments of society;

WHEREAS, in October 2018, the Houthis launched multiple cruise missiles at United States Navy warships while they were in international waters near the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait;

WHEREAS, in July 2018, the Houthis attacked two Saudi oil tankers transiting through the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait;

WHEREAS, in its January 2018 and January 2019 reports, the United Nations Panel of Experts on Yemen expressed concern that Houthi missile attacks and sea mines released in the Red Sea and Bab-el-Mandeb Strait threatened commercial shipping and humanitarian aid;

WHEREAS, in October 2018, the Houthis launched multiple cruise missiles at United States Navy warships while they were in international waters near the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait;

WHEREAS, in July 2018, the Houthis attacked two Saudi oil tankers transiting through the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait;

WHEREAS, in its January 2018 and January 2019 reports, the United Nations Panel of Experts on Yemen expressed concern that Houthi missile attacks and sea mines released in the Red Sea and Bab-el-Mandeb Strait threatened commercial shipping and humanitarian aid;

WHEREAS, in October 2018, the Houthis launched multiple cruise missiles at United States Navy warships while they were in international waters near the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait;

WHEREAS, in July 2018, the Houthis attacked two Saudi oil tankers transiting through the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait;

WHEREAS, in its January 2018 and January 2019 reports, the United Nations Panel of Experts on Yemen expressed concern that Houthi missile attacks and sea mines released in the Red Sea and Bab-el-Mandeb Strait threatened commercial shipping and humanitarian aid;

WHEREAS, in October 2018, the Houthis launched multiple cruise missiles at United States Navy warships while they were in international waters near the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait;

WHEREAS, in July 2018, the Houthis attacked two Saudi oil tankers transiting through the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait;

WHEREAS, in its January 2018 and January 2019 reports, the United Nations Panel of Experts on Yemen expressed concern that Houthi missile attacks and sea mines released in the Red Sea and Bab-el-Mandeb Strait threatened commercial shipping and humanitarian aid;

WHEREAS, in October 2018, the Houthis launched multiple cruise missiles at United States Navy warships while they were in international waters near the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait;

WHEREAS, in July 2018, the Houthis attacked two Saudi oil tankers transiting through the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait;

WHEREAS, in its January 2018 and January 2019 reports, the United Nations Panel of Experts on Yemen expressed concern that Houthi missile attacks and sea mines released in the Red Sea and Bab-el-Mandeb Strait threatened commercial shipping and humanitarian aid;

WHEREAS, in October 2018, the Houthis launched multiple cruise missiles at United States Navy warships while they were in international waters near the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait;

WHEREAS, in July 2018, the Houthis attacked two Saudi oil tankers transiting through the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait;

WHEREAS, in its January 2018 and January 2019 reports, the United Nations Panel of Experts on Yemen expressed concern that Houthi missile attacks and sea mines released in the Red Sea and Bab-el-Mandeb Strait threatened commercial shipping and humanitarian aid;

WHEREAS, in October 2018, the Houthis launched multiple cruise missiles at United States Navy warships while they were in international waters near the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait;

WHEREAS, in July 2018, the Houthis attacked two Saudi oil tankers transiting through the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait;

WHEREAS, in its January 2018 and January 2019 reports, the United Nations Panel of Experts on Yemen expressed concern that Houthi missile attacks and sea mines released in the Red Sea and Bab-el-Mandeb Strait threatened commercial shipping and humanitarian aid;

WHEREAS, in October 2018, the Houthis launched multiple cruise missiles at United States Navy warships while they were in international waters near the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait;

WHEREAS, in July 2018, the Houthis attacked two Saudi oil tankers transiting through the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait;

WHEREAS, in its January 2018 and January 2019 reports, the United Nations Panel of Experts on Yemen expressed concern that Houthi missile attacks and sea mines released in the Red Sea and Bab-el-Mandeb Strait threatened commercial shipping and humanitarian aid;

WHEREAS, in October 2018, the Houthis launched multiple cruise missiles at United States Navy warships while they were in international waters near the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait;

WHEREAS, in July 2018, the Houthis attacked two Saudi oil tankers transiting through the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait;

WHEREAS, in its January 2018 and January 2019 reports, the United Nations Panel of Experts on Yemen expressed concern that Houthi missile attacks and sea mines released in the Red Sea and Bab-el-Mandeb Strait threatened commercial shipping and humanitarian aid;

WHEREAS, in October 2018, the Houthis launched multiple cruise missiles at United States Navy warships while they were in international waters near the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait;

WHEREAS, in July 2018, the Houthis attacked two Saudi oil tankers transiting through the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait;

WHEREAS, in its January 2018 and January 2019 reports, the United Nations Panel of Experts on Yemen expressed concern that Houthi missile attacks and sea mines released in the Red Sea and Bab-el-Mandeb Strait threatened commercial shipping and humanitarian aid;

WHEREAS, in October 2018, the Houthis launched multiple cruise missiles at United States Navy warships while they were in international waters near the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait;

WHEREAS, in July 2018, the Houthis attacked two Saudi oil tankers transiting through the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait;

WHEREAS, in its January 2018 and January 2019 reports, the United Nations Panel of Experts on Yemen expressed concern that Houthi missile attacks and sea mines released in the Red Sea and Bab-el-Mandeb Strait threatened commercial shipping and humanitarian aid;

WHEREAS, in October 2018, the Houthis launched multiple cruise missiles at United States Navy warships while they were in international waters near the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait;

WHEREAS, in July 2018, the Houthis attacked two Saudi oil tankers transiting through the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait;

WHEREAS, in its January 2018 and January 2019 reports, the United Nations Panel of Experts on Yemen expressed concern that Houthi missile attacks and sea mines released in the Red Sea and Bab-el-Mandeb Strait threatened commercial shipping and humanitarian aid;

WHEREAS, in October 2018, the Houthis launched multiple cruise missiles at United States Navy warships while they were in international waters near the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait;

WHEREAS, in July 2018, the Houthis attacked two Saudi oil tankers transiting through the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait;

WHEREAS, in its January 2018 and January 2019 reports, the United Nations Panel of Experts on Yemen expressed concern that Houthi missile attacks and sea mines released in the Red Sea and Bab-el-Mandeb Strait threatened commercial shipping and humanitarian aid;
on Thursday, June 27, 2019, at 10 a.m.,
to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 27, 2019, at 10 a.m.,
to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 27, 2019, at 2:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Peter Joseph Philpott, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, Charles R. Eskridge III, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, William Shaw Stickman IV, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, Jennifer Philpott Wilson, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, and Wilmer Ocasio, to be United States Marshal for the District of Puerto Rico, Department of Justice.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 27, 2019, at 2 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Jake Vince and James Schmidt, legislative correspondents in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the day.

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my defense follow. Joshua Culver, be granted floor privileges for the length of the current debate on the NDAA.

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

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following members of my staff from Ohio and Washington be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the day: Diana Baron, Mary Topolinski, Shindale Bambarg, Alea Brown, John Patterson, Joe Gilligan, Ann Longsworth Orr, and John Ryan.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration for the consideration of Calendar Nos. 300 through 325 and all nominations on the Secretary’s desk in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy; that the nominations be confirmed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the Record; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed, are as follows:

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral
Rear Adm. (ih) Gene F. Price
Rear Adm. (ih) Alan J. Reyes
Rear Adm. (ih) Troy M. McClelland

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general
Maj. Gen. Charles A. Flynn

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)
Cap. Mark E. Moritz
Capt. Christopher A. Asselta

The following named officer for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)
Dr. Michael T. Curran
Capt. Leslie E. Rearyzanz, III

The following named officer for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)
Capt. Kenneth R. Blackmon
Capt. Robert C. Nowakowski
Capt. Thomas S. Wall
Capt. Larry D. Watkins

The following named officers for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Scott K. Fuller
Capt. Michael J. Steffen

The following named officer for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Paula D. Dunn

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Pamela C. Miller

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be general

Gen. John W. Raymond

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Eric P. West

The following named Army National Guard of the United States for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Michael R. Berry

PN63 ARMY nominations (167) beginning JASON B. ALISSANGCO, and ending D014026, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN635 ARMY nomination of Carmen Y. Salcedo, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN734 ARMY nominations (3) beginning GRETCHEN N. JUMAN, and ending D015471, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN735 ARMY nomination of Andre L. Thomas, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN736 ARMY nomination of D013839, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN737 ARMY nominations (2) beginning RUSSEL F. DUBOSE, and ending TIMOTHY D. FORREST, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN738 ARMY nomination of Michelle C. Reeves, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN739 ARMY nomination of John R. Abella, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN740 ARMY nominations (2) beginning JASON J. BALLARD, and ending D015102, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN741 ARMY nominations (3) beginning MIAO X. ZHOU, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN742 ARMY nominations (75) beginning JULIE A. AKE, and ending D013716, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 23, 2019.

PN743 ARMY nomination of Shane R. Reeves, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 26, 2019.

PN744 ARMY nominations (19) beginning ALISON M. ALBANO, and ending D014810, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN745 ARMY nominations (167) beginning JASON B. ALISSANGCO, and ending D014026, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN746 ARMY nominations (2) beginning MICHAEL M. ARMSTRONG, and ending D014026, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN747 ARMY nominations (167) beginning JASON B. ALISSANGCO, and ending D014026, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN748 ARMY nominations (2) beginning MICHAEL M. ARMSTRONG, and ending D014026, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN749 ARMY nominations (167) beginning JASON B. ALISSANGCO, and ending D014026, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.
PN324 MARINE CORPS nomination of Michael R. Lukkes, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN325 NAVY nominations (2) beginning MICHAEL R. BRUNEAU, and ending HANS L. HELD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN676 NAVY nominations (12) beginning MATTHEW P. BEARE, and ending KEITH A. TUKES, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN677 NAVY nominations (27) beginning RICHARD L. BOSWORTH, and ending MATTHEW C. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN678 NAVY nominations (13) beginning LANCE C. ASKEW, and ending DONALD V. WILSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN679 NAVY nominations (10) beginning MARK A. ANGELO, and ending GREGORY E. SUTTON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN680 NAVY nominations (17) beginning REX A. BOONYOBIHAS, and ending SARAH E. ZARRO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN681 NAVY nominations (3) beginning SCOTT DRAYTON, and ending THOMAS R. WAGENER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN682 NAVY nominations (11) beginning KEITH ARCHIBALD, and ending DAVID C. WEBER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN683 NAVY nominations (5) beginning ERIN E. O. ACOSTA, and ending CHRISTI S. HALL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN684 NAVY nominations (21) beginning MITCHELL W. ALBIN, and ending TODD D. ZENTNER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN685 NAVY nominations (15) beginning ADRIAN Z. BEJAR, and ending ROBERT A. WOODRUFF, III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN686 NAVY nominations (5) beginning ERIN E. O. ACOSTA, and ending CHRISTI S. HALL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN687 NAVY nominations (10) beginning MARK A. ANGELO, and ending GREGORY E. SUTTON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN688 NAVY nominations (6) beginning JAMES M. BELMONT, and ending JON M. HERSEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN738 NAVY nominations (2) beginning MICHAEL R. BRUNEAU, and ending HANS L. HELD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN741 NAVY nominations (5) beginning MICHAEL E. HALL, and ending DARREN L. STENSTROM, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN742 NAVY nominations (24) beginning LILLIAN J. CHARLIES, and ending M. TELLIS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN743 NAVY nominations (16) beginning VIRGINIA S. BLACKMAN, and ending ABI-GAIL M. YABLONSKY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN744 NAVY nominations (11) beginning BRIAN J. ELLIS, JR., and ending SYLVAIN M. ZENTNER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN745 NAVY nominations (30) beginning ZIAD T. ABOONA, and ending LISA A. WHITE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN746 NAVY nominations (75) beginning RUBEN D. ACOSTA, and ending LUKE A. ZABROCKI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN747 NAVY nominations (18) beginning DAVID L. BELL, JR., and ending HAROLD S. ZALD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN748 NAVY nominations (8) beginning WILLIAM R. BUTLER, and ending OMAIR E. TOBIAS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN749 NAVY nominations (5) beginning BRIAN J. HALL, and ending PHILLIP E. SMITH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN750 NAVY nominations (3) beginning ESTHER A. BOPP, and ending ROBERTA S. TAYLOR, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN751 NAVY nominations (3) beginning FREDERICK J. LEACHMAN, and ending LIKELI O. KAMBU, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN752 NAVY nominations (15) beginning JEREMIAH C. GREGG, and ending JOSEPH M. ZACK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN753 NAVY nominations (94) beginning FREDERICK G. ALEGRE, and ending KENNETH B. WOOSTER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN754 NAVY nominations (4) beginning MIGUEL A. CASTELLANOS, and ending KEVIN A. SCHNITTKER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN755 NAVY nominations (2) beginning CHARLOTTE A. BROWNING, and ending RACHEL H. WADEBROWN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN756 NAVY nominations (16) beginning JUILLIE M. BARR, and ending JACOB S. WIEMANN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN757 NAVY nominations (8) beginning LIAM M. APOSTOL, and ending ANN M. VALLEONS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN758 NAVY nominations (5) beginning ANTHONY L. LACOURSE, and ending SHANNON C. ZAHUMENSEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN759 NAVY nominations (2) beginning SCOTT A. HIGGINS, and ending PEIHUA KU, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN761 NAVY nominations (8) beginning NATHANIEL A. BAILEY, and ending LEONARD W. WALKER, IV, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN762 NAVY nominations (2) beginning ONOPRIO F. MARGIONI, and ending KURT W. WAGENER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN763 NAVY nominations (4) beginning DAVID L. BACHELOR, and ending THOMAS J. TAYLOR, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN764 NAVY nominations (3) beginning ANDREW M. COOK, and ending DENIZ M. PISKIN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN765 NAVY nomination of Christina M. Allee, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN766 NAVY nomination of David A. Serio, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN767 NAVY nomination of Jon B. Vondra, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN768 NAVY nominations (4) beginning R. KEWAH J. JKISHON, and ending ROBERTS. THOMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN769 NAVY nomination of Matthew A. Buch, and ending TROY J. SHERHILL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN811 NAVY nomination of Meager D. Chappell, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN812 NAVY nomination of Ryan D. Scully, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN813 NAVY nomination of Brandon T. Bridges, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN814 NAVY nomination of Mark S. Jundt, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN815 NAVY nomination of Chandler W. Johnson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN816 NAVY nomination of Justin R. Taylor, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN818 NAVY nominations (25) beginning DIEGO F. ALVARADO, and ending JARED
Mr. MCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar No. 245.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nominations.

The nominations were confirmed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar No. 113.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nominations.

The nominations were confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar No. 295.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Christopher Scolese, of New York, to be Director of the National Reconnaissance Office. (New Position)

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. MCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Scolese nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar No. 342.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nominations.

The nominations were confirmed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar No. 199.

The nominations were confirmed.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?
Without objection, it is so ordered.
The clerk will report.
The legislative clerk read the nominations of Ronald Douglas Johnson, of Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of El Salvador; and David Michael Satterfield, of Maryland, to be a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Turkey.
There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.
Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Jorjani nomination?
Without objection, it is so ordered.
The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Johnson and Satterfield nominations en bloc?
The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR
Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 180 and 219.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?
Without objection, it is so ordered.
The clerk will report.
The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lane Genatowski, of New York, to be Director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy, Department of Energy.
There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.
Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?
Without objection, it is so ordered.
The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Genatowski nomination?
The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR
Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 109, 110, and 360.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?
Without objection, it is so ordered.
The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Bamzai nominations en bloc?
The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR
Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?
Without objection, it is so ordered.
The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Bamzai, LeBlanc, and Felton nominations?
The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR
Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 343.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.
The motion was agreed to.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nominations.
The legislative clerk read the nominations of Daniel Aaron Bress, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.
Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.
The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION
We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Daniel Aaron Bress, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit:

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR
Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.
The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR
Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 47.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.
The motion was agreed to.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nominations.
The legislative clerk read the nomination of T. Kent Wetherell II, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Florida.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Peter C. Wright, of Michigan, to be Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste, Environmental Protection Agency.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Peter C. Wright, of Michigan, to be Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste, Environmental Protection Agency.

Mr. McConnell, Steve Daines, John Thune, John Barrasso, Joni Ernst, John Barrasso, Jeff Sessions, Shelley Moore Capito, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, Thom Tillis, John Hoeven.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The legislative clerk read the nomination of Peter C. Wright, of Michigan, to be Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste, Environmental Protection Agency.

Mr. McCrery, John Thune, Mike Crapo, James M. Inhofe, Pat Roberts, Mike Crapo, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, John Barrasso, Jerry Moran, Shelby, W. Blunt, Shelley Moore Capito, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, Thom Tillis, John Hoeven.

CONFIRMATION OF ROB WALLACE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to state a few words about Rob Wallace, the newly confirmed Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife, and Parks at the Department of Interior.

I have known Rob for over 35 years. Without question, Rob is the right person for the job. Throughout his long and distinguished career, Rob has struck the proper balance between wildlife management, habitat management, and the use of our public lands.

In terms of wildlife conservation, Rob has served in a variety of jobs that directly relate to the two Federal agencies he has been nominated to oversee. Rob began his career as a seasonal park ranger in Grand Teton National Park. Since then, Rob has served in a number of positions. He has been Assistant Director of the National Park Service, chief of staff for Wyoming Senator Malcolm Wallop, staff director for the U.S. Senate Energy and Natural Resource Committee—a committee on which I currently sit. He has been chief of staff for Wyoming Governor Jim C. Mathis, and manager of U.S. Government Relations for the General Electric Company.

Rob currently serves as the president of the Upper Green River Conservancy. It is the Nation’s first cooperative conservation bank. Rob cofounded the Upper Green River Conservancy. It protects core sage grouse habitat in the ecologically rich and the energy rich Upper Green River watershed in southwest Wyoming.

Rob builds innovative partnerships of ranchers, conservation groups, energy companies, investors, and other stakeholders. Rob is also the founding member of the board of the Grand Teton National Park Foundation, a group of people absolutely working together, committed to the Grand Teton National Park. It promotes the park’s cultural, historic, and natural resources. He has also worked on the boards of many organizations dedicated to conserving wildlife and enhancing our national parks.

Rob’s nomination passed the Environment and Public Works Committee by unanimous vote, and a near-unanimous reported vote in the Committee of Energy and Natural Resources.

Rob’s nomination passed the Environment and Public Works Committee by unanimous vote, and a near-unanimous reported vote in the Committee of Energy and Natural Resources.

Rob Wallace is an outstanding choice for this position of Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks. He is the right person for the job, and I am so pleased the Senate has now confirmed his nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

SIGNING AUTHORITY

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader, the senior Senator from South Carolina, and the junior Senator from North Carolina be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions from June 27 through the July 8.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

IRAN

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I am going to try to do this in about 12 minutes, since I am not sure how many people are left to speak tonight and I know the staff worked hard and we will be up early tomorrow voting on the pending Udall amendment. That is what I want to talk about.

I have watched all week the debate on some of these topics. I think it is a really good debate, actually. In some ways, I am very pleased the amendment has been offered because it has given us an opportunity to talk about a topic I don’t think we have talked enough. Green that that issue, the security threats before our country, and, in particular, what the role of Congress is in all of this.

There are a couple of things I want to say at the outset. Here is the first. A lot of people who cover this stuff in the news like very simplistic terms. It makes it easier to write the articles and makes it easier to describe the circumstances. The terms people like to use are “hawk,” or “dove” or “war-like.” I am not in favor of war. I have actually never advocated for a military attack on Iran, in these circumstances especially. There are a lot of reasons for it, but it will take me more than 15 minutes to explain. If it is to say, it certainly not the first or the second.

The policy of the United States in Iran today is the one I support; that is, crippling economic sanctions that deny them the money to do the bad things they do but also a forced posture that we are prepared with enough people there in the military, so if they do attack us, we can defend ourselves.

I want to say at the outset that I am not going to say today to say war or to call for war but to speak about reality and the situation as we face it today.

The second thing I want to point to is that there is some legislative limitation on the President when it comes to the use of force in virtually every circumstance and that somehow the current President is being enabled by the Members of his party here to do things, or to try to do things, that is just not true. I will explain why in a moment. I want to begin with why we are even here. It is one of the topics that has been touched on this week, which I think deserves a direct response. I heard a number of Senators who came to the floor. I watched the debate last night, and there will be another one tonight within the Democratic Party. You almost get a sense that what they are arguing is that Iran was under sanctions, Iran wasn’t doing anything, until Donald Trump came along and pulled us out of the Iran deal. That is just not true. That is patently false.

The only thing Iran wasn’t doing is enriching uranium beyond a certain threshold. That is not necessarily a bad thing that they weren’t doing it, but that is the only thing that deal covered.

Here is what Iran was still doing. Iran was still sponsors terrorism. You cannot say at the outset that that is just terrorism? Iran wants to be the dominant power in the Middle East, and one of the ways they seek to achieve it is to find all of these groups—Hezbollah, Shia militias in Iraq and Syria, the Houthis in Yemen—and empower these groups.

They have an organization called the IRGC, which is the real military and the real power in Iran. Underneath the IRGC, there is an organization called the Quds Force, which is their covert operations unit led by a guy named General Soleimani. He goes around the entire region sponsoring these groups—training them and providing weapons.
Here is what they hope to do. If they ever get into a conflict, they will use these groups to attack people. Why do they use those groups? No. 1, because Iran doesn’t have the ability to station troops all over the region. No. 2, it gives some level of deniability. They can say: We didn’t attack you. It was the Houthis or Shia militia. It allows them some level of deniability while still inflicting pain.

If you want to know what else Iran has done using that strategy, it has maxed or killed hundreds of American service men and women in Iraq. They didn’t buy all those IEDs that were blowing up on Amazon; they didn’t come from eBay. They were built and supplied by the Iranians. That is who did it. There is no dispute about that.

President Obama signed this Iran deal. Iran began to get more money into its education system and it could now engage in certain economic activity. What did Iran do with that money? Let me tell you what they didn’t do. They didn’t build schools, roads, and bridges. They didn’t reinvest it in their economy or their education system. Iran took the money they were making from the Iran deal. The Iran deal now allows them to engage in commerce that they weren’t allowed to. They took that extra money, and they used it to sponsor terrorism—to sponsor Hezbollah in Lebanon.

Today Hezbollah not only has more missiles than they had 10 or 15 years ago, but their missiles are better than they were before. They could now, theoretically, overwhelm Israel’s defenses with barrages of attacks. They have guidance systems on those missiles now. In fact, they have gotten so much assistance from Iran, they don’t even need to try. They have had to cut back. They have budget cuts. They are feeling it.

What about the Houthis? The Houthis are a group that already existed, but they were only able to make the gains they made in Yemen with Iran’s help. And every day about these missiles and drones used by the Houthis to attack Saudi Arabia. It doesn’t get a lot of coverage, but where do you think they bought these things from? Do you think they made them? We didn’t sell them to them. Those are Iranian missiles. All of it is provided by this additional money they got their hands on. They also conduct cyberattacks. Heinlein said: “There are no dangerous parts of the Iran deal. Yes, it dealt with uranium enrichment, and supervision, but it did nothing with the missile system.

To have a nuclear threat, you have to do three things: No. 1, have a bomb designer. That is what the deal dealt with. I believe it or not; No. 2, have the industrial capacity to enrich uranium to weapons grade, and that is just a function of time and willingness. Once you can enrich at any level, you can keep going. That is what the deal dealt with: and the third thing you have to do is deliver it. You have to launch it on something to reach your target.

The deal with Iran did nothing on the missiles. It gave them more money, and they used some of that money to build missiles that now have longer ranges. Where Iran, 5 or 10 years ago, had a more limited range of places to attack offensively, it now has virtually every capital in the Middle East and every base in the region. That is where they were putting this money.

The Trump administration came in and said: Let me get this straight. We will not only get a lot in more money. They use that money to build better missiles, to sponsor terrorism, to conduct cyber attacks, and the only thing is they can’t enrich uranium for a period of time until the deal goes away. That is not a bad deal for Iran because what they were banking on is that in 10 years, we would be focused on something else. The world would forget, and all of a sudden they would say: Yes, we were doing it.

The deal was a fraud. It did nothing to make Iran less dangerous. The only thing the deal did is slow down their enrichment capability, but at no time are they less than 1/2 to 2 years away to have a working nuclear bomb. At some point, they would—at least they retain that very option.

This idea that somehow Iran wasn’t doing anything wrong but pulling out of the deal caused all these tensions is just not true. Even with a deal in place, Iran was arming and training and equipping all these groups in the region and conducting cyber attacks and building these missiles unabated. That is what was going on. Now they have to do it more.

By the way, today Iran is generating a lot less revenue than they were when the deal was in place. We are at a point now where even Hezbollah is out there saying: We have had to cut back. They have budget cuts. They are putting out leaflets and things they posted publicly inside of Lebanon asking people to donate to Hezbollah because Iran can’t donate as much as they used to in Iran. There are real constraints. That is not a bad thing. Likewise, with some of these Shia militias and others, it has constrained Iran’s ability to operate.

Iran has decided the only way to reverse this is to force us back to some negotiation at some point to either. A, intimidate us back into the deal or, B, force us to the negotiating table to get something like it. How can they do that? How can they position themselves with some strength in order to get into that kind of negotiation? They can’t sanction us economically. The only thing they can do is these terrorist attacks—these attacks that started to connect. That is what they are in the pattern of doing.

Do you realize, last week, over a period of 7 days, every single day there was a Shia militia attack against a U.S. installation? Luckily, nobody died, but that was happening. That is what they were trying and are trying to do.

They were trying to position themselves and accumulate some strength so they can get into future negotiations from a position of strength. The only way they think they can do that is by threatening to attack us and, more interestingly, to attack us with some level of deniability. You have this tanker out there in the middle of the Gulf, which is a huge ocean, and suddenly some missiles blow up, and you have journalists and politicians saying, how do we know it was Iran? Who was it? It wasn’t the Iranians. It wasn’t the French. It wasn’t Luxembourg. There is only one organization in that part of the world with the capability to do what happened—Iran. Everybody knows it.

The only reason some countries don’t admit it is because they would have to do something about it. If you are a European country and you want the Iran deal to come back in place and you want to see it, you can’t say you know Iran put those on those ships. If you say that, you have to pull out of the deal. That is why they wouldn’t acknowledge it.

We have them on video. I heard people ask how we know those were Iranian. This is ridiculous. For the way, the mines look identical to the ones Iran makes. So they did that. That was their plan, OK? Their plan was to attack us using other forces but to have some level of deniability. “It was not us.”

They also know that there are divisions in American politics and that the President is unpopular in many countries. A lot of people around the world and in the United States would love nothing more than to say: “Yes, how do we know it was Iran?” for different reasons. That is what they were banking on, but then they shot down an unmanned U.S. vehicle, and they admitted it because that would have been too difficult to cover. That is what really kicked off a lot of this argument that we are now hearing.

I want everybody to remember, if you go back 3 or 4 weeks, that there were people in the building and people on television—I saw them—commentators and others—who were basically implying that this was all not true, that there was no threat emanating from Iran, that it wasn’t doing anything unusual. Now they are admitting that Iran is doing something unusual and dangerous. But the reason they were basically implying that this was all being made up by people who wanted a war.

Think that through logically. That means there would be dozens and dozens of career service men and women in the U.S. Armed Forces and in the Pentagon who would be, basically, lying to us about this. That is absurd.

So we get to the point of how this really got us here. It wasn’t the deal with Iran or the pulling out of the deal that caused this. This has always been. This is what Iran has always done, and it has been doing it for two decades.
now and longer. To somehow act as if Iran is more belligerent today than it was 6 months ago or 6 years ago is just not true. It is just that the threats have become more imminent directly against us.

When you look at this amendment, the amendment is basically designed to say that the President cannot enter into a war unless Congress approves it, which is an interesting dynamic.

No. 1, when you hear people saying you don't have a right to introduce military forces, what they are talking about is the War Powers Resolution. In the aftermath of Vietnam and that era, Congress said, from now on, we are not getting into any more of these undeclared wars. If a President is going to commit service men and women for an extended period of time, it has to come through Congress.

No President—no administration—has ever accepted that resolution as being in the Constitution. From that point on, every single administration—Democrat and Republican—has taken the position that this is an unconstitutional infringement on the power of the Commander in Chief. That has been the official position of every administration, Republican and Democrat, since that passed.

Nonetheless, on various occasions, Presidents have come to Congress for authority, which I think is a smart thing to do, especially for an extended engagement, because we are stronger and our policies are more effective when Congress and the American people are behind you. That is why President George W. Bush sought the authorization for Afghanistan and why he sought it for Iraq. It was the right thing to do, and it made sense. Yet no President has ever admitted that it is constitutional, and I share that view.

For a moment, let’s assume that it were. Well, that resolution lays out three things that happen: if a President, a Commander in Chief, can commit U.S. forces to a hostility, to a war, to a fight.

The first thing is that there has to be a declaration of war. That is in the Constitution too. Congress can declare war.

The second is that Congress can authorize the use of force. That is when you hear all of this talk about the authorization for use of military force, the AUMF, which we had in Afghanistan, and that is what we had in Iraq. That is what a lot of people around here think we need if we are going to do something with Iraq.

There is a third component they like to ignore, and the third component is that a President can institute U.S. military action if Congress declares war, if Congress authorizes the use of force, or, No. 3, if there is an emergency that causes us to respond to an attack against the United States, our territories, our holdings, or our Armed Forces.

I want to tell you that if a Shia militia attacks a U.S. base in Iraq, this is a pretty clear attack on the Armed Forces. If it shoots down one of our unmanned, unarmed platforms over international airspace, that is an attack on our Armed Forces. If they try to kidnap or murder an ambassador or a diplomat by backing a drone or an embryo, that is an attack on U.S. territory since embassies are sovereign territories.

If you look at what the administration has done, the only thing the administration has done when it has these opportunities is made the decision to ensure that we have had enough ships and enough airplanes and enough personnel and enough assets in the Middle East so, if we are attacked, we can respond. That is the only thing it has done.

I don’t know how you read the plain text of the language that they are wrapping themselves around—those who criticize what the administration has done—and not realize that it is fully authorized. If we are attacked, the President is going to do that, he has a right to respond—he has an obligation.

Think of the reverse. If the Iranians were to attack a facility in Iraq and murder 100 Americans who would be working as diplomats or if they were to kill 200 soldiers, the first questions that every one of the President’s critics would be asking on TV would be: Why didn’t we have enough forces in the region to protect them? Why didn’t we have a plan to save them? Would there be congressional hearings, and there would be Members of Congress who would scream at the administration: Why didn’t you have people there to save them?

In anticipating that this could happen, our military leaders, in their looking at the threats and understanding the environment, asked the administration to send additional forces so that they may be in a position of having enough people and assets to respond in case of an attack.

I will go further than that. Imagine this: is given verifiable information that an attack is imminent by Iran or one of its proxies and that the only way to save American lives is to wipe out the place from which it is going to launch the attack. Even if you acted first, that is self-defense. You are getting ahead of preventing an attack, not to mention the fact that the best way to respond to an attack is to prevent it from happening in the first place, and having a force posture in the region is one of the best ways to do that. That is the only thing that has been done here.

This amendment is just not necessary because, in assuming they are arguing that the War Powers Resolution should be understood to mean what Congress’s power and role are in all of this, in the very text of that resolution, it makes clear that a President has a right to introduce military forces and to use military force to defend Americans, to defend America, and to defend our Armed Forces.

So why do we need language that says that a second time? Some would say: Well, it is redundant, and it is already the law. Why not just vote for it again?

That is the final and, perhaps, the most important point in all of this—that the timing couldn’t really be any more clear. It is not necessary, but the redundancy here is actually damaging, and here is why.

I think sometimes we make a terrible mistake in American politics. We ascribe our attributes to those of the leaders of other countries. When we hear that the President of Iran said something, we think Iran’s President and his system is like ours. They are not. The President of Iran doesn’t have one-tenth the power of our President, meaning there is a Supreme Leader, and everything goes to the Supreme Leader, a cleric. That is where the power really resides.

No. 2, we make a terrible mistake of believing that they truly understand us, our systems, and our debates when they don’t, experts claim. The President is a cleric. He is not a world traveler nor a constitutional expert nor a consumer of a varied amount of news and information from around the world nor a nuanced person who understands that this amendment, for example, is never going to become law.

Here is what they do believe, and I encourage all Members here to go out and inform themselves as to this. As a Senator, one has the opportunity to do that. If you do believe the President cannot respond. They believe that this President cannot and would not respond. They believe that there is a threshold—that there are x numbers of Americans they can kill and that there are certain types of attacks they can get away with without getting a response back. That is what they believe. Why do they believe it?

No. 1, it is that our President has talked on various occasions about engaging all of Asia in the region. So they begin by believing, by and large, that we don’t even want to be there.

No. 2, they believe it because they look at our domestic politics, and they say: I have heard the debates, and I watched 5 minutes of CNN or some other network the other night, and here is why. People on there who were from Congress or wherever who told the President he can’t do this and can’t do that. That is no support in America for responding, so the President is constrained in what he is able to do.

Is that a problem?

It is because that is where you miscalculate. That is where what their think would trigger a response and what will actually trigger a response are two very different things.

If this thing were to pass—and I know there are still a couple of people who are thinking about voting for it—this would not be reported as an amendment that had passed on a bill but that was never going to become law because it was never going to get signed with that in there. That is not
how it would be reported. In fact, if there were a close vote on it, as I anticipate there will be, the way it would be reported would be as ‘even a handful of Republicans and virtually every Democrat voted to send the President a message that we don't want you using our Armed Forces in wars against Iran.’ That is how it would be reported. That is how they would read it. It would only reinforce this belief among some in that regime that they can go further than they actually can.

I don't mean to say this to argue that there are Members of this body here who are deliberately putting the men and women of our Armed Forces in danger. I am telling them I don't know if they have thought through that part of it. What we do here and how it is perceived in other parts of the world, especially in a reclusive organization such as the regime in Iran, are often two very different things.

The danger with this amendment is that it would send a very clear and unmistakable signal that the Administration says it intends to do. It has made it very clear that this is the only way it intends to use it. It has made it abundantly clear that this is the only way it intends to use it. And if you look at what we have in the region—the number of ships and the number of people—we are not postured for an invasion or an all-out war. We are postured for defensive operations and retaliatory strikes to an attack, and that is what the Administration says it intends to do.

What it intends to do is to continue forward, strangling the sources of finance that the Iranian regime is using to sponsor terrorism and its ballistic missile program and having enough force in the region to protect our men and women who serve us if they were to come under attack. The President is allowed to do that in the Constitution and in the War Powers Resolution.

All this amendment does is create a dangerous opportunity to be misunderstood and to cause something, and that will trigger a response. Then we will have a war. For those who are considering still voting for this because they want to reassert Congress’s role, this is the wrong time and place in which to do it.

I will close with this. I don't agree with all of the President’s foreign policy views. I can tell you, for example, that I do believe that openly talking about getting out of the Middle East as soon as possible and some of this thinking that America is constrained and that we really don't have the dedication or the commitment to see this through if we are attacked. Yet, in fairness, this President is far less likely to go into a war or to start one than was his predecessor—or his two predecessors, actually. He showed great restraint the other day.

It strikes me that not only is this unnecessary from a policy perspective, it is also unnecessary from a personality perspective. This is not a President who is looking to start wars. This is a President who is looking to get out of the ones we are already in. Again, I just don't know why we would run the risk of putting something out there that could be misconstrued and lead to an attack when we have a President who has no intention of starting a war, when we have a military posture in the region that would not support an offensive military operation or anything to what Pakistan or Iran would like, and when we have this danger of miscalculation.

The amendment has been filed, and there will be a vote on it tomorrow. I just hope that the handful of people still thinking about it will consider all of these points. 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. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

APPOINTMENTS AUTHORITY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the upcoming adjournment of the Senate, the President of the Senate, the President pro tempore, and the majority and minority leaders be authorized to make appointments to Commissions, Committees, Boards, Conferences, or Interparliamentary Conferences authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two houses, or by order of the Senate.

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

EXTENDING THE PROGRAM OF BLOCK GRANTS TO STATES FOR TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES AND RELATED PROGRAMS, THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 2940.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2940) to extend the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families and related programs through September 30, 2019.

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

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

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

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

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

The bill (H.R. 2940) was passed.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

PROVIDING FOR A 2-WEEK EXTENSION OF THE MEDICAID COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2047, submitted today.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2047) to provide for a 2-week extension of the Medicaid community mental health services demonstration program, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. I further ask that the bill be read a second 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2047) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2047

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF THE MEDICAID COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

Section 223(d)(3) of the Protecting Access to Medicare Act of 2014 (42 U.S.C. 1396v note) is amended by striking “June 30, 2019” and inserting “June 30, 2024”.

SEC. 2. MEDICAID IMPROVEMENT FUND.

Section 1911(b)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396w–1(b)(1)) is amended by striking “$6,000,000” and inserting “$1,000,000”.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STONEMAN UPRISE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 270, submitted earlier today.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 270) recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Stonewall uprising.

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

Mr. McCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 270) was agreed to.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The preamble was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 270) was agreed to.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The preamble was agreed to.

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

The amendment (No. 904) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the authorization amount)

On page 3, line 23, strike “such sums as are necessary” and insert “$1,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2020 through 2025”.

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

Mr. McCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 50), as amended, was passed as follows:

S. 50

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Columbia River In-Lieu and Treaty Fishing Access Sites Improvement Act”.

SEC. 2. SANITATION AND SAFETY CONDITIONS AT CERTAIN BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS FACILITIES.

(a) ASSESSMENT OF CONDITIONS.—The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, in consultation with the affected Columbia River Treaty tribes, may assess current sanitation and safety conditions on lands held by the United States through the affected Columbia River Treaty tribes, including all permanent Federal structures and improvements on those lands, that were set aside to provide affected Columbia River Treaty tribes access to traditional fishing grounds—

(1) in accordance with the Act of March 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 10, chapter 9) (commonly known as the “River and Harbor Act of 1945”); or

(2) in accordance with title IV of Public Law 100–581 (102 Stat. 2544).

(b) EXCLUSIVE AUTHORIZATION; CONTRACTS.—The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Indian Affairs—

(1) subject to paragraph (2), shall be the only Federal agency authorized to carry out the activities described in this section; and

(2) may delegate the authority to carry out activities described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (d)—

(A) through one or more contracts entered into with an Indian Tribe or Tribal organization under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.); or

(B) to include other Federal agencies that have relevant expertise.

(c) DEFINITION OF AFFECTED COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY TRIBES.—In this section, the term “affected Columbia River Treaty tribes” means the Confederated Tribes of Umatilla Indian Reservation, the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, and the Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior $11,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2020 through 2025, to remain available until expended—

(1) for improvements to existing structures and infrastructure to improve sanitation and safety conditions assessed under subsection (a); and

(2) to improve access to electricity, sewer, and water infrastructure, where feasible, to reflect needs for sanitary and safe use of facilities referred to in subsection (a).

SEC. 3. STUDY OF ASSESSMENT AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES.

The Comptroller General of the United States, in consultation with the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate, shall contract a study to evaluate whether the sanitation and safety conditions on lands held by the United States for the benefit of the affected Columbia River Treaty tribes (as defined in section 2(c)) have improved as a result of the activities authorized in section 2; and

(1) subject to paragraph (2), shall be the only Federal agency authorized to carry out the activities described in this section; and

(2) may delegate the authority to carry out activities described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (d)—

(A) through one or more contracts entered into with an Indian Tribe or Tribal organization under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.); or

(B) to include other Federal agencies that have relevant expertise.

(c) DEFINITION OF AFFECTED COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY TRIBES.—In this section, the term “affected Columbia River Treaty tribes” means the Confederated Tribes of Umatilla Indian Reservation, the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, and the Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior $11,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2020 through 2025, to remain available until expended—

(1) for improvements to existing structures and infrastructure to improve sanitation and safety conditions assessed under subsection (a); and

(2) to improve access to electricity, sewer, and water infrastructure, where feasible, to reflect needs for sanitary and safe use of facilities referred to in subsection (a).

SEC. 3. STUDY OF ASSESSMENT AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES.

The Comptroller General of the United States, in consultation with the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate, shall—

(1) contract a study to evaluate whether the sanitation and safety conditions on lands held by the United States for the benefit of the affected Columbia River Treaty tribes (as defined in section 2(c)) have improved as a result of the activities authorized in section 2; and

(2) prepare and submit to the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report containing the results of that study.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

INDIAN COMMUNITY ECONOMIC ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2019

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 63, S. 212.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 212) to amend the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000, the Buy Indian Act, and the Native American Programs...
Act of 1974 to provide industry and economic development opportunities to Indian communities.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Hoeven amendment at the desk be agreed to and the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

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

The amendment (No. 905) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the Indian Economic Development Feasibility Study)

On page 12, line 16, insert “the extent to which the programs and services overlap or are duplicative,” after “development.”

The bill (S. 212), as amended, was passed as follows:

S. 212

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Indian Community Economic Enhancement Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that —

(1) to bring industry and economic development to Indian communities, Indian Tribes must overcome a number of barriers, including —

(i) geographical location;

(ii) lack of infrastructure or capacity;

(iii) lack of sufficient collateral and capital;

(iv) regulatory bureaucracy relating to —

(I) development; and

(II) access to services provided by the Federal Government;

(B) the barriers described in subparagraph (A) often add to the cost of doing business in Indian communities;

(2) Indian Tribes —

(A) enact laws and exercise sovereign governmental powers;

(B) determine policy for the benefit of Tribal members; and

(C) produce goods and services for consumers;

(3) the Federal Government has —

(A) an important government-to-government relationship with Indian Tribes; and

(B) a role in facilitating healthy and sustainable Tribal economies;

(4) the input of Indian Tribes in developing Federal policy and programs leads to more meaningful and effective measures to assist Indian Tribes and Indian entrepreneurs in building Tribal economies;

(5)(A) many components of Tribal infrastructure need significant repair or replacement; and

(B) there is a need to provide capital for projects in Indian communities —

(i) may not be available; or

(ii) may come at a higher cost than such access elsewhere;

(6)(A) Federal capital improvement programs, such as those that facilitate tax-exempt bond financing and loan guarantees, are tools that help improve or replace crumbling infrastructure;

(B) lack of parity in treatment of an Indian Tribe and a governmental and the Federal tax and certain other regulatory laws impede, in part, the ability of Indian Tribes to raise capital through issuance of tax exempt debt, in which they invest, and benefit from other investment incentives accorded to State and local governmental entities; and

(C) a result of the disparity in treatment of Indian Tribes described in subparagraph (B), investors may avoid financing, or demand a premium to finance, projects in Indian communities, making the projects more costly or inaccessible;

(7) there are a number of Federal loan guarantee programs available to facilitate financing of business, energy, economic, housing, and community development projects in Indian communities, and those programs may support public-private partnerships for infrastructure development, but improvements and support are needed for those programs specific to Indian communities to facilitate more effectively private financing for infrastructure and other urgent development needs; and

(8)(A) most real property held by Indian Tribes is trust or restricted land that essentially cannot be sold, and

(B) while creative solutions, such as lease-hold mortgages, have been developed in response to the problems identified in subparagraph (A), some solutions remain subject to review and approval by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, adding additional costs and delay to Tribal projects.


(a) FINDINGS; PURPOSES.—Section 2 of the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000 (25 U.S.C. 4301) is amended by adding at the end of the following:

(2) pursuant to section 5 of the Act of August 15, 1876 (19 Stat. 200, chapter 289; 25 U.S.C. 251).

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 3 of the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000 (25 U.S.C. 4302) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (11), respectively, as paragraphs (2) through (12), respectively;

(2) by adding at the end the following:

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall serve as—

(A) the program and policy advisor to the Secretary with respect to the trust and governmental relationship between the United States and Indian Tribes; and

(B) the point of contact for Indian Tribes, Tribal organizations, and Indians regarding—

(i) policies and programs of the Department of Commerce; and

(ii) other matters relating to economic development and doing business in Indian lands.

(3) DEPARTMENTAL COORDINATION.—The Director shall coordinate with all offices and agencies within the Department of Commerce to ensure that each office and agency has—

(A) encouragement, programs, and procedures —

(i) meaningful and timely coordination and assistance, as required by this Act; and

(ii) consultation with Indian Tribes regarding the policies, programs, and activities of the offices and agencies.

(4) OFFICE OPERATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section not more than $2,000,000 for each fiscal year.

(d) INDIAN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES.—The Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000 is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 8 (25 U.S.C. 4307) as section 10; and

(2) by inserting after section 7 (25 U.S.C. 4306) the following:

SEC. 8. INDIAN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES.

(a) INTERAGENCY COORDINATION.—Not later than 1 year after the enactment of this section, the Secretary, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall coordinate—

(1) to develop initiatives that—

(A) encourage, programs, and provide education regarding investments in Indian communities through—

(i) loan guarantee program of Bureau of Indian Affairs under section 104(d) of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1481); and

(ii) programs carried out using amounts in the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund established under section 104(a) of the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994 (12 U.S.C. 4703a(a)); and

(B) other capital development programs;

(2) to consult with Indian Tribes and the Securities and Exchange Commission to study, and collaborate to establish, regulatory changes necessary to qualify an Indian Tribe as an accredited investor for the purposes of sections 230.500 through 230.508 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), consistent with the goals of promoting capital formation and ensuring qualifying Indian Tribes have the ability to withstand investment loss, on a basis comparable to other legal entities that qualify as accredited investors who are not natural persons;

(3) to identify regulatory, legal, or other barriers to increasing economic development, and to consult with the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Treasury regarding the policies, programs, and activities of the offices and agencies.

(4) COORDINATION.—The Director shall coordinate with all offices and agencies within the Department of Commerce to ensure that each office and agency has—

(A) encouragement, programs, and procedures —

(i) meaningful and timely coordination and assistance, as required by this Act; and

(ii) consultation with Indian Tribes regarding the policies, programs, and activities of the offices and agencies.

(5) OFFICE OPERATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section not more than $2,000,000 for each fiscal year.

(6) Programs.—The funds made available under the Indian Community Development Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1481) shall be available to—

(1) carry out programs, activities, and initiatives identified in this section; and

(2) make grants and contracts available to Indian Tribes and Indian organizations to further the purposes of this section.
measurements of economic strength, and contributions of Indian economies in Indian communities through the Authority established under section 4 of the Indian Tribal Reform and Business Development Act of 2000 (25 U.S.C. 4301 note);

“(4) to ensure consultation with Indian Tribes regarding increasing investment in Indian communities and the development of the report required in paragraph (5); and

“(5) not less than once every 2 years, to provide a report to Congress regarding—

“(A) capitalization and related programs resulting from such initiatives and recommendations for promoting sustained growth of the Tribal economies;

“(B) the study and collaboration regarding the necessary changes referenced in paragraph (2) and the impact of allowing Indian Tribes to qualify as an accredited investor; and

“(C) the identified regulatory, legal, and other barriers referenced in paragraph (3).

“(b) WAIVER.—For assistance provided pursuant to section 108 of the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994 (12 U.S.C. 4707) to benefit Native Community Development Financial Institutions, as defined by the Secretary of the Treasury, section 108(e) of such Act shall not apply.

“(c) INDIAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FEASIBILITY STUDY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Government Accountability Office shall conduct a study and, not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this subsection, submit to the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report on the findings of the study and recommendations.

“(2) CONTENTS.—The study shall include an assessment of each of the following:

“(A) the capital needs of Indian communities and services identified, the study shall assess the current use and demand by Indian communities, businesses, and economic development, including manufacturing, physical infrastructure (such as telecommunications and broadband), community development, and facilities construction for such purposes.

“(B) the National Indian Community Health Foundation, the capital needs of Indian Tribes, businesses, and communities related to economic development, the extent to which the programs and services overlap or are under the extent that similar programs have been used to assist non-Indian communities compared to the extent used for Indian communities.

“(C) FINANCING ASSISTANCE.—The study shall assess and quantify the extent of assistance provided to non-Indian borrowers and to Indian (both Tribal and individual) borrowers, information and guidance assistance as a percentage of need for Indian borrowers and for non-Indian borrowers, assistance to Indian borrowers and to non-Indian borrowers as a percentage of total applicants, and such assistance to Indian borrowers as a percentage as compared to such assistance to Indian Tribes) through the loan programs, the loan guarantee programs, or bond guarantee programs.

“(D) TAX INCENTIVES.—The study shall assess and quantify the extent of the assistance and allocations afforded for non-Indian projects and for Indian projects pursuant to each of the following tax incentive programs:

“(i) New market tax credit.

“(ii) Low income housing tax credit.

“(iii) Community Renewal Tax Credit.

“(iv) Renewable energy tax incentives.

“(v) Accelerated depreciation.

“(D) TRIBAL INVESTMENT INCENTIVE.—The study shall assess the current use and demand by Indian communities and services identified, the study shall assess the current Federal capitalization and related programs and services identified, the study shall assess the current use and demand by Indian communities, and not less frequently than once every 2 years thereafter, each of the Committees shall submit to the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report describing, during the period covered by the report, the implementation of this section by each of the respective Committees.

“(E) a summary of all deviations granted under part 1480 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), to harmonize the procurement procedures of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Health and Human Services, to the maximum extent practicable.

“(4) require regional offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service to aggregate data regarding compliance with this section;

“(5) require procurement management reviews by their respective Departments to include a review of the implementation of this section; and

“(6) consult with Indian Tribes, Indian industrial entities, and other stakeholders regarding methods to facilitate compliance with—

“(A) this section; and

“(B) other small business or procurement goals.

“(4) REPORT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, and not less frequently than once every 2 years thereafter, each of the Committees shall submit to the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report describing, during the period covered by the report, the implementation of this section by each of the respective Committees.

“(2) CONTENTS.—Each report under this subsection shall include, for each fiscal year during the period covered by the report—

“(A) the names of each agency under the respective jurisdiction of each of the Committees to which this section has been applied, and efforts made by additional agencies and the Secretaries to respect Department to use the procurement procedures under this Act;

“(B) a summary of the types of purchases made, and contracts awarded, including any relevant modifications, extensions, or renewals awarded to, Indian economic enterprises, expressed by agency region;

“(C) the percentage increase or decrease in total dollar value and number of purchases and awards made within each agency region, as compared to the number of the region for the preceding fiscal year;

“(D) a description of the methods used by applicable contracting officers and employing personnel to ensure that competitive and non-competitive contracts awarded to Small Business Administration and Indian Tribe business are not awarded to small business, including any relevant modifications, extensions, or renewals awarded to, Indian economic enterprises, including a description of the dollar value of the awards;

“(E) a summary of the total number and value of all purchases of, and contracts awarded for, supplies, services, and
construction (including the percentage increase or decrease, as compared to the preceding fiscal year) from—

"(i) Indian economic enterprises; and

"(ii) non-Indian economic enterprises;

"(H) any administrative, procedural, legal, or other barriers to achieving the purposes of this section, together with recommendations for legislative or administrative actions to address those barriers; and

"(I) for each agency region—

"(i) the total amount spent on purchases made from, and contracts awarded to, Indian economic enterprises; and

"(ii) a comparison of the amount described in clause (i) to the total amount that the agency region would likely have spent on the same purchases made from a non-Indian economic enterprise or contracts awarded to a non-Indian economic enterprise.

"(e) Goals.—Each agency shall establish an annual minimum percentage goal for procurement in compliance with this section.

SEC. 5. NATIVE AMERICAN PROGRAMS ACT OF 1974.

(a) FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR NATIVE AMERICAN PROJECTS.—Section 803 of the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2991b) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) through (d) as subsections (c) through (e), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

"(b) ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner may provide assistance under subsection (a) for the development financial institution, including the development of nonprofit subsidiaries or economic enterprises; and

"(2) PRIORITY.—With regard to not less than 50 percent of the total amount available for assistance under this subsection, the Commissioner shall give priority to any application describing a program which: (A) the development of a Tribal code or court system for purposes of economic development, including commercial codes, training for court personnel, regulation pursuant to section 5 of the Act of August 15, 1876 (19 Stat. 209, chapter 289; 25 U.S.C. 261), and the development of nonprofit subsidiary or other business structure; (B) the development of a community development financial institution, including training and administrative expenses; or (C) the development of a Tribal master plan for community and economic development and infrastructure.

(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.—Section 804 of the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2991c) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "The Commissioner" and inserting the following:

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner; and

"(b) by adding at the end the following:

"(b) PRIORITY.—In providing assistance under subsection (a), the Commissioner shall give priority to any assistance application described in section 803(b)(2)."

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 816 of the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2991d) is amended—

(1) by striking "$833,000;" each place it appears and inserting "$800,000;" and

(2) in subsection (b), (A) by striking "such sums as may be necessary" and inserting "$34,000,000;" and

(B) by striking "1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002" and inserting "$20,200 through 2024".

(d) CONFORMING AND TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—The Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2991 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking "Tribe" each place the term appears and inserting "Tribe;"

(2) by striking "tribe" each place the term appears and inserting "tribes;" and

(3) by striking "tribal" each place the term appears and inserting "tribal;"

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the following Calendar items, en bloc: Calendar Nos. 110, 41, 73, 42, 64, 49, 34, 57, and 33.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bills, en bloc.

NULIFYING THE SUPPLEMENTAL TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE CONFEDERATED TRIBES AND BANDS OF INDIANS OF MIDDLE OREGON

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 832) to nullify the Supplemental Treaty Between the United States of America and the Confederated Tribes and Band of Indians of Middle Oregon, concluded on November 15, 1865.

PROVIDING FOR THE CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO THE TANANA TRIBAL COUNCIL LOCATED IN TANANA, ALASKA, AND TO THE BRISTOL BAY AREA HEALTH CORPORATION LOCATED IN DILLINGHAM, ALASKA

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 224) to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Tanana Tribal Council located in Tanana, Alaska, and to the Bristol Bay Area Health Corporation located in Dillingham, Alaska, and for other purposes.

PROGRESS FOR INDIAN TRIBES ACT

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 209) to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide further self-governance by Indian Tribes, and for other purposes.

ESTHER MARTINEZ NATIVE AMERICAN LANGUAGES PROGRAMS REAUTHORIZATION ACT

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 256) to amend the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to provide flexibility and reauthorization to ensure the survival and continuing vitality of Native American languages.

NATIVE AMERICAN BUSINESS INCUBATORS PROGRAM ACT

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 294) to establish a business incubators program within the Department of the Interior to promote economic development in Indian reservation communities.

TRIBAL HUD-VASH ACT OF 2019

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 205) to provide for rental assistance for homeless or at-risk Indian veterans, and for other purposes.

SPOKANE TRIBE OF INDIANS OF THE SPOKANE RESERVATION EQUITABLE COMPENSATION ACT

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 216) to provide for equitable compensation to the Spokane Tribe of Indians of the Spokane Reservation for the use of tribal land for the production of hydropower by the Grand Coulee Dam, and for other purposes.

KLAMATH TRIBE JUDGMENT FUND REPEAL ACT

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 46) to repeal the Klamath Tribe Judgment Fund Act.

LEECH LAKE BAND OF OJIBWE RESERVATION RESTORATION ACT

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 199) to provide for the transfer of certain Federal land in the State of Minnesota for the benefit of the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bills en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bills, en bloc, be considered read a third time.

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

The bills were ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and were read the third time, en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the bills, en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate? Having none, the bills having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bills pass, en bloc?

The bills (S. 832, S. 224, S. 209, S. 256, S. 294, S. 257, S. 216, S. 46, S. 199) were passed, en bloc, as follows:

S. 832

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

SECTION 1. NULLIFICATION OF TREATY.

The Supplemental Treaty Between the United States of America and the Confederated Tribes and Bands of Indians of Middle Oregon, concluded on November 15, 1865, and entered into pursuant to the Senate resolution of ratification dated March 2, 1867 (14 Stat. 751), shall have no force or effect.

S. 224

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

SECTION 1. CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY TO THE TANANA TRIBAL COUNCIL.

(a) CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable, but not later than 180 days, after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior to promote economic development in Indian reservation communities.
this Act as the ‘Secretary’ shall convey to the Tanana Tribal Council located in Tanana, Alaska (referred to in this section as the ‘Council’), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the property described in subsection (b) for use in connection with health and social services programs.

(b) EFFECT ON ANY QUITCLAIM DEED.—The conveyance by the Secretary of title by warranty deed under this subsection shall, on the effective date of the conveyance, supersede and render of no further effect any quitclaim deed to the property described in subsection (b) executed by the Secretary and the Council.

(c) CONDITIONS.—The conveyance of the property under this section—

(1) I N GENERAL.—As soon as practicable, the Secretary shall comply with subsection (b) on or before the date on which the property described in subparagraph (A) includes any oil or petroleum products, hazardous substances, hazardous materials, hazardous waste, pollutants, toxic substances, solid waste, or any other environmental contamination described in any Federal or State law.

(2) E ASEM ENT.—The Secretary shall be accorded any easement or access to the property conveyed under this section as may be reasonably necessary to satisfy any retained obligation or liability of the Secretary.

(3) NOTICE OF HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE ACTIVITY AND LIABILITY.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall comply with subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 120(h)(3) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620(h)(3)).

SEC. 2. CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY TO THE BRISTOL BAY AREA HEALTH CORPORATION.

(a) CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY.—

(1) I N GENERAL.—As soon as practicable, but not later than 180 days, after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall convey to the Bristol Bay Area Health Corporation located in Dillingham, Alaska (referred to in this section as the ‘Corporation’), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the property described in subsection (b) for use in connection with health and social services programs.

(2) EFFECT ON ANY QUITCLAIM DEED.—The conveyance by the Secretary of title by warranty deed under this subsection shall, on the effective date of the conveyance, supersede and render of no further effect any quitclaim deed to the property described in subsection (b) executed by the Secretary and the Corporation.

(c) CONDITIONS.—The conveyance of the property under this section—

(1) I N GENERAL.—As soon as practicable, the Secretary shall comply with subsection (b) on or before the date on which the property described in subparagraph (A) includes any oil or petroleum products, hazardous substances, hazardous materials, hazardous waste, pollutants, toxic substances, solid waste, or any other environmental contamination described in any Federal or State law.

(2) E ASEM ENT.—The Secretary shall be accorded any easement or access to the property conveyed under this section as may be reasonably necessary to satisfy any retained obligation or liability of the Secretary.

(3) NOTICE OF HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE ACTIVITY AND LIABILITY.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall comply with subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 120(h)(3) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620(h)(3)).
``(B) the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs; or
``(C) the Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians.

(8) Joint participation.—The term "program" means any program, function, service, or activity (or portion thereof) within the Department that is included in a funding agreement.

(9) Self-determination contract.—The term, 'program' means any program, function, service, or activity (or portion thereof) within the Department that is included in a funding agreement.

(10) Self-determination contract.—The term "self-determination contract" means a self-determination contract entered into under section 102.

(11) Self-governance.—The term "self-governance" means the Tribal Self-Governance Program established under this title.

(12) Tribal share.—The term "Tribal share" means the portion of all funds and resources of an Indian Tribe that—

(A) includes an Indian Tribe and the United States as parties; and

(B) quantifies or otherwise defines any water right of the Indian Tribe.

(c) Establishment.—Section 402 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5363) is amended to read as follows:

``SEC. 402. TRIBAL SELF-GOVERNANCE PROGRAM.

(a) Establishment.—The Secretary shall establish and carry out a program within the Department known as the Tribal Self-Governance Program.

(b) Selection of Participating Indian Tribes.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) Eligibility.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Office of Self-Governance, may select not more than 50 eligible under subsection (c) to participate in self-governance.

(B) Joint Participation.—On the request of each Indian Tribe, the Secretary may enter into an agreement providing that theTribe or other tribe otherwise eligible Indian Tribes may be treated as a single Indian Tribe for the purpose of participating in self-governance.

(C) Joint Participation of Indian Tribes or Tribal Organization.—If an Indian Tribe authorizes another Indian Tribe or a Tribal organization to plan for or carry out a program on its behalf under this title, the authorized Indian Tribe or Tribal organization shall have the rights and responsibilities of the authorizing Indian Tribe (except as otherwise provided in this subsection).

(D) Joint Participation as Organization.—Two or more Indian Tribes that are not otherwise eligible under subsection (c) may be treated as a single Indian Tribe for the purpose of participating in self-governance as a Tribal organization if—

(A) each Indian Tribe so requests; and

(B) the Tribal organization itself, or at least one of the Indian Tribes participating in the Tribal organization, is eligible under subsection (c).

(2) WRITTEN FUNDING AGREEMENT TO THE SECRETARY.—

(A) AN INDIAN TRIBE THAT WANTS TO WITHDRAW FROM PARTICIPATION IN THE TRIBAL ORGANIZATION.—If an Indian Tribe withdraws from participation in a Tribal organization, the Indian Tribe shall be entitled to its Tribal share of funds and resources associated with the withdrawal of the Indian Tribe as specified in the Tribal resolution and fully or partially withdraw its Tribal share of any program in a funding agreement from a participating Tribal organization.

(B) NOTIFICATION.—The Indian Tribe shall provide a copy of the Tribal resolution described in clause (i) to the Secretary.

(3) EFFECT OF WITHDRAWAL.—If an Indian Tribe withdraws from participation in a Tribal organization, the Indian Tribe shall be entitled to its Tribal share of funds and resources associated with the withdrawal of the Indian Tribe as specified in the Tribal resolution and shall carry out under the compact and funding agreement of the Indian Tribe.

(4) PARTICIPATION IN SELF-GOVERNANCE.—

(A) TRIBAL ORGANIZATION.—If an Indian Tribe authorizes another Indian Tribe or a Tribal organization to plan for or carry out a program on its behalf under this title, the authorized Indian Tribe or Tribal organization shall be entitled to participate in self-governance if the Indian Tribe is eligible under subsection (c).

(B) ELIGIBILITY.—The Secretary shall—

(i) conduct a review of the Indian Tribe to determine the Tribe's ability to carry out programs described in subsection (d); and

(ii) determine whether the Tribe is eligible for grants through the Tribal Self-Governance Program established under section 402.

(C) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to participate in self-governance, an Indian Tribe shall—

(A) be conducted to the satisfaction of the Indian Tribe; and

(B) include—

(i) an evaluation of the Tribe's progress in implementing the program and achieving benefits under the agreement; and

(ii) internal Tribal government planning, training, and organizational preparation.

(D) DETERMINATION.—The Secretary shall—

(i) conduct a determination of the Tribe's eligibility under subsection (c); and

(ii) if the Secretary determines that the Tribe is not eligible under subsection (c), notify the Tribe of the determination and the reasons for the determination.

(E) DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—If an Indian Tribe or Tribal organization eligible to enter into a self-determination contract or a compact or funding agreement fully or partially withdraws from a participating Tribal organization, the withdrawing Indian Tribe, in whole or in part, shall be entitled to its Tribal share of funds and resources supporting the programs that the Indian Tribe withdraws from participation in a Tribal organization, as specified in the Tribal resolution and fully or partially withdraws its Tribal share of any program in a funding agreement from a participating Tribal organization.

(5) JOINT PARTICIPATION AS ORGANIZATION.—

(A) An Indian Tribe that withdraws from participation in a Tribal organization in part, shall be entitled to participate in self-governance if the Indian Tribe is eligible under subsection (c).

(B) EFFECT OF WITHDRAWAL.—If an Indian Tribe withdraws from participation in a Tribal organization, the Indian Tribe shall be entitled to its Tribal share of funds and resources associated with the withdrawal of the Indian Tribe as specified in the Tribal resolution and shall carry out under the compact and funding agreement of the Indian Tribe.

(C) PARTICIPATION IN SELF-GOVERNANCE.—

The withdrawal of an Indian Tribe from a Tribal organization shall not affect the eligibility of the Tribal organization to participate in self-governance if the withdrawing Indian Tribe or Tribal organization still qualifies under subsection (c).

(D) WITHDRAWAL.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—An Indian Tribe may, by Tribal resolution, fully or partially withdraw its Tribal share of any program in a funding agreement from a participating Tribal organization.

(ii) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The withdrawal shall become effective on—

(aa) the earlier of—

(AA) 1 year after the date of submission of the request; and

(AB) the date on which the funding agreement expires; or

(bb) such date as may be mutually agreed upon by the Secretary, the withdrawing Indian Tribe, and the Tribal organization that signed the compact and funding agreement of the withdrawing Indian Tribe or Tribal organization.

(iii) NO SPECIFIED DATE.—In the absence of a date specified in the resolution, the withdrawal shall become effective on—

(aa) the earlier of—

(AA) 1 year after the date of submission of the request; and

(AB) the date on which the funding agreement expires; or

(bb) such date as may be mutually agreed upon by the Secretary, the withdrawing Indian Tribe, and the Tribal organization that signed the compact and funding agreement of the withdrawing Indian Tribe or Tribal organization.

(6) DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—If an Indian Tribe or Tribal organization eligible to enter into a self-determination contract or a compact or funding agreement fully or partially withdraws from a participating Tribal organization, the withdrawing Indian Tribe—

(C) DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—If an Indian Tribe or Tribal organization eligible to enter into a self-determination contract or a compact or funding agreement fully or partially withdraws from a participating Tribal organization, the withdrawing Indian Tribe, in whole or in part, shall be entitled to its Tribal share of funds and resources supporting the programs that the Indian Tribe withdraws from participation in a Tribal organization, as specified in the Tribal resolution and fully or partially withdraws its Tribal share of any program in a funding agreement from a participating Tribal organization.

(7) DETERMINATION.—The Secretary shall—

(A) conduct a determination of the Tribe's eligibility under subsection (c); and

(B) if the Secretary determines that the Tribe is not eligible under subsection (c), notify the Tribe of the determination and the reasons for the determination.

(8) DETERMINATION.—The Secretary shall—

(A) conduct a determination of the Tribe's eligibility under subsection (c); and

(B) if the Secretary determines that the Tribe is not eligible under subsection (c), notify the Tribe of the determination and the reasons for the determination.

(9) DETERMINATION.—The Secretary shall—

(A) conduct a determination of the Tribe's eligibility under subsection (c); and

(B) if the Secretary determines that the Tribe is not eligible under subsection (c), notify the Tribe of the determination and the reasons for the determination.

(10) DETERMINATION.—The Secretary shall—

(A) conduct a determination of the Tribe's eligibility under subsection (c); and

(B) if the Secretary determines that the Tribe is not eligible under subsection (c), notify the Tribe of the determination and the reasons for the determination.

(11) DETERMINATION.—The Secretary shall—

(A) conduct a determination of the Tribe's eligibility under subsection (c); and

(B) if the Secretary determines that the Tribe is not eligible under subsection (c), notify the Tribe of the determination and the reasons for the determination.

(12) DETERMINATION.—The Secretary shall—

(A) conduct a determination of the Tribe's eligibility under subsection (c); and

(B) if the Secretary determines that the Tribe is not eligible under subsection (c), notify the Tribe of the determination and the reasons for the determination.

(13) TRIBAL WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT.—

The term 'Tribal water rights settlement' means the settlement, compact, or other agreement expressly ratified or approved by an Act of Congress authorizing resolution.

(E) DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—If an Indian Tribe or Tribal organization eligible to enter into a self-determination contract or a compact or funding agreement fully or partially withdraws from a participating Tribal organization, the withdrawing Indian Tribe, in whole or in part, shall be entitled to its Tribal share of funds and resources supporting the programs that the Indian Tribe withdraws from participation in a Tribal organization, as specified in the Tribal resolution and fully or partially withdraws its Tribal share of any program in a funding agreement from a participating Tribal organization.

(F) DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—If an Indian Tribe or Tribal organization eligible to enter into a self-determination contract or a compact or funding agreement fully or partially withdraws from a participating Tribal organization, the withdrawing Indian Tribe, in whole or in part, shall be entitled to its Tribal share of funds and resources supporting the programs that the Indian Tribe withdraws from participation in a Tribal organization, as specified in the Tribal resolution and fully or partially withdraws its Tribal share of any program in a funding agreement from a participating Tribal organization.
(I) in clause (i), as redesignated by clause (ii), by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting ‘‘; and’’; and
(II) in clause (ii), as so redesignated, by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting ‘‘; and’’; and
(v) by redesigning subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B);
(vi) in subparagraph (B), as redesignated by clause (v), by striking the semicolon and inserting ‘‘; and’’; and
(vii) by adding at the end the following:
(A) any other program, service, function, or activity (other than that which is provided through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, or the Office of the Trustee for American Indians with respect to which Indian Tribes or Indians are primary or significant beneficiaries); (B) a program or project—
(1) by striking ‘‘section 405(c)’’ and inserting ‘‘section 412(c)’’; and
(2) by inserting ‘‘and’’ after the semicolon; and
(C) in the subsection heading, by striking ‘‘FOR REVIEW’’;
(D) by striking ‘‘such agreement to’’— and all the following through ‘‘Indian Tribe’’ and inserting ‘‘such agreement to each Indian Tribe’’;
(E) by inserting ‘‘agreement’’; and inserting ‘‘agreement’’; and
(D) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3); and
(4) in subsection (k), by striking ‘‘section 405(c)(1)’’ and inserting ‘‘section 406(c)’’; and
(5) by adding at the end the following:
‘‘(m) OTHER PROVISIONS.—
(1) EXCLUDED FUNDING.—A funding agreement shall not include a program or activity that is carried out under section 106; or
(2) COST PRINCIPLES.—An Indian Tribe shall apply cost principles under the applicable Office of Management and Budget circular, except as modified by—
(A) any provision of law, including section 407; and
(B) any exemptions to applicable Office of Management and Budget circulars subsequently granted by the Office of Management and Budget.
(5) FEDERAL CLAIMS.—Any claim by the Federal Government against an Indian Tribe relating to funds received under a funding agreement based on any audit under this subsection shall be—
(A) so long as the redesign or consolidation does not have the effect of denying eligibility for services to population groups otherwise eligible to be served under applicable Federal law; and
(B) except that, with respect to the reallotment, consolidation, and reallocation of programs described in subsections (b)(2) or (c) of section 403, a joint agreement between the Secretary and the Indian Tribe shall be required.
(e) RETROCESSION.—
(1) in general.—An Indian Tribe may fully or partially retrocede to the Secretary any program under a compact or funding agreement
(2) effective date.—
(A) agreement.—Unless an Indian Tribe respectfully requests a retrocession under paragraph (1), the retrocession shall become effective on the date specified by the Indian Tribe.
(B) no agreement.—In the absence of a specification of an effective date in the compact or funding agreement, the retrocession shall become effective on
(I) the earlier of:
(i) the later of—
(A) effective date:—A funding agreement shall become effective on the date specified in part (iii) of this section; or
(B) EXISTING AND SUBSEQUENT FUNDING AGREEMENTS.—
(1) SUBSEQUENT FUNDING AGREEMENTS.—
(A) a funding agreement shall remain in full force and effect until a subsequent funding agreement is executed, with funding paid annually for each fiscal year the agreement is in effect; and
(B) the term of the subsequent funding agreement shall be retroactive to the end of the term of the preceding funding agreement for the purposes of calculating the amount of funding to which the Indian Tribe is entitled.
(2) existing funding agreements.—An Indian Tribe participating in self-governance under this title on the date of enactment of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act shall have the option at any time after that date—
(A) to retain its existing funding agreement (in whole or in part) to the extent that the provisions of that funding agreement are not directly contrary to any express provision of this title; or
(B) to negotiate a new funding agreement in a manner consistent with this title.
(4) multiyear agreements.—An Indian Tribe may, at the discretion of the Indian Tribe, negotiate with the Secretary for a funding agreement with a term that exceeds 1 year.
(e) general revisions.—Title IV of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5361 et seq.) is amended by striking sections 414 through 416 and inserting the following:
SEC. 404. COMPACTS.
(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall negotiate and enter into a written compact with each Indian Tribe participating in self-governance in a manner consistent with the trust responsibilities of the Federal Government, treaty obligations, agreements, and compact-to-governmental relationship between Indian Tribes and the United States.
(b) CONTENTS.—A compact under subsection (a) shall—
(1) specify and affirm the general terms of the government-to-government relationship between the Indian Tribe and the Secretary; and
(2) include such terms as the parties intend shall control during the term of the compact.
(c) AMENDMENT.—A compact under subsection (a) may be amended only by agreement of the parties.
(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The effective date of a compact under subsection (a) shall be—
(1) the date of the execution of the compact by the parties; or
(2) such date as is mutually agreed upon by the parties.
(e) DURATION.—A compact under subsection (a) may remain in effect—
(1) for so long as permitted by Federal law; or
(2) until termination by written agreement of the parties or retrocession under subsection (f).
(f) EXISTING COMPACTS.—An Indian Tribe participating in self-governance under this title, as in effect on the date of enactment of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act, shall have the option at any time after that date—
(1) to retain its negotiated compact (in whole or in part) to the extent that the provisions of the compact are not directly contrary to any express provision of this title; or
(2) to negotiate a new compact in a manner consistent with this title.
SEC. 405. GENERAL PROVISIONS.
(a) APPLICABILITY.—An Indian Tribe and the Secretary shall include in any compact or funding agreement provisions that reflect the requirements of this title.
(b) CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—An Indian Tribe participating in self-governance shall ensure that internal measures are in place to address, prevent, and, to the extent that the provisions of the compact are not directly contrary to any express provision of this title; or
(c) audits.—
(1) single agency audit act.—Chapter 75 of title 31, United States Code, shall apply to a funding agreement under this title.
(2) cost principles.—An Indian Tribe shall apply cost principles under the applicable Office of Management and Budget circular, except as modified by—
(A) any provision of law, including section 407; and
(B) any exemptions to applicable Office of Management and Budget circulars subsequently granted by the Office of Management and Budget.
(3) FEDERAL CLAIMS.—Any claim by the Federal Government against an Indian Tribe relating to funds received under a funding agreement based on any audit under this subsection shall be—
(1) so long as the redesign or consolidation does not have the effect of denying eligibility for services to population groups otherwise eligible to be served under applicable Federal law; and
(2) except that, with respect to the reallotment, consolidation, and reallocation of programs described in subsections (b)(2) or (c) of section 403, a joint agreement between the Secretary and the Indian Tribe shall be required.
(e) RETROCESSION.—
(1) in general.—An Indian Tribe may fully or partially retrocede to the Secretary any program under a compact or funding agreement
(2) effective date.—
(A) agreement.—Unless an Indian Tribe respectfully requests a retrocession under paragraph (1), the retrocession shall become effective on the date specified by the parties in the compact or funding agreement.
(B) no agreement.—In the absence of a specification of an effective date in the compact or funding agreement, the retrocession shall become effective on
(I) the earlier of:
(i) the later of—
(II) the date on which the request is submitted; and
(II) the date on which the funding agreement expires; or
(III) the date on which the funding agreement terminates.
(e) NONDUPUCATION.—A funding agreement shall provide that, for the period for any noncontinuing program, service, or activity contained in a funding agreement.
“(1) shall not be entitled to contract with the Secretary for funds under section 102, except that the Indian Tribe shall be eligible for new programs on the same basis as other Indian Tribes; and

“(2) shall be responsible for the administration of programs in accordance with the compact or funding agreement.

“(d) Final Offer—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Unless an Indian Tribe specifies otherwise in the compact or funding agreement, the Secretary shall be the designated official. An Indian Tribe shall not be considered to be Federal records for purposes of chapter 5 Title 5, United States Code.

“(2) RECORDKEEPING SYSTEM.—An Indian Tribe shall—

“(A) maintain a recordkeeping system; and

“(B) on a notice period of not less than 30 days, provide the Secretary with reasonable access to the records to enable the Department to meet the requirements of sections 3101 through 3106 title 44, United States Code.

“SEC. 406. PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE SECRETARY.

“(a) Trust Evaluations.—A funding agreement shall include a provision to monitor the performance of trust functions by the Indian Tribe through the annual trust evaluation

“(b) Reassumption.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A compact or funding agreement shall include provisions for the Secretary to reassume a program with responsibilities of the Secretary with reasonable funding for circumstances beyond the control of the Secretary, upon written request by the Secretary to the Indian Tribe.

“(2) EXCEPTION.—The deadline described in paragraph (2) may be extended for any length of time agreed upon by both the Indian Tribe and the Secretary.

“(c) Inability to Agree on Compact or Funding Agreement.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall designate one or more appropriate officials in the Department to receive a copy of the final offer described in paragraph (1).

“(2) No designation.—If no official is designated, the Director of the Office of the Executive Secretariat and Regulatory Affairs shall be the designated official.

“(3) No timely determination.—If the Secretary fails to make a determination with respect to a final offer within the period specified in paragraph (2), including any extension agreed to under paragraph (3), the Secretary shall be deemed to have agreed to the offer, except that with respect to any compact or funding agreement provision concerning a program included under section 403(b), the Secretary shall be deemed to have rejected the offer with respect to such provision and the terms of clause (ii) through (iv) of paragraphs (6)(A) shall apply.

“(d) Rejection of Final Offer.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary rejects a final offer of one or more provisions or funding levels in a final offer, the Secretary shall—

“(i) provide timely written notification to the Indian Tribe that contains a specific finding that clearly demonstrates, or that is supported by a controlling legal authority, that—

“(I) the amount of funds proposed in the final offer exceeds the applicable funding level as determined under section 106a(a)(1);

“(II) the program that is the subject of the final offer is an inherent Federal function or a function subject to the Secretary under section 403(c);

“(III) the Indian Tribe cannot carry out the program if it would not result in significant danger or risk to the public health, safety, or natural resources, or to trust resources;

“(IV) the Indian Tribe is not entitled to participate in self-governance under section 402(c);

“(V) the funding agreement would violate a Federal statute or regulation; or

“(VI) with respect to a program or portion of a program included in a final offer pursuant to section 403(b)(2), the program or portion of the program is not otherwise available to Indian Tribes or Indians under section 102(a)(1)(E);

“(ii) provide technical assistance to overcome the objections stated in the notification required by clause (i);

“(iii) provide the Indian Tribe with a hearing on the record with the right to engage in full discovery relevant to any issue raised in the matter, and the opportunity for appeal on the objections raised, except that the Indian Tribe may, in lieu of filing such appeal, direct the Secretary to initiate an action in a United States district court under section 110(a); and

“(iv) provide the Indian Tribe the option of entering into an applicable compact or final proposed compact or funding agreement (including a lesser funding amount, if any), that the Secretary did not reject, subject to any additional alterations necessary to conform the compact or funding agreement to the severed provisions.

“(2) of the exercising certain option.—If an Indian Tribe exercises the option described in subparagraph (A)(i) and

“(i) the Indian Tribe shall retain the right to appeal the rejection by the Secretary under this section; and

“(ii) clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of subparagraph (A) shall apply only to the portion of the Indian Tribe participating in self-governance that was rejected by the Secretary.

“(d) Burden of Proof.—In any administrative action, hearing, appeal, or civil action brought under this section, the Secretary shall have the burden of proof—

“(1) of demonstrating, by a preponderance of the evidence, the validity of the grounds for a reassumption under subsection (b); and

“(2) of clearly demonstrating the validity of the grounds for rejecting a final offer made under subsection (c).

“(e) Good Faith.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the negotiation of compacts and funding agreements, the Secretary shall at all times conduct itself in good faith to maximize implementation of the self-governance policy.

“(2) Policy.—The Secretary shall carry out this title in a manner that maximizes the benefits of Indian Tribes and Tribal programs under this title reduce the administrative or other responsibilities of the Secretary with respect to the operation of those programs and result in savings that have not otherwise been included in the amount of Tribal shares and other funds determined under section 406(c), are generated in whole or in part by measures described in programs under section 403(c), the Secretary shall make such savings available to the Indian Tribes or Tribal organizations with the Department for the provision of additional services to program beneficiaries in a manner equitable to directly served, contracted, and compacted programs.

“(2) Discretionary Programs of Special Significance.—For any savings generated as a result of the assumption of a program by the Secretary under section 403(c), such savings shall be made available to that Indian Tribe.

“(c) Trust Responsibility.—The Secretary may not assign Indian Tribes or individual Indians that exist under treaties, Executive orders, other laws, or court decisions.

“(d) Decision Maker.—A decision that constitutes final agency action and relates to the operation within the Department conducted under subsection (c)(b)(A)(iii) may be made by—

“(1) the official of the Department who holds a position at a higher organizational level within the Department than the level of the departmental agency in which the decision is that the subject of the appeal was made; or

“(2) an administrative law judge.

“(1) Rules of Construction.—Subject to section 102(a) of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act, each provision of this title and each provision of a compact or funding agreement shall be liberally construed for the benefit of the Indian Tribe participating in self-governance, and any ambiguity shall be resolved in favor of the Indian Tribe.

“SEC. 407. CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS AND CONGRESSMAN, RECORD—SENATE

“(a) In General.—Indian Tribes participating in Tribal self-governance may carry
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out any construction project included in a compact or funding agreement under this title.

"(b) TRIBAL OPTION TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL ACTIVITIES.—In carrying out a construction project under this title, an Indian Tribe may, subject to the agreement of the Secretary, elect to assume some Federal responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), division A of subtitle III of title 54, United States Code, and related provisions of law and regulations that would apply if the Secretary were to undertake a construction project, by adopting a resolution that—

"(1) designating a certifying Tribal official to represent the Indian Tribe and to assume the status of a responsible Federal official under those Acts, laws, or regulations; and

"(2) accepting the jurisdiction of the United States courts for the purpose of enforcing the responsibilities of the certifying Tribal official assuming the status of a responsible Federal official under those Acts, laws, or regulations.

"(c) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Notwithstanding subsection (b), nothing in this section authorizes the Indian Tribe to include in any compact or funding agreement duties of the Secretary under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), division A of subtitle III of title 54, United States Code, and other related provisions of law and Federal functions.

"(d) CODES AND STANDARDS.—In carrying out a construction project under this title, an Indian Tribe shall—

"(1) adhere to applicable Federal, State, local, and Tribal building codes, architectural and engineering standards, and applicable Federal guidelines regarding design, space, and operational standards, appropriate for the particular project; and

"(2) use only architects and engineers—

"(A) who are licensed to practice in the State in which the facility will be built; and

"(B) who certify that—

"(i) they are qualified to perform the work required by the specific construction involved; and

"(ii) upon completion of design, the plans and specifications meet or exceed the applicable construction codes, standards, and safety codes.

"(e) TRIBAL ACCOUNTABILITY.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—A Tribal option under this title shall be included in funding agreements as annual or advance payments at the option of the Indian Tribe.

"(2) ADVANCE PAYMENTS.—The Secretary shall include all associated project contingency funds with each advance payment, and the Indian Tribe shall be responsible for the management of such contingency funds.

"(f) IMOPOSTATIONS.—At the option of the Indian Tribe, construction project funding proposals shall be negotiated pursuant to the statutory process in section 105, and any resulting construction project agreement shall be incorporated into the funding agreement as addenda.

"(g) FUTURE FUNDING.—Upon completion of a facility constructed under this title, the Secretary shall provide funding to the Indian Tribe to carry out the funding agreement; or

"(h) FUTURE FUNDING.—Upon completion of a construction project under this title, the Secretary shall—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (e) and sections 403 and 405, the Secretary shall provide funds to the Indian Tribe under a funding agreement for programs in an amount that is equal to the amount that the Indian Tribe would have been entitled to receive under contracts and grants under this Act (including amounts for direct program support and the costs of maintaining tribal employees, which are considered to be incurred by the Secretary when the Tribe is authorized to receive such funding), and in addition, any funds that are specifically or functionally related to the provision by the Secretary of services and benefits to the Indian Tribe's members without regard to the tribe's organization level within the Department at which the programs are carried out.

"(1) CONSTRUCTION OF THIS SECTION.—Nothing in this section reduces programs, services, or funds of, or provided to, another Indian Tribe.

"(d) TIMING.—Pursuant to the terms of any compact or funding agreement entered into under this title, the Secretary shall transfer to the Indian Tribe all funds provided for in the funding agreement, pursuant to subsection (c), and provide for funding for periods covered by joint resolution adopted by Congress making continuing appropriations, to the extent permitted by law.

"(2) TRANSFERS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act, in any Indian Tribe for which a compact requires an annual transfer of funding to be made at the beginning of the fiscal year, or requires a transfer at the beginning of the fiscal year, the first such transfer shall be made not later than 10 days after the apportionment of such funds by the Office of Management and Budget to the Department, unless the funding agreement provides otherwise.

"(3) DEDICABILITY.—Funds for trust services to individual Indians shall be available under a funding agreement only to the extent that the same services that would have been provided by the Secretary are provided to individual Indians by the Indian Tribe.

"(4) MULTYEAR FUNDING.—A funding agreement may provide for multiyear funding.

"(e) LIMITATIONS ON AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall not—

"(f) limit to an Indian Tribe its full and undivided interest in real property transferred to an Indian Tribe or its members) without regard to the Indian Tribe's organization level within the Department at which the programs are carried out.

"(2) withhold any portion of such funds for transfer over a period of years; or

"(3) reduce the amount of funds required under this title—

"(A) to make funding available for self-governance monitoring or administration by the Indian Tribe;

"(B) in subsequent years, except as necessary as a result of—

"(i) a reduction in appropriations from the previous fiscal year for the program to be included in a compact or funding agreement; or

"(ii) a Tribal authorization; or

"(iii) a Tribal authorization; or

"(iv) a change in the amount of pass-through funds subject to the terms of the funding agreement; or

"(v) completion of an activity under a program for which the funding is provided; or

"(C) to pay for Federal functions, including—

"(1) Federal pay costs;

"(2) Federal payroll retirement benefits;

"(3) automated data processing;

"(4) technical assistance; and

"(5) monitoring of activities under this title; or

"(D) to pay for Federal personnel displaced by self-determination contracts
under this Act or self-governance under this title.

"(b) FEDERAL RESOURCES.—If an Indian Tribe elects to carry out a compact or funding agreement use of Federal personnel, Federal supplies (including supplies available from Federal warehouse facilities), Federal supply sources (including lodging, airline transportation, and other means of transportation, including the use of interagency motor pool vehicles), or other Federal resources (including supplies, services, and resources) are required to be acquired and transferred to the Indian Tribe under this title.

"(1) DEPARTMENTAL PAYMENT ACT.—Chapter 28 of title 31, United States Code, shall apply to the transfer of funds due under a compact or funding agreement authorized under this title.

"(j) INTEREST OR OTHER INCOME.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—An Indian Tribe may retain interest or income earned on any funds held by the Secretary that are available until expended.

"(2) NO EFFECT ON OTHER AMOUNTS.—The retention of interest or income under paragraph (1) shall not be subject to, and shall not constitute income or interest or income earned or in any subsequent fiscal year.

"(3) INVESTMENT STANDARD.—Funds transferred under this title shall be managed by the Indian Tribe using the prudent investment standards provided that the Secretary shall not be liable for any investment losses of funds managed by the Indian Tribe that are not otherwise guaranteed or insured by the Federal Government.

"(k) CARRYOVER OF FUNDS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any provision of an appropriations Act, all funds paid to an Indian Tribe in accordance with a compact or funding agreement shall remain available until expended.

"(2) EFFECT OF CARRYOVER.—If an Indian Tribe elects to carry over funding from one year to the next, the carryover shall not diminish the amount of funds the Indian Tribe is entitled to receive under a compact or funding agreement in that fiscal year or any subsequent fiscal year.

"(l) LIMITATION OF COSTS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—An Indian Tribe shall not be obligated to continue performance that requires an expenditure of funds in excess of the amount of funds transferred under a compact or funding agreement.

"(2) NOTICE OF INSUFFICIENCY.—If at any time the Indian Tribe has reason to believe that the amount provided for a specific activity or program under a funding agreement is insufficient, the Indian Tribe shall provide reasonable notice of such insufficiency to the Secretary.

"(m) APPROPRIABILITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, section 101(a) of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act applies to subsections (a) through (m).

"SEC. 409. FACILITATION.

"(a) In General.—Except as otherwise provided by law, the Secretary, in accordance with section 101(a) of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act, the Secretary shall implement each Federal law and regulation in a manner that facilitates—

"(1) the negotiation of programs in funding agreements; and

"(2) the implementation of funding agreements.

"(b) REGULATION WAIVER.—

"(1) REQUEST.—An Indian Tribe may submit to the Secretary a written request for a waiver of applicability of a Federal regulation, including—

"(A) an identification of the specific text in the regulation sought to be waived; and

"(B) the basis for the request.

"(2) DETERMINATION BY THE SECRETARY.—Not later than 120 days after receipt by the Secretary and the designated officials under paragraph (4) of a request under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall approve or deny the requested waiver in writing to the Indian Tribe.

"(3) EXTENSIONS.—The deadline described in paragraph (2) may be extended for any length of time, as agreed upon by both the Indian Tribe and the Secretary.

"(4) DETERMINATION BY THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall designate one or more appropriate officials in the Department to receive a copy of the waiver request described in paragraph (1).

"(5) GROUNDS FOR DENIAL.—The Secretary may deny a request under paragraph (1) upon a specific finding by the Secretary that the requested waiver may not be granted because such a waiver is prohibited by Federal law.

"(f) FAILURE TO MAKE DETERMINATION.—If the Secretary fails to make a determination, with respect to a waiver request within the period specified in paragraph (2) (including any extension agreed to under paragraph (3)), the Secretary shall be deemed to have agreed to the request, except that for a waiver request relating to programs eligible under section 403(b)(2) or section 403(c), the Secretary shall be deemed to have denied the request.

"(g) FINALITY.—A decision of the Secretary under this section shall be final for the Department.

"SEC. 410. DISCRETIONARY APPLICATION OF OTHER SECTIONS.

"(a) In General.—Except as otherwise provided in section 101(a) of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act, at the option of a participating Indian Tribe, any of the provisions of title I may be incorporated in any compact or funding agreement under this title. The inclusion of any such provision shall be subject to, and shall not conflict with, section 101(a) of such Act.

"(b) EFFECT.—Each incorporated provision under subsection (a) shall—

"(1) have the same force and effect as if set out in full in this title;

"(2) supplement or replace any related provision in this title; and

"(3) apply to any agency otherwise governed by the law providing the incorporated provision.

"(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—If an Indian Tribe requests incorporation at the negotiation stage of a compact or funding agreement, the incorporation shall—

"(1) be effective immediately; and

"(2) control the negotiation and resulting compact or funding agreement.

"SEC. 411. ANNUAL BUDGET LIST.

"The Secretary shall list, in the annual budget request submitted to Congress under section 403(c) of United States Code, any funds proposed to be included in funding agreements authorized under this title.

"SEC. 412. REPORTS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—

"(1) REQUIREMENT.—On January 1 of each year, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report regarding the administration of this title.

"(2) ANALYSIS.—Any Indian Tribe may submit to the Office of Self-Governance and to the appropriate committees of Congress a detailed annual analysis of unmet Tribal needs for funding agreements under this title.

"(c) CONTENTS.—The report under subsection (a) shall—

"(1) be compiled from information contained in funding agreements, annual audit reports, and data of the Secretary regarding the disposition of Federal funds;

"(2) identify—

"(A) the relative costs and benefits of self-governance; and

"(B) with particularity, all funds that are specifically or functionally related to the provision by the Secretary of services and benefits to self-governance Indian Tribes and members of Indian Tribes;

"(3) the funds transferred to each Indian Tribe and the corresponding reduction in the Federal employees and workload; and

"(D) the funding formula for individual Tribal shares of all Central Office funds, together with the components of Federal funds, developed under subsection (d);

"(3) before being submitted to Congress, be distributed to the Indian Tribes for comment (with a comment period of not less than 30 days);

"(4) include the separate views and comments of each Indian Tribe or Tribal organization; and

"(5) include a list of—

"(A) all such programs that the Secretary determines, in consultation with Indian Tribes participating in self-governance, are eligible for negotiation to be included in a funding agreement at the request of a participating Indian Tribe; and

"(B) all such programs which Indian Tribes have formally requested to include in a funding agreement under section 403(c) due to the special geographic, historical, or cultural significance of the program to the Indian Tribe, indicating whether each request was granted or denied, and stating the grounds for any denial.

"(c) REPORT ON NON-BIA PROGRAMS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to optimize opportunities for including non-BIA programs in funding agreements with Indian Tribes participating in self-governance, the Secretary shall review all programs administered by the Department, other than those of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, or the Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians, without regard to the agency or office concerned.

"(2) PROGRAMMATIC TARGETS.—The Secretary shall establish programmatic targets, after consultation with Indian Tribes participating in self-governance, to encourage the bureaus of the Department to ensure that an appropriate portion of those programs are available to be included in funding agreements.

"(3) PUBLICATION.—The lists under subsection (b) and targets under paragraph (2) shall be published in the Federal Register and made available to any Indian Tribe participating in self-governance.

"(4) ANNUAL REVIEW.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall annually review and publish in the Federal Register, after consultation with Indian Tribes participating in self-governance, to encourage the bureaus of the Department to ensure that an appropriate portion of those programs are available to be included in funding agreements.

"(B) MANDATED REVIEW.—The Secretary shall annually review and publish in the Federal Register, after consultation with Indian Tribes participating in self-governance, the revised lists and programmatic targets.

"In conducting the review of the revised lists and programmatic targets, the Secretary shall consider all programs that were
eligible for contracting in the original list published in the Federal Register in 1995, except for programs specifically determined not to be contractible as a matter of law.

((d) amendments to CIRCULARS, POLICIES, MANUALS, GUIDANCE, AND RULES.—Not later than January 1, 2020, the Secretary shall, in consultation with Indian Tribes, develop a funding formula to determine the individual Tribal share of funds controlled by the Central Office of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Office of the Special Trustee for inclusion in the compacts."

SEC. 412. REGULATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) PROMULGATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations under this section (i) to carry out this title.

(b) COMMITTEE.—

(1) MEMBERSHIP.—A negotiated rulemaking committee established pursuant to section 102 of title 5, United States Code, to carry out this section shall have as its members only representatives of the Federal Government and Tribal government.

(2) ADAPTATION OF PROCEDURES.—The Secretary shall adapt the negotiated rulemaking procedures to the unique context of self-governance and the government-to-government relationship between the United States and Indian Tribes.

(c) EFFECT.—

(1) REPEAL.—The Secretary may repeal any regulation that is inconsistent with this Act.

(2) CONFLICTING PROVISIONS.—Subject to section 101(a) of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act, with respect to any program described under section 430(c), this title shall supersede any conflicting provision of law (including any conflicting regulations).

(3) EFFECTIVENESS WITHOUT REGARD TO REGULATIONS.—The lack of promulgated regulations on an issue shall not limit the effect or implementation of this title.

SEC. 414. EFFECT OF CIRCULARS, POLICIES, MANUALS, GUIDANCE, AND RULES.

"Unless expressly agreed to by a participating Indian Tribe in a compact or funding agreement, the participating Indian Tribe shall not be subject to any agency circular, policy, manual, guidance, or rule adopted by the Department, except for—

(1) the eligibility provisions of section 105(g); and

(2) regulations promulgated pursuant to section 412.

SEC. 415. APPEALS.

"Except as provided in section 406(d), in any administrative action, appeal, or civil action, the Secretary, in its review of any decision made by the Secretary under this title, the Secretary shall have the burden of proof of demonstrating by a preponderance of the evidence—

(1) the validity of the grounds for the decision; and

(2) the consistency of the decision with the requirements and policies of this title.

SEC. 416. APPLICATION OF OTHER PROVISIONS.


SEC. 417. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

"There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this title."
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Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE. This Act may be cited as the "Native American Business Incubators Program Act."

SECTION 2. NATIVE AMERICAN LANGUAGES GRANT. Section 108 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5328) is amended—

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS. In this Act:

SEC. 4. ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL. The Secretary shall establish a program in the Office of Indian Economic Development under which the Secretary shall provide financial assistance in the form of competitive grants to applicants to conduct business development and operation of business incubators that serve reservation communities by providing business incubation and other business services to Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs.

(b) ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS. (1) IN GENERAL. To be eligible to receive a grant under the program, an applicant shall—

(A) be—

(1) an Indian tribe;

(2) a tribal college or university;

(3) an institution of higher education; or

(4) a private nonprofit organization or tribal nonprofit organization.

(B) provide services and products in reservation communities.

(c) DURATION OF GRANTS. Grants provided under this section shall be for a period of not less than 1 year and not more than 3 years.

(d) GRANT AMOUNT. The amount of a grant under this section shall be determined by the Secretary and shall be not less than $500,000 nor more than $1,000,000.

SEC. 5. CONTRACT OR GRANT SPECIFICATIONS.

SEC. 6. ELIGIBILITY FOR GRANTS.

SEC. 7. DISCUSSION AND CONSENT AGREEMENT.

SEC. 8. TERMINATION OF PROGRAM.

SEC. 9. DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY.

SEC. 10. DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR GRANTS.

SEC. 11. ADMINISTRATION.

SEC. 12. INTERNAL REVIEW.

SEC. 13. AMENDMENT TO OFFICE OF INDIAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.

SEC. 14. PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO SAVINGS.

SEC. 15. EFFECTIVE DATE.

SEC. 16. CONSTRUCTION.

SEC. 17. IMPLEMENTATION.

SEC. 18. TECHNICAL CORRECTION.

SEC. 19. REAUTHORIZATION OF NATIVE AMERICAN LANGUAGES PROGRAM.

SEC. 20. CONSIDERATION OF EFFECTIVE DATE.

SEC. 21. CONCLUSION.

SEC. 22. APPROPRIATIONS.

SEC. 23. STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION.

SEC. 24. CONTRACT FUNDING AND INDIRECT COSTS.

SEC. 25. CONTRACT OR GRANT SPECIFICATIONS.

SEC. 26. ELIGIBILITY FOR GRANTS.

SEC. 27. DISCUSSION AND CONSENT AGREEMENT.

SEC. 28. TERMINATION OF PROGRAM.

SEC. 29. DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY.

SEC. 30. DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR GRANTS.

SEC. 31. ADMINISTRATION.

SEC. 32. INTERNAL REVIEW.

SEC. 33. AMENDMENT TO OFFICE OF INDIAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.

SEC. 34. PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO SAVINGS.

SEC. 35. EFFECTIVE DATE.

SEC. 36. CONSTRUCTION.

SEC. 37. IMPLEMENTATION.

SEC. 38. TECHNICAL CORRECTION.

SEC. 39. REAUTHORIZATION OF NATIVE AMERICAN LANGUAGES PROGRAM.

SEC. 40. CONSIDERATION OF EFFECTIVE DATE.

SEC. 41. CONCLUSION.

SEC. 42. APPROPRIATIONS.

SEC. 43. STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION.

SEC. 44. TERRITORIAL CLAIMS.

SEC. 45. CONCLUSION.

SEC. 46. APPROPRIATIONS.

SEC. 47. STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION.

SEC. 48. TERRITORIAL CLAIMS.

SEC. 49. CONCLUSION.

SEC. 50. APPROPRIATIONS.

SEC. 51. STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION.

SEC. 52. TERRITORIAL CLAIMS.

SEC. 53. CONCLUSION.

SEC. 54. APPROPRIATIONS.

SEC. 55. STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION.

SEC. 56. TERRITORIAL CLAIMS.

SEC. 57. CONCLUSION.

SEC. 58. APPROPRIATIONS.

SEC. 59. STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION.

SEC. 60. TERRITORIAL CLAIMS.

SEC. 61. CONCLUSION.

SEC. 62. APPROPRIATIONS.

SEC. 63. STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION.

SEC. 64. TERRITORIAL CLAIMS.

SEC. 65. CONCLUSION.

SEC. 66. APPROPRIATIONS.

SEC. 67. STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION.

SEC. 68. TERRITORIAL CLAIMS.

SEC. 69. CONCLUSION.

SEC. 70. APPROPRIATIONS.

SEC. 71. STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION.

SEC. 72. TERRITORIAL CLAIMS.

SEC. 73. CONCLUSION.

SEC. 74. APPROPRIATIONS.

SEC. 75. STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION.

SEC. 76. TERRITORIAL CLAIMS.

SEC. 77. CONCLUSION.

SEC. 78. APPROPRIATIONS.

SEC. 79. STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION.

SEC. 80. TERRITORIAL CLAIMS.

SEC. 81. CONCLUSION.

SEC. 82. APPROPRIATIONS.

SEC. 83. STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION.

SEC. 84. TERRITORIAL CLAIMS.

SEC. 85. CONCLUSION.

SEC. 86. APPROPRIATIONS.

SEC. 87. STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION.

SEC. 88. TERRITORIAL CLAIMS.

SEC. 89. CONCLUSION.

SEC. 90. APPROPRIATIONS.

SEC. 91. STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION.

SEC. 92. TERRITORIAL CLAIMS.

SEC. 93. CONCLUSION.

SEC. 94. APPROPRIATIONS.

SEC. 95. STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION.

SEC. 96. TERRITORIAL CLAIMS.

SEC. 97. CONCLUSION.

SEC. 98. APPROPRIATIONS.
(A) In general.—Before making a grant to an eligible applicant, the Secretary shall conduct a site visit, evaluate a video submission, or evaluate a written proposal (if the applicant is not yet in possession of the site) of the proposed site to ensure the proposed site will permit the eligible applicant to meet the requirements of the program; and

(ii) a timeline describing when the eligible applicant will be—

(1) in possession of the proposed site; and

(2) operating the business incubator at the proposed site.

(C) FOLLOWUP.—Not later than 1 year after awarding a grant under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall—

(1) DURATION.—Each grant awarded under the program shall be for a term of 3 years.

(2) PAYMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall disburse grant funds awarded to an eligible applicant in annual installments.

(B) MORE FREQUENT DISBURSEMENTS.—On request by the eligible applicant, the Secretary may make disbursements of grant funds more frequently than annually, on the condition that disbursements shall be made not more frequently than quarterly.

(3) NON-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR INITIAL ASSISTANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall disburse grant funds awarded to an eligible applicant in annual installments.

(B) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive, in whole or in part, the requirements of subparagraph (A), if—

(i) the proposed location of the business incubator is in a Native American community, including the 1 or more reservation communities described in the application; and

(ii) the proposed location of the business incubator is in a Native American community, including the 1 or more reservation communities described in the application.

(C) NON-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR RENEWALS.—An eligible applicant that receives a grant renewal under subparagraph (A) shall provide non-Federal contributions in an amount equal to not less than 25 percent of the total amount of the grant.

(D) NO DUPLICATIVE GRANTS.—An eligible applicant shall not be awarded a grant under this subpart if the Secretary has made a grant to an eligible applicant under the program, and annually thereafter for the duration of the grant, the Secretary shall

(ii) sating the business incubator in the identified location will serve the interests of the 1 or more reservation communities to be served; and

(ii) siting the business incubator in the identified location will serve the interests of the 1 or more reservation communities to be served.
conduct an evaluation of, and prepare a report on, the eligible applicant, which shall—
(A) describe the performance of the eligible applicant; and
(B) include an determination of the ongoing eligibility of the eligible applicant.

(2) ANNUAL REPORT.—
(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the Secretary awards a grant to an eligible applicant under the program, and annually thereafter for the duration of the grant, each eligible applicant receiving funds under the program shall submit to the Secretary a report describing the services the eligible applicant provided under the program during the preceding year.

(B) REPORT CONTENT.—The report described in subparagraph (A) shall include—
(i) a detailed breakdown of the Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs receiving services from the business incubator, including, for the year covered by the report—
(I) the number of Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs participating in or receiving services from the business incubator and the types of services provided to those Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs;
(II) the number of Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs that received business incubation or departure from the business incubator and after graduation; and
(III) the performance of Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs while participating in the business incubator and after graduation or departure from the business incubator; and
(ii) any other information the Secretary may require to evaluate the performance of a business incubator to ensure appropriate implementation of the program.
(C) TO THE MAXIMUM EXTENT PRACTICABLE, THE SECRETARY SHALL NOT REQUIRE AN ELIGIBLE APPLICANT TO REPORT UNDER SUBPARAGRAPH (A) INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE SECRETARY BY THE ELIGIBLE APPLICANT UNDER OTHER PROGRAMS.

(D) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall coordinate with the heads of other Federal agencies to ensure that, to the maximum extent practicable, the report content and form under subparagraphs (A) and (B) are consistent with other reporting requirements for Federal programs that provide business and entrepreneurial assistance.

(3) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—
(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date on which the Secretary first awards funding under the program, and biennially thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report on the performance and effectiveness of the program.

(B) REPORT CONTENT.—Each report submitted under subparagraph (A) shall—
(i) account for each program year; and
(ii) include with respect to each business incubator receiving grant funds under the program—
(I) the number of Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs that received business incubation services; and
(II) the number of businesses established with the assistance of the business incubator;
(iii) the number of jobs established or maintained by Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs receiving business incubation services, including a description of where the jobs are located with respect to reservation communities;
(iv) to the maximum extent practicable, the amount of capital investment and loan financings provided by Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs receiving business incubation services; and
(v) an evaluation of the overall performance of the business incubator.

SEC. 5. REGULATIONS.
Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations to implement the program.

SEC. 6. SCHOOLS TO BUSINESS INCUBATOR PIPELINE.
The Secretary shall facilitate the establishment of relationships between eligible applicants receiving funds through the program and educational institutions serving Native American communities, including tribal colleges and universities.

SEC. 7. AGENCY PARTNERSHIPS.
The Secretary shall coordinate with the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that business incubators receiving grant funds under the program have the information and materials needed to provide Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs with the information and assistance necessary to apply for business and entrepreneurial development programs administered by the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the Department of the Treasury, and the Small Business Administration.

SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.
There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the program $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.

S. 257
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.
This Act may be cited as the ‘‘Tribal HUD–VASH Act of 2019.’’

SEC. 2. RENTAL ASSISTANCE FOR HOMELESS OR AT-RISK INDIAN VETERANS.
Section 8(a)(19) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(a)(19)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(II) INDIAN VETERAN.—The term ‘eligible Indian veteran’ means an Indian veteran who—
(aa) homeless or at risk of homelessness; and
(bb) living—
(AA) on or near a reservation; or
(BB) in or near any other Indian area.

(II) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary may not waive or specify alternative requirements under subparagraph (A) and applicable appropriations Acts, including administration in connection with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

(III) EXCEPTIONS.—
(aa) SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.—After consultation with Indian tribes, eligible recipients, and any other appropriate tribal organizations, the Secretary may make necessary and appropriate modifications to facilitate the use of the Program by eligible recipients to serve eligible Indian veterans.
(bb) SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—After consultation with Indian tribes, eligible recipients, and any other appropriate tribal organizations, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may make necessary and appropriate modifications to facilitate the use of the Program by eligible recipients to serve eligible Indian veterans.

(IV) ELIGIBLE RECIPIENTS.—The Secretary shall make amounts for rental assistance and associated administrative costs under the Program available in the form of grants to eligible recipients.

(V) FUNDING CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall award grants under the Program based on—
(i) need;
(ii) administrative capacity; and
(iii) any other funding criteria established by the Secretary in a notice published in the Federal Register after consulting with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

ADMINISTRATOR—
(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The Administrator under the Program shall be administered in accordance with the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4101 et seq.), except that recipients shall—
(i) submit to the Secretary, in a manner prescribed by the Secretary, reports on the utilization of rental assistance provided under the Program; and
(ii) provide to the Secretary information specified by the Secretary to assess the effectiveness of the Program in serving eligible Indian veterans.

(II) CONSULTATION.—
(a) ELIGIBLE RECIPIENTS; TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS.—The Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, shall consult with eligible recipients and any other appropriate tribal organizations to determine the design of the Program to ensure the effective delivery of rental assistance and supportive services to eligible Indian veterans under the Program.

(III) INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE.—The Director of the Indian Health Service shall provide any assistance requested by the Secretary or the Secretary of Veterans Affairs in carrying out the Program.

(IV) WAIVER.—
(I) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subclause (II), the Secretary may waive or specify alternative requirements for any provision of law (including regulations) that the Secretary administers in connection with the use of rental assistance made available under the Program if the Secretary finds that the waiver or alternative requirement is necessary for the effective delivery and administration of rental assistance under the Program to eligible Indian veterans.

(II) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary may not waive or specify alternative requirements for any provision of law (including regulations) relating to labor standards or the environment.
(ix) RENEWAL GRANTS.—The Secretary may—

(I) set aside, from amounts made available for tenant-based rental assistance under this subsection, such amounts as may be necessary to award rental grants to eligible recipients that received rental grants under the Program in a previous year; and

(II) specify criteria that an eligible recipient must satisfy to receive a renewal grant under subsection (I), including providing data on how the eligible recipient used the amounts of any grant previously received under the Program.

(k) Reporting—

(I) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Tribal HUD-VASH Act of 2019, and every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Director of the Indian Health Service, shall—

(aa) conduct a review of the implementation of the Program, including any factors that may have limited its success; and

(bb) submit a report describing the results of item (aa) to—

(AA) the Committee on Indian Affairs, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(BB) the Subcommittee on Indian, Insular and Alaska Native Affairs of the Committee on Natural Resources, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(ii) ANALYSIS OF HOUSING STICK LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall include in the initial report submitted under clause (I) a description of—

(aa) any regulations governing the use of formula current assisted stock (as defined in section 1000.314 of title 24, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation)) within the Program; and

(bb) the number of recipients of grants under the Program that have reported the regulations described in item (aa) as a barrier to implementation of the Program; and

(cc) proposed alternative legislation or regulations developed by the Secretary in consultation with recipients of grants under the Program to allow the use of formula current assisted stock within the Program.

S. 216

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE. This Act may be cited as the “Spokane Tribe of Indians of the Spokane Reservation Equitable Compensation Act.”

SEC. 2. FINDINGS. Congress finds that—

(1) from 1927 to 1931, at the direction of Congress, the Corps of Engineers investigated the Columbia River and its tributaries to determine sites at which power could be generated at a low cost;

(2) under section 10(e) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 792(e)), when licenses are issued involving tribal land within an Indian reservation, a reasonable annual charge shall be fixed for the use of the land, subject to the approval of the Indian tribe having jurisdiction over the land;

(3) prior to passage of the Columbia Basin Commission, an agency of the State of Washington, received a preliminary permit from the Federal Power Commission for water power at the Grand Coulee site; and

(4) had the Columbia Basin Commission or a private entity developed the site, the Spokane Tribe would have been entitled to a reasonable annual charge for the use of the land of the Spokane Tribe;

(5) in the mid-1930s, the Federal Government determined that future licensing compensation under the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 792 et seq.)—

(A) federalized the Grand Coulee Dam project; and

(B) began construction of the Grand Coulee Dam;

(6) when the Grand Coulee Dam project was federalized, the Federal Government recognized that—

(A) development of the power affected the interests of the Spokane Tribe and the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation; and

(B) it would be appropriate for the Spokane and Colville Tribes to receive a share of revenue from the disposition of power produced at Grand Coulee Dam;

(7) in the Act of June 29, 1940 (16 U.S.C. 835d et seq.), Congress—

(A) granted to the United States—

(i) in aid of the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Columbia Basin Project, all power and interests of the Spokane Tribe and Colville Tribes in and to the tribal and allotted land within the Spokane and Colville Reservations, as designated by the Secretary of the Interior from time to time; and

(ii) other interests in that land as required and designated by the Secretary for certain construction undertaken in connection with the project; and

(B) provided that compensation for the land and other interests was to be determined by the Secretary in such amounts as the Secretary determined to be just and equitable;

(8) pursuant to that Act, the Secretary paid—

(A) to the Spokane Tribe, $4,700; and

(B) to the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, $53,000.

(9) in 1994, following litigation under the Act of August 13, 1946 (commonly known as the “Indian Claims Commission Act” (60 Stat. 1049, chapter 959; former 25 U.S.C. 70 et seq.), Congress ratified the Colville Settlement Agreement, which required—

(A) for past use of the Colville Tribes, a payment of $3,000,000; and

(B) for continued use of the land of the Colville Tribes, annual payments of $15,250,000, adjusted annually based on revenues from the sale of electric power from the Grand Coulee Dam project and transmission of that power by the Bonneville Power Administration;

(10) the Spokane Tribe, having suffered harm similar to that suffered by the Colville Tribes, did not file a claim within the 5-year statute of limitations under the Indian Claims Commission Act;

(11) neither the Colville Tribes nor the Spokane Tribe filed claims for compensation for use of the land of the respective tribe with the Commission prior to August 13, 1951, but both tribes filed unrelated land claims prior to August 13, 1951;

(12) in 1978 and subsequently, in objections by the United States, the Colville Tribes were successful in amending the 1951 Claims Commission land claims to add the Grand Coulee claim of the Colville Tribe to the United States. The United States, the Commission determined that the Colville Tribe had no such claim to amend, having settled the Claims Commission land claims of the Spokane Tribe with the United States in 1967;

(13) the Spokane Tribe had suffered significant harm from the construction and operation of Grand Coulee Dam;

(14) Spokane Tribe’s邵oke Business Council in 1987; and

(15) Spokane Tribe’s邵oke Business Council in 1987;

SEC. 3. PURPOSE. The purpose of this Act is to provide fair and equitable compensation to the Spokane Tribe for the use of the land of the Spokane Tribe for the generation of hydropower by the Grand Coulee Dam.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS. In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration or the head of any successor agency, corporation, or entity that markets power produced at Grand Coulee Dam.

(2) COLVILLE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.—The term “Colville Settlement Agreement” means the Settlement Agreement entered into between the Federal Government and the Colville Tribes, signed by the United States on April 21, 1994, and by the Colville Tribes on April 16, 1994, to settle the claims of the Colville Tribes in Docket 181–D of the Indian Claims Commission, which docket was transferred to the United States Court of Federal Claims.

(3) COLVILLE TRIBES.—The term “Colville Tribes” means the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation.

(4) COMPUTED ANNUAL PAYMENT.—The term “Computation Annual Payment” means the payment calculated under paragraph 2.b. of the Colville Settlement Agreement, without regard to any increase or decrease in the payment under section 2.d. of the agreement.


(6) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(7) SPOKANE BUSINESS COUNCIL.—The term “ Spokane Business Council” means the governing body of the Spokane Tribe under the constitution of the Spokane Tribe.

(8) SPOKANE TRIBES.—The term “Spokane Tribe” means the Spokane Tribe of Indians of the Spokane Reservation, Washington.

SEC. 5. PAYMENTS BY ADMINISTRATOR.

(a) INITIAL PAYMENT.—On March 1, 2022, the Administrator shall pay to the Spokane Tribe an amount equal to 25 percent of the Computed Annual Payment for fiscal year 2021.

(b) SUBSEQUENT PAYMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 1, 2023, and March 1 of each year thereafter through March 1, 2029, the Administrator shall pay to the Spokane Tribe an amount equal to 25 percent of the Computed Annual Payment for the preceding fiscal year.

(2) MARCH 1, 2030, AND SUBSEQUENT YEARS.—Not later than March 1, 2030, and March 1 of each year thereafter, the Administrator shall pay to the Spokane Tribe an amount equal to 25 percent of the Computed Annual Payment for the preceding fiscal year.

SEC. 6. TREATMENT AFTER AMOUNTS ARE PAID.

(a) USE OF PAYMENTS.—Payments made to the Spokane Business Council or Spokane Tribe under section 5 may be used or invested by the Spokane Business Council in
the same manner and for the same purposes as other Spokane Tribe governmental amounts.

(b) No Trust Responsibility of the Secretary.—The Administrator shall have any trust responsibility for the investment, supervision, administration, or expenditure of any amounts after the date on which the funds are paid to the Spokane Business Council or Spokane Tribe under section 5.

(c) Treatment of Funds for Certain Purposes.—Payments of all amounts to the Spokane Business Council and Spokane Tribe under section 5, and the interest and income generated by those amounts, shall be treated the same manner as payments under section 6 of the Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe of Michigan Distribution of Judgment Funds Act (100 Stat. 677).

(d) Pro Rata Payments.—(1) The date on which amounts are paid to the Spokane Business Council or Spokane Tribe under section 5, the amounts shall—

(i) be treated in the same manner as payments under section 5, (ii) be subject to a payment under transfer to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, or (iii) the Secretary of the Interior, as identified by the Secretary of the Interior, under that Act (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act).

(2) The Secretary shall disburse to the Klamath Tribe the balance of any funds that, on or before the date of enactment of this Act, were appropriated or deposited into the trust accounts for remaining legal fees and administration and per capita trust accounts, as identified by the Secretary of the Interior, under that Act (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act).

S. 199

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

SECOND TITLE. This Act may be cited as the “Klamath Tribe Judgment Fund Repeal Act”.

SEC. 2. REPEAL. After Public Law 89-224 (commonly known as the “Klamath Tribe Judgment Fund Act”) (79 Stat. 897) is repealed.

SEC. 3. DISBURSEMENT OF REMAINING FUNDS. Notwithstanding any provision of Public Law 89-224 (as effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act) relating to the distribution or use of funds, as provided in paragraph (1) of subsections (2) and (3) of section 5, $2,700,000.

S. 46

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE. This Act may be cited as the “Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe Reservation Restoration Act”.

SEC. 2. LEECH LAKE BAND OF OJIBWE RESERVATION RESTORATION. (a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(i) the federal land described in subsection (b)(1) was taken from members of the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe during a period—

(A) beginning in 1948, and

(B) during which the Bureau of Indian Affairs incorrectly interpreted an order of the Secretary of the Interior to mean that the Department of the Interior had the authority to sell tribal allotments without the consent of a majority of the rightful landowners; and

(ii) ordered to cease conducting those sales;

(ii) as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, submit a map and legal description of the Federal land to—

(A) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and

ii) the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate.

(2) FORCE AND EFFECT.—The map and legal description submitted under paragraph (1), the Federal land shall be—

(A) held in trust for the United States for the benefit of the Tribe; and

(B) considered to be a part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(c) Transfer to Reservation. The term “Secretary’’ means the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe.

(b) TRANSFER TO RESERVATION.—

(1) In General.—Subject to valid existing rights and paragraph (2), the Secretary shall transfer to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land.

(2) Treatment.—Effective immediately on the transfer under paragraph (1), the Federal land shall be—

(A) held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe; and

(B) considered to be a part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(d) Survey, Map, and Legal Description.—

(1) In General.—The Secretary shall—

(A) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, complete a plan of survey to establish the boundaries of the Federal land; and

(B) as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, submit a map and legal description of the Federal land to—

(i) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and

(ii) the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate.

(e) Administration.—

(1) In General.—Except as otherwise expressly provided in this section, nothing in this section affects any right or claim of the Tribe, as in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, to any land or interest in land.

(2) Prohibitions.—

(A) Exports of Unprocessed Logs.—Federal law (including regulations) relating to the export of unprocessed logs harvested from the Federal land shall apply to any unprocessed logs that are harvested from the Federal land.

(B) Non-Permissible Use of Land.—The Federal land shall not be eligible or used for any gambling activity carried out under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

(C) Forester Management.—Any commercial forestry activity carried out on the Federal land shall be managed in accordance with applicable Federal law.

Mr. MCELWAIN. I ask unanimous consent that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.
CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 27, 2019:

PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD


TRAVIS LEBLANC, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 29, 2022.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

VERONICA DADLE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

LANCE SENATORES, OF NEW YORK, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY-ENERGY, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

RONALD DOUGLAS JOHNSON, OF FLORIDA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF EL SALVADOR.

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

AMIR KATHYNN JOHANSEN, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 19, 2023.

DEPARTMENT OF SECURITY

CHRISTOPHER SLOCEK, OF NEW YORK, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL RECONNAISSANCE OFFICE.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 1230:

To be rear admiral

BEAR ADM. (LH) GENE F. PRICE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 1230:

To be rear admiral

BEAR ADM. (LH) JOHN B. MUSTIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 1230:

To be rear admiral

BEAR ADM. (LH) SHAWN R. DUAN

BEAR ADM. (LH) JOHN B. MUSTIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 1230:

To be rear admiral

BEAR ADM. (LH) JOHN A. SCHUMER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 1230:

To be rear admiral

BEAR ADM. (LH) ALAN J. REY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 1230:

To be rear admiral

BEAR ADM. (LH) TROY M. MCCLILLAND

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 61:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. CHARLES A. FLYNN

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 1230:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. MARK E. MORTZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 1230:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. CHRISTOPHER A. ASSELTA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 1230:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. MICHAEL T. CURRAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 1230:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. LEESIE R. RIECORD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 1230:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. SCOTT K. FULLER

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 61:

To be general

GEN. JOHN W. RAYMOND

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 61:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. MICHAEL P. SHERMAN

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 61:

To be vice admiral

BEAR ADM. RICKY L. WILLIAMSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 1230:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. PHILIP W. YU

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 1230:

To be brigadier general

COL. ARTHUR P. WUNDER

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS A CHAPLAIN UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be brigadier general

COL. WILLIAM GREEN JR.
IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON BULLOCK AND ENDING WITH DEMETRIUS WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMI-
NATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-
PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 5,
2019.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JULIA A. AKE AND ENDING WITH ALEKSA L. SIEGERT, WHICH
NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-
PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEB-
RUARY 25, 2019.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON J. ALDANA AND ENDING WITH ELIZABETH B. TROYTEN,
WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-
PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29,
2019.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH AVERI W. ALBANO AND ENDING WITH SARAH D. MAMELLO,
WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-
PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29,
2019.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ALFORD IV AND ENDING WITH TRACIE L. SWINGLE, WHICH
NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-
PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13,
2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GLENN N. JUAN AND ENDING WITH RUSSELL T. MCNEAL, WHICH
NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-
PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13,
2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTIAN A. APSTOL AND ENDING WITH ANN M. VALLANDINGHAM,
WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-
PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23,
2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON B. ALBANO AND ENDING WITH STANTON D. TROTTER, WHICH
NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-
PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13,
2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KEVIN D. LYONS AND ENDING WITH LAUREN M. MITCHELL, WHICH
NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-
PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13,
2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KEVIN E. PARKER AND ENDING WITH JASON BULLOCK, WHICH
NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-
PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13,
2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON B. DUBOSE AND ENDING WITH TIMOTHY D. FORREST, WHICH
NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-
PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13,
2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON B. ARMSTRONG AND ENDING WITH MIAO X. ZHOU, WHICH
NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-
PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13,
2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON V. CASTELLANOS AND ENDING WITH KEVIN A. SCHNITTKER,
WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-
PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13,
2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON H. JUMAN AND ENDING WITH RUSSELL T. MCNEAR, WHICH
NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-
PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13,
2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON R. ALISANGCO AND ENDING WITH D014026, WHICH NOMINA-
TIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN
THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 5, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON W. ARMSTRONG AND ENDING WITH KEITH A. TUKES, WHICH
NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-
PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23,
2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON F. BOONYOBHAS AND ENDING WITH SARAH E. ZARRO, WHICH
NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-
PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23,
2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON A. ASHLEY AND ENDING WITH JASON B. DUBOSE, WHICH
NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-
PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY
29, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON R. ARMSTRONG AND ENDING WITH KEITH A. TUKES, WHICH
NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-
PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 5,
2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON S. ARMSTRONG AND ENDING WITH SHAWN S. CARPENTER, WHICH
NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-
PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 5,
2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON B. ALDANA AND ENDING WITH ELIZABETH B. TROYTEN, WHICH
NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-
PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29,
2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON J. ALDANA AND ENDING WITH ELIZABETH B. TROYTEN, WHICH
NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-
PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29,
2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON J. ALDANA AND ENDING WITH ELIZABETH B. TROYTEN, WHICH
NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-
PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29,
2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON J. ALDANA AND ENDING WITH ELIZABETH B. TROYTEN, WHICH
NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-
PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29,
2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON J. ALDANA AND ENDING WITH ELIZABETH B. TROYTEN, WHICH
NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-
PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29,
2019.
NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ALBERT E. ARTHUR AND ENDING WITH JUAN P. GONZALEZ, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.


NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATTHEW A. BAILEY AND ENDING WITH LEONARD N. WALKER IV, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARGIER D. BANAZWSKI AND ENDING WITH EVAN B. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.


NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATTHEW A. BAILEY AND ENDING WITH LEONARD N. WALKER IV, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARGIER D. BANAZWSKI AND ENDING WITH EVAN B. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.


NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATTHEW A. BAILEY AND ENDING WITH LEONARD N. WALKER IV, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARGIER D. BANAZWSKI AND ENDING WITH EVAN B. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.


NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATTHEW A. BAILEY AND ENDING WITH LEONARD N. WALKER IV, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARGIER D. BANAZWSKI AND ENDING WITH EVAN B. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.


NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATTHEW A. BAILEY AND ENDING WITH LEONARD N. WALKER IV, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARGIER D. BANAZWSKI AND ENDING WITH EVAN B. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.


NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATTHEW A. BAILEY AND ENDING WITH LEONARD N. WALKER IV, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.