



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

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

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 17, 2019

No. 120

## Senate

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

### PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Mighty God, hear our prayers, search our hearts, and know our thoughts.

Keep our lawmakers on Your path, inspiring them to walk with integrity. Hear and answer their prayers, saving them with Your might. Lord, preserve our Senators as the apple of Your eye, ordering their steps and bringing them to Your desired destination.

We love You, Lord, for You are our strength.

And, Lord, we thank You for the life and service of retired Supreme Court Justice John Paul Stevens.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). The Senator from Iowa.

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

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

### ANTI-COUNTERFEITING CONSUMER EDUCATION AND AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, in honor of Anti-Counterfeiting Consumer Education and Awareness Month, I wish to highlight the problem of counterfeits sold online.

Counterfeiters are increasingly turning to e-commerce to sell all of their

fakes. In the past, I have advocated for increased education and awareness efforts because I believe these efforts and education are critical tools in our country's arsenal against counterfeits.

I encourage our Customs and Border Protection to identify ways to increase information sharing with their private industry partners. This is one way we can prevent the sale of fakes and keep consumers safe.

I yield the floor.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

### REMEMBERING JOHN PAUL STEVENS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, first, this morning, the Senate recognizes the death of a distinguished American. We received word last night that the remarkable life of former Associate Justice John Paul Stevens had come to a close at the age of 99.

Justice Stevens served for 34 years on the Nation's highest Court. You didn't have to agree with his constitutional philosophy to admire his obvious intelligence or the universal reports about his kindness and collegiality or the passionate patriotism he was proud to wear on his sleeve. No question, this was a quintessential public servant of the "greatest generation."

A son of Chicago who enlisted in the Navy the day before Pearl Harbor and went on to earn a Bronze Star for his work in cracking the coded messages of Imperial Japan, there was just something about Justice Stevens that told you this man lived life to the fullest. At age 12, he was there to see Babe Ruth's "called shot" at Wrigley Field. At age 99, just this year, he published a memoir that was subtitled "Reflections on My First 94 Years." In between, alongside his time on the Court,

he found time to weigh in on Shakespeare scholarship on the side.

So the Senate joins the Nation in appreciating this American life fully lived, and our condolences are with the Stevens family on this sad day.

### NOMINATION OF MARK T. ESPER

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday, our colleagues on the Armed Services Committee heard testimony from Dr. Mark Esper, the Senate-confirmed Secretary of the Army and President Trump's nominee for Secretary of Defense. They examined his extensive record of military and public service and discussed the variety of challenges the next Secretary will face. By the end, I believe anybody impartial would have to have come away impressed by Dr. Esper's mastery, intelligence, and thoroughness.

Of course, it is not exactly surprising that a decorated combat veteran and distinguished scholar would convey expertise and calm under pressure. For those of us who knew him during his service as national security adviser to the former majority leader, Bill Frist, those qualities are familiar.

You could hardly invent better qualifications for the top job at the Pentagon than Mark Esper's: a graduate of West Point, advanced degrees from the Harvard Kennedy School and George Washington University, courageous service with the 101st Airborne in the Gulf war, service at the Defense Department, a successful career in the private sector.

Every step of the way, he earned respect and admiration. That includes high praise from DOD leaders of the last administration, the Obama administration. They say that Dr. Esper "works hard, he's smart, he's dedicated." He has "all the qualifications."

Our colleagues at the hearing saw an exceptionally well-qualified nominee. In fact, as my friend the junior Senator from Virginia has put it, they saw a

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S4871

man of “sound character and moral courage.” He is a man of honor and integrity, dedicated to our Nation and committed to the men and women who serve in uniform, and I think it is clear he deserves prompt confirmation. Even more, the Pentagon and our Nation’s security deserve a Senate-confirmed Secretary of Defense to be in place and on the job.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting his confirmation as soon as it can reach the floor.

#### TREATIES

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the Senate is in the midst of considering bilateral tax treaties with Spain, Switzerland, Japan, and Luxembourg. If yesterday’s overwhelming votes on the first protocol are any indication, all four will be ratified with huge bipartisan margins by the end of the day, and American businesses and workers in all 50 States will be thrilled to finally be back on fair footing.

The details of these nuanced agreements are complicated, but the core principles are quite simple. Foreign trade and international investment are key cornerstones of the U.S. economy. Major parts of proud American businesses and hundreds of thousands of hard-working Americans’ jobs are oriented around trade with these four nations. So their governments and our government sit down and negotiate which country will tax which kind of activities. The result is more clarity, more certainty, and a lot less unfair double taxation that has cost American businesses millions and millions of dollars.

Let me say clearly that the years of delays in getting these noncontroversial treaties ratified have cost American businesses that employ American workers millions and millions of dollars. Inaction on this subject has needlessly—needlessly—put our firms that employ all of our constituents at a complete disadvantage and delayed capital investments that could have helped American workers.

Let me bring this home with some numbers. I have mentioned one Kentucky manufacturer that produces more than one-third of all stainless steel that America makes. They employ 1,500 people. I happen to know this firm is contemplating a capital investment of more than \$30 million that would benefit Kentucky workers and provide a shot in the arm for the local economy. But there has been a wrinkle because this one employer had to pay a \$15 million tax bill back in April because we hadn’t ratified the agreement with Spain. And—listen to this—if the delay had continued, an additional \$35 million tax liability would have been next—had we delayed. If the Senate had not finally acted on this, this single American manufacturer would have owed \$50 million in unnecessary or redundant taxes, had we not acted.

For nearly 6 years, this manufacturer has been laboring on an unfair playing

field that discouraged them from making investments that could have expanded operations and created more jobs in Kentucky and elsewhere in America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the news story containing their CEO’s statement on yesterday’s ratification of the Spain treaty be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From Business Wire, July 16, 2019]

STATEMENT OF NORTH AMERICAN STAINLESS CEO CRIS FUENTES REGARDING THE PASSAGE OF THE PROTOCOL AMENDING THE TAX CONVENTION WITH SPAIN 94-2

GHENT, KY.—Today, the United States Senate passed a tax protocol with Spain that had been languishing for over five years, causing unfair double taxation for American companies with foreign investors. This has cost companies like North American Stainless tens of millions of dollars over the years; alleviation of the double taxation could now allow for greater investment in plants and workers.

NAS Chief Executive Officer Cristobal Fuentes released the following statement heralding news of the Spanish protocol’s passage:

“This is a great day for North American Stainless and so many U.S. companies with foreign investors that had been subject to unfair double taxation for many years. We are located in Kentucky, and if it had not been for Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell and his tireless efforts I firmly believe this day would never have come. Senator McConnell stood up for his constituents and helped many working people at our Ghent, Kentucky plant by moving this protocol through the Senate. He listened to us and put Kentucky first. Workers in all 50 states stand to benefit from Senator McConnell’s efforts, and companies nationally have him to thank for improving the American business climate.

“In addition to Senator McConnell, we are grateful to Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jim Risch and the bipartisan group of Senators on his committee that moved this protocol forward. We are also thankful that President Donald Trump and U.S. Treasury Secretary Steve Mnuchin and their staff members understood the vital importance of this protocol and strongly engaged to work with the Senate to achieve this victory. It is now vital that President Trump’s Administration move quickly to finalize and implement this protocol with the Spanish Government so that affected companies can have fiscal certainty before year’s end as it relates to tax payments. We are confident that President Trump will move quickly because this protocol falls squarely within his America First agenda.

“At a time when Chinese stainless steel producers are engaged in unfair trade practices and market uncertainty exists, this treaty victory gives a leg up to the American workers who produce quality stainless slabs in Ghent, Kentucky. Senator McConnell, President Trump, Secretary Mnuchin and everyone who supported the protocol stood up for workers all over America today, including the ones right here in Kentucky. This treaty will preserve and unlock large investments in our facility, and we look forward to talking more about that in the near future.”

Mr. McCONNELL. Multiply this kind of story by all of the other numerous, significant Kentucky companies whom these agreements affect; then multiply

by 50 States because U.S. businesses from coast to coast interact with these four nations; then consider how many hundreds of thousands of workers all of these companies employ. That is the scale of what we are talking about—the highest consequences.

I know job creators across the country are thrilled that the Senate is finally moving forward this week, and I am certainly proud to have helped resolve this matter. But, curiously, it seems that not all of our colleagues are thrilled. Don’t get me wrong; the vote totals on the floor have spoken volumes. The cloture vote on the Spain agreement was 94 to 1—just one Senator in opposition—and the treaty was ratified yesterday 94 to 2.

Yet I was curious to hear one colleague of ours come to the floor yesterday and passionately argue against what I have done as majority leader to support these agreements. As the Member himself stated, he has made obstructing these tax treaties a yearlong personal project. The United States and Spain agreed on this protocol back in 2013. Spain ratified it in 2014. That is when it also arrived here in the Senate.

For nearly 6 years, he has worked to stall ratification. I know, because on multiple occasions I sought unanimous consent to secure Senate ratification of this protocol. During that time, he has tried and failed to persuade Treasury Departments of two different administrations to insist on certain changes that would have required reopening the international negotiations. He tried and failed to persuade his colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee that his ideas were so necessary that we should risk scuttling the treaties—scuttling all of the treaties—over them. He tried and failed to persuade the whole Senate.

At every step, executive branch officials and Senate colleagues have tried to engage his concerns in good faith. But for 6 years in the case of the Spain treaty, 8 years with respect to Switzerland, and 9 years with respect to Luxembourg, he was unable to persuade anybody—over 9 years. In all of that time, no one was persuaded, partly because the changes he demanded don’t solve a real problem, partly because they would have forced reopening the treaties for even more negotiations, and partly because everybody else was actually listening to the job creators who have been pleading with us for years to get this millstone off their necks. There were 9 years—9 years of rejecting reasonable counteroffers and accommodations, 9 years of working to hold up these treaties and trying to sell the Obama administration, the Trump administration, and his Senate colleagues on an off-the-wall story that failed to persuade anyone.

Look, I am a patient man, but my patience is not inexhaustible. After unanimous consent was denied on multiple occasions, I determined, after consulting with the Treasury Secretary and the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, that I would prepare

to file cloture on these tax protocols. Yet even after this whole journey, our colleague still was not blocked or shut out of the process. He had his opportunity.

A few weeks ago, he had the opportunity to offer amendments to the protocols in committee. They failed on a vote of 17 to 5. Last night, we put two more of his amendments up for votes on the floor; they went nowhere.

Nine years is long enough. In fact, it is far too long—too long for our U.S. businesses to have been either paying needless double taxes or deferring huge amounts of money in dividend payments that could otherwise have been invested right here at home.

Year after year, money that could have been immediately used to hire Americans or make new investments had to either be frozen up or handed over in duplicate taxes—all in large part because one of our colleagues could not accept that one single Senator who hasn't persuaded his fellow Members is not entitled to singlehandedly rewrite international treaties. No wonder all kinds of American employers came out of the woodwork yesterday and urged the Senate to reject his misguided amendments and waste no more time in ratifying these treaties. I don't know why the Senator believes he was close to a breakthrough after his years of effort. Hope springs eternal, I suppose.

Even if he had convinced the administration or his colleagues, the U.S. Government would have had to reopen the treaties for negotiation all over again with the other party, which would almost certainly have brought about changes that they wanted. No wonder President Trump's Treasury Department expressed opposition to these amendments. Treasury told Senators yesterday that going back and inserting these changes could force a years-long renegotiation of the treaties themselves, jeopardize their ratification, and have a significant adverse impact on America's standing among the international community.

I am not quite sure what all these years of heel-dragging will have accomplished—except impose unnecessary taxes on Kentucky employers and deferring investments in the United States. I can't see anything to show for this crusade except hurting American businesses for the better part of a decade, all to no effect. But I am glad we can turn the page this week and get these treaties on the books.

I haven't been able to identify a constituency for which he has advocated, but I know my actual constituents in Carroll County—real people in Kentucky—are sure glad the Senate has taken this important action.

It is the right thing to do for the country. It is the right thing to do for Kentucky workers and all the employers nationwide who have been waiting and waiting for this unfair competitive disadvantage to be removed. I am glad that is exactly what we are doing this week.

#### MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 1327

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk due a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the bill for the second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1327) to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2092, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCONNELL. In order to place the bill on the calendar under the provision of rule XIV, I would object to further proceedings.

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

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### PROTOCOL AMENDING TAX CONVENTION WITH SWISS CONFEDERATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following treaty, which the clerk state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Treaty Document No. 112-1, Protocol Amending Tax Convention with Swiss Confederation.

Pending:

McConnell amendment No. 912, of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 913 (to amendment No. 912), to change the enactment date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

#### UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA AGREEMENT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, after years of economic stagnation during the Obama administration, we are experiencing an economic revival. Thanks to Republican economic policies, the economy has taken off during the Trump administration. Unemployment is near its lowest level in half a century. June marked the 16th month that unemployment has been at or below 4 percent. For 15 straight months—15 straight months—we have had more job openings than Americans looking for work. Right now, there are roughly 1.6 million more job openings than Americans looking for work. That is the largest margin ever recorded. June also marked the 11th straight

month that wage growth has been at or above 3 percent. Before 2018, wage growth had not hit 3 percent in nearly a decade.

Importantly, the benefits of this economic growth are being spread far and wide. Ordinary Americans are seeing bigger paychecks, more jobs, and more opportunities. Over the past 3 years, pay hikes for the lowest income workers have grown the fastest. Huge numbers of new blue-collar jobs have been created. Unemployment rates for minorities have decreased substantially. The unemployment rates for Asian Americans, African Americans, and Hispanic Americans are all at or near record lows.

While our economy as a whole is thriving, there is one segment of our economy that is not fully enjoying the economic growth we have been experiencing. While our Nation's farmers and ranchers have seen benefits from tax reform, years of commodity and livestock prices that are below the cost of production, protracted trade disputes, and natural disasters mean our agricultural economy is trailing behind the economy as a whole.

I am privileged to represent South Dakota farmers and ranchers in the U.S. Senate, and addressing the needs of these hard-working Americans is one of my top priorities.

Recently, I was very pleased to be able to help persuade the Department of Agriculture to move the haying and grazing date to September 1 for this year for cover crops on prevent plant acres. This will allow farmers and ranchers in northern States like South Dakota to sow cover crops without worrying that they won't be able to harvest or graze them before winter weather sets in.

Cover crops help farmers by improving soil health, which improves future yields, and they can save farmers significant money by serving as an important source of feed. That second benefit is particularly important for farmers right now. Due to last year's severe and lengthy winter, feed supplies disappeared, leaving no reserves. Cornstalks—a source of grazing and bedding—will be in short supply this year, and so will the supply of alfalfa due to winterkill. Cover crops will be crucial to alleviating this feed shortage.

If necessary, I will be encouraging the Department of Agriculture to release Conservation Reserve Program acres for emergency haying and grazing this year to further address the feed shortage.

The best source of information about what farmers and ranchers need is the farmers and ranchers themselves. Right now, producers are telling me that what they need more than anything else is market access for their products around the globe. Farmers and ranchers depend on trade. Our Nation's farmers and ranchers don't just sell their products here at home; they sell them around the world. In my home State of South Dakota, we export

a substantial portion of the agricultural products we produce. Right now, though, farmers and ranchers are facing a lot of uncertainty when it comes to trade.

While farmers appreciate the assistance the administration has provided to offset the lower commodity prices resulting from current U.S. trade policies, they would prefer to receive a check from selling their products instead of from the government.

Farmers are deeply concerned that their access to global markets, which has already diminished, will continue to erode, as U.S. agricultural products continue to be replaced by those from foreign competitors.

That is why passing the United States-Mexico-Canada trade agreement and wrapping up the other trade agreements the U.S. is negotiating has to be a priority. I have repeatedly relayed this message to the President and key members of his administration, and I will continue to do so.

While I strongly support the administration's goal of strengthening market access for our Nation's farmers and ranchers, the most urgent need right now is to get farmers certainty about what international markets are going to look like. Agreements with China, Japan, and the European Union all need to be concluded quickly to end current trade and market uncertainties.

We need to pass the already negotiated United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement as soon as humanly possible. This agreement will preserve and expand market access for farmers and ranchers in two of our Nation's most significant agricultural export markets—Canada and Mexico. Of particular interest to the rapidly growing dairy industry in South Dakota, USMCA will expand market access for U.S. dairy products in Canada. The U.S. International Trade Commission estimates that the agreement will boost U.S. dairy exports by more than \$277 million. The agreement will also expand market access for U.S. poultry and egg producers, and it will make it easier for American producers to export wheat to Canada.

Senate Republicans are ready to pass this agreement as soon as the President formally submits it to Congress. We are just waiting for Democrats in the House, who have still not indicated they are ready to take up the agreement despite the significant steps taken to address their priorities. It is high time for the Democrats in the House to make it clear they are ready to approve this agreement and allow our Nation's agricultural producers to start seeing the benefits. I will continue to fight to get USMCA passed as soon as possible.

I am honored to represent thousands of farmers and ranchers in the Senate. I am proud that Republican economic policies have been lifting Americans across the economic spectrum. I will continue to work to get our Nation's

agricultural economy going again so that our Nation's farmers and ranchers can prosper and thrive.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

#### REMEMBERING JOHN PAUL STEVENS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, last night, we received the news, the sad news, that Justice John Paul Stevens passed away at the age of 99. He was a son of the "greatest generation," a code breaker in the U.S. Navy at Pearl Harbor, a lifelong Chicago Cubs fan, and a Shakespearean scholar. What a combination.

John Paul Stevens was the third longest serving Justice on the U.S. Supreme Court in the Nation's history. The length of his tenure meant the jurisprudence of Justice Stevens left a mark on nearly every area of the law. Just as remarkable as the length of his tenure was its quality.

Justice John Paul Stevens was a champion for civil rights, equality, and accountability, who devoted his life to the ideal of equal justice under the law. He worked to constrain the use of the death penalty, defend abortion rights, articulate the bounds of Presidential power—very needed today—and believed that unravelling the limits on corporate campaign spending "threatens to undermine the integrity of elected institutions across the nation." He was so right.

The fact that Leader MCCONNELL and all our Republican friends lead the charge in allowing so much corporate money—money of the very wealthy—to cascade into our system—well, Justice Stevens is in Heaven reminding them of what they are doing to faith in our democratic institutions.

Stevens was at times an iconoclast. He was willing to buck conventional approaches and have his own views evolve. One constant, however, was his courtesy. During oral arguments, he would begin with the preface: "May I ask a question," as if the counsel were doing him a favor. Out of respect for the respect he paid to everyone who came before the Court, on his last day on the Bench, lawyers and spectators throughout the Supreme Court Chamber wore his signature bow tie in his honor, a more fitting tribute than anything I could say on the Senate floor.

Justice Stevens was a great man, a model jurist: wise, fair, compassionate, and caring about the little guy and gal. Our judiciary today needs more like him. There are too many on the Supreme Court who are virtually the opposite of what Stevens stood for. He will be sorely missed.

#### SENATE LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

Mr. President, on a different subject, it is certainly abhorrent that Leader MCCONNELL has said we should move on from the President's comments this weekend without him even pausing to condemn them, but that is not the only subject Leader MCCONNELL is stifling debate on in this Chamber.

The size of Leader MCCONNELL's legislation graveyard grows with each session. Leader MCCONNELL has stood in the way of progress on a multitude of issues: healthcare, in his legislative graveyard; climate change, in his legislative graveyard; voting rights, in his legislative graveyard; gun safety, in his legislative graveyard; and paycheck fairness, in his legislative graveyard.

When Leader MCCONNELL refuses to even debate these issues and allows them to be amended, he hurts average Americans. He hurts Americans of all color and all creeds. He hurts Americans, whether their families have been in this country for 12 generations or they are new immigrants, new Americans, in this country.

There are so many issues: healthcare costs going through the roof, drug costs going through the roof, and MCCONNELL doesn't let us vote on them—preexisting conditions and the right to be protected if you have one. So if your son or daughter has cancer, the insurance company can't say: "I am cutting you off" and you watch that child suffer and you can't give him or her the healthcare they need. MCCONNELL says: "No debate, no change."

In fact, so many Republicans are silent on the lawsuit that President Trump and 19 Republican attorneys general filed that would get rid of preexisting conditions.

Climate change. We know what is happening to our planet. Ask Senators from anywhere on the coasts, anywhere where we have had disasters, and talk to our farmers in terms of temperatures and predators, natural pests. The world is changing, and we are doing nothing about it. He will not let a single bill on that. There is also voting rights or people are being deprived of gun safety, where thousands lose their lives, and we could close loopholes that 90 percent of Americans support.

#### HEALTHCARE

Mr. President, there are so many issues. Let me dwell on one of them, healthcare, where Leader MCCONNELL's graveyard hurts every American: immigrant, nonimmigrant, Black, White, Brown, every religion, and every creed. Healthcare is the No. 1 issue in the minds of most American families. Millions of families across the country are still struggling with how to afford healthcare and how to afford prescription drugs, but at the moment, as I have mentioned, the Trump administration is actively supporting a lawsuit that would dismantle the healthcare protections we have today.

The consequences of the lawsuit are mind-boggling: tens of millions—tens

of millions—would lose coverage and see premiums rise. Up to 133 million Americans—close to half of us—who have preexisting conditions would see their protections vanish. Yet Leader MCCONNELL has not allowed this Chamber to vote on whether the Senate can intervene in that lawsuit, let alone on any legislation that would improve our healthcare system. Astonishingly, many Republicans—many Senate Republicans—are publicly rooting for the Trump administration’s lawsuit to succeed, even if it means plunging our country into a healthcare crisis.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. President, as I mentioned, healthcare is far from the only subject Leader MCCONNELL has prevented the Senate from debating. Later today, my friend from Hawaii Senator SCHATZ will host the first hearing of the Senate Democrats’ special committee on the climate crisis, bringing mayors from across the country to talk about how their cities are combating climate change.

This Senate, because of Senator MCCONNELL’s graveyard, will sit on its hands and do nothing, but our cities and States have no choice but to do something. They are closer to the people. They are doing stuff. We will hear about it today.

Climate change is the greatest threat to our planet, and Leader MCCONNELL will not even let the Senate debate the issue. This will go down in history poorly for all of our Republican friends who back that up, which is just about everyone.

We had to form our own committee because Republicans wouldn’t join a bipartisan committee to discuss this. In his time as majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL has brought forward exactly one bill to address climate change, and it was so his party and he could vote against it—a sham, a ruse, a trick, which flopped.

Many Republicans don’t support every Democratic idea to address climate change. I understand that, but Leader MCCONNELL has provided no way for the Senate to even debate the matter. How are we supposed to compromise or make progress if the Senate leader refuses to allow us to debate any legislation? How can America make progress, even when the House moves forward, when the Senate has become a legislative graveyard for so many issues?

On climate change, healthcare, and so many other issues, Leader MCCONNELL’s legislative graveyard is standing in the way of progress for average American families.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask that the 11 o’clock vote series start now.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the amendments to the treaty are withdrawn.

The amendments (No. 912 and No. 913) were withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution of ratification.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the resolution of ratification as follows:

Resolution of Advice and Consent of the Protocol Amending the Convention between the United States of America and the Swiss Confederation for the Avoidance of Double Taxation with Respect to Taxes on Income, signed at Washington on October 2, 1996, signed on September 23, 2009, at Washington, as corrected by an exchange of notes effected November 16, 2010 (the proposed Protocol) (Treaty Doc. 112-1), and a related agreement effected by an exchange of notes on September 23, 2009 (the related Agreement).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 95 and nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 210 Ex.]

YEAS—95

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

NAYS—2

Lee	Paul
-----	------

NOT VOTING—3

Bennet	Harris	Isakson
--------	--------	---------

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). On this vote, the yeas are 95, the nays are 2.

Two-thirds of the Senators having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

The resolution of ratification was agreed to, as follows:

TREATIES APPROVED

PROTOCOL AMENDING TAX CONVENTION WITH SWISS CONFEDERATION (TREATY DOC. 112-1)

*Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein),*

Section 1. Senate Advice and Consent Subject to a Declaration and Conditions.

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Protocol Amending the Convention between the United States of America and the Swiss Confederation for the Avoidance of Double Taxation with Respect to Taxes on Income, signed at Washington on October 2, 1996, signed on September 23, 2009, at Washington, as corrected by an exchange of notes effected November 16, 2010 (the “proposed Protocol”) (Treaty Doc. 112-1), and a related agreement effected by an exchange of notes on September 23, 2009 (the “related Agreement”) subject to the declaration of section 2 and the conditions in section 3.

Sec. 2. Declaration.

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following declaration: The Protocol is self-executing.

Sec. 3. Conditions.

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following conditions:

(1) Not later than 2 years after the Protocol enters into force and prior to the first arbitration conducted pursuant to the binding arbitration mechanism provided for in the Protocol, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transmit to the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Joint Committee on Taxation the text of the rules of procedure applicable to arbitration panels, including conflict of interest rules to be applied to members of the arbitration panel.

(2)(A) Not later than 60 days after a determination has been reached by an arbitration panel in the tenth arbitration proceeding conducted pursuant to the Protocol or any of the treaties described in subparagraph (B), the Secretary of the Treasury shall prepare and submit to the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, subject to laws relating to taxpayer confidentiality, a detailed report regarding the operation and application of the arbitration mechanism contained in the Protocol and such treaties. The report shall include the following information:

(i) For the Protocol and each such treaty, the aggregate number of cases pending on the respective dates of entry into force of the Protocol and each treaty, including the following information:

(I) The number of such cases by treaty article or articles at issue.

(II) The number of such cases that have been resolved by the competent authorities through a mutual agreement as of the date of the report.

(III) The number of such cases for which arbitration proceedings have commenced as of the date of the report.

(ii) A list of every case presented to the competent authorities after the entry into force of the Protocol and each such treaty, including the following information regarding each case:

(I) The commencement date of the case for purposes of determining when arbitration is available.

(II) Whether the adjustment triggering the case, if any, was made by the United States or the relevant treaty partner.

(III) Which treaty the case relates to.

(IV) The treaty article or articles at issue in the case.

(V) The date the case was resolved by the competent authorities through a mutual agreement, if so resolved.

(VI) The date on which an arbitration proceeding commenced, if an arbitration proceeding commenced.

(VII) The date on which a determination was reached by the arbitration panel, if a determination was reached, and an indication as to whether the panel found in favor of the United States or the relevant treaty partner.

(iii) With respect to each dispute submitted to arbitration and for which a determination was reached by the arbitration panel pursuant to the Protocol or any such treaty, the following information:

(I) In the case of a dispute submitted under the Protocol, an indication as to whether the presenter of the case to the competent authority of a Contracting State submitted a Position Paper for consideration by the arbitration panel.

(II) An indication as to whether the determination of the arbitration panel was accepted by each concerned person.

(III) The amount of income, expense, or taxation at issue in the case as determined by reference to the filings that were sufficient to set the commencement date of the case for purposes of determining when arbitration is available.

(IV) The proposed resolutions (income, expense, or taxation) submitted by each competent authority to the arbitration panel.

(B) The treaties referred to in subparagraph (A) are—

(i) the 2006 Protocol Amending the Convention between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital and to Certain Other Taxes, done at Berlin June 1, 2006 (Treaty Doc. 109-20) (the “2006 German Protocol”);

(ii) the Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income, and accompanying protocol, done at Brussels July 9, 1970 (the “Belgium Convention”) (Treaty Doc. 110-3);

(iii) the Protocol Amending the Convention between the United States of America and Canada with Respect to Taxes on Income and on Capital, signed at Washington September 26, 1980 (the “2007 Canada Protocol”) (Treaty Doc. 110-15); and

(iv) the Protocol Amending the Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the French Republic for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital, signed at Paris August 31, 1994 (the “2009 France Protocol”) (Treaty Doc. 111-4).

(3) The Secretary of the Treasury shall prepare and submit the detailed report required under paragraph (2) on March 1 of the year following the year in which the first report is submitted to the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, and on an annual basis thereafter for a period of five years. In each such report, disputes that were resolved, either by a mutual agreement between the relevant competent authorities or by a determination of

an arbitration panel, and noted as such in prior reports may be omitted.

(4) The reporting requirements referred to in paragraphs (2) and (3) supersede the reporting requirements contained in paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 3 of the resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the 2009 France Protocol, approved by the Senate on December 3, 2009.

PROTOCOL AMENDING THE TAX CONVENTION WITH JAPAN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next treaty.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Treaty document No. 114-1, Protocol Amending the Tax Convention with Japan.

Pending:

McConnell amendment No. 914, of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 915 (to amendment No. 914), to change the enactment date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the amendments to the treaty are withdrawn.

The amendments (No. 914 and No. 915) were withdrawn.

The clerk will report the resolution of ratification.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Resolution of Advice and Consent to Ratification of the Protocol Amending the Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Japan for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with respect to Taxes on Income and a related agreement entered into by an exchange of notes (together the “proposed Protocol”), both signed on January 24, 2013, at Washington, together with correcting notes exchanged March 9 and March 29, 2013.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 95, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 211 Ex.]

YEAS—95

Alexander	Cardin	Duckworth
Baldwin	Carper	Durbin
Barrasso	Casey	Enzi
Blackburn	Cassidy	Ernst
Blumenthal	Collins	Feinstein
Blunt	Coons	Fischer
Booker	Cornyn	Gardner
Boozman	Cortez Masto	Gillibrand
Braun	Cotton	Graham
Brown	Cramer	Grassley
Burr	Crapo	Hassan
Cantwell	Cruz	Hawley
Capito	Daines	Heinrich

Hirono	Murkowski	Shaheen
Hoeben	Murphy	Shelby
Hyde-Smith	Murray	Sinema
Inhofe	Perdue	Smith
Johnson	Peters	Stabenow
Jones	Portman	Sullivan
Kaine	Reed	Tester
Kennedy	Risch	Thune
King	Roberts	Tillis
Klobuchar	Romney	Toomey
Lankford	Rosen	Udall
Leahy	Rounds	Van Hollen
Manchin	Rubio	Warner
Markey	Sanders	Warren
McConnell	Sasse	Whitehouse
McSally	Schatz	Wicker
Menendez	Schumer	Wyden
Merkley	Scott (FL)	Young
Moran	Scott (SC)	

NAYS—2

Lee Paul

NOT VOTING—3

Bennet Harris Isakson

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). On this vote, the yeas are 95, the nays are 2.

Two-thirds of the Senators voting having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

The resolution of ratification was agreed to as follows:

PROTOCOL AMENDING THE TAX CONVENTION WITH JAPAN (TREATY DOC. 114-1)

*Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein),*

Section 1. Senate Advice and Consent Subject to a Declaration and Conditions.

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Protocol Amending the Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Japan for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with respect to Taxes on Income, and a related agreement entered into by an exchange of notes, both signed at Washington January 24, 2013, as corrected by exchange of notes on March 9 and 29, 2013 (the “Protocol”) (Treaty Doc. 114-1), subject to the declaration of section 2 and the conditions in section 3.

Sec. 2. Declaration.

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following declaration: The Protocol is self-executing.

Sec. 3. Conditions.

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following conditions:

(1) Not later than 2 years after the Protocol enters into force and prior to the first arbitration conducted pursuant to the binding arbitration mechanism provided for in the Protocol, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transmit to the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Joint Committee on Taxation the text of the rules of procedure applicable to arbitration panels, including conflict of interest rules to be applied to members of the arbitration panel.

(2)(A) Not later than 60 days after a determination has been reached by an arbitration panel in the tenth arbitration proceeding conducted pursuant to the Protocol or any of the treaties described in subparagraph (B), the Secretary of the Treasury shall prepare and submit to the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, subject to laws relating to taxpayer confidentiality, a detailed report regarding the operation and application of the arbitration mechanism contained in the Protocol and such treaties. The report shall include the following information:

(i) For the Protocol and each such treaty, the aggregate number of cases pending on



the respective dates of entry into force of the Protocol and each treaty, including the following information:

(I) The number of such cases by treaty article or articles at issue.

(II) The number of such cases that have been resolved by the competent authorities through a mutual agreement as of the date of the report.

(III) The number of such cases for which arbitration proceedings have commenced as of the date of the report.

(i) A list of every case presented to the competent authorities after the entry into force of the Protocol and each such treaty, including the following information regarding each case:

(I) The commencement date of the case for purposes of determining when arbitration is available.

(II) Whether the adjustment triggering the case, if any, was made by the United States or the relevant treaty partner.

(III) Which treaty the case relates to.

(IV) The treaty article or articles at issue in the case.

(V) The date the case was resolved by the competent authorities through a mutual agreement, if so resolved.

(VI) The date on which an arbitration proceeding commenced, if an arbitration proceeding commenced.

(VII) The date on which a determination was reached by the arbitration panel, if a determination was reached, and an indication as to whether the panel found in favor of the United States or the relevant treaty partner.

(iii) With respect to each dispute submitted to arbitration and for which a determination was reached by the arbitration panel pursuant to the Protocol or any such treaty, the following information:

(I) In the case of a dispute submitted under the Protocol, an indication as to whether the presenter of the case to the competent authority of a Contracting State submitted a Position Paper for consideration by the arbitration panel.

(II) An indication as to whether the determination of the arbitration panel was accepted by each concerned person.

(III) The amount of income, expense, or taxation at issue in the case as determined by reference to the filings that were sufficient to set the commencement date of the case for purposes of determining when arbitration is available.

(IV) The proposed resolutions (income, expense, or taxation) submitted by each competent authority to the arbitration panel.

(B) The treaties referred to in subparagraph (A) are—

(i) the 2006 Protocol Amending the Convention between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital and to Certain Other Taxes, done at Berlin June 1, 2006 (Treaty Doc. 109-20) (the “2006 German Protocol”);

(ii) the Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income, and accompanying protocol, done at Brussels July 9, 1970 (the “Belgium Convention”) (Treaty Doc. 110-3);

(iii) the Protocol Amending the Convention between the United States of America and Canada with Respect to Taxes on Income and on Capital, signed at Washington September 26, 1980 (the “2007 Canada Protocol”) (Treaty Doc. 110-5); and

(iv) the Protocol Amending the Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of

the French Republic for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital, signed at Paris August 31, 1994 (the “2009 France Protocol”) (Treaty Doc. 111-4).

(3) The Secretary of the Treasury shall prepare and submit the detailed report required under paragraph (2) on March 1 of the year following the year in which the first report is submitted to the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, and on an annual basis thereafter for a period of five years. In each such report, disputes that were resolved, either by a mutual agreement between the relevant competent authorities or by a determination of an arbitration panel, and noted as such in prior reports may be omitted.

(4) The reporting requirements referred to in paragraphs (2) and (3) supersede the reporting requirements contained in paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 3 of the resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the 2009 France Protocol, approved by the Senate on December 3, 2009.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

SENATOR LEAHY’S 16,000TH VOTE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the Democratic leader and I just want to take a few minutes here to point out to everyone that our colleague, the senior Senator from Vermont, just cast a truly historic vote. Of course, these tax treaties are significant, but I am talking about the fact that Senator LEAHY just cast his 16,000th vote of his Senate career. We know of no single statistic that could begin to capture such a tenure, but this figure comes close—16,000 votes cast for his constituents. With numbers like that, Senator LEAHY has already left towering figures like our late colleagues Ted Stevens and Ted Kennedy in the dust. Now he is gaining on legends like Danny Inouye.

I think it is safe to say that all of Senator LEAHY’s colleagues on both sides of the aisle are reminded every day why the good people of Vermont made him the youngest U.S. Senator ever from Vermont back in 1974 and why they have rehired him over and over. He must be a hard act to follow, too, because, believe this or not, he is still technically—technically—the only Democrat Vermont has ever sent to the Senate.

I know we all admire the Senator’s passion and perseverance. I remember him fondly from our time together as chair and ranking member on the Appropriations Subcommittee on State and Foreign Operations. Foreign Ops was one of my favorite committee assignments, and I am proud of the investments Senator LEAHY and I helped make in support of democracy, good governance, and human rights around the world.

I think I speak for all of us when I offer congratulations to our good friend from Vermont on his historic milestone.

(Applause.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I join my colleague Senator MCCONNELL and offer my congratulations and my

kudos—that is singular, as we learned in our caucus lunch a few weeks ago—to my dear friend from Vermont, Senator PAT LEAHY, on his 16,000th vote as Senator. He is only the fourth person to reach this milestone out of nearly 1,900 men and women who have served in this Chamber. It is a great achievement and a great mark on history. So many of his votes were so significant—on healthcare, education, declaration of war, international treaties, every issue foreign and domestic. They cover four decades, each vote in some small way impacting the trajectory of our great Nation.

Just a little perspective. Imagine taking 16,000 pennies and stacking them one on top of the other. They would surpass the height of the Washington Monument. They would be more than double the height of the Capitol dome. It is a reminder that a multitude of smaller actions and the accumulation of smaller accomplishments over a lifetime of quiet dedication can amount to a great monument of achievement.

Leader MCCONNELL noted that Senator LEAHY was the youngest Senator ever elected from Vermont. He is still just as young at heart, at dedication, and at conviction as he was the day he came to the Senate.

We welcome Senator LEAHY and know that he will serve many, many more happy, productive years in this Chamber.

(Applause.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I wish to join the chorus here. This is a big day, as Senator MCCONNELL and Senator SCHUMER said, for our friend and colleague PAT LEAHY.

PAT and I have been working together a long time; this is our fourth decade. As we were told, he just cast his 16,000th vote in the U.S. Senate. I want to note that only three Senators have ever hit that mark—Senator Robert Byrd, Senator Danny Inouye, and Senator Strom Thurmond. And he is still going. PAT still has some time on his hands. This is an extraordinary achievement, as we all know, here in the Senate.

As I said, PAT and I have served together for more than three decades. As Senators MCCONNELL and SCHUMER said, he was first elected at the age of 34, making him one of the youngest Senators here.

As we all know, last year we completed our work, working together, before the Fourth of July recess, on the Appropriations Committee. We are going to try to do it again this year, working together. I just think, if we work together, as we have before—PAT and I have given and taken from each other—it is good for the Senate.

I congratulate Senator LEAHY again on this rare and remarkable achievement—16,000 votes. It is a first. He currently ranks first in seniority in the Senate—first, folks, in seniority. He is

our senior Senator. It has been nothing short of a privilege to serve alongside him. He is an excellent colleague, he has been a class act. I have enjoyed working with him and look forward to a few more years in the future.

PAT.  
(Applause.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished Democratic leader—both very close friends of mine whom I have served with for so long. And my dear, dear friend Senator SHELBY from Alabama.

It is the friendships that mean the most, both to me and to my wife Marcelle. It is the friends we gather on both sides of the aisle and the people I have traveled with around the world.

One of my proud achievements was the War Victims Fund, but it was Senator MITCH MCCONNELL who had it renamed the “PATRICK J. LEAHY War Victims Fund.” I know that Senator SCHUMER helped guide me into committee assignments that made the most sense for Vermont and for my own career and, I hope, for the Senate.

My first vote was for the Church Committee. Frank Church wanted oversight of our intelligence agencies, and the Intelligence Committee came out of that. The two leaders of the Intelligence Committee now—Senator BURR and Senator WARNER—do such a great job with that.

As I was looking at the paper today, I thought of the first Supreme Court Justice I voted for, John Paul Stevens, a wonderful man. I have voted on each member of the Supreme Court since then.

Going back through the 16,000 votes, I am sure I could find some and think, what the heck was I thinking when I voted that way?

But I am proud to serve Vermont. I am proud to be in this body. I am mostly proud to serve with all the Senators who are here on both sides of the aisle. Some of my closest friendships are here.

I have served with three wonderful Senators from Vermont. Senator Robert Stafford, who is no longer with us, was the senior Senator from Vermont when I came here. He was Mr. Republican in our State, and I wondered how he was going to react to this youngster, this Democrat coming in. He and his wife Ellen took Marcelle and me under their wing and helped us on everything. He taught me how best to form coalitions across the aisle. I will never forget that.

I am not going to hold up my colleagues here. I will speak more about this at another time.

But I was the first Vermonter to vote to end the war in Vietnam, which we ended by a one-vote margin at that time in the Armed Services Committee. There were other votes that were very close. There were bipartisan votes.

It is a privilege to be in this body. This body has been at times, and can be and should be, the conscience of the Nation. I urge my friends on both sides of the aisle to continue to work together. We have worked together on trips that many of us have taken. I will close with mentioning just one trip to give you an idea of that.

Senator Hubert Humphrey and Republican Leader Hugh Scott were going to go to Moscow. He said: PATRICK, you and Marcelle are going to come to Moscow.

I was 34 years old. I had just gotten through a campaign that nobody had contributed to. We were flat broke.

I blurted out: What is the airfare to Moscow?

He said: No, we are going to take Jerry's plane.

I said: Jerry who?

He said: Jerry Ford. He is the President. Don't you read the papers?

We had an equal number of Republicans and Democrats on that trip, and we formed lifelong friendships and learned how to work together. I urge Senators to continue doing that. And it was better than flying commercial.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I thank my colleagues.

(Applause.)

#### PROTOCOL AMENDING TAX CONVENTION WITH LUXEMBOURG

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next treaty.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Treaty document No. 111-8, Protocol Amending Tax Convention with Luxembourg.

Pending:

McConnell amendment No. 916, of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 917 (to amendment No. 916) to change the enactment date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the amendments to the treaty are withdrawn.

The amendments (No. 916 and No. 917) were withdrawn.

The clerk will report the resolution of ratification.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follow:

Resolution of Advice and Consent to Ratification of the Protocol Amending the Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital, signed on May 20, 2009, at Luxembourg (the “proposed Protocol”) and a related agreement effected by the exchange of notes also signed on May 20, 2009.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 93, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 212 Ex.]

YEAS—93

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

NAYS—3

Durbin Lee Paul

NOT VOTING—4

Bennet Isakson  
Harris Sanders

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 93, the nays are 3.

Two-thirds of the Senators voting having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

The resolution of ratification was agreed to as follows:

PROTOCOL AMENDING TAX CONVENTION WITH LUXEMBOURG (TREATY DOC. 111-8)

*Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein),*

Section 1. Senate Advice and Consent Subject to a Declaration.

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Protocol Amending the Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital, signed on May 20, 2009, at Luxembourg (the “Protocol”) and the related agreement effected by exchange of notes on May 20, 2009 (Treaty Doc. 111-8), subject to the declaration in section 2.

Sec. 2. Declaration.

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following declaration: The Protocol is self-executing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid



upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Clifton L. Corker, of Tennessee, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Tennessee.

The Senator from New York.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 1327

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that as in legislative session, the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 153, H.R. 1327; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it has long been my feeling that we need to address our massive debt in this country. We have a \$22 trillion debt. We are adding debt at about \$1 trillion a year. Therefore, any new spending that we are approaching, any new program that is going to have the longevity of 70 or 80 years should be offset by cutting spending that is less valuable. At the very least, we need to have this debate.

I will be offering up an amendment if this bill should come to the floor, but until then, I will object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I am deeply disappointed that my colleague has just objected to the desperately needed and urgent bill for our 9/11 first responders—a bipartisan bill that just earned over 400 votes in the U.S. House of Representatives and that has 73 cosponsors in this Chamber.

Enough of the political games. Our 9/11 first responders and the entire Nation are watching to see if this body actually cares. Do we care about the men and women who answer the call of duty?

When our country was attacked on 9/11/2001, the entire world looked on in shock as many people rightfully sought to get away as quickly as they could. As those towers began to crumble, there was one group of men and women—our heroes, the bravest among us—who ran the opposite way. They ran toward danger. They raced up the towers. They went into harm's way to answer the call of duty.

Then, in the days and weeks that followed and the months and months that followed, life slowly began to return to normal for the rest of the country, but at Ground Zero, nothing was normal.

The pile kept burning. It was smoldering. You could smell it blocks and blocks away—10 blocks, 20 blocks, 30 blocks away. Men and women kept going to that pile to do the very hard work of, first, trying to find survivors and then, of course, just trying to find remains and doing all the hard work of cleaning up. They dove in. They got to work. They wanted to help our country heal.

Now more than 18 years have actually passed, and thousands of those men and women have actually died. Thousands more are getting sick. They are getting grueling, painful diseases, like cancer, and they are now dying. Why? Because they did the work at Ground Zero that we asked them to do, and it made them very sick—the air they breathed, the smoke, the burning metal, the crushed glass, the crushed electronics, the toxins they breathed in that the EPA told them was safe.

These heroes have since had to quit their jobs and doing the jobs they love and providing for the families they love because they are too sick. They have had to give up their income. They have had to give up their dreams. They have had to give up their future. They have had to face the terrifying reality that they are actually going to die because of what they did on 9/11 and the months thereafter.

If that wasn't a great enough burden, they had to use their most precious commodity, time—time away from their families, time away from their friends, and time away from their children, from their loved ones, and from their community. To do what? To come here. To come here to walk the Halls of Congress, to go to office after office, to ask that this body and this government stand by them in their greatest time of need, to ask for the basic compensation that they have earned and deserve, to ask for the healthcare that could actually keep them alive maybe another year longer and not have to go through bankruptcy, and to have to come here week after week, spending thousands of dollars of their own money, sacrificing the time and energy that they have left.

I have seen first responders in wheelchairs, attached to oxygen tanks, spending their last moments here in Congress just asking that we do the right thing.

Almost a decade ago, 9 years after the attacks, Congress finally listened. We passed a healthcare and compensation fund for the people who got sick because of 9/11, but that compensation fund was only designed to last for 5 years. You know how this place works. They wanted to make sure it worked right. They wanted to make sure every i was dotted and every t was crossed. They wanted to make sure there could be no fraud and no corruption. Well, of course, there wasn't. So it was limited. These first responders—many of them sick and some dying—had to come back again and again and again to spend more of their time walking these halls.

Eventually, we passed another compensation bill, but, again, it was for another 5 years. Even though thousands of 9/11 first responders are sick and even more will become sick, they still had to come back, even though some of these diseases are lifetime diseases and more will die. And, now, sadly, the fund is running out.

The 5 years aren't over yet, and the Federal Government is already having to tell these families who have gotten cancer and died since 9/11 that we have actually run out of money for them, that the compensation they have earned and the need their families have will be cut by up to 70 percent.

Once again, sick and dying first responders are being forced to come here to knock on our office doors to remind Members of Congress of what they did on that day and the weeks and months since, to tell them their personal stories of how painful it is to lose everything you love. First, it is your ability to work, then your ability to play with your kids, then your ability to eat, and then your ability to breathe.

I believe we have a responsibility—a sacred responsibility—so that anyone in this Chamber who has any sense of decency, compassion, or patriotism would listen to our first responders and give them what they need: a permanent compensation program so that these men and women will never have to spend another moment in these hallways again.

We could pass this bill right now, but, instead, my colleague has objected, asking people to come back over and over. Everyone loves to point fingers in this place, but there is nowhere else to point that finger today than this Chamber.

The House has already passed the bill overwhelmingly 402 to 12. It is about as bipartisan as it gets. Shame on those 12 Members who voted no.

The same bipartisan bill, the one I just called on my colleagues to pass already, has 73 cosponsors—73. When was the last time that happened?

I want to say how grateful I am to my Republican colleague from Colorado, Senator GARDNER, for leading this bipartisan bill with me. In these divided times, what other bill can you imagine would have so much support by both parties?

Enough is enough. We should pass this bill today. We should have passed this bill today, and I hope we can pass this bill with no further delay.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, let me thank my colleague and friend, the Senator from New York, for the amazing work she has done to get this bill to this point. She has worked long and hard on this for years and years and years with compassion, dedication, intelligence, and persistence. The bill wouldn't be here today without her hard work. I thank her for that.

I also want to thank—I know there are police and firefighters in the Gallery over here. I want to thank them

for coming. You are the people who got this done. You are the people who made this happen more than any of us and more than anyone else. The heroes of 21st century America have names like Zadroga and Pfeifer and Alvarez, for whom this bill is named—three of the thousands who rushed to the towers bravely and lost their lives because of their bravery and selflessness.

I say to my friend from Kentucky: Throughout the history of America, when our young men and women or older men and women volunteered in the armed services and risked their lives for our freedom, we came back and gave them healthcare, and we are still working on making it better. Why are these people any different? They, too, risked their lives in a time of war and were hurt by it—by diseases they didn't even know they could get. How can we, for whatever reason, stop this bill from moving forward?

We are going to have a defense bill on the appropriations floor. We are not going to offset it. It has pay raises for our soldiers. It has new equipment. We are not going to ask for an offset. Why this bill—why is it different? It is not. This fund needs to be fully funded.

I say to Leader MCCONNELL, the House leadership, hardly people who aren't careful with the dollar—sometimes too careful—when KEVIN MCCARTHY and SCALISE, the Freedom Caucus leader, MARK MEADOWS, all voted for it, why are we holding this bill up? If we put it on the floor today, we could pass it, and it would be on the President's desk this week, and those brave people here and the many more who came would not have to come again. They should not have to come again.

It is not that it will be a joyous day when this bill passes. They are going to have to return to nurturing their brothers and sisters who are sick and to worry if they might get sick from all the gunk that was in the air that poisoned their systems, their lungs, their digestive systems, their kidneys, and their livers.

The bottom line is very simple. You can come up with 10,000 reasons not to do something, but you shouldn't come up with any reason not to do something noble and right.

I urge my friend from Kentucky to withdraw his objection. I urge Senator MCCONNELL, the leader, to put it on the floor now, and we can let these folks in the Gallery and so many others do what they need to do—help their families, help their friends, and make sure their health is given the best protection possible.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I thank Senator SCHUMER for being such an extraordinary advocate for the men and women who have served our Nation. This bill would never have gotten this far without his leadership, without his dedication, and without his absolute commitment to the men and

women in the Gallery, as well as the men and women in all 50 States throughout this country.

I thank Senator SCHUMER for never giving up on this bill and for always bringing it across the finish line when we need his skills and his leadership and his tenacity the most. I thank him, for the record, for his undying commitment to the men and women who serve this Nation.

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

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

#### GOVERNMENT WASTE

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, today is "Washington Waste Wednesday." It is a new series I launched last week to highlight all of the ways Washington wastes taxpayer dollars. Unfortunately, there are a lot of ways.

My belief is that you, the American taxpayer, can spend your money better than Washington can. It is a novel concept here in DC. The way Washington spends your money is oftentimes an embarrassment.

As Governor of Florida, my focus on responsible spending meant more money in the pockets of Florida families and more funding available to pay down State debt and invest in what mattered most to our families. We paid down \$10 billion in State debt over my 8 years as Governor—nearly one-third of total State debt. We cut taxes 100 times, giving more than \$10 billion back to Florida families and job creators. And we have record funding for education, for the environment, and for transportation.

But right now, our national debt is impossible to fathom, much less sustain. It is \$22 trillion. Just let that sink in for a minute. We are already \$22 trillion in the hole, but that doesn't stop the far-left Democrats from proposing more debt for this country.

Medicare for All, which I like to call Medicare for None, would not only throw 150 million people off the private insurance they like, but it is projected to cost as much as \$32 trillion over a decade. That is \$32 trillion with a "t."

The problem with our healthcare system is rising costs. It just costs too much. Prescription drugs cost too much. Hospital visits cost too much. ObamaCare drove up the cost of healthcare. That is obvious. Then the government tried to hide that cost by providing Federal subsidies to the tune of \$737 billion in 2019—\$737 billion in 2019 and \$1.3 trillion by 2029.

Instead of providing subsidies and proposing more wasteful ideas, we should be focused on bringing down the cost of healthcare, which solves two problems. First, it will result in more people having healthcare coverage, and, second, it would ensure that

health insurance results in actual healthcare.

Reduce costs and you solve both of these problems, but solving problems is a novel concept in Washington. The Democrats in Washington just want to spend more money to solve every problem. On top of Medicare for All, the Democrats want a Green New Deal. The Green New Deal—I call it the Green Job Killer—would cost as much as \$93 trillion. These two proposals alone will cost more than \$100 trillion. To put that in perspective, that is more than \$300,000 for every man, woman, and child in the United States—\$300,000. You wouldn't run a business like this, so why are Democrats proposing to run a country this way?

We are turning this Nation around. Our economy is booming, and wages are rising. We can't go along with this dangerous socialist playbook. Higher taxes, more debt, and more regulation will reverse our success and bankrupt our country. These ideas are the craziest examples of Washington waste we have seen in a long time.

Thankfully, the American people will not go along with socialism. We can cut the waste and cut the spending, but we have to be thoughtful. We have to propose real solutions, just as we did in Florida, to make Washington work for all American families.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

#### HEALTHCARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to once again give the facts about the Democrats' one-size-fits-all healthcare proposal, the legislation that many Democrats are referring to as Medicare for All.

My focus today is what is going to happen to American patients if the government takes full control of our Nation's healthcare system. I speak as a doctor who practiced medicine for 24 years in Casper, WY. It is so interesting, as a doctor, to take a look at what is being proposed because I know the specifics of the impacts on the lives of patients, patients I have taken care of as part of my training and part of my practice in Wyoming, and as a doctor, I have personally studied what is happening to healthcare in other countries around the world.

You have no doubt heard about the worsening crisis of care in England. There are doctor shortages, and, of course, there is rationing of care. British rationing has actually become the focus of a recent article in the magazine, *The Economist*. The article is entitled, "The front line of England's NHS is being reinvented." It says, "A shortage of family doctors leaves little choice but to try something new."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD.

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

[From The Economist]

THE FRONT LINE OF ENGLAND'S NHS IS BEING REINVENTED

A SHORTAGE OF FAMILY DOCTORS LEAVES LITTLE CHOICE BUT TO TRY SOMETHING NEW

The National Health Service is free, so it is also rationed. Family doctors, known as general practitioners (GPs), act as the first port of call for patients; friendly gatekeepers to the rest of the service who refer people to specialists only if needed. But in some parts of the country, including St Austell on the Cornish coast, access to the rationers is itself now rationed. "You can't book an appointment to see me here," explains Stewart Smith, a 39-year-old GP, one of a team in charge of an innovative new medical centre. "You go on a list and then we triage you."

It is an approach that will soon be familiar to more patients. Simon Stevens, chief executive of NHS England, has said that being a GP is arguably the most important job in the country. There is, however, a severe shortage of them. According to the Nuffield Trust, a think-tank, there are 58 GPs per 100,000 people, down from 66 in 2009—the first sustained fall since the 1960s. Only half of patients say they almost always see their preferred doctor, down from 65% six years ago. The average consultation lasts just nine minutes, among the quickest in the rich world.

Although the NHS hopes to train and recruit new family doctors, the gap won't be plugged any time soon. A new five-year contract to fund GP practices will eventually include £891m (\$1.1bn) a year for 20,000 extra clinical staff, such as pharmacists and physiotherapists, with the first cash for such roles arriving on July 1st. To access the money, practices will have to form networks which, it is hoped, will help them take advantage of economies of scale and do more to prevent illnesses rather than merely treating them.

When the four practices serving St Austell merged in 2015, it was an opportunity to reconsider how they did things. The GPs kept a diary, noting precisely what they got up to during the day. It turned out that lots could be done by others: administrators could take care of some communication with hospitals, physios could see people with bad backs and psychiatric nurses those with anxiety. So now they do. Only patients with the most complicated or urgent problems make it to a doctor. As a result, each GP is responsible for 3,800 locals, compared with an average of 2,000 in the rest of Cornwall.

Although few practices have made changes on the scale of St Austell Healthcare, across England the number of clinical staff other than GPs has grown by more than a third since 2015. The logic behind the introduction of these new roles is compelling, says Ben Gershlick of the Health Foundation, another think-tank. The NHS estimates that 30% of GPs' time is spent on musculoskeletal problems, for instance, which could often be handled by a physiotherapist. Another estimate suggests 11% of their day is taken up by paperwork. Doctors complain that they are overworked, and growing numbers retire early. They are also expensive: the starting salary for a GP is £57,655, whereas a physio costs around half as much.

NHS leaders hope the new workers will help practices play a more active role in their community, linking up with services provided by local authorities and charities. Each network will be responsible for a population of 30,000–50,000. The plan is that they will use data analysis to intervene early to prevent illness, and that practices will often share the new staff with others in their network.

Those that are further down the road sing the benefits of the new approach. Caroline

Taylor of the Beechwood Medical Centre in Halifax says that new roles quickly show their worth. Her practice took in a "work wellness adviser" employed by the council. The adviser's goal was to help ten people over the age of 50 with poor mental health back to work in a year—a task which she completed in just six weeks. In St Austell two pharmacists last year helped to cut more than £140,000 from prescribing costs. Far fewer staff now report that they are burnt out.

Working in a team will nevertheless require a big shift in mindset for many doctors, particularly those in surgeries that have never before employed anyone else aside from the odd nurse. One worry is that practices will end up doing what they must to get the extra funding, but little more. There are also more practical problems. Seven in ten GPs say their practices are too cramped to provide new services, and it is not clear where some of the extra staff will be hired from.

Perhaps the biggest problem is that patients have grown used to having a doctor on demand. Although those who no longer have to queue for an appointment may be happy, others might feel fobbed off if diverted to another clinician. A study published last year by Charlotte Paddison of the Nuffield Trust, and colleagues, in the *British Medical Journal* found that patients had less trust in the care provided by a nurse if they initially expected to see a doctor. Patients who have a close relationship with their GP tend to be more satisfied and enjoy better health outcomes than others.

But other evidence suggests that, for some conditions, nurses provide care that is as good as or better than that provided by GPs. The aim, says Nav Chana of the National Association of Primary Care, which helped develop the new approach, is therefore to use small teams of doctors and other clinical staff to replicate the sort of relationship with patients that used to be more common. Just parachuting in "a lot of people who look like doctors" will not raise standards, he warns.

The shortage of GPs leaves the NHS with little choice but to try something new. "A lot of the world has either copied or is trying to copy English primary care," in particular its openness to all and the continuity of care that it provides, says Dr. Chana. Keeping these strengths, while changing how primary care works, is the task NHS officials are now facing up to. Even if they succeed, it will take time for the public to adjust. Having explained the benefits of the new way of doing things, one GP pauses, before adding: "I should say, though, patients don't love it."

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, the story opens with a simple observation, and this is the first sentence: "The national health service is free, so it is also rationed."

That is what we are seeing, and that is what people are living with every day in Britain. Under the guise of healthcare being free, they live in a world where healthcare is rationed.

So how bad can that be? What would this mean with this one-size-fits-all Medicare for All, which the Democrats are proposing?

The Economist writes that in Britain today "[o]nly patients with the most complicated or urgent problems make it to a doctor." Actually, today you need a doctor's referral to see a specialist in England. But now, in some parts of the country, a British bureau-

crat must preapprove your visit to the family doctor, who will then make the referral to the specialist. I can't imagine people in our country tolerating that. So, ironically, "access to the rationers is itself now rationed." According to the article, "Only half of [British] patients say they almost always get to see their preferred doctor." So only half get to see the doctor they choose.

Remember that old line—"If you like your healthcare, you can keep it. If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor." In Britain, only half get to see their doctor—if they get to see them, if they get to go through the rationer, who is a bureaucrat.

What happens after you wade through all of this, wade through the morass of the bureaucrat and the family doctor to get to the specialist? What does the article say about when you actually get to see a doctor? The average consultation time, it says, is only 9 minutes. It is 9 minutes on average. As a doctor, I can state that 9 minutes is one of the shortest consults I have ever heard of. I cannot imagine 9 minutes—after waiting all of this time to see the doctor, 9 minutes and then you are done, and they are on to the next patient, who has also been waiting and waiting and waiting to see the doctor.

What does this tell us about what would happen in the United States to patients trying to see doctors if we followed this one-size-fits-all, government-run healthcare program that Senator SANDERS and so many of the Democrats are supporting? If we adopt a government-run, one-size-fits-all healthcare system, which is what they are proposing, I would tell Americans to expect to pay more to wait longer for worse care. That is what we would see. To borrow the line from The Economist, bureaucrats will, as they say, reinvent what healthcare means for you.

You may have seen the stories about the thousands of elderly patients right now going blind in Britain—going blind. Why are they going blind? Well, because the British health service is rationing eye surgery. The president of the Royal College of Ophthalmologists has said that the rationing is part of the government's cost-cutting in England, and people are going blind as a result. Thousands of elderly patients are desperately in need of eye surgery, but the bureaucrats who must approve it are denying the treatment. The number of denials has doubled in the last 2 years.

According to the Royal College of Surgeons, a quarter of a million British patients have been waiting more than 6 months for planned medical treatment. That is happening in England today. The waiting times are getting longer.

Now let's look at Canada. According to the New York Times, Senator BERNIE SANDERS likes the Canadian healthcare system because he says it is "free." Of course, Senator SANDERS

knows it is anything but free. After all, the healthcare proposal that Senator SANDERS is proposing has a \$32 trillion price tag. The Senator admits the plan hikes taxes on middle-class families. He said it in the debate the other night. The truth is, even doubling our taxes couldn't cover this huge cost. Yet a majority of Democrats in the House of Representatives—a majority—have cosponsored what Senator SANDERS is proposing. A majority of the Democratic Senators running for President today have cosponsored Senator SANDERS' one-size-fits-all proposal. Apparently Senator SANDERS approves of the Canadian long wait times because he says wait times are not a problem. Well, maybe he should check with the Canadians to see if wait times are a problem, because patients in Canada typically wait 3 months for treatments and for certain treatments, much, much longer. In some ways, the Canadian healthcare system has been called trick-or-treat medicine because if you haven't gotten your care by the end of October, by Halloween, you will have to wait until next year because they will have run out of the money allotted for that procedure or that healthcare in that country in that year.

As a doctor practicing in Wyoming, I have actually operated on people from Canada who came to the United States for care. It is free up in Canada, but they couldn't afford to wait for the free care they were going to get in Canada, so they came to the United States to pay for the care here.

Still, that is what the Democrats are proposing—a one-size-fits-all approach. So people will pay more through their taxes to wait longer for care that will be worse care. Even the Congressional Budget Office people who looked at this in terms of funding, looked at what it would cost to do a Senator SANDERS' style approach, said it would be expensive, complicated, and the delays would be not just in treatment but also in technology.

Many Democratic candidates for President have also endorsed—amazingly so—free healthcare for illegal immigrants. You saw the question being asked on the debate stage. Every one of the Democrats running for President was standing there and was asked: Which one of you would have in your healthcare plan free health insurance, free healthcare, for people in this country illegally? And every hand on the stage went up.

When you take a look at what the proposal actually is—this Medicare for All, this one-size-fits-all approach—it actually takes health insurance away from 100 million people who get it through work and gives it to illegal immigrants. So 180 million American citizens will lose their on-the-job insurance while illegal immigrants will get it for free. That is the Democrats' Medicare for All proposal.

The Congressional Research Service recently reported that the Sanders bill ends Medicare as well as on-the-job

health insurance, and what we will be doing is entering into one expensive, new, government-run system.

Still, the Democratic Senators who are running for President and the 118 Democratic Members of the House support the Sanders' legislation. They have cosponsored it, saying: Let the Washington, DC, bureaucrats call the shots—unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats calling the shots as they ration your care. They will micromanage your care, and they will delay your care, delay your treatment—treatment that you urgently need. That is the difference. People will lose the freedom to see their own doctor. We have seen what has happened in England. Patients will wait months for treatment. Keep in mind—care delayed is often care denied, and if they finally get to see a physician, the amount of time in consultation will be incredibly short. That is why what is being proposed by the Democrats in this one-size-fits-all approach—a British plan, a Canadian plan—is completely unacceptable to American citizens.

You don't need Democrats' phony promises of free care; what you need is to have the freedom to get the care you want and need from a doctor whom you choose at lower cost. That is why Republicans are going to continue to work on real reforms that improve patient care, that increase transparency, that lower the cost of care, and that lower the cost of what people pay out of their own pockets, without adding these incredibly longer wait times and the loss of the ability to make choices on your own. Why should we pay more to wait longer for worse care, which is what we are seeing with a one-size-fits-all approach? Let's make sure patients can get the care they need from the doctor they choose at lower costs.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROMNEY). The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I would ask unanimous consent that Senators ALEXANDER and MENENDEZ be allowed to speak for 5 minutes each before the vote scheduled at 2 p.m. today.

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

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF "APOLLO 11"

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, 50 years ago, the world was transfixed by a grainy, black-and-white image of Neil Armstrong descending a ladder, preparing to take humankind's first steps on the Moon. I was one of more than half a billion people—the largest television audience in history—glued to the TV screen on that day. I was actually in high school, and, like so many Texans at the time, I was totally engrossed in what was going on.

Staring at the television, it was hard to imagine that hundreds of thousands of miles away, two brave Americans were sitting on the surface of the Moon while their comrade remained in lunar orbit up above. I didn't quite understand what this development would mean for the future; I just remember

thinking at that moment how proud I was to be an American. I looked up to these three men, and I still do, and I marvel at their courage, their intelligence, and their patriotism, as well as that of the tens of thousands of Americans involved in getting them to the Moon in the first place.

We now know that this lunar trio had quite a sense of humor. Michael Collins was once asked in an interview what he was thinking about in the moments leading up to the liftoff on July 16, 1969, and he joked, "I was thinking of per diem, you know, how many dollars per mile we'd be paid for this voyage." Upon the astronauts' return, we learned that when Buzz Aldrin stepped off the ladder, he told Armstrong he was being careful not to lock the door behind him. And when talking about the fact that most of the photos from the surface of the Moon were of Aldrin, Neil Armstrong joked, "I have always said that Buzz was the far more photogenic of the crew."

While the first lunar landing meant many different things to people around the world, there is one thing that was abundantly clear: That date—July 20, 1969—established the United States as the world leader in human space exploration. It also put my hometown, the place of my birth, Houston, on the map as a hub for spaceflight innovation in the United States.

We all remember the very first words uttered by Neil Armstrong after landing. He said, "Houston, Tranquility Base here. The Eagle has landed." Of course, he was talking to the greatest minds of the generation, who were working at Johnson Space Center in Houston, TX. The men and women at Mission Control Center exercised full control over *Apollo 11*, from the launch at Kennedy Space Center, to landing on the Moon, to the splashdown in the Pacific Ocean.

For more than 50 years now, the Johnson Space Center in Houston has been at the heart of America's space program. The success marked the turning point in space exploration, and folks across Texas are eager to celebrate this momentous anniversary. You can do like I have and visit Johnson Space Center yourself and see NASA's Mission Control from Apollo. It was redesigned to look exactly the way it did in 1969, down to the retro coffee cups and glass ashtrays. You can watch the Houston Astros take on Oakland while wearing *Apollo 11* caps. Across the State, you can see special movie screenings, space-themed menus, and "ask an astronaut" events to educate our next generation of space travelers.

To commemorate this historic mission in Washington, I introduced a bipartisan, bicameral resolution with my colleagues Senator BROWN, Congressman BABIN, and Congresswoman HORN last month. I thank my colleagues who supported this effort and urge my fellow Senators to join me in passing it this week. This resolution honors *Apollo 11*'s three crew members—Buzz

Aldrin, Neil Armstrong, and Michael Collins—whose bravery and skill made this feat possible. In addition, it commends the work of the brilliant men and women who supported this mission on Earth, including mathematicians like Katherine Johnson and the astronauts who lost their lives in previous spaceflight missions.

To ensure that America remains the leader in human spaceflight, this resolution also supports the continued leadership of the United States. With this in mind, earlier this year, I introduced a bill called Advancing Human Spaceflight Act with Senator PETERS from Michigan to provide greater certainty and stability for our space program.

This legislation will extend the authorization for the International Space Station through 2030 and launch the United States into a new era of space exploration.

Our future astronauts need spacesuits with advanced capabilities beyond what current technology can do, so this bill will also direct NASA to develop the next-generation spacesuit for future exploration to the Moon, to Mars, and beyond.

In order to make this dream a reality, this legislation will allow NASA to partner with private space innovators to ensure we have the best and brightest working to achieve these goals.

In addition, this bill will, for the first time, codify human space settlement as a national goal. I believe this legislation will help set the stage to launch the United States into a new era of space exploration, and there is no better time than this momentous anniversary to recommit ourselves to American leadership in space.

In the year since that first “small step,” we have watched goal after goal being set and then met. From the Viking 1 landing on Mars to the Voyager Program exploring the outer planets, to the International Space Station making human space habitation a reality, I have no doubt that the success of the *Apollo 11* mission made each of these victories possible and paved the way for the future.

For the 50th anniversary of the lunar landing, today we honor the brave and brilliant astronauts, physicists, engineers, mathematicians, and scientists of all kinds who made our Nation the first to touch down on lunar soil. We are grateful for their courage, their sacrifices, and their immeasurable contributions to our Nation’s space program.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### REMEMBERING JOHN PAUL STEVENS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, yesterday marked the passing of a giant in American law. Justice John Paul Stevens passed away at the age of 99. I just bought his most recent book. The subtitle of it is “My First 94 Years.”

Justice Stevens was a favorite, born and raised in the city of Chicago. He was a lifelong Cubs fan. He was in the crowd of Wrigley Field as a very young man in 1932, on October 1, during a World Series game, when Babe Ruth made the famous called shot—hitting a home run over the fence.

He attended the University of Chicago and Northwestern School of Law. Naturally, he graduated at the top of his class. In between, he served as lieutenant commander of the U.S. Navy during World War II and was awarded the Bronze Star.

After law school and a clerkship with Supreme Court Justice Wiley Rutledge, John Paul Stevens became an accomplished attorney in Chicago, leading to his nomination to the Seventh Circuit in 1970. In 1975, he was nominated to the Supreme Court by President Gerald Ford and confirmed by the Senate 98 to 0. Judge Stevens served on the Supreme Court for nearly 35 years, bringing to the Court his midwestern blend of brilliance, courtesy, and humility.

He leaves behind an enormous legacy. He was committed to safeguarding the rights and liberties protected by the Constitution, and he cherished the importance of the Judiciary as an “impartial guardian of the rule of law.” Those were his words in his famous *Bush v. Gore* dissent, where he said that judging of the Court as an “impartial guardian of the rule of law” was at stake in that majority opinion.

He was respectful at all times and respected by his colleagues at all times, and by litigants, and by the American people.

When he retired in 2010, at the age of 90, he was the third longest tenured Justice in the history of the Supreme Court. He was the last living Justice to have served in World War II.

I want to extend my sympathy to Justice Stevens’ family, including his surviving daughters, Elizabeth and Susan, his 9 grandchildren and 13 great-grandchildren.

Today we bid farewell to a giant, and we thank Justice Stevens for his decades of service to this country and for his profound contribution to American law.

#### OPIOID EPIDEMIC

Mr. President, years ago, there was a Senator from Wisconsin named William Proxmire. He used to come to the floor every month and give what he called his “Golden Fleece Award” for the worst example of Federal Government waste. Earlier this year, I launched a new series dedicated to that tradition with floor speeches that built off the Proxmire work, with a focus on the most extreme cases of the pharmaceutical industry’s greed. It is known as the Pharma Fleece Award.

I have highlighted price-gouging for lifesaving insulin, the patent abuses that extend monopoly control over pricing of drugs, and the billions of dollars’ worth of medications that are thrown away each year deliberately due to the production of oversized, unnecessary drug vials.

This month, I want to focus on the pharmaceutical industry’s role in another national disgrace—the opioid epidemic. We are in the midst of the Nation’s worst drug overdose epidemic in our history. There is no town too small, no suburb too wealthy to be spared the suffering and the deaths that have been wrought by this problem.

Last year, 2,062 people in my home State of Illinois died from opioid overdose. There is culpability with nearly all the stakeholders, including the U.S. Government. There is no denying how this epidemic was ignited. For years, the pharmaceutical industry wildly mischaracterized the risk of opioids, falsely claiming they were less addictive and less harmful; that these painkillers should be prescribed for common aches and pains, even when the industry itself had information proving the dangers of such long-term use.

In 2007, the manufacturer of OxyContin, Purdue Pharma, pleaded guilty to a felony charge of misbranding the drug by misrepresenting OxyContin’s risks. This resulted in a modest fine as the company continued to flood the Nation with their deadly painkillers.

New reporting this morning from the Washington Post found that Big Pharma saturated the country with 76 billion oxycodone and hydrocodone pills between 2006 and 2012. During a 6-year period, 76 billion pills were produced by pharma. One subsidiary company, Mallinckrodt, put 28 billion opioid pills on the market during this time.

Downstate in Illinois is a small rural county, Hardin County. It has fewer than 10 doctors who can prescribe controlled substances. The total population of the county is 4,300 people. It is one of the smallest, least populated counties in my State. In the year 2010, approximately 6 million hydrocodone pills and 1 million oxycodone pills were shipped to Hardin County and its surrounding communities. For 4,300 people, they shipped 7 million pills. All of this data was actually captured and reported to a Federal agency, the Drug Enforcement Administration. They will come up again in my presentation. That means drug manufacturers knew about this obscene volume of pills being produced and sold; that drug distributors knew exactly where and how this was being transported, and law enforcement had its eyes on it all along.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the list of the top opioid distributors and manufacturers from 2006 to 2012.

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

TOP PILL MANUFACTURERS, 2006 THROUGH 2012

Manufacturer	Number of Pills	Percent of Market
SpecGx (Mallinckrodt)	29 billion	37.70
Actavis Pharma	26 billion	34.50
Par Pharmaceutical (Endo)	12 billion	15.70
Purdue Pharma	2.5 billion	3.30
Amneal Pharmaceuticals	2.3 billion	2.90
Teva Pharmaceuticals USA	690 million	0.90
KVK Tech	580 million	0.80
West-Ward Pharmaceuticals (Hikma)	380 million	0.50
Kaiser Foundation Hospitals	370 million	0.50
Endo Pharmaceuticals	300 million	0.40
Ethex Corporation	290 million	0.40
AbbVie Inc.	250 million	0.30
Sun Pharmaceutical Industries, Inc.	240 million	0.30
UCB, Inc.	180 million	0.20
Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	140 million	0.20
Cardinal Health	120 million	0.20
Dispensing Solutions Inc.	95 million	0.10
Golden State Medical Supply, Inc.	85 million	0.10
Aphena Pharma Solutions—Tennessee, LLC.	74 million	0.10
McKesson Corp.	65 million	0.10
Xanodyne Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	55 million	0.10
Forest Laboratories, Inc.	47 million	0.10
Bryant Ranch Prepack	37 million	0.10
Pfizer Laboratories Div Pfizer Inc.	31 million	0.00
A-S Medication Solutions	28 million	0.00

TOP PILL DISTRIBUTORS, 2006 THROUGH 2012

Distributor	Number of Pills	Percent of Market
McKesson Corp.	14 billion	18.40
Walgreens	13 billion	16.50
Cardinal Health	11 billion	14.00
AmerisourceBergen	9.0 billion	11.70
CVS	5.9 billion	7.70
Walmart	5.3 billion	6.90
Smith Drug Co.	1.3 billion	1.80
Rite Aid	1.3 billion	1.70
Kroger	1.2 billion	1.60
H. D. Smith	1.1 billion	1.50
Anda, Inc.	1.1 billion	1.50
Kaiser Permanente	880 million	1.10
Morris & Dickson Co	880 million	1.10
Thrifty Payless Inc	870 million	1.10
Eckerd Corporation	780 million	1.00
Omnicare Distribution Center LLC	700 million	0.90
Kinray Inc	630 million	0.80
N C Mutual Wholesale Drug Co	550 million	0.70
Smith's Food & Drug Ctr's Inc.	500 million	0.70
The Harvard Drug Group	410 million	0.50
Advantage Logistics	380 million	0.50
Value Drug Co	310 million	0.40
Publix Super Markets, Inc.	280 million	0.40
River City Pharma	270 million	0.40
SAJ Distributors	270 million	0.40
HEB Grocery Company, LP	240 million	0.30
Harco	210 million	0.30
Valley Wholesale Drug Co	210 million	0.30
Associated Pharmacies Inc.	190 million	0.30
Louisiana Wholesale Drug Co	190 million	0.30
Qualitest Pharmaceuticals	180 million	0.20
Frank W Kerr Inc	170 million	0.20
KeySource Medical	160 million	0.20
Top Rx, Inc.	160 million	0.20
American Drug Stores	150 million	0.20
American Sales Company	140 million	0.20
Longs Drug Store	130 million	0.20
Quest Pharmaceuticals Inc.	120 million	0.20
Miami-Luken	120 million	0.10
Hy-Vee	110 million	0.10
Pharmacy Buying Association	110 million	0.10
Mc Queary Brothers	100 million	0.10
Meijer Distribution Inc #90	100 million	0.10
Rochester Drug Co-Operative Inc	100 million	0.10
HBC Service Company	93 million	0.10
Par Pharmaceutical, Inc.	85 million	0.10
Dakota Drug	79 million	0.10
Dik Drug Co	78 million	0.10
KPH Healthcare Services, Inc.	76 million	0.10
Albertsons LLC	74 million	0.10
Aphena Pharma Solutions	71 million	0.10
Sunrise Wholesale, Inc	66 million	0.10
P J C Distributor Co Inc	65 million	0.10
Wakefern Food Corporation	65 million	0.10
Auburn Pharmaceutical	62 million	0.10
Winn Dixie Logistics	58 million	0.10
Southwood Pharmaceuticals Inc.	57 million	0.10
Discount Drug Mart	54 million	0.10
Dispensing Solutions	52 million	0.10
Prescription Supply Inc	51 million	0.10
Murfreesboro Pharmaceutical	47 million	0.10
Burlington Drug Company	46 million	0.10
NuCare Pharmaceuticals	45 million	0.10
DRx Pharmaceutical Consultants, Inc.	40 million	0.10
Bellico Drug Corp	39 million	0.10
Bryant Ranch Prepack	37 million	0.10
Schnucks Pharmacy Distribution Ctr	37 million	0.10
Drogueria Betances	36 million	0.10
Bloodworth Wholesale Drugs	36 million	0.10
Expert-Med	35 million	0.10

Mr. DURBIN. This opioid epidemic wasn't started by some runaway virus. They were decisions made by real peo-

ple to flood America's towns and streets with "a blizzard of prescriptions," as Richard Sackler of Purdue Pharma put it in his own words. In fact, the pharmaceutical industry in the United States produced 14 billion opioid pills in 2016 alone—enough opioid pills for every adult in America to have a 3-week supply of opioids. Who would approve the production of 14 billion opioid pills in 1 year, 2016? It turned out it was your government. The Drug Enforcement Administration of the United States of America is responsible for determining and basically giving a license for the production of a specific amount of opioid pills allowed to be distributed to the market each year.

It is the Drug Enforcement Administration—of all agencies—that establishes annual production quotas for opioids that are, effectively, the gatekeepers for pharma. Pharma, of course, wants to produce as much as possible in order to sell as much as possible. The Drug Enforcement Administration is supposed to draw the line. Yet, for all of these years, while we have faced this epidemic, our government—the Drug Enforcement Administration—has been increasing the production quotas each year for opioid pills.

Between 1993 and 2015, the Drug Enforcement Administration allowed the production of oxycodone to increase in America 39 times—from 3½ tons of opioids in 1993 to 151 tons of opioids in 2015. It is the same story for hydrocodone, which increased twelvefold, and for fentanyl, which increased twenty-fivefold.

I pressed those in the Drug Enforcement Administration on this issue. I asked them how they could possibly approve of these ever-increasing quotas while America faced this epidemic. How did they reconcile their decision to flood America with these drugs at a time in which they were being abused and when addiction was leading to death all across our country?

Last year, I passed bipartisan legislation. I and Senator JOHN KENNEDY, a Republican from Louisiana, gave those at the Drug Enforcement Administration more authority to set common-sense production levels. It is hard to believe we had to do that—to actually bring to their attention that they were authorizing the production of opioid pills for an America that was facing the worst opioid epidemic in its history.

Previously, those at the Drug Enforcement Administration could only look at what pharma asked for when it determined quotas. In other words, they believed, officially, that they had statutory blinders by which they couldn't even consider the impact of pharma's annual request for production. So Senator KENNEDY and I, on a bipartisan basis, changed the law to require the Drug Enforcement Administration to consider abuse, overdose deaths, and the impact on public health.

Finally, between 2016 and 2019, the Drug Enforcement Administration has lowered opioid quotas by an average of 46 percent. No longer can Big Pharma get away with producing this sheer volume of painkillers. The Drug Enforcement Administration will soon be proposing its 2020 quotas, and I will soon be sending it a letter and will urge it to use its new authority, which we put in this new law that I passed with Senator KENNEDY, to continue reining in Big Pharma's insatiable demand.

Think about that. While we are going through this opioid epidemic, pharma—made up of the people who make the pills—is coming to Washington, to the Drug Enforcement Administration, and is getting permission each year to produce billions of opioid pills to be sold in the United States—enough for every adult American to have a 3-week opioid prescription.

Incidentally, 2 years ago, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention sent out a notice to doctors. It read that only in the most extraordinary cases should one prescribe a drug to last for more than 3 days—only in the most extraordinary cases. Then watch them carefully because, in a short period of time, addiction begins. Three days? Pharma was asking for a production of opioid pills so that each adult American could buy 3 weeks' worth of pills, and the Drug Enforcement Administration was complicit.

To hold all stakeholders accountable, major legal challenges have been brought against the pharmaceutical industry for its role in deceptive promotion and all of the suffering and deaths that have resulted. Over 1,600 lawsuits from States, counties, cities, and victims have been consolidated into one Federal case in Cleveland, OH.

This reminds me of another public health scourge we confronted when Americans suffered the consequences of misleading marketing and false information about the health risks of tobacco. It took the 1998 Tobacco Master Settlement Agreement to finally hold major manufacturers of tobacco responsible for their actions—that of cigarettes that hook adults and youth to lifetimes of addiction and death.

That settlement was estimated to provide States with \$246 billion over 25 years ago. Sadly, only a tiny fraction of that amount—only 8 percent of the settlement—was actually dedicated to tobacco's prevention and cessation. Instead, \$145 billion from the tobacco settlement has gone to fill State budgets and pet projects—roads, bridges, stadiums, even a tobacco museum.

Should today's opioid litigation result in large monetary settlements from the pharmaceutical companies and their distributors, it will be essential that this funding be dedicated to legitimate public health efforts so as to respond to the current epidemic and prevent the next one.

In the city of Chicago, near an area known as Greektown, there is a drug rehab facility that I have visited many



times. It is called Haymarket. It was started many years ago by a Catholic priest who took on a ministry that nobody else wanted. He was the one who prowled every night along skid row and helped those who were addicted to drugs and alcohol turn their lives around. He started this Haymarket House as a refuge for them in an attempt to get them some help in escaping their addictions and being rehabbed.

Can you imagine what it is like today?

Today, sadly, he is gone, but they continue the Haymarket House. Imagine what they face in trying to deal with a combination of addiction to drugs and alcohol and mental illness on top of it. They are dramatically understaffed. They don't have the necessary bed space for people who need a helping hand—for folks who realize they need a helping hand.

Should there be a successful outcome of this Cleveland lawsuit, wouldn't it be best if some of the resources would be dedicated to places just like that all over the United States?

I can tell you, in the city of Chicago, there are many more options than there are in the more sparsely populated downstate areas from which I hail. There are some counties in which people wait 6 months—once they have realized their need for help—for any kind of treatment whatsoever, and then they have to travel great distances for that to happen.

Senator SHERROD BROWN and I recently wrote an opinion piece that was published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer. I confess publicly that I hope those who are party to this lawsuit in Cleveland will read it, which is where the consolidated court case is taking place. In it, we outlined what we thought should happen if we were to have any input in a settlement agreement.

We need to make sure that the money is spent for addiction; treatment; medication; residential and community treatment services; mental health counseling, which is a necessary adjunct to this effort; building on a behavioral health workforce and naloxone distribution; and addressing childhood trauma, which is often the root of addiction.

Wouldn't it be great if there were to be a settlement here that would be dedicated to ending this drug epidemic, turning lives around, and saving people from addiction and death?

The diversion of tobacco's settlement money should be a cautionary tale that guides our efforts to heal from the opioid epidemic. If Big Pharma is held to account for fueling this crisis, its restitution should be devoted to helping our Nation heal.

This chart shows the dramatic increase in the production of two of the most popular opioid products. I will never be able to explain how the agency of the U.S. Federal Government, which is dedicated to protecting us from drug crime and drug addiction,

ended up authorizing these enormous quotas of the production of opioid pills. Yet we know what happened. In tiny Hardin County in southern Illinois, as well as on the streets of Chicago, they were flooded with opioid pills. When the opioid pills became too expensive, they turned to a cheaper alternative—heroin. Heroin was then being laced with fentanyl, and we have today this deadly epidemic that is almost out of control.

I can't understand what pharma was thinking except for its just looking at the profits and the bottom line that would justify the production of that level of opioid pills into the United States of America. All I can promise is that a number of us—myself included—will be holding the Drug Enforcement Administration accountable in order to make certain that this is not duplicated again in the years to come.

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

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

#### NOMINATION OF CLIFTON L. CORKER

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, within a few minutes, the Senate will be voting on President Trump's nomination of Cliff Corker to be the U.S. Federal District Judge for the Eastern District of Tennessee. I am here to strongly urge my colleagues to support Cliff Corker.

Cliff Corker has the respect of the people who know him best. He was selected to serve as a magistrate judge by the district court judges of the Eastern District of Tennessee—a very high testament to his qualifications.

When Cliff Corker was appointed magistrate judge, this is what he said:

It's a tougher job to be the decision maker rather than the advocate. There's so much more responsibility in making the decision than advocating for the client because you really want to see justice done.

Prior to his nomination to be magistrate in 2015, Judge Corker had his own law firm in Johnston City, TN. He handled a wide range of cases, from civil litigation to capital murder.

He graduated from James Madison University and received his J.D. from the William & Mary Law School.

The American Bar Association rated Judge Corker as unanimously "well qualified," the highest ranking a nominee can receive. I am sure that is because of his judicial and litigation experience.

Judge Corker has big shoes to fill. He is taking over for Judge Ronnie Greer, a very well respected Tennessean, a friend of mine for many years, who has served as a judge in Tennessee's Eastern District for the last 15 years. Prior to that, he was a State senator in Tennessee.

Cliff Corker demonstrates the qualities that I look for in a judge: good character, good temperament, high intelligence, respect for the law, and respect for those who come before the court.

Tennessee is fortunate that President Trump chose to nominate such a well-qualified candidate.

I urge my colleagues to support Judge Corker's nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 5 minutes.

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

#### NOMINATION OF LYNDA BLANCHARD

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I regret that I come to the floor to announce my opposition to one of President Trump's political nominees, Ms. Lynda Blanchard. To be honest, I cannot even believe that we are considering her nomination on the floor of the Senate.

U.S. Ambassadors are supposed to represent the best of America to nations around the world, and I challenge my colleagues, Republican and Democrat alike, to look at this nominee's record and tell me with a straight face that Lynda Blanchard should represent the United States anywhere.

Look, I have made a good-faith effort to work with this administration to confirm a number of well-qualified individuals to State Department positions that are vital to advancing America's interests around the world. I don't think anyone can deny that.

But there are some nominees who just raise too many red flags, and I raised this to Secretary of State Mike Pompeo in a letter I sent in June of 2018, shortly after his confirmation.

I explained that a number of nominees before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had demonstrated histories of questionable temperament and judgement, of questionable conduct, of #MeToo issues, just to mention a few, and I expressed my hope that we could work together to find qualified nominees to the U.S. Department of State. I am disappointed that that effort went unheeded.

Ms. Blanchard has a history of using Facebook as a platform to post incendiary, false articles and disturbing statements. For example, she once shared an article titled "The Clinton 'Body Count' EXPANDS—5 Mysterious DEATHS in the Last 6 Weeks," resurrecting the vicious lie and preposterous conspiracy theory that President Bill Clinton and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton have systematically murdered political opponents and associates.

Then, on election day of 2016, she posted on Facebook "Make God our Father paint this country Red with the Blood of Jesus!"—inappropriately using religion as a blunt instrument in a political campaign.

She has also shared articles by the far-right Conservative Tribune, some of

which were taken down for failing to meet its “editorial standards”—quite literally, fake news.

What is perhaps most disappointing to me is that 2½ years into the Trump administration, none of this is particularly new. We have had Trump diplomatic appointments call for putting political opponents in prison, such as Kyle McCarter, President Trump’s Ambassador to Kenya, who tweeted on election night of 2016: “Hillary for prison. No, really!”

We have had Trump diplomatic appointments, already at their posts, make totally inappropriate and inflammatory forays into American politics, which is taboo for the Foreign Service, such as in June of this year, when Carla Sands, President Trump’s Ambassador to Denmark, appeared to accuse former President Obama of an “attempted coup d’etat in America”—the U.S. Ambassador in Denmark, June of 2019.

And we have had Trump diplomatic appointments embarrass the country by making false claims and then failing to take responsibility for them.

Pete Hoekstra, appointed by President Trump as Ambassador to the Netherlands, has claimed that there were “no-go zones” too dangerous to enter due to Muslim migration. When asked about these statements, Ambassador Hoekstra claimed they were “fake news” until he was confronted with footage of his own words.

This is not normal. We cannot grow accustomed to this kind of disgraceful behavior. We cannot look at the poor behavior of already-confirmed nominees and conclude that we should lower our standards when it comes to Ms. Blanchard’s nomination.

This is the U.S. Senate—supposedly, the world’s greatest deliberative body. We should examine the fitness and qualifications of every single individual nominated to be the face of America in nations across the world. We should expect our Ambassadors to represent the United States with dignity, respect, and sound judgment, and we should remember that America’s role as a leader of nations rests on our moral standards and greatest values.

Something is wrong if we willingly confirm people to these positions who repeatedly spread fake news, baseless slander, and the most despicable of conspiracy mongering.

For these reasons, I will be opposing the nomination of Lynda Blanchard and urge my colleagues to do the same. I yield the floor.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Clifton L. Corker, of Tennessee, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Tennessee.

Mitch McConnell, Roger F. Wicker, Pat Roberts, Chuck Grassley, John Cornyn, Tom Cotton, David Perdue, Ron Johnson, Joni Ernst, Mike Braun, Martha McSally, John Boozman, Richard Burr, Lindsey Graham, Shelley Moore Capito, Johnny Isakson, Thom Tillis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Clifton L. Corker, of Tennessee, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Tennessee, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 55, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 213 Ex.]

#### YEAS—55

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

#### NAYS—41

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

#### NOT VOTING—4

Bennet	Isakson
Harris	Sanders

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 55, the nays are 41.

The motion is agreed to.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the

Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Lynda Blanchard, of Alabama, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Slovenia.

Mitch McConnell, Ron Johnson, Steve Daines, John Kennedy, James E. Risch, Roy Blunt, Thom Tillis, Cory Gardner, Johnny Isakson, Pat Roberts, John Thune, John Hoeven, Tim Scott, Mike Crapo, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, Bill Cassidy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Lynda Blanchard, of Alabama, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Slovenia, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 55, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 214 Ex.]

#### YEAS—55

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

#### NAYS—41

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

NOT VOTING—4

Bennet Isakson  
Harris Sanders

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 55, the nays are 41. The motion is agreed to.

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 senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Donald R. Tapia, of Arizona, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Jamaica.

Mitch McConnell, Martha McSally, Pat Roberts, Mike Crapo, James E. Risch, John Barrasso, Tom Cotton, Roger F. Wicker, John Cornyn, Jerry Moran, Shelley Moore Capito, Deb Fischer, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Richard Burr, Thom Tillis, John Boozman, Chuck Grassley.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Donald R. Tapia, of Arizona, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Jamaica, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 67, nays 28, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 215 Ex.]

YEAS—67

Alexander	Crapo	Kennedy
Barrasso	Cruz	King
Blackburn	Daines	Lankford
Blunt	Duckworth	Leahy
Boozman	Enzi	Lee
Braun	Ernst	Manchin
Burr	Fischer	McConnell
Capito	Gardner	McSally
Cardin	Graham	Menendez
Carper	Grassley	Moran
Cassidy	Hassan	Murkowski
Collins	Hawley	Murphy
Coons	Hoeven	Paul
Cornyn	Hyde-Smith	Perdue
Cortez Masto	Inhofe	Portman
Cotton	Johnson	Risch
Cramer	Jones	Roberts

Romney	Scott (SC)	Toomey
Rosen	Shaheen	Whitehouse
Rounds	Shelby	Wicker
Rubio	Sinema	Young
Sasse	Sullivan	
Scott (FL)	Thune	

NAYS—28

Baldwin	Hirono	Smith
Blumenthal	Kaine	Stabenow
Booker	Klobuchar	Tester
Brown	Markey	Udall
Cantwell	Merkeley	Van Hollen
Casey	Murray	Warner
Durbin	Peters	Warren
Feinstein	Reed	Wyden
Gillibrand	Schatz	
Heinrich	Schumer	

NOT VOTING—5

Bennet Isakson Tillis  
Harris Sanders

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 67, the nays are 28. The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Donald R. Tapia, of Arizona, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Jamaica.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF "APOLLO 11"

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, July 20 marks the 50th anniversary of the first step man took on the Moon. For that brief moment, all mankind stood united, watching an awesome spectacle transpire few would have imagined possible just years earlier. It stands as one of the greatest achievements in the history of mankind, and it cemented the United States as the world leader in science, technology, and discovery.

In 1961, when President Kennedy boldly challenged the Nation to land a man on the Moon and return him safely to Earth by the end of the decade, the technology needed to do so, for the most part, didn't even exist.

That we accomplished this monumental goal is a testament to American ingenuity and innovation. In fact, some of the very technology developed for the Apollo missions is still having a positive impact on the lives of Iowans nearly half a century later. Our first responders wear fire-resistant textiles developed for the use in Apollo space suits. Our communities rely on water purification technology designed for the Apollo spacecraft. Our soldiers in the field depend on the MREs, Meals Ready to Eat, created to safely feed Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Michael Collins on their half-million-mile journey to the Moon and back. My daughter Libby, who is a cadet at West Point, was recently sharing some very strong opinions about these MREs, but maybe she will feel differently after I tell her this was actually food for astronauts.

Yet, in all seriousness, when the government makes wise and sound investments in the development of emerging technology, the benefits can be tremendous.

GPS is a great example of this, especially in Iowa. GPS has its roots in the military and has a strong Air Force stewardship, and its significance only continues to grow with the advancements of satellites and the development of drones. Yet GPS has evolved beyond just military use; it impacts the everyday lives of Iowans. From driving directions in rideshare services to the electric power grid, GPS is utilized by businesses and consumers across the country. This important technology supports new and emerging applications, including water quality, driverless vehicles, and precision agriculture. It is estimated that civilian and commercial access to GPS added \$90 billion in annual value to the U.S. economy in 2013.

Examples like these demonstrate why it is so important this body and our Nation as a whole continue to push the envelope when it comes to science, technology, and discovery, and that is exactly what Senate Republicans have been doing.

As chairman of the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, I have made it a priority to ensure that the United States remains the world's leader in the development of artificial intelligence, or AI. From novel defensive capabilities and data analysis to the predictive maintenance of military hardware, there is no overstating the value of AI to our national security.

I also fought to ensure the recent Defense bill prioritized the continued development of advanced manufacturing techniques, otherwise known as 3D printing. Look no further than Rock Island Arsenal, which employs so many of my fellow Iowans. They are doing some truly innovative work in this arena—work that has the potential to transform the way we supply our men and women in uniform. As a former company commander who oversaw supply convoys into a war zone, I know personally how important this is.

Of course, there is a consensus on both sides of the aisle that we can do more to get our students—especially young girls—excited about futures in STEM and STEAM. I hope we can work together to advance that effort in the near future. After all, the Moon landing could have never happened without the contributions of thousands of women from across the Nation. These unsung heroes did everything from developing Apollo's onboard software to weaving the copper wire for the spacecraft's guidance system.

As we mark the 50th anniversary of the *Apollo 11* Moon landing, there will be countless commemorations and tributes to this monumental event. We will look back on President Kennedy's bold call to action, the hundreds of thousands of hard-working American men and women who answered that call, and the three heroes who rode *Apollo 11* to the Moon and back. Then, in that same spirit, we will turn our gaze to the future—to the innovation, to the

technology, and to discovery. Be it here on Earth or out amongst the stars, the United States will continue to lead the way as we look to take that next great step for mankind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues in commemorating the 50th anniversary of American astronauts becoming the first humans to walk on the Moon.

It was 50 years ago that the United States met one of the biggest challenges it had ever set for itself. Through determination, hard work, invention, and innovation, the United States fulfilled President Kennedy's vision of reaching the Moon before the end of the 1960s.

I remember that time very well, for July 16, 1969, was my dad's 37th birthday. We were vacationing in Florida, at the Spyglass Inn on the beach. We were so excited to be close to Merritt Island, FL, where *Apollo 11* was being launched. We were in our hotel room, watching the television. That is one vacation I will never forget. As a young girl, I remember watching those first astronauts step foot on the Moon. It was with great awe that I watched *Apollo 11* lift off from the Earth and watched the lunar module land safely on the surface of the Moon. With a lot of amazement, I watched Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin as they announced "the Eagle has landed" and then as they took those first brave steps on the Moon. It was with great pride that I watched them plant the American flag on the Moon.

Those brave NASA astronauts of the Apollo program today continue to serve as an inspiration that we are capable of anything we set our minds to. Equally important is the reminder that those astronauts could not have reached the Moon without their having the support of the thousands of men and women who were both in NASA and in the aerospace industry. It is a reminder that we are at our best when we work together.

While NASA's mission has changed and evolved over the last 60 years, the aerospace industry continues to play a vital role in our quest for knowledge and America's national security mission.

In my home State of Mississippi, we are very proud of the conspicuous roles our citizens play in our Nation's space exploration and endeavors. Since the earliest days of America's space program, Mississippi has played an important role in the quest to explore the stars.

For more than 50 years, the John C. Stennis Space Center, in Hancock County, MS, has dutifully tested and approved NASA's largest rocket engines, including the Saturn V rockets that took our astronauts to the Moon and, later, the engines for the space shuttle program. Stennis is today testing engines and rocket stages for NASA's Space Launch System, which

will again take humans beyond low-Earth orbit. I am pleased, much like in the Apollo days, that Mississippi has an important role in the SLS program. As we are fond of reminding everyone, "The road to space goes through Mississippi."

However, Stennis isn't only known for its rocket testing to support NASA missions; it also proudly bears the title of the "Federal City" and is one of the Federal Government's best places to work. With a 13,800-acre area that is surrounded by a 125,000-acre buffer zone, it has allowed dozens of our Federal and private sector tenants to take advantage of its unique isolation and security to serve our Nation's interest across many sectors, perhaps most notably in the field of oceanography and meteorology.

The meteorological and oceanographic modeling and forecasting capabilities at Stennis provide naval commanders with the information they need to make good decisions that affect the safety of ships and sailors around the world every single day. The Navy's largest supercomputer is located at Stennis.

The unique Federal city of Stennis Space Center covers exploration from the bottom of the ocean to the far reaches of the universe. It is America's largest rocket test complex—an impressive tsunami and weather buoy production site—and is a place where elite Naval Special Warfare personnel conduct highly advanced riverine and jungle training by using cutting-edge unmanned systems technology. Stennis also houses several private initiatives, such as Aerojet Rocketdyne's engine assembly facility, Lockheed Martin's Mississippi Space & Technology Center, a Rolls Royce test facility, and Relativity Space. The national and international scope of work that takes place at Stennis every day creates a local, direct economic impact of nearly \$600 million and has nearly \$1 billion in its global impact.

As we mark this 50th anniversary, I am pleased that Stennis Space Center is helping to inspire, encourage, and prepare students to pursue science, technology, engineering, and math-related careers—the talents we will need to get to Mars and beyond.

Since its inception more than 60 years ago, NASA has pioneered scientific discovery and captivated the Nation. These capabilities are especially important in today's world, where innovation and fostering an interest among our youth in the science, technology, mathematics, and engineering fields are vital to the United States' continuing to be a success in this world.

I am proud that Mississippi plays a vital role in our Nation's work to meet the technological challenges of today and tomorrow. This work occurs not only at Stennis Space Center but also at so many other related businesses across the State of Mississippi.

The people of Mississippi look with pride at our role in the United States'

having reached the Moon 50 years ago, and we look forward to the decades ahead when the testing, technology, and innovation taking place in our State helps the American space program reach new, monumental achievements. I believe the 50th anniversary of the *Apollo 11* Moon landing can and should inspire generations of people around the world to explore and push the boundaries of what they believe to be possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I am honored to join my colleagues today to commemorate this anniversary of an incredible event.

Fifty-eight years ago in May of 1961—the year in which I was born—President John F. Kennedy appeared before Congress and boldly declared the United States would send an American to the Moon before the end of the decade. This was no small task, obviously, as programs had to be funded, as scientific advancements had to be made, and as foreign adversaries had to be kept at bay. As the head of NASA's Space Task Group said, "Flying a man to the Moon required an enormous advance in the science of flight in a very short time." Yet President Kennedy was not deterred. In his ignoring conventional wisdom and the ever-present naysayers, he pressed on, and so did the patriotic Americans who were charged with making this happen.

A few years later, NASA began its Apollo missions, and the necessary scientific advancements became a reality. In October of 1968, *Apollo 7* was the first Apollo mission in space, and it conducted the very first live TV program of a U.S. spacecraft. *Apollo 8* launched 2 months later and successfully orbited the Moon. *Apollo 9* carried the first lunar module into orbit in March of 1969. We were getting closer. *Apollo 10* launched in May. It was a full dress rehearsal for the *Apollo 11* mission. It was successful. We were ready.

Fifty years ago yesterday, Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Michael Collins launched the *Apollo 11* mission to fulfill President Kennedy's promise of landing on the Moon. That week, my 8-year-old self and an estimated 650 million of my closest friends from around the world watched Neil Armstrong land on the Moon and plant our Nation's flag. He offered the famous phrase: "That's one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind."

That giant leap was a monumental moment in history, for sure, and it didn't happen in the abstract. It was really the result of hundreds of years of scientific discovery and decades of work from countless public servants who devoted their lives to this cause. *Apollo 10* gave *Apollo 11* the confidence that the operation would be successful. *Apollo 7* gave us the opportunity to see its success with our own eyes. The astronauts of *Apollo 1*, in a fatal 1967 tragedy, gave their lives to this mission. That giant leap happened because

of the small steps that had been taken before it, and those who took that giant leap are pressing on even today.

The scientific discovery and space exploration that were made possible because of those missions continue to this day, including in my great State of North Dakota. Just a few years after the Moon landing, the University of North Dakota's John Odegard asked Buzz Aldrin to come to our State to help him start a space education program within the University of North Dakota, and Buzz Aldrin said yes.

He left the State, of course, ultimately, but the program stayed, and it grew.

Today, students from across the globe enroll in the University of North Dakota to learn about the cutting-edge technologies and scientific breakthroughs in space exploration. Some of their recent endeavors provide vital insights for future space exploration, including for a mission to Mars.

North Dakotans don't just learn; they get involved. Some even become astronauts. New Rockford's own James Buchli joined NASA in 1979 and 6 years later became the first North Dakotan to go to space, and he is now in the U.S. Astronaut Hall of Fame.

Shortly after Buchli's space flight came West Fargo's Tony England, who launched into space 6 months later. England's career is marked by his work 15 years earlier at Mission Control, where he and others heard the chilling words, "Houston, we have a problem." England's team helped save the lives of those on the *Apollo 13* mission that day.

Then Jamestown's Rick Hieb launched into space three times starting in 1991. The University of North Dakota's 1994 graduate Karen Nyberg was the 50th woman ever to launch into space. She did it first in 2008. She also spent 6 months on the *International Space Station* in 2013 and now serves on the board of the University of North Dakota School of Aerospace Sciences' foundation, giving back to her alma mater.

North Dakotans leave an outsized mark in the world of space exploration, and they are just getting started. The University of North Dakota touts over 100 students taking graduate classes in the Department of Space Studies, and they have handed out nearly 800 master of science degrees in space studies since the program began.

I am optimistic about the roles these leaders will play in the future, following the leads of giants like Buzz Aldrin and Karen Nyberg.

I was only 8 years old during the *Apollo 11* mission. Like most Americans, I found it to be an exhilarating experience, even watching it on my parents' black and white television. But I know I didn't fully grasp the importance of what I was watching that day. I worry sometimes that many people still don't. Space was, is, and will be integral to our way of life, and we must continue to maintain our commercial, technological, and military edge in this important domain.

I hope we will use this anniversary as an opportunity to reaffirm our commitment to space exploration and to remind ourselves of the impact investments made today can have on our future, and along the way, perhaps we can renew that unifying American spirit that was so prevalent on that day 50 years ago and perhaps even give inspiration to aspiration once again.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, if the Senator from North Dakota was here to speak about *Apollo 11* and got here a moment or two before me, I am happy to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I thank the good Senator from Mississippi.

This weekend, our Nation will mark the 50th anniversary of the *Apollo 11* Moon landing. This was a tremendous feat for our country.

In recognition of this true American triumph, I am cosponsoring a Senate resolution celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Moon landing. Our resolution recognizes the vision of President Kennedy and the hard work and the ingenuity of the men and women of NASA who made it possible for our Nation to achieve what seemed to be an impossible goal at the time.

Like many Americans, I can still remember the excitement of seeing the American flag planted on the Moon and hearing Neil Armstrong say the famous line, "That's one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind."

Truly it was a giant leap. NASA not only helped develop technologies to put astronauts on the Moon, but these technologies have benefited industries, including our military, the medical field, energy, and many others.

We all know NASA is a premiere center for scientific research and technological advancement, but it is important to remember that NASA's mission includes not only space but also aeronautics.

As our Nation did during the space race, we are now working to stay at the forefront of new technologies, including unmanned aerial systems. In particular, I want to highlight the research NASA is doing right now in support of unmanned aviation. NASA is designing an unmanned air traffic management system that will provide air traffic control for unmanned aircraft operations. This traffic management project is critical to unlocking the potential of unmanned aviation, from package delivery to pipeline inspections.

NASA is at the forefront of this effort to make unmanned flights safe and efficient for a multitude of operators. North Dakota works right along with NASA toward this goal, with a UAS test site that is helping advance all aspects of unmanned aviation. In fact, they were recently selected by the FAA to host an unmanned traffic pilot pro-

gram and have developed a strong partnership with NASA to research, develop, and demonstrate this technology.

I continue to support funding for unmanned traffic management research because I am confident that NASA, with the help of its industry partners, as well as our test site in North Dakota, will meet this complex technological challenge. By making a relatively small investment in unmanned traffic management research today, NASA is going to help unlock billions of dollars in economic activity in the not-too-distant future.

We have worked hard to ensure that North Dakota is an important part of exploring this new NASA frontier, and we are thrilled to help realize the wide variety of benefits that unmanned aviation will bring, making our Nation more prosperous and secure, and we can only imagine where we will be 50 years from today.

I yield the floor to the great Senator from the great State of Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I thank my friend from North Dakota, and I thank all of the people who have arranged for this special recognition.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. WICKER. I am delighted to yield to my friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Mississippi, I be recognized for such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, it is really hard to believe that the first Moon landing was 50 years ago, but, in fact, 50 years ago today, three Americans were on their way to the Moon—Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Michael Collins.

I had the honor of actually meeting with Buzz Aldrin just the other day, shaking his hand, and being able to listen to his perspectives about what has happened in the last 50 years. What a great American.

At this moment, I would also honor the names of Neil Armstrong and Michael Collins. While Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin got to step foot on the Moon, Michael Collins' assignment was to stay in the vehicle and orbit solo above. It was not at all guaranteed that his two colleagues would get back. We certainly thought we had the technology; we thought we could do it, and indeed we did, but it was not a given.

Michael Collins wrote during that lonely flight while his two colleagues were walking on the face of the Moon:

I am . . . absolutely isolated from any known life. I am it. If a count were taken, the score would be three billion plus two over on the other side of the Moon, and one plus God knows what on this side.

Those are the words of American hero Michael Collins.

These three men were separated from the rest of humanity, but they certainly were not alone. Hundreds of millions of people watched and prayed and gave them their best wishes.

It is hard to believe—and I still have to pinch myself—that I was a freshman in college for this Moon walk, and that was 50 years ago. How could 50 years have passed by so quickly?

Men and women have always looked up at the night sky and seen their heroes in the constellations. Now we still look up at the sky, and we see our heroes, but among them are astronauts who go to the stars and return and will go to the Moon and to Mars and return.

I want to salute the people who have done it before and the people who are making plans to put a man and woman on the face of the Moon within 5 years.

I was so honored to chair a hearing just this morning featuring NASA Administrator Bridenstine, who has put forward a bold proposal from the Trump administration, which has moved the deadline up from 10 years to 5 years. Indeed, I can tell you, it is the goal of NASA and it is the goal of this Member of the U.S. Senate and the committee that I chair to facilitate making this go and actually putting a man and a woman back on the face of the Moon in 5 years and then, beyond that, on Mars.

These are ambitious goals, which match and rival the ambition of President Kennedy, who announced this plan in 1961. Credit goes to President Johnson, who took up the cause after the assassination of President Kennedy, and President Nixon, a Republican succeeding two Democrats, who saw it to fruition in 1969.

I am proud to salute all of the people—some nameless, faceless people who are not famous—for their role in this magnificent accomplishment.

I am proud to say that Mississippians were among the first to answer President Kennedy's call. After all, the Saturn V rocket used for the Apollo Program was tested at Stennis Space Center in Hancock County in Mississippi, where we still do almost all of the rocket testing in the United States of America.

As Wernher von Braun, one of the leaders of U.S. early space efforts once said, "I don't know yet what method we will use to get to the Moon, but I do know that we [will] have to go through Mississippi to get there." That was true back in the sixties, and it is true today as we approach the one-fifth mark of the 21st century.

We owe so much to the pioneers. Humankind owes so much to the people who answered President Kennedy's charge not only to win the space race—our country against those cosmonauts of the Soviet Union—but also for all of the peaceful results that have come from this.

Technologies behind CT scans came from the space program. Intensive care

monitoring equipment, which saves lives every day around the globe, came from the scientific discoveries that were accomplished during our race to the Moon. GPS and smart phones all have their origins in Apollo.

The commercial space sector is now valued at more than \$400 billion, and it is reminding us all of the power of free enterprise to open up new frontiers. Clearly, that \$400 billion will grow over the next decade, perhaps to trillions and trillions of dollars.

Certainly the writers of Newsweek were correct when they called the Moonshot "the best return on investment since Leonardo da Vinci bought himself a sketch pad." They were exactly right, and this next shot should give us an opportunity also to get our money's worth.

We will go back to the Moon; we will go on to Mars. So as we celebrate the 50th anniversary, we look toward the future to all the missions that will come and go, and we remind ourselves of this country's common purpose and potential. The Moon landing was not the end of an age of discovery; it was only the beginning.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The Senator from Oklahoma.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I am looking forward to joining in on this discussion that is taking place right now on what is happening with these people and Oklahoma's role in this. Jim Bridenstine is a fairly recent Director of NASA, and he is committed to reestablishing our position of leadership. We haven't really lost it, but it hasn't been as prominent as it has been in the past.

We have people like Tom Stafford. I talk to Tom Stafford almost on a daily basis. He is still around. He is still active. He still rejoices in the fact that we are reestablishing our position, and I am very excited about that.

I wasn't going to talk about that today. I think that is going to be tomorrow.

There is another area in which President Trump and the Republican Senate have had great success, and that is in remaking the Federal judiciary. As of this week, we have confirmed 43 appellate judges. That is more at this 2½-year point than in any other President's term in the history of this country. That is what is going on, and it goes unnoticed. These judicial confirmations have real impact.

Here is a great example. This week, the Ninth Circuit—the notoriously liberal appellate court in California—ruled that portions of President Trump's "Project Life" rule can—not can't, can—go into effect. This is a commonsense rule.

All it says is that in States that receive title X funding, it cannot be used by clinics to provide abortions. We calculate that this would have the result of defunding Planned Parenthood by about an initial \$60 million annually. It

is a great start to defunding the abortion-on-demand culture, and it is possible only because President Trump and Leader MCCONNELL have rightly made remaking the Federal judiciary a top priority.

What I want to talk about is something we need to talk about now because it has not been called to the attention of the American people, and that is about the great work being done in this administration to better our environment.

When you say that perhaps it can be argued the Trump administration may go down as one of the truly great environmental administrations, nobody will believe that. In my lifetime and in my history, I have never seen a President so detested by members of the media. So people, consequently, don't know, with the exception of a few tweets. I admit that I cringe a little bit when I hear a new tweet coming out. But, look, if that is the only way you can get the truth out, it is something that has worked, and it has been very effective.

We have a White House dedicated to clean air, land, and water by cutting excessive, duplicative regulations. Based on what you see in the media, you would think this President turned his back on the environment, but it has been just the opposite. We are seeing significant progress in environmental protection that we have not seen in any other administration. Americans should know the truth about how this administration is leading the world in environmental gains, all the while growing the economy.

People say: Well, you can't do that. That can't be done. You can't increase economic activity at the same time as making environmental gains.

But that is actually happening.

Look at the chart behind me. There are a couple facts most Americans really don't know. They had no way of knowing, until now. Since 1970, combined emissions of the six common pollutants—we are talking about the recognized six common pollutants out there—dropped by 74 percent while the U.S. economy grew by 275 percent.

Is it possible that could happen? It did happen because there it is right there—all this economic activity, all this growth. The bottom line is the aggregate emissions of the six common pollutants. There they are, going down. That is because this administration knows what it is doing and has the commitment that other people are not aware of.

Now look at CO<sub>2</sub>. We have had debates over the years about whether or not CO<sub>2</sub> is one of the pollutants. It is not one of the six common pollutants, but nonetheless it is one that people seem to be looking at.

Since 2005 the United States' energy-related CO<sub>2</sub> emissions fell by 14 percent, while global energy-related CO<sub>2</sub> emissions increased by over 20 percent. We are talking about all the emissions increased, and still we had a reduction.



Despite this drop in emissions, in 2018 the United States became the world's leading producer of oil and natural gas and a net exporter of oil and natural gas fossil fuels for the first time in 75 years. I am particularly proud of this. I am from an oil State, the State of Oklahoma. I know how many jobs are tied to it. I know what has happened to our economy, and a lot of that can be attributed to using the proper energy sources that we have available to us.

This administration has proven that we don't have to impose massive tax increases or regulatory burdens on American families in order to reduce pollution. We are reducing pollution, clearly. Democrats often say the United States is failing to properly reduce carbon emissions, and this just isn't true.

Look at chart No. 2. The reality is our CO<sub>2</sub> emissions have been falling. In 2017 the United States led the world in CO<sub>2</sub> emission reductions while, notably, China led in emissions.

You have to look at this. The top line is the United States. That is reduction. We are leading the world in reductions of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. All the way across, at the very bottom of the page, China has the largest increase of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. What a contrast that is. It defies everything else we read about, and yet there it is. That is the truth.

A lot of people are not aware that there is a big party which takes place every December. It has happened now for about 21 or maybe 22 years. That is where 180 countries get together and talk about what they are going to do to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. We see who is and who is not reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions with this chart.

They talk about the great Paris accord, which this President wisely took us out of. What that did was to have these countries line up, and between India and China, they are responsible for one-fourth of all CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. At that time, their obligation was to continue doing what they were doing with coal-fired plants until 2025. Then, they will consider reducing their emissions. What kind of a commitment is that?

Meanwhile, our President at that time was President Obama, and President Obama made commitments that could not be kept by our country. Yet, stop to think. We don't need to. We are already doing it. Just look at what we are doing right now. People don't know that. China and India represent almost half of all the global carbon emissions. We just don't hear this in the news, and that is why we need to be talking about it.

Another thing I bet most people don't know is that in the early 1970s, more than 40 percent of America's drinking water systems failed basic health standards, but today 93 percent of the systems meet all health standards all the time. In fact, the United States is ranked No. 1 in the world for clean drinking water.

Clearly, this President's environmental policies are working. We would

think environmentalists and Democrats would be praising our President, given these undeniable successes, but instead they are pushing for the Green New Deal. We have all heard about the Green New Deal and what it is going to be doing. It is about a \$93 trillion program being promoted by a lot of the liberals around this environment here in Washington. The authors of this Green New Deal spent four pages painting the scary and inaccurate picture of our environment. Then, they spent the next nine pages outlining their socialist agenda, aimed at ensuring the government dictates life in America—from the car you drive to the energy you consume.

In the Green New Deal, they talk about eliminating air traffic. That is very nice. I don't know how people will get around.

They also want to eliminate beef. I happen to be from a beef State. We like beef, but, apparently, there are things that cows do. They make noise and don't smell good. So they want to eliminate beef.

They want to eliminate oil and gas altogether. You can't eliminate oil and gas. Right now, 80 percent of our energy that we use to enjoy life in America comes from oil and gas, and that is going to continue. I don't see it changing in the near future.

Scientists like MIT's Richard Lindzen have been calling out climate alarmists for years on this conspiracy to control our lives. This flawed plan doesn't take into account that over 80 percent of the United States' energy comes from fossil fuels—80 percent. If you eliminate fossil fuels, how do you run this machine called America? The answer is, you can't. Our Nation runs on American coal, oil, and gas, and that isn't going to change any time soon.

We had a vote in the Senate on this radical Green New Deal plan, but not a single Democrat was willing to vote for it. A lot of them voted present. They didn't want to get on record voting for it, and yet that is what they are promoting over in the House. They know their plan will not work and is extremely unpopular. So they weren't going to join it. Anytime you don't want to vote for or against something, what do you do? You vote present.

I didn't think Democrats could be more radical than they were under the Obama administration, but I was wrong. At least I give the Obama administration credit for being honest about its radical war on fossil fuels. For 8 years, President Obama targeted oil and gas producers in States like my State of Oklahoma, but President Obama lost that fight, and Oklahoma energy producers continue to create thousands of jobs to fuel this machine called America.

I think back to 1990. I was here in 1990, and that is when we passed a landmark piece of legislation called the Clean Air Act. I cosponsored that act, and that succeeded in reducing acid

rain, air pollution, and harm to our ozone layer. It has gone down in history as one of the true great successes that has happened in this country in terms of the environment. We are all a part of this, and we have been successful.

Many of today's Democrats are virtually unrecognizable compared to those back in 1990. I urge my Democratic colleagues to reject radical socialist environmental policies, come back to reality, and support our President's very effective approach.

I am proud of President Trump and his administration's record on improving our Nation's environment while streamlining government overreach. It is possible to have a thriving economy while safeguarding our air and water.

Again, I ask you to look at this chart. Just look and see what we have done and where we are. In spite of what you hear, we are leading the country, under this administration, which is going to go down and be recognized as one of the truly great environmental administrations. I am very proud of that. I think it is time that people know it.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### AMERICAN MINERS ACT

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, once again I am here to announce a looming deadline hanging over the heads of our hard-working and patriotic coal miners. It is a shame that we have to do this again, and the reason is that we didn't fix it the first time.

If we don't pass the American Miners Act, there will be 1,200 retired coal miners who will lose their healthcare by the end of this year. Those 1,200 coal miners spent a lifetime underground, in part, digging the coal that we needed to become the strongest and greatest Nation the world has ever seen. They have always done the heavy lifting. They gave up raises and bonuses year after year in exchange for the promise of economic security when they retired. So they paid for this. They held up their end of the bargain, and it is time that we held up ours.

Why is the healthcare of retired coal miners once again on the chopping block? We have gone through this before. It is because of the courts. Our court system has again allowed coal companies to break their promises to their workers. Through bankruptcy, they were able to shed their obligations to pay for these hard-earned healthcare and pension benefits, and then they were able to reemerge from bankruptcy as a profitable company once all the money was basically taken

from them. This time around, it was Westmoreland Coal Company and Mission Coal Company that both declared bankruptcy approximately at the same time in 2018.

For those of you who think this is another big government program, let me share a little history with you.

In 1946, due to the horrendous working conditions our miners faced every day, there was a nationwide strike. It brought our Nation's economy to its knees. President Truman dispatched the Secretary of the Interior, Julius Krug, to meet with the president of the United Mine Workers of America, John L. Lewis. They ended that strike by signing the Krug-Lewis Agreement, which created a retirement fund and healthcare benefits for our Nation's miners and their families that had the full backing of the U.S. Government.

It was not coming from government tax dollars. It did not come from the people of the United States paying for this retirement and pension plan and healthcare. It came from every ton of coal that was sold. From that time forward, there would be a certain amount of that set aside. So they worked for it, and they paid for it. It was part of their compensation. Unfortunately, over 70 years later, we are still fighting to make good on that promise.

Then, in the 1980s, with the bankruptcy laws changing the way they did, people were basically walking away. This money was there. Somebody got it. Usually, through the bankruptcy, it was dispersed to the creditors and not to the miners who had earned it. That is what we are really talking about.

We have the chance today to pass my bill, the American Miners Act, along with all of my colleagues who worked so hard with us on that, to ensure that once and for all these coal miners and their wives and children will not lose their healthcare and pension benefits and will get them back. It is fully offset and will not cost the taxpayers a dime. We are using money that we are not only borrowing, but basically it is from abandoned mine land money, of which we have excesses, which can still take care of the obligations we have to use it for those who mine the coal.

The entire Democratic caucus co-sponsored this bill when it was filed on the National Defense Authorization Act last month. Everybody signed off. If our colleague here, the Senator from Kentucky, would just put it on the agenda, it would pass. It came out of the Finance Committee last year in a bipartisan vote—a very strong bipartisan vote. We all know we have made a commitment to the people who work so hard.

I am asking all of us to keep our promise the way we did when we passed the Miners Protection Act, which saved the healthcare of 22,600 miners. We need to finish the job, but guess what. We still have 87,000 miners who are going to lose their pensions by no later than 2022 if we don't do something. This adds another 1,200 who are going

to lose their healthcare by the end of the year. So the crunch time is here. These people have worked hard.

Let me tell you about the pensions. The people who would receive the pensions are mostly widows. Do you know what the average pension is? Less than \$600 a month—less than \$600 a month for the people who have worked for 20, 30, 40 years underground and have provided the energy to keep the lights on in the country and have kept our country strong enough to help us win every war.

I am happy that my colleagues have joined me here today. I am happy that my neighboring Senator from the great State of Virginia is right here beside me.

Senator KAINE has been a champion working very hard for the coal miners in Southwest Virginia who have contributed so much to our country and basically worked very closely with the miners in West Virginia. We are proud to have him here.

So without further conversation from me, I am going to now turn it over to my good friend and colleague Senator TIM KAINE from Virginia.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I thank my colleague from West Virginia because this is a matter of the heart for him. He has worked so hard on this as a Governor of West Virginia and as a U.S. Senator. It has been my honor to work together with him on this and so many other issues.

I will begin with a little bit of history. We are right in the midst of Virginia's 30th anniversary of the Pittston Coal strike. It began on April 5, 1989, in Southwest Virginia. The Pittston Coal Company, which was headquartered in Pennsylvania, terminated all healthcare benefits for approximately 1,500 retirees, widows, and disabled miners. That anniversary is being celebrated right now. When these healthcare benefits were terminated, it led to a strike. It lasted from April of 1989 until February 20 of 1990—nearly 10 months.

Then-president of the United Mine Workers Union, Rich Trumka, who is now the president of AFL-CIO, was asked during this time period as the miners and their families and the retirees made great sacrifices for striking: How long can you hold out? They were seeing the benefits they were getting as strikers—instead of a \$600-a-week strike benefit, which was the original plan, the funds had dwindled down, and they were getting \$200 a week. That was all they were getting during the strike, and when Rich Trumka was asked "How long can the miners hold out?" he said: We can hold out one day longer than the Pittston Coal Company.

That is, in fact, what happened. In February, they reached an agreement. It was a historic labor strike that was because of healthcare benefits and be-

cause of the need of the people who do one of the toughest jobs in this country—a job that will rack its pain on your body in a physical way, unlike any other kind of work. Losing healthcare is tough for anybody, but for somebody working underground in a mine, it is absolutely catastrophic.

As my colleague mentioned, we are here to talk about the American Miners Act, which he is leading and I am proud to cosponsor. The UMWA Pension Plan is projected, right now, to become insolvent by 2022, and this could be advanced and come even sooner if there is another major bankruptcy.

My colleague talked about the history of this pension plan. During the Presidency of President Truman and in the aftermath of that strike, there was an agreement that there would be employer contributions into the pension plan based on every ton of coal that was sold.

The employer contributions have declined significantly in recent years as coal companies have gone out of business and other companies have creatively used the bankruptcy laws, as my colleague indicated, to skate out of their obligations to these hard-working miners and their families and retirees.

If we do not intervene, if we do not pass the American Miners Act or something essentially identical, 87,000—87,000—current beneficiaries and an additional 20,000 vested retirees could lose all or part of their pension benefits.

The insolvency of the mine workers' pension would put further pressure on the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, which is already facing other shortfalls. And it is not just pensions; it is also healthcare. Because of a recent bankruptcy of the Westmoreland Coal Company, as my colleague mentioned, 1,200 miners and their families, largely widows and others, are slated to potentially lose healthcare coverage very soon. That would include 800 Virginians who could lose health coverage by the end of the year.

I remember when my colleague was leading the successful effort in 2017. To fix one of the issues with healthcare benefits for these families, I attended a roundtable session with many of them in Castlewood, VA, at the UMWA field office there. I went in at a midweek, midafternoon time when you wouldn't normally expect a lot of people to attend a meeting, and the room was absolutely packed with people who were so very, very frightened. They were slated, at that point, to lose health coverage.

Remember, this was at the end of April. It was about April 20 when I was there with them. They were looking at me with fear in their eyes, asking what they should do: Should I go out and buy insurance on my own? But who is going to cover me? Look at my age. Look at my physical condition. Look at the conditions my wife is dealing with.

It wasn't uncommon to be dealing with a working or recently retired

miner with a spouse who had cancer, and the threat of losing health insurance in that circumstance was existential. I could look him in the eye, and I couldn't really promise him anything except that we would try.

We were able to get a fix at that point that saved healthcare for thousands and thousands of miners, and we did that with our colleagues in this body—Democratic and Republican—and in the House as well. Well, it is time for us to step up again.

Here is what the American Miners Act would do. It would shore up the pension plan to ensure that workers receive the benefits they have earned. The bill would also safeguard healthcare coverage for workers who are projected to lose their coverage because of the Westmoreland Coal Bankruptcy. It builds on the bill that we passed in a bipartisan way in 2017.

Lastly—and this is really important. I am so happy that in working on the bill, Senator MANCHIN and I decided to do this. The bill is going to ensure financing for medical treatment and basic expenses for workers suffering from black lung because we are extending the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund. Right now, that is also—because of a revenue source that was sort of sunset—scheduled to be stopped, and then the trust fund will dwindle down, and those suffering from black lung will also lose the protections that they have. This American Miners Act not only protects pensions and not only protects folks who are having their healthcare bankrupted by Westmoreland but would extend the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund that is so very, very important.

The best news is that the bill is fully paid for. We are not asking to increase the deficit. We are not asking to increase tax rates. The bill is fully paid for. We would simply extend an existing tax to protect the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund, and then we would utilize an existing source of revenue that we used before—mine reclamation funds that are currently oversubscribed and are not being used to help backstop healthcare needs.

So this is a bill that would do an awful lot of good for an awful lot of people, and we are not coming here just asking without paying for it. We have a solution on the table so that we can pay for it.

My hope is that the body will come together the same way we did in 2017 to protect these hard-working people and their families and their widows who have done the hardest work that just about anybody does in this country and whose bodies have suffered as a result, and they need to have us having their back.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, if I could, first of all, thank my colleague from Virginia, my dear friend Senator KAINE. I just want to touch on one thing before we have Senator CASEY speak on behalf of all the coal miners

he represents in the State of Pennsylvania.

On the Black Lung Fund, a lot of people don't know, the House of Representatives basically, 2 years ago, passed a bill reducing the fund from \$1.10 to 55 cents. I called over to my friends and colleagues in the House, and I said: You would think we don't need the money anymore because we have cured black lung—but it is just the contrary. We have more diseases and more younger people getting black lung, and I will tell you the reason why.

When mining coal, you are cutting through a lot of rock, and you get silica coming out from that. We are cutting into more rock than ever before. We have even more younger miners contracting black lung. We need to fund more now than ever before, and this is not the time to cut it. That 55 cents a ton makes a difference between solvency or not, curing people or the Federal Government having to step in.

The coal miners have been proud to pay their own way. They paid for their pension. They paid for their healthcare. They didn't take money home because when they negotiated, this is how much stayed in the fund. Basically, somebody received that money, the benefit, but not the people who worked for it. Now they are willing to try to fix that with the coal they mined from the abandoned mine land money. That is all we are asking for. We will take care of our own problems.

We are begging the majority leader of this respected body to please put this bill on the floor and let the body vote on it because we have had good bipartisan support. Everybody respects the person providing the energy who protected this country, and that is all we are asking for.

There is no one who has fought harder and worked harder on this than Senator CASEY from Pennsylvania, and that is another State that borders West Virginia that we are proud of and are very close with, and they have given so much.

With that, I yield the floor to Senator CASEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I rise to discuss this urgent issue of pensions and our legislative proposal to address this looming crisis.

I commend and salute the work of Senator MANCHIN, my colleague from West Virginia, for his indefatigable work on this. There are probably a few other words I could use for his determination over time, and not just over months but literally now over years, as well as Senator KAINE's, from Virginia, and Senator BROWN's, who will follow me. We are grateful for this combination of States coming together to stand up for workers.

We know this discussion on the floor of the Senate takes place at a significant time. The House Ways and Means Committee just passed the bipartisan

Butch Lewis Act, H.R. 397, on the 10th of July. The House is taking much needed action, and it is long past time that the U.S. Senate does the same.

In my home State, there is a whole group of workers. Obviously, miners are a big part of this, the Teamsters, Bakery and Confectionery Workers, all of whom, through no fault of their own, are seeing their hard-earned pensions threatened. Failure to act could result in devastating economic consequences to communities across both the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as well as throughout the Nation. Tens of thousands of pensions of Pennsylvanians could be at risk, including—and these are just some of the numbers—11,831 coal miners and 21,460 Teamsters.

Despite the challenges ahead, the good news is, we have bipartisan legislation to deal with this pension crisis through the legislation known as the Butch Lewis Act. The bill creates a loan program for troubled pensions. It is a commonsense solution that brings the public and private sectors together to address this crisis.

We must also pass legislation so we can address coal miner health and pension benefits. Senator MANCHIN, as I referred to earlier, has shown great leadership throughout this process. We want to thank all the Senators who are with us today and others who are not with us on the floor, necessarily, but are with us by way of supporting this legislation.

We have a long way to go and a mountain to climb for several reasons. There are a number of Senators around this Chamber who, on a regular basis, when a multinational corporation needs help, will pull out all the stops. They will overturn any stone. They will surmount any barrier. They will fight through any wall of opposition or resistance. That is the same kind of persistence and determination and resolve we need for workers—in my case, whether it is a coal miner or a teamster or a bakery and confectionery worker.

It is long past due that we bring the same sense of urgency to the issues that involve workers as some here brought to corporate taxes. Just by way of one example, we were debating the 2017—November 2017 and December 2017 tax bill. My God, there were lobbyists all over town and people scurrying back and forth to make sure the corporate tax rate came down, to make sure the rate a corporation was paying was lowered substantially. In the end, they got more than they asked for, in my judgment. What was supposed to flow from that was an abundance of jobs, a rushing current of jobs, and wage growth was supposed to come from that legislation. Of course, it didn't. Some of us are right about our prediction—a prediction that we would not want to be right about, but we were.

So if that kind of determination and concerted action and then the legislative result that flowed from that can

be undertaken to help huge, multinational corporations. I think the same effort should be undertaken on behalf of workers who earned these pension benefits.

This isn't something extra. This isn't something new. This isn't something other than an earned benefit, and for some of them, they earned it in the most difficult way possible, by going underneath the ground to mine coal year after year and, in some cases, decade after decade.

Stephen Crane, the great novelist, wrote an essay in the early 1900s or just around the turn of the century, I should say, about a coal mine in my hometown of Scranton. He described all of the horrors, all of the darkness. He described the ways a miner could die. He referred to it as the "hundred perils"—life-threatening. He described the mine in a very moving way. He talked about the mine being a place of inscrutable darkness, a soundless place of tangible loneliness—loneliness because you can't see your hand in front of your face and loneliness, of course, if you were injured on the job, or if you had an injury that debilitated you, or if you, in fact, lost your life. Tens of thousands of people lost their lives in mines.

I know that is a long time ago. I know we have made advancements, but it is still hard work just as it is to do the other jobs I mentioned, whether you are a teamster or a bakery and confectionery worker. Just pick your particular work area or union.

So we have some work to do here, and we are going to have to fight through a lot, but we are grateful we have some momentum and some sense of urgency that may not have been there only weeks ago.

With that, I will yield the floor to my colleague from the State of Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. I thank Senator CASEY for his work on behalf of workers during his whole 13 years in the Senate and his work especially for mine workers and teamsters with the Butch Lewis Act and with pension and healthcare. That is so important.

Senator KAINE has been stalwart for these retirees and particularly in southwest Virginia, where he has worked as Governor, and also Senator MANCHIN who was speaking earlier.

We need to remind this body that 86,000 miners are facing a looming threat of massive cuts to the pension they have earned. What people in this body don't often understand is these miners and their widows aren't getting rich from these pensions. These pensions are \$500 or \$600 a month. Also 1,200 miners and their families can lose their healthcare by the end of the year because of the Westmoreland and Mission Coal bankruptcies.

The bankruptcy court can allow these corporations to shed their liabilities. That sounds familiar. So often big companies go to court, and these lawyers and judges don't really understand what collective bargaining is and

don't understand the sacrifices these workers made to earn these pensions. Shedding their liabilities is a fancy way of saying walk away from paying miners the healthcare benefits they earned.

Two years ago, we worked to save the miners' healthcare. We have to do it again. We can't leave these workers behind just because of the date their company filed for bankruptcy. We have to make sure they don't lose retirement security on top of that.

All 86,000 UMW union mine workers are facing crippling pension cuts. They aren't alone. The retirement security of hundreds of thousands of teamsters in Virginia and Ohio and Pennsylvania and ironworkers in Cleveland and carpenters in Dayton and Cincinnati—so many retirees and so many workers' pensions are at risk.

Congress tried to ignore these retirees, but they fought back. Workers rallied. They called, they wrote letters, and they rallied outside the Capitol on 90-degree days in July. They rallied outside the Capitol in 15-degree days in February.

We have seen those Camo UMW T-shirts around the Capitol. They are persistent. They don't give up. Many of them are veterans. They left the mines to serve their country. They went back into the mines. Now, as they fought for us, we need to fight for them.

It comes back to the dignity of work. When work has dignity, we honor the retirement and security people earn. We honor work. We respect work. The dignity of work is about their wages, about their retirement, about their healthcare. It is about safety in the workplace. This is why I wear this pin. It is a depiction of a canary in a birdcage. The mineworker took the canary into the mines. The mineworker did not always have a government that stood with them to protect their safety. That is what the union did so many times.

People in this town too often don't understand the collective bargaining process. This town is overrun with lobbyists up and down the hall and in Senator MCCONNELL's office. Lobbyists line up and get favors from the Republican leader. Never ever does organized labor, never do workers get these same kinds of favors when it comes to support like this.

With regard to collective bargaining, what people don't understand is that the people give up their wages today to put money aside for their future pensions. We made progress with the bipartisan pensions committee. I thank Senators PORTMAN and MANCHIN and all the Members—Senator KAINE and CASEY—all the Members of both parties who put in months of work in good faith on this.

I am committed to these miners. I know my friend TIM KAINE is committed to these miners, to these workers, to these small businesses. For their success and their livelihood, they depend on getting these pensions they have earned.

We will continue to work for a bipartisan solution. If you love this country, you will fight for the people who make it work—people like these mineworkers.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

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

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

#### FACEBOOK CRYPTOCURRENCY

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, yesterday the Banking Committee heard from one of Facebook's executives about, if we can believe this—it almost doesn't seem possible—how Facebook wants to create its own monopoly money. That is right, after scandal after scandal with Facebook, where they betrayed the public trust, with the damage they have done to journalism and the damage they have done to democracy, the compromising and betrayal of people's privacy.

Again, believe it or not, even the United Nations said what Facebook did to contribute to the humanitarian disaster in what we know as Burma, Myanmar, where literally hundreds of people died—the United Nations said Facebook contributed to the genocide. That almost doesn't sound believable, but they contributed to the genocide, a U.N. report said, in that part of the world.

Now, after scandal after scandal, Facebook expects Americans to trust them with their hard-earned paychecks. It is pretty breathtaking.

When you think about it, in this body, you know what happens when corporations want something. They always get it. With the leadership in this body and with the White House looking like a retreat for Wall Street executives and the big banks, they always get what they want.

When have big corporations ever been held accountable? Look how the majority leader and President Trump treated Wall Street banks. Of course Facebook thinks they can make mess after mess, they can refuse to clean it up, and they face no consequences.

We know that big banks scam customers and break laws. Not only do they get away with it, they get rewarded. Last year, as we know, this Congress passed and President Trump signed legislation rolling back laws protecting working families from Wall Street greed, as if Wall Street weren't doing well enough. They had record profit and record executive compensation.

Remembering 10 years ago and what happened with Wall Street—there is a collective amnesia in this body. My

colleagues seem to forget what Wall Street did to our country 10 years ago.

I have said this on the floor before, and I will say it again: My ZIP Code in Cleveland where Connie and I live is 44105. That ZIP Code had more foreclosures in 2007 than any other ZIP Code in the United States of America. I still see the remnants of those foreclosures—high levels of lead-based paint, homes abandoned, property values going down. Yet this Congress and President Trump want to do more for Wall Street.

The big banks ask for weaker rules, even though it put millions of families at risk—job losses, the evisceration of retirement plans, people losing their jobs, people losing their homes. President Trump said: OK. Let's do what the banks want.

The year before that, Congress passed and President Trump signed a \$1.5 trillion tax cut for corporations, big banks, and the richest Americans. Since the Republican tax bill passed, corporations have moved jobs overseas. They spent hundreds of billions of dollars on stock buybacks because the executives apparently weren't making enough money with their record compensation. Corporations have spent \$1 trillion in these stock buybacks. Of the eight companies with the most stock buybacks last year, half of them were on Wall Street.

The big banks and the big investment houses have done very well with this Trump economy. They have done very well because of the goodies this body continues to bestow on them.

One thing we also know is that Wall Street can never get enough handouts. They always want one more. Not too long ago, a bank lobbyist said: "We don't want just a seat at the table, we want the whole table." That is so brazen and arrogant. Unfortunately, this Congress and this President seem to want to give it to them.

They let banks haggle over their stress test results. We require these banks to take a stress test, but before they take the test—imagine getting to do this in high school or college. Before you take the test, we will tell you a little more about what will be on the test.

They take away consumers' right to have their day in court when banks scam them.

They go easy on foreign megabanks. You could name them. So many of the foreign banks have gotten their way so often in this body and done damage to our economy.

We gave them breaks in the rulings that the Federal Reserve made. Last month, we saw the Fed once again go easy on Wall Street banks during their annual stress test. They basically gave them extra credit for even submitting to these tests at all. What does that mean for the giant banks? The Fed will let them do even more stock buybacks. The Fed ought to understand that megabank CEOs are not playing T-ball, where everyone gets a participation

trophy just for showing up; they are playing with family's lives.

We know all over the country what happened to people's retirement, what happened to their jobs, what happened to their homes. People in this town may have collective amnesia and have forgotten the financial crisis and housing crisis, but families who lost their homes and jobs and retirement savings and their college funds haven't forgotten what happened. This town has forgotten what happened 10 years ago, and it could happen again.

The more we roll back these rules and look the other way when corporations want to take big risks—not with their money but with other people's money—the higher the chance one of these big risks doesn't pay off. You know who pays the price. You remember who paid the price 10 years ago when the economy tanked because of Wall Street greed and Wall Street overreach. When Wall Street bets don't pay off, it is workers, families, taxpayers, and people in my neighborhood who pay the price. It is your money they are gambling with.

Hard-working Americans face real consequences when they break the law, and so should Wall Street executives.

#### BORDER SECURITY

Mr. President, this past weekend, my wife Connie and I went to El Paso, to the U.S.-Mexico border, to bear witness to this humanitarian crisis. We met with children and families coming to our country to flee violence and persecution. These are families just like our own who only want a safe place for their kids to lay their heads at night. It underscored the inhumanity and coldness of President Trump's family separation policy—something I still can't believe our country is doing. In fact, the leader of our country is almost gleeful and bragging about this family separation policy of taking their children away from their parents.

We talked to one mother from Honduras. She and her teenage son and 6-year-old daughter were fleeing violent gangs who already murdered her brother. She choked back tears as she told her story. She arrived in the United States and was sent back to Juarez, Mexico, where she and her children slept outdoors on rocks and were given no access to even basic hygiene. She told us how hard it was to see her daughter cry, that "it was very hard for me seeing her treated as if she was a criminal." We are talking about a 6-year-old little girl. That is something no Member of this body would stand for if it were their child, but it happens to be a child from somewhere else who wants to be able to live a decent, safe life.

This story is a reminder of why the policy the Trump administration announced yesterday makes no sense for the American people and is so dangerous for those families. The President wants to require refugees to apply for asylum in the first country they pass through. For refugees like this

mother, that country would be Guatemala, but people are fleeing Guatemala too.

I talked to one volunteer at Annunciation House, the shelter we visited that takes in refugees after they are released from CBP custody. She said their numbers at the shelter were down recently. That has her worried because she knows that when families make it to the Annunciation House, they will be safe and well cared for. The staff are overwhelmingly volunteers, people in their churches and neighborhoods who want to help their fellow human beings. Now she is terrified that even more families are trapped in Juarez and other dangerous cities.

It is despicable how little compassion the President and his administration have. It is mind-boggling. It is not who we are as a country. It is not what people in Ohio think we should do. Yet this government thinks it is proper to separate children from their families.

As we were in El Paso, throughout the day, what went over and over in my mind was Matthew 25: When I was hungry, you fed me. When I was thirsty, you gave me drink. When I was sick, you visited me. When I was a stranger, you welcomed me.

I have read a lot of translations of that, and some translations say: When I was thirsty, you gave me drink. When I was hungry, you fed me. What you did for the least of these, you did for me.

There are other translations that I like more than that: When I was hungry, you fed me. When I was thirsty, you gave me drink. When I was a stranger, you visited me. What you did for those less important, you did for me.

I have read many translations, but do you know what translation I have never read? When I was hungry, you fed me. When I was thirsty, you gave me drink. When I was in prison, you visited me. When I was a stranger, you welcomed me but only if I had the proper paperwork.

That is not in Matthew 25. Only this administration that splits up families will say: When I was a stranger, you welcomed me but only if I had the proper paperwork.

These are families whose lives are in danger. They are victims of drug violence and sexual violence. They are people who came hundreds of miles—not because they want so much to come to America, but they want to get away from the violence and the chances of death.

As I said, I met a mother and her son and her daughter. Her brother was murdered by these gangs. She came north. And President Trump, having no empathy, not caring about other human beings—especially if they look like they might be from Honduras or Guatemala or El Salvador—calls them names. He says: Go back to the countries you live in. Whether you call it racist or not, it is simply inhumane.

Despite seeing the inhumanity of this administration's policies—when we

were there, we weren't even allowed to see the worst. Frankly, government employees who were there were mostly doing their best. But the people who make these decisions—the people in the White House, the people at Mar-a-Lago, the people who don't have any idea of what people can see—they didn't want us to see the worst of the worst. They were denying me, as a representative of 12 million people in my State—they don't want people to see what they are doing to these kids. It is troubling because Ohio tax dollars are supporting them. It makes you wonder what else the administration is hiding.

Despite all that, so many parts of this trip were inspiring. We saw the passion and dedication of advocacy groups. So many people in Texas, in Ohio, in Iowa, in Minnesota, and in Wyoming had traveled on their vacation time to these border communities to try to help these refugees, people whose lives are in danger. They were trying to help feed them and clothe them and visit with them and heal them. They were trying to help because they know our government hasn't. They know our government—President Trump and the people around him—have abandoned them.

I saw the Border Network for Human Rights shining a light on migrants' mistreatment and abuse to hold our government accountable. We saw the generosity and kindness of the volunteers at Annunciation House. All of those advocates and volunteers represent the best of American values.

I remember seeing a bus of refugees who arrived at Annunciation House holding babies and children, smiling and waving at us. You could see the relief on their faces because they saw people who remembered: When I was a stranger, you welcomed me. They saw American citizens who love this country, Americans who understand our values, Americans who know we are a nation of immigrants. Those children knew they were welcomed. Their families knew their children were safe.

We saw the innocence of those children who find joy through play even at the darkest times, after witnessing horrors many of us can only imagine.

Connie held a smiling baby. I picked up a Wiffle Ball bat and handed it to one of the children, and then I picked up a ball. I was told this little boy had probably never held a baseball bat because in Guatemala and Honduras and El Salvador, they mostly play soccer. I pitched to him, and he was kind of a natural. It is a reminder of our common humanity—something I hope my colleagues will keep in mind as we think about and actually fix our immigration system.

One place where we ought to be able to start is on something so many of us in both parties agree on—that we have to find a solution for the Dreamers who are American in every sense but the paperwork.

Let me tell you a story. I was in Toledo, OH, 2 months ago. I met a young

woman who is probably in her midtwenties. She is married with a small child. She works full time. She has been in this country since she was 4. Her parents brought her from Central America. She doesn't remember Central America; she was 4. She is from Toledo, not from Guatemala anymore. Her parents speak Spanish. She speaks Spanish at home, but in every other way, she is as American as just about anybody else in Toledo. She said that she and her husband have one car. She goes to work. She drops him off, and she takes the car to work and then picks him up at the end of the day. She said: Senator, when I go to work every day, I go outside and I check my turn signal and I check my brake lights. When I stop at a stop sign, I count to three because I am terrified I am going to get picked up for a traffic violation and deported.

She works hard. She pays her taxes. She does what we ask her to do. She is active in her church. She does all the things that Italian and French immigrants coming to the United States have done.

In fact, I was talking to a gentleman who works downstairs in this body. He works in the Senate. He has worked here for 40 years. He came from Italy when he was 10. He said he was discouraged and unhappy about President Trump's comments about sending them back to where they came from. He said: When I was a kid, my parents were Italian. Their English isn't as good as mine. I was 10 years old. People told us to go back where we came from.

That is just wrong.

I hope my colleagues will keep in mind the comments from a young activist in El Paso, Saida Navar. She is a Dreamer. She was raised in El Paso. She is a faculty member at the University of Texas at El Paso. She has dedicated her life to fighting for immigrant families. She has been a Dreamer for years. She said: "I don't know what it means to be without anxiety. That is not a dignified way to live." She is always worried. She is worried like that young woman in Toledo.

We share a common human dignity. It is despicable that this administration tries to rob people of that. I hope my colleagues think about that. We know the way we solve our complex immigration problem isn't by locking up families and children in cages. It is not by tearing apart families or by throwing out hard-working, law-abiding teachers and workers and students and families of servicemembers. Many of these Dreamers end up in the military. They have known no other home but America. We can't abandon our values—the same values that have made the United States a beacon of hope around the world for generations.

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.

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

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

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I come to the floor this afternoon with a number of my colleagues because we are very concerned about the lack of legislating that is happening here in the Senate, particularly on the issue of climate change.

As this poster shows, it has been 76 days since the House passed H.R. 9, which is the Climate Action Now Act. It is legislation that would prevent the President from using funds to withdraw the United States from the Paris climate agreement. We also have a Senate proposal, which is bipartisan legislation that I have sponsored, called the International Climate Accountability Act. It has been cosponsored by 46 Senators. Yet the majority leader has refused to bring these bills to the floor for a debate.

It didn't used to be this way. Even in my time in the Senate, it didn't used to be this way. The Senate used to take up important issues, put them on the floor for substantive debate, and at the end of the day, work to pass legislation to improve the lives of Americans. Sadly, what we see now is that the Senate is turning into a legislative graveyard. Unfortunately, the International Climate Accountability Act is one of several proposals that the majority leader wishes to bury. Yet, without a doubt, climate change is the greatest environmental challenge the world has ever faced.

At the end of last year, the U.S. Global Change Research Program released its "Fourth National Climate Assessment." This report makes it abundantly clear that every American is affected by climate change and that the threat it poses will get worse over time unless we take action.

I want to be clear that climate change is not just an environmental issue; it affects our public health, and it affects our economy. In New Hampshire, we understand this all too well. Rising temperatures are shortening our fall foliage season. They are disrupting maple syrup production. They are affecting our ski industry and snowmobiling industry. We are seeing stresses on our fisheries. Our trout is moving farther north in streams. We see an increase in insect-borne diseases. Lyme disease is on the rise in New Hampshire and throughout New England. Our moose population is down 40 percent, and other wildlife is being affected. All of these changes are tied to the effects of climate change.

A few months ago, I met with members of the New England Water Environment Association to discuss the enormous effect climate change is having on our water infrastructure. Rising temperatures and increased rainfall brought on by climate change make flooding more frequent and rainstorms



more intense. We are seeing that now on our gulf coast, where we have seen 20 inches of rain in parts of Louisiana.

Americans are witnessing this firsthand across the country with the historic flooding and with the tornadoes that have swept across the South and the Midwest. These extreme weather events not only endanger families and homes and businesses, but they increase the strain on our Nation's overburdened water systems. They take water treatment plants offline. This means debris is discharged into our rivers and streams, which affects our water quality.

These extreme weather events are particularly dangerous for coastal communities. I see my colleague from Maine is here, Senator KING. They take this in Maine with its long coastline. In New Hampshire, we have 18 miles of coastline, but we still see it at our coastline.

Accelerated sea level rise, which is primarily driven by climate change, is worsening tidal flooding conditions and imperiling coastal homes and businesses.

According to a 2018 study from the Union of Concerned Scientists, projected tidal flooding in the United States will put as many as 311,000 coastal homes that are collectively valued at \$117 billion at risk of chronic flooding within the next 30 years. That is the lifespan of a typical mortgage. By the end of the century, the report estimates that 2.4 million homes and 107,000 commercial properties that are currently worth more than \$1 trillion will be at risk for chronic flooding. This includes properties in towns like Hampton Beach, which is located in New Hampshire's Seacoast Region.

For those who haven't had a chance to visit Hampton Beach, it is beautiful. It is a perfect vacation destination. It is a barrier island town with the Hampton River on one side of the city and the ocean on the other. Unfortunately, this makes Hampton Beach one of the State's most at-risk towns from rising sea levels.

In this photograph, we can see the impact of rising sea levels. This was taken in November of 2017. We see what is happening. All of these homes should not be underwater here. Yet that is what we are seeing.

A 2019 report from Columbia University and the First Street Foundation found that Hampton Beach lost \$7.9 million in home value due to tidal flooding between 2005 and 2017. In total, increased tidal flooding has cost New Hampshire homeowners \$15 million in lost property value. This is just in recent years, and the problem is only going to get worse.

The impact of climate change will get worse if we don't act now to reduce harmful greenhouse gas emissions. I am proud that in New Hampshire, we understand the need for climate action. We have implemented policies that reduce carbon emissions, that help us transition to a more energy-efficient,

clean economy, but New Hampshire can't do this alone, and the United States can't do this alone. International cooperation is key to reducing global greenhouse gas emissions. That is why the Paris Agreement is so critical in mitigating the worst effects of climate change.

With a delegation from the Senate, I had the opportunity to attend the 2015 U.N. climate summit, and we participated in discussions that led to the Paris climate accord. During the summit, we were impressed by the leadership and the determination that was shown by the United States to encourage other nations to reach ambitious emissions reduction goals. Unfortunately, when President Trump announced his intention to withdraw from the Paris Agreement, the United States forfeited this leadership to other countries.

In the absence of leadership from the White House, the majority leader should allow the Senate to consider the International Climate Accountability Act, which would keep the United States in the Paris Agreement. Let's take up the bill that has been sent over by the House. Let's take up the Senate bill. Let's bring this bill to the floor, and let's have a debate. If people don't support it, they can debate it, but we should be talking about this. The threat to New Hampshire and to this country is in doubt, and until we act, it is only going to get worse.

We have a number of our colleagues who would like to come to the floor and speak to this issue, and I am pleased that Senator KING from Maine, my colleague, is here to talk about these impacts.

Yet, before my colleagues speak, I ask unanimous consent to show a banner that was delivered to my office by the Moms Clean Air Force.

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

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Let me just show everyone this. This was made by the mothers who came to our office. What they have written is: "Please protect the families of New Hampshire from air pollution and climate change. Moms Clean Air Force." You are able to see all of the folks who were with the delegation and who visited my office to sign this because everyone is concerned about what the impact is going to be on their families and on their communities if we don't address climate change.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am happy to join my colleague from New Hampshire and other colleagues tonight to talk about one of the most serious threats to ever face this Nation or, in fact, this world.

A few years ago, Tom Brokaw, the television news anchor, wrote a wonderful book called "The Greatest Generation." He was writing about the generation of our parents and grand-

parents who fought in World War II, who paid off the debt from World War II, who built the Interstate Highway System—who, by the way, paid for it—and who built the greatest economy the world has ever seen. That was the "greatest generation."

The characteristic of that generation was that of meeting their responsibilities. It was not of avoiding problems but of meeting them head-on and establishing for the world and for this country an example of governance and of the responsible dealing with issues and problems the likes of which we have not seen in our lifetimes.

If Tom Brokaw were writing another book today about us, it would be called "The Lousiest Generation." We are the ones who have built up an unconscionable debt for our children. We cut taxes in the middle of a war in 2005. It was the first time I had been able to find in world history when that had ever happened. We have given ourselves tax cuts and not paid the bill, and we are passing on this enormous \$22 trillion debt to our children.

None of us on our deathbed, when our children are standing around, would lean up and say: Here is the credit card, kids. I have run it up to the max. You can now pay for it. Yet that is exactly what we are doing collectively—the lousiest generation, the one that hasn't paid its bills.

Infrastructure. We have allowed our infrastructure to fall to pieces. It is the infrastructure that was given to us by our parents, that was paid for—the bridges, the roads, the railroads, and the airports. Now we have one of the poorest infrastructure situations in the world. It is embarrassing to go to a small country somewhere else in the world and walk into an airport that makes ours look old and falling apart.

So we haven't kept up with the infrastructure, and that is a debt that we are passing on to our children, just as real as the national debt.

Finally, we are facing a known, real, unquestionable crisis in terms of the effect on the climate, and this is something that we are shamefully passing on to our children. They are the ones who are going to have to deal with the consequences that we will not face. They are the ones who are going to have to pay the bills, who are going to have to shore up the infrastructure, who are going to have to respond to the drastic changes in the climate not only here but around the world, and we are doing nothing.

What will it take? What will it take for us to meet this responsibility? What is it going to take?

Well, OK, let's go down a list. Maybe it will take scientific data that demonstrates the level of CO<sub>2</sub> that we have put into the atmosphere.

I don't seem to have a chart. I don't need a chart. For millions of years, CO<sub>2</sub> has varied between 180 and 280 parts per million. People say: Well, it varies over time. This is nothing new. No, between 180 and 280 is the variation until the

last 50 to 75 years, when it has become a hockey stick. We are now at over 400 parts per million, the highest it has been in 3 million years, and, by the way, the last time it was at 400 parts per million, the oceans were 60 feet higher.

CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere is our responsibility. It didn't come from volcanoes. It came from the consumption of fossil fuel, which developed and built the wonderful economy that we have and the economy around the world. Nobody can gainsay that.

The question is, Now that we are seeing the consequences, don't we have a responsibility to do something about it? Has there been a gigantic increase in CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere? Check. Yes. Unquestionably.

No. 2, how about Arctic ice? Here we are. In the last 30 years, two-thirds of the Arctic ice has disappeared—two-thirds.

I was at a conference this morning on the Arctic. The Arctic Ocean is open for the first time in human history. The conference was about shipping and mineral exploration and Native peoples losing their habitat and their way of life. Two-thirds of the Arctic ice is gone in 25 years. This is a place that has been covered with ice for thousands of years—as long as we have any memory, but now the Arctic ice is going.

Every time I see a prediction of where it is going to be in 10 years, lo and behold, it is there in 2 or 3 years. It is opening up. That is telling us something.

Is there an indication from the Arctic ice that something drastic is happening to our climate? Yes. Check that box.

No. 3 is the increased intensity of fires. We have seen the most intense wildfires in this country in the last 10 years that we have ever seen—more acreage, more intensity, more lives lost, more property lost. This is caused by drought and by changes in the climate, all wrought by our activity.

Increase in fires and wildfires? Check.

Sea level rise. Here is the background on the sea level. We tend to think of the sea level as being a fixed quantity. We walk out in the ocean, and it always looks pretty much the way it is, whether it is off the Maine coast or the New Hampshire coast.

Well, it turns out that back here, 24,000 years ago, when the glaciers were covering most of North America, the sea was 390 feet shallower than it is today. Chesapeake Bay was dry land. It was 390 feet shallower than it is today.

Then, the glaciers melted, and the sea level started to rise. This is an interesting period about 14,000 years ago called the meltwater pulse 1A.

This drastic rise in sea level is about a foot a decade. That is what is predicted for the next century.

Oh, it could never happen. A foot a decade? You must be crazy.

It happened. We know that it happened.

Now, here is why we aren't paying attention. The last 6,000 years, it has been pretty flat. It has been pretty level. The sea level has plateaued, in effect, and, therefore, that happens to be recorded human history, that 6,000 years. So we think that is just where the ocean has always been.

But do you know what? The last remnant of the glaciers are in Greenland and Antarctica, and they are going. They are going. There is 20 feet of sea level rise in the Greenland ice sheet and 212 feet of sea level rise stored in the Antarctic ice sheet, and they are going.

I have been to Greenland. You can see it. The Jakobshavn Glacier has retreated as much in the last 10 years as it retreated in the prior 100 years.

The only thing slower than a glacier, by the way, is the U.S. Congress. We make glaciers look like they are moving fast, and, in fact, the Jakobshavn Glacier is moving fast.

Sea level rise is happening. In Norfolk, VA, they have seen a foot and a half in the last decade. They are having sunny day floods. They are having sunny day floods in Miami. They are spending millions of dollars to build up their roads.

People say dealing with climate change is too expensive. Not dealing with it is too expensive. In not dealing with it, the expense is going to be astronomical.

By the way, if you talk about sea level in Norfolk, VA, it is a national security risk. With the number of bases that we have around the world that are at or near sea level, it is going to be an enormous task and a very expensive one to protect those assets.

There is another national security issue involved in this that we are ignoring, and that is the displacement of peoples. During the Syrian civil war, there were 4 to 6 million Syrian refugees. A few came here, not many. Most went to Western Europe, and, as we know, that refugee flow turned the politics of Western Europe upside-down. Call it 5 million people.

The estimates for refugees from climate change over the next 100 years is between 200 and 400 million people. Imagine what that is going to do to the geopolitics of this world—200 million people on the march, looking for water, looking for a place that is habitable, looking for relief from drought, from fires. This is a national security threat.

Is it a national security threat? Yes. Check that box.

What is it going to take? What is it going to take?

Intense storms. We don't need to tell people about the intensity of storms. We have seen them. We have lived through them. I once made a joke in Maine that I am 300 years old, and somebody said: Why? I said: Because according to the news, I have lived through three storms of the century.

We keep having storms of the century or 500-year storms, and they are happening more and more frequently.

The heat. Nine out of 10 of the hottest years on record occurred in the last 15 years. This past June was the hottest June since records were kept—the hottest June since records were kept.

Now, there is a difference between weather and climate. I understand that, and I am not going to say that the heat wave that the Midwest is suffering this weekend is a reflection of climate change. It may or may not be. Weather is what happens day-to-day. Climate is what happens in the long term, and we know that we have already increased global climate by about 1.5 degrees Celsius. In many cases, it is causing irreversible damage.

When we get to 2 degrees Celsius, which we are headed for, it is going to be catastrophic for coral, for farms, for animals, and for people.

Species are already on the move. Senator SHAHEEN mentioned the ocean. There are the lobsters in Maine. There used to be a vigorous lobster fishery in Massachusetts and Rhode Island. It is essentially gone now, and the lobsters are in Maine, which is a mainstay of our economy. It is a \$1.5 billion a year business. The lobsters are moving north and east. Why? Because the Gulf of Maine is heating faster than 99 percent of the areas of the world. The only place heating faster than the Gulf of Maine is the Arctic, and those lobsters are doing what any animal does. They seek out more hospitable climate.

Climate. This isn't academic. These aren't predictions. This is something you can see. The people on the water in Maine know it is happening. The woodsmen know it is happening because they are seeing different species of trees. Bugs are moving farther north. Ticks are a huge problem in Northern New England and places where they weren't before. This isn't something that is academic.

What is it going to take?

One of the things that the Senator from New Hampshire talked about is—and I think it is important to emphasize because I hear this sometimes—why should we do this? It is happening everywhere in the world.

Yes, that is why the Paris climate accord was so important. It wasn't mandatory, but it was a set of goals, and the entire world was engaged. Now there is the entire world but one—us. We are out. We are outliers. We have lost our voice. We have lost our influence. We have lost our leadership position on one of the most important challenges faced by this or any generation. Yes, we haven't met our responsibilities as our parents and our grandparents did.

On December 1, 1862, Abraham Lincoln came to the House Chamber and spoke about the crisis of the Civil War. The Congress didn't get it. They were doing politics as usual, and President Lincoln was trying to move them from the lethargy of the legislative process into the emergency and the urgency of the Civil War.

He said two things toward the end of that speech that I think are profoundly instructive for us today. The first is how to deal with this change. And this is a change. This is new. I understand that, and dealing with change is difficult.

Abraham Lincoln uttered what I think are the most profound words about change that I have ever encountered. Here is what Abraham Lincoln said:

The dogmas of the quiet past, are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise—with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew, and act anew.

And here is the punch line:

We must disenthrall ourselves, and then we shall save our country.

“We must disenthrall ourselves,” and that means to think in new and different ways, to see reality as it is, “and then we shall save our country” and, in this in case, the world.

The other admonition from Lincoln that day, which I think is very important for us, puts the responsibility directly on us right here. He was talking to Members of Congress.

He said:

Fellow-citizens, we cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this administration, will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance, or insignificance, can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass—

Of course he was talking about the Civil War, and we are talking about a fiery trial of our generation.

The fiery trial through which we pass, will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the latest generation.

The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the latest generation.

I want to meet this responsibility. I want this Congress to be remembered, as we will be, either way, but I want this Congress to be remembered as people who met the fiery trial, who met our responsibility, who thought about others more than ourselves and made a difference in the life of this country and the world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I rise with my colleagues to talk about this urgent issue that faces us: climate change.

Climate disruption is an existential threat to our planet—an existential threat. Scientists recognize this, so do the American people, and so does the international community. One hundred ninety-four countries and the European Union have signed the Paris Agreement, and so did the United States.

Quite frankly, we shouldn't even have to argue this anymore, but for those who still don't see the evidence of climate change, it is all around us: a warming climate; recordbreaking hurricanes off the Atlantic, the Gulf of Mexico, and in the Caribbean; unprecedented flooding in the Midwest; Native

villages in Alaska actually falling into the sea; and drought and the most severe wildfires in the West we have ever seen.

This is from a 2003 fire near the Taos Pueblo in New Mexico. We in New Mexico are on pins and needles every fire season now. We don't know what disaster will hit us. We know this climate catastrophe is caused by human activity. Report after report tells us we don't have any time to waste; that we need to act now.

Even this administration's most recent climate analysis finds that global warming “is transforming where and how we live and presents growing challenges to human health and the quality of life, the economy, and the natural systems that support us.” The report concludes we must act now “to avoid substantial damages to the U.S. economy, environment, and human health and well-being over the coming decades.”

That is coming from an administration of a climate change-denying President. Yet this administration has slashed and burned every protection, program, and agreement aimed at combating climate change it can find, from the Clean Power Plan to methane control regulations, to the Paris Agreement. I can tell you who in this Congress is the administration's No. 1 accomplice: the majority leader of the Senate. The leader's legislative graveyard is littered with legislation the American people want and deserve, from improving healthcare to reforming our democracy, to commonsense measures to prevent gun violence.

Climate change threatens the land, the lives, and the livelihoods of homeowners, small businesses, farmers, ranchers, fishers, and so many others all across the Nation. The majority leader's refusal to take up climate action is about as bad as congressional malfeasance gets.

In May, the House of Representatives passed the first major climate legislation in nearly a decade—the Climate Action Now Act. H.R. 9 aims to decrease greenhouse gas emissions by about one-quarter by 2025. The bill ensures the United States stays in the Paris Agreement.

This bill is not extreme, but it does respond to the dire situation we face. The Senate should debate this bill and pass it, but we will not. We all know the majority leader will continue to stand in its way.

Due to this negligence and inaction, States are filling the void and taking it upon themselves to act. My home State of New Mexico passed legislation this year aimed at transitioning to 100 percent carbon-free electricity. Our largest utility says they can do this by 2040. It is an approach that is consistent with the renewable electricity standard bill I introduced last month. That legislation is designed to achieve at least 50 percent renewable electricity nationwide in 15 years, putting the United States on a path for a zero carbon power sector by 2050.

The fact is, no American is immune from the threats of climate change, and many of our most underrepresented and vulnerable communities are at the greatest risk. For example, the most recent National Climate Assessment finds that Tribes and indigenous peoples are impacted disproportionately and uniquely. Many Native people's way of life is intimately tied to the land and water. These natural resources—that they have depended on for hundreds or even thousands of years—are being disrupted in ways that upend their communities. Their subsistence, their cultural practices, their sacred sites are all being threatened.

Look at the proximity of this fire to the Taos Pueblo. It is not only sacred to the Taos people, but it is a UNESCO World Heritage Site.

Last week, Senator SCHATZ and I wrote to American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian leaders seeking their input on how climate change is affecting their communities. We want to foster a dialogue about what actions Congress and Federal agencies should take to mitigate the impacts.

I am the vice chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee. Senator SCHATZ is the chair of the Special Committee on the Climate Crisis, and we were joined by all Democratic Senators on the Indian Affairs Committee. This effort should have been bipartisan—climate change is blind to political party—but it wasn't because too many Republican members just follow President Trump and the majority leader, killing anything aimed at progress.

The majority leader jokes that he is the grim reaper, sounding the death knell on legislation, but climate change is no laughing matter and neither is access to healthcare for millions of Americans, or our broken campaign finance system, or the safety of American schoolchildren.

The Senate must do its duty to the American people and tackle these most pressing problems. This does not mean rubberstamping legislation sent to us by the House. The Senate has a storied tradition of debate and compromise. Let's return to that tradition, have a real climate debate, and pass some real bipartisan solutions.

We all came to the Senate to solve problems—problems like climate change. We didn't come here to spend time in a legislative graveyard. We don't want to be a place where good ideas come to die.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, Leader MCCONNELL may, in fact, be proud that he has turned the Senate floor into a legislative graveyard, but that doesn't mean we Senators have abandoned our effort to make this body work for the American people.

Today the special committee on the climate crisis held its very first hearing, where we heard from five mayors from cities across the United States.

They told our committee that the average temperature in Atlanta has already increased 2 degrees since 1980; that 3 of St. Paul's 10 biggest floods ever recorded have happened in the last 10 years. So it is clear to them that climate change is not something that will happen eventually, in 5 or 10 or 20 years. It is happening now. It is happening in realtime.

That is why these mayors are not waiting for Leader MCCONNELL, or for the Trump administration, or anyone else to start doing something about it. Honolulu, St. Paul, Pittsburgh, Atlanta, Portland and cities and towns across the Nation are working to transition to 100 percent clean energy.

Atlanta is converting an abandoned quarry into a reservoir to increase the city's emergency drinking water supply. Portland, OR, has designated more than \$50 million for a green jobs and healthy homes initiative.

The experience of these mayors stands in contrast to some of the rhetoric we hear on the Senate floor and elsewhere about how climate action is somehow economically unwise.

The Portland mayor, Ted Wheeler, pointed out that his city's investments in reducing carbon emissions are the very things that make people want to live in Portland. He said in his testimony that "failing to take meaningful action to address climate change is bad for the economy."

That is why Senate Democrats are not going to wait for Republican colleagues—because the cost of climate inaction is so much higher than the cost of action. The damage that is being done to our cities, our farmers, our fisheries—and the risks that are threatening our workers, our small businesses, our financial industry, and our taxpayers—are too high for us to wait any longer. The benefits of action are way higher than the cost of inaction.

The Pittsburgh mayor, William Peduto, said today that if you want to turn a coal miner into an environmentalist, then give them a paycheck. If you want to turn a coal miner into an environmentalist, then give them a paycheck.

Hawaii isn't a coal mining State, but his words rang true to me because they illustrate the basic point, which is that climate action can, should, and will work for everybody.

So we are not going to let Majority Leader MCCONNELL stop us from taking action. He is certainly slowing us down, but he is not going to stop us.

Over the coming months, the Senate Democrats' special committee on the climate crisis will establish the predicate for climate action. Through hearings both in Congress and out in the field, we are going to build the record and the coalitions needed to move forward.

We are also going to keep an open door for our Republican colleagues to join us. There is a way to address the climate crisis that is consistent with

conservative principles. Senator WHITEHOUSE and I have introduced a carbon pricing bill that aligns with traditional conservative principles and has the support of Republicans outside of the U.S. Senate, but as long as Leader MCCONNELL keeps standing in the way of the Senate doing anything, as long as he has turned this body into a legislative graveyard—not just on climate but on healthcare, on prescription drug costs, on the cruelty shown to children and families on the southern border of the United States—then we are going to have to find other ways to act without it.

All of this stuff should be bipartisan, and one day it again will be, but right now we cannot wait. We will not wait. The severity of the climate crisis and the urgency for action are just too great.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in bringing up the challenges of climate change and our responsibility to do something about it.

Climate change is real. It is putting our communities at risk. Our activities here on Earth are affecting climate change, and we can do something about it. By reducing carbon emissions, we can make a real difference in the trajectory of the catastrophic impact of climate change. I just want to give a couple examples.

Last Monday, we had record flash flooding in this region. In less than 1 hour, we had 1 month's worth of rain. That is becoming typical as a result of climate change. In our region, we saw streets that were flooded, sinkholes that developed, water pouring into our Metro stations, and roads that were literally ripped apart.

This shows one major road in Potosi, MD—not very far from here—that is critically important for a community to be connected. The road was destroyed by the record rainfall during that period of time.

We had CSX and Amtrak put high-speed restrictions on the rail service. In Baltimore, we had 1.3 million gallons of sewage from the Jones Falls river flow into the Inner Harbor, which produced a sight in the Inner Harbor of Baltimore that is truly regrettable.

This photo I think shows beautiful downtown Baltimore. It doesn't look very beautiful. That was just this past Monday and was as a result of the high amount of water flow and the inability of our sewage treatment facilities to treat that amount of runoff. We are just not prepared for it. It is another example of why we need to act.

We need to act now. Climate change is here. The catastrophic impacts are here, and we can do something about it.

Let me just make a couple of suggestions. We need to upgrade our stormwater systems in this country. We have a 21st-century problem with 20th-century infrastructure. It can't

handle it. We need to invest in adaptation and deal with the realities of the new weather systems we are confronting every day.

Yes, we have to act on climate change. As I said, it is real. Our activities are impacting it, and we could do something about it. There are many examples I could give that are affecting our lives. I have already shared some about some water. We have wildfires in the West. We have extreme weather conditions throughout. We have unprecedented concentration and frequency of rainfall in the mid-Atlantic, driven by climate change.

Studies have shown that tropical storms move more slowly, with much more precipitation. We saw that with Hurricanes Harvey and Irma in 2017 and Florence in 2018. All those were slower moving hurricanes, dropping a lot more water, saturating our inlands, and making it more difficult to deal with the next weather condition. We have warmer ocean temperatures that are making these storms more costly to our communities. We have what is known as compound flooding as a result of climate change—storm surges that hit our shorelines, which are already saturated by inland precipitation.

After Tropical Storm Barry, FEMA said: "Given [the] unprecedented magnitude of natural disasters over the past two years and the current projected path of the storm, a hurricane making landfall is likely to impact communities still working to recover from the previous event." That is how frequent we are going through flooding.

I will give another example of how much flooding we have had. In my region, in Baltimore, if you use the period from 1957 to 1963, that 6-year period, we had an average of 1.3 floods per year. If you use 2007 through 2013, we have had 13.1 floods per year. In Annapolis, those numbers are 3.8 floods in the 1957 through 1963 period, compared to 39 floods from 2007 to 2013. That is a tenfold increase in the number of flooding events.

This is an issue that is with us today. Thanks to climate change, Baltimore may feel more like the Mississippi Delta than Chesapeake Bay country.

Professor Matt Fitzpatrick at the University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science published a study in February in the journal *Nature Communications* with Robert Dunn, an ecologist at North Carolina State University, to match cities with their climate counterparts in 2080. If we continue this trajectory, they predict that the average city will come to resemble climates more than 500 miles away, often to the south or west. Each one of our communities is going to be impacted by climate change if we do not take action to change the trajectory.

Like all States, Maryland has a very important agricultural community. As a farmer, it is difficult to make ends meet today, but with these extreme weather conditions, it becomes even more difficult.

It is in our economic interest, our environmental interest, as well as our security interest for us to deal with the climate issues. Unchecked, the sea level in Maryland coasts will rise. If we don't do anything about it in the next century, it is projected to be at least 16 inches and could be as high as 4 feet. We know the catastrophic impact to our coastal communities if we do not take action to prevent that from happening.

Our activities of reducing carbon emissions can make a difference, and we should do that now to reduce our use of fossil fuels.

Our States have acted. I am very proud of the actions we have seen from local governments and from the private sector. Nine Northeastern and Mid-Atlantic States, including Maryland, announced an intent of a new, regional, low-carbon transportation policy proposal. All are members of the Transportation and Climate Initiative. This is great. Our States are doing what we need to do.

But I just want to underscore what many of my colleagues have said. President Trump made the egregious decision to withdraw us from the Paris climate agreement. I was there when U.S. leadership was indispensable in bringing the world community together to take action. Every country in the world joined us in making commitments to reduce our carbon emissions. It was U.S. leadership. The President has withdrawn us from that agreement—or is attempting to do that. We can act. We are an independent branch.

I applaud the action of the House in passing H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act, but it has been 76 days since the House has taken action on this very important climate issue.

Senator SHAHEEN was on the floor earlier and has introduced S. 1743, the International Climate Accountability Act. The United States should meet its nationally determined contributions. We determine our own contributions. We should meet those contributions and join the international community in doing something about climate change.

So, yes, I do ask the majority leader to let the Senate do what we should do. Let us consider climate legislation. Let us debate and act on climate legislation. We shouldn't be the graveyard on these important issues. The Senate must stop denying action on important issues and do the right thing to meet the threat of climate change. It is real here today. I urge my colleagues to bring this issue up so that we can, in fact, do the responsible thing.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 11:30 a.m. on Thursday, July 18, the Senate vote on the Corker and Blanchard nominations and that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered

made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; further, that following disposition of the Blanchard nomination, the Senate resume consideration of the Tapia nomination; finally, that at 1:45 p.m., the Senate vote on the Tapia nomination and that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

#### MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

#### U.S. VICTIMS OF STATE SPONSORED TERRORISM FUND

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I commend my colleague from New York for his tireless work to ensure that the brave men and women who selflessly responded to the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, receive the compensation and care they deserve. Out of respect for his work and their sacrifice I do not want to hold up the passage of this bill. However, I think it is also important that we remember the other Americans who have suffered and lost loved ones at the hands of foreign terrorists. In 1979, a group of Americans were taken hostage from the U.S. Embassy in Tehran, Iran.

In 1981, after 444 days of torture, 52 of them were finally released. Years later, I had the opportunity to meet with several of these brave Americans who reside in my State. In 2015, I worked with my colleagues in this body to ensure that these victims, their families, and other victims of international terrorism were able to receive compensation through the creation of the U.S. Victims of State Sponsored Terrorism Fund. Congress was clear that this fund was created specifically to help the Tehran hostages and other victims of state-sponsored terrorism who were not eligible to participate in other compensation funds.

However, due to a misinterpretation of the statute, the fund has become overwhelmed. This year will mark the 40th anniversary of the Iran Hostage Crisis. Time is not on our side. People who have been waiting for decades are now dying without the compensation they were promised.

Will Senator SCHUMER work with me and Chairman GRAHAM to secure a solution to this problem in the next appropriate vehicle so that the Tehran

hostages and other victims of state-sponsored terrorism can finally receive their due?

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I promise to work with Senator ISAKSON to ensure that the Tehran hostages receive the compensation they deserve and provide equitable treatment for all victims of terrorism.

#### AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, on October 22, 2018, the Departments of Health and Human Services and the Treasury issued a document, entitled State Relief and Empowerment Waivers, relating to section 1332 of the Affordable Care Act and its implementing regulations.

Although it was not submitted to Congress for review under the Congressional Review Act, CRA, this so-called guidance document seemed to me to be a substantive rule that should be subject to review under the CRA. Accordingly, I wrote a letter, along with Chairman PALLONE of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, asking the U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO, to determine whether the CRA applied.

This week, I received a reply, in which the GAO general counsel concludes that the 2018 guidance "is a rule under the CRA, which requires that it be submitted to Congress for review."

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from GAO, dated July 15, 2019, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my remarks. The letter I am now submitting to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is the original document provided by GAO to my office. I will also provide a copy of the GAO letter to the Parliamentarian's office.

Based on Senate precedent, my understanding is that the publication of the GAO legal opinion in today's RECORD will start the "clock" for congressional review under the provisions of the CRA.

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

U.S. GOVERNMENT  
ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE,  
Washington, DC, July 15, 2019.

Subject: Department of Health and Human Services and Department of the Treasury—Applicability of the Congressional Review Act to State Relief and Empowerment Waivers

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

Hon. FRANK PALLONE, JR.,  
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,  
House of Representatives.

This responds to your request for our legal opinion as to whether guidance issued by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and the Department of the Treasury (Treasury) on October 22, 2018, entitled "State Relief and Empowerment Waivers" (2018 Guidance), is a rule for purposes of the Congressional Review Act (CRA). Letter from Ranking Member of the Committee on

Finance, United States Senate, and Chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, House of Representatives, to Comptroller General (Feb. 6, 2019). The 2018 Guidance at issue relates to section 1332 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA) and its implementing regulations. Pub. L. No. 111-148, §1332, 124 Stat. 119, 203-206 (Mar. 23, 2010) (classified at 42 U.S.C. §18052); 45 C.F.R. pt. 155. For the reasons discussed below, we conclude that the 2018 Guidance is a rule under the CRA, which requires that it be submitted to Congress for review.

Our practice when rendering opinions is to contact the relevant agencies and obtain their legal views on the subject of the request. GAO, Procedures and Practices for Legal Decisions and Opinions, GAO-06-1064SP (Washington, D.C.: Sept. 2006), available at [www.gao.gov/products/GAO-06-1064SP](http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-06-1064SP). We contacted HHS and Treasury to obtain the agencies' views. Letter from Managing Associate General Counsel, GAO, to General Counsel, HHS (Mar. 4, 2019); Letter from Managing Associate General Counsel, GAO, to General Counsel, Treasury (Mar. 4, 2019). We received a response on March 22, 2019. Letter from General Counsel, HHS, to Managing Associate General Counsel, GAO (Mar. 22, 2019) (HHS Letter).

#### BACKGROUND

PPACA requires that most United States citizens and legal residents maintain health coverage that meets minimum requirements. 42 U.S.C. §18021. PPACA also requires the establishment of exchanges in every state so that individuals and small businesses can purchase such coverage and contains requirements for exchange functions, such as maintaining web portals for individuals and small businesses to access the exchange and call centers to provide customer service. 42 U.S.C. §18003(a). In addition, PPACA provides for premium tax credits and cost-sharing reductions for eligible individuals, among other things. 26 U.S.C. §36B.

Section 1332 of the statute permits states to seek federal approval to waive certain key requirements under the law. See 42 U.S.C. §18052. For example, section 1332 authorizes HHS and Treasury to approve state proposals to waive PPACA requirements related to, among other things, the maintenance of insurance coverage for individuals, exchange functions, and subsidies for exchange coverage. 42 U.S.C. §18052(a)(2). PPACA requires that state 1332 proposals meet four approval criteria. Specifically, a state proposal must demonstrate that the waiver will result in coverage that is at least as comprehensive, at least as affordable, and available to at least a comparable number of residents as would have been provided without the waiver, and that the waiver will not increase the federal deficit. 42 U.S.C. §18052(b)(1)(A)-(D).

PPACA required that the Secretaries of HHS and Treasury promulgate regulations relating to waivers under section 1332 of PPACA. 42 U.S.C. §18052(a)(4)(B). The regulations were required to include processes for (1) public notice and comment at the state level sufficient to ensure a meaningful level of public input, (2) the submission of an application that ensures the disclosure of the provisions of law that the state involved seeks to waive, (3) additional public notice and comment after the application is received, (4) a process for the submission of periodic reports concerning implementation of the program under the waiver, and (5) periodic evaluation of the program under the waiver. Id. HHS and Treasury issued such regulations on February 27, 2012. Application, Review, and Reporting Process for Waivers for State Innovation, 77 Fed. Reg. 11700 (Feb. 27, 2012) (codified at 45 C.F.R. pt. 155).

On December 16, 2015, HHS and Treasury issued guidance prescribing what a state needs to demonstrate for a waiver proposal to meet the statutory criteria under section 1332 of PPACA and how the proposed waiver will be evaluated. Waivers for State Innovation, 80 Fed. Reg. 78131 (Dec. 16, 2015) (2015 Guidance). For example, the 2015 Guidance provided that assessment of whether the proposal meets the coverage and affordability criteria must take into account effects across different groups of state residents, such that even if a state could demonstrate that the waiver would provide coverage to a comparable number of residents overall, it would not be approved if it reduced coverage for vulnerable groups, like low-income or elderly individuals. Id. at 78132.

In 2018, the Departments issued new guidance superseding the 2015 Guidance. 83 Fed. Reg. 53575 (Oct. 24, 2018). According to HHS and Treasury, the Departments reviewed the 2015 Guidance in accordance with Executive Order 13765 issued in January 2017, which, among other things, called for executive branch agencies with responsibilities under PPACA to "exercise all authority and discretion available to them to provide greater flexibility to states and cooperate with them in implementing healthcare programs." Id. at 53584 (citing Exec. Order No. 13765, Minimizing the Economic Burden of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act Pending Repeal, 82 Fed. Reg. 8351 (Jan. 24, 2017)). As a result of this review, HHS issued updated guidance revising the agency's policies implementing the statutory criteria for a section 1332 waiver. In particular, the 2018 Guidance changed the analysis of comprehensiveness and affordability articulated in the 2015 Guidance. For example, as noted above, the 2015 Guidance prohibited approval of a section 1332 waiver of a state plan that made coverage less comprehensive or affordable for vulnerable groups of residents; whereas, the 2018 Guidance provides that while analysis will continue to consider effects on all categories of residents, the revision gives states more flexibility to decide that improvements in comprehensiveness and affordability for state residents as a whole offset any small detrimental effects for particular residents. 83 Fed. Reg. at 53578. In addition to providing new interpretations for certain provisions of the 1332 waiver criteria, like the 2015 Guidance, the 2018 Guidance explains how the Departments will evaluate each of the statutory requirements for a section 1332 waiver and what a state must include and demonstrate in its waiver proposal to comply with each criterion.

CRA, enacted in 1996 to strengthen congressional oversight of agency rulemaking, requires all federal agencies, including independent regulatory agencies, to submit a report on each new rule to both Houses of Congress and to the Comptroller General before it can take effect. 5 U.S.C. §801 (a)(1). The report must contain a copy of the rule, "a concise general statement relating to the rule," and the rule's proposed effective date. 5 U.S.C. §801 (a)(1)(A). In addition, the agency must submit to the Comptroller General a complete copy of the cost-benefit analysis of the rule, if any, and information concerning the agency's actions relevant to specific procedural rulemaking requirements set forth in various statutes and executive orders governing the regulatory process. 5 U.S.C. §801 (a)(1)(8).

CRA adopts the definition of rule under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), 5 U.S.C. §551(4), which states that a rule is "the whole or a part of an agency statement of general or particular applicability and future effect designed to implement, interpret, or prescribe law or policy or describing the organization, procedure, or practice require-

ments of an agency." 5 U.S.C. §804(3). CRA excludes three categories of rules from coverage:

- (1) rules of particular applicability;
- (2) rules relating to agency management or personnel; and
- (3) rules of agency organization, procedure, or practice that do not substantially affect the rights or obligations of non-agency parties. 5 U.S.C. §804(3).

Neither HHS nor Treasury sent a CRA report on the 2018 Guidance to Congress or the Comptroller General.

#### ANALYSIS

To determine whether the 2018 Guidance is a rule subject to review under CRA, we first address whether the Guidance meets the APA definition of a rule. As explained below, we conclude that it does. The next step, then, is to determine whether any of the CRA exceptions apply. We conclude that they do not.

We can readily conclude that the 2018 Guidance meets the APA definition of a rule upon which the CRA relies. First, the 2018 Guidance is an agency statement, as it was issued by HHS and Treasury announcing supplementary information about the requirements that must be met for the approval of a State Innovation Waiver. Second, the Guidance is of future effect, as the Departments state in the 2018 Guidance that the document will be in effect on the date of publication and will be applicable for section 1332 waivers submitted after the publication date of the 2018 Guidance. Finally, the Guidance is designed to implement, interpret, or prescribe law or policy as it provides interpretations of the section 1332 criteria, sets forth what states need to provide to demonstrate that a waiver proposal meets these statutory criteria, and how the proposed waiver will be evaluated.

In 2012, we examined a substantially similar issue to the one presented here and concluded that an Information Memorandum issued by HHS concerning the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program was a rule for purposes of CRA. 8-323772, Sept. 4, 2012. The TANF program was established by section 402 of the Social Security Act, and provides federal funding to states for both traditional welfare case assistance as well as a variety of other benefits and services to meet the needs of low-income families and children. 42 U.S.C. §601. Section 1115 of the Social Security Act provides HHS with the authority to waive compliance with the requirements of section 402 in cases of experimental, pilot, or demonstration projects that HHS determines are likely to assist in promoting the objectives of TANF. 42 U.S.C. §1315. The HHS Information Memorandum at issue in our 2012 opinion sets forth requirements that must be met for a waiver request to be considered by HHS. We held that the HHS Information Memorandum was concerned with authorizing demonstration projects in the future, rather than evaluation of past or present demonstration projects, and thus was prospective in nature. We also found that because the Information Memorandum stated that HHS will use its statutory authority to consider waiver requests and set out requirements that waiver requests must meet, it was designed to implement, interpret, or prescribe law or policy. Like the HHS Information Memorandum at issue in our 2012 decision, the 2018 Guidance at issue here meets the definition of a rule.

We next consider whether the 2018 Guidance falls within one of the exceptions enumerated in CRA. 5 U.S.C. §804(3)(A)-(C). In this case, the 2018 Guidance is clearly a rule of general and not particular applicability, as it applies to all states. Additionally, the



Guidance is not a rule relating to agency management or personnel. In that regard, our 2012 opinion regarding HHS's Information Memorandum is instructive. See B-323772, at 4. There, we found that the Information Memorandum did not relate to agency management or personnel since it applied to the states.

With respect to the final exception—rules of agency organization, procedure, or practice that do not substantially affect the rights or obligations of non-agency parties—the Guidance issued by HHS and Treasury provides requirements that a state must meet for a waiver proposal to be approved. For that reason, these requirements affect the obligations of states, which are non-agency parties. Our 2012 opinion is again instructive. There, we determined that because the Information Memorandum set out the criteria by which states may apply for waivers from certain obligations of the states, the Information Memorandum affected the rights and obligations of third parties and therefore did not fall under CRA's third exception. We similarly find here that the 2018 Guidance does not fall under CRA's third exception.

We requested the views of the General Counsels of HHS and Treasury on whether the 2018 Guidance is a rule for purposes of CRA. Treasury deferred to HHS's response. HHS responded by letter dated March 22, 2019, stating that the 2018 Guidance is not a rule under CRA because it is not binding and if it were rescinded, it would not alter or affect the rights and obligations of any state or other stakeholder under PPACA. HHS also noted that it informally notified member offices, the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions and Senate Finance Committees, and the House Ways and Means and Education and Labor Committees of the 2018 Guidance. See HHS Letter at 1.

HHS provided a similar response when we requested its views on its Information Memorandum concerning the TANF program. See B-323772, at 5. As we noted in our 2012 opinion, the definition of rule is expansive and specifically includes documents that implement or interpret law or policy, whether or not the agency characterizes the document as non-binding. *Id.* (citing B-281575, January 20, 1999). Finally, as we have stated previously, informal notification does not meet the reporting requirements of CRA. 5 U.S.C. §801(a)(1); B-323772, at 5.

#### CONCLUSION

The 2018 Guidance sets forth what a state needs to provide to demonstrate that its proposal meets the four criteria for a waiver under section 1332 of PPACA and how the proposals will be evaluated. The 2018 Guidance meets the APA definition of a rule and does not fall under an exception as provided in CRA. Accordingly, given our conclusions above, and in accordance with the provisions of 5 U.S.C. §801(a)(1), the 2018 Guidance is subject to the requirement that it be submitted to both Houses of Congress and the Comptroller General before it can take effect.

If you have any questions about this opinion, please contact Shirley A. Jones, Managing Associate General Counsel, or Janet Temko-Blinder, Assistant General Counsel.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS H. ARMSTRONG,  
General Counsel.

#### HELPING ENTREPRENEURS AFFECT REGULATORY DECISIONS ACT

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise to introduce legislation with my friend

and colleague from New Hampshire, Senator SHAHEEN. The Helping Entrepreneurs Affect Regulatory Decisions Act or the HEARD Act is a straightforward bill that would make our government agencies more accessible to our Nation's small business owners and improve participation in the regulatory process.

When Federal agencies, including the Environmental Protection Agency, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, or Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, propose a new regulation with a potential large economic impact, these agencies must convene Small Business Advocacy Review panels. These panels allow for the views of small business owners to be heard. The small businesses provide input on how a particular regulation may affect their business and have a chance to work with the regulators to address challenges and concerns.

As it stands, these panels are open to invitees, but participating is often a challenge, especially when small businesses are often asked to go to these panels at their own expense. Small businesses owners in Maine and other parts of our country can little afford to shut down for the day or use their own money to travel to these panels. Business will not stop because of a meeting held hundreds of miles away. To address these barriers, the HEARD Act would allow a small business to participate remotely. Small businesses, which are the backbone of the American economy, deserve to be heard, especially when we ask for their input, and this bill would help facilitate that.

Small businesses and their advocates support this effort. In my State, the Maine Chamber of Commerce has endorsed this bill because it would allow Mainers to give their input on new regulations more easily. Nationally, the NFIB, which advocates for America's small businesses, supports this bill because it would ensure that Main Street has a voice in the regulatory process.

Our bipartisan legislation would allow small businesses to be a part of the process by providing input and recommendations on regulations that would affect them. I encourage my colleagues to support the HEARD Act to ensure that the Federal Government hears from our small businesses, the backbone of our economy.

#### SENATOR LEAHY'S 16,000TH VOTE

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I congratulate my friend and the senior Senator from Vermont, PATRICK LEAHY, for casting his 16,000th vote in the U.S. Senate. Since he was first elected in 1974, Senator LEAHY has worked tirelessly for the people of Vermont, bringing to Washington, DC, Vermont values: a belief in justice, civic engagement, and the importance of community. Senator LEAHY has long been a champion of human rights, a steward of the environment, and his efforts have brought important Federal re-

sources to our State. I join with his wife Marcelle, his children and grandchildren, and Vermonters throughout our State in congratulating him on this milestone vote and thanking him for his 44 years of dedicated service. I look forward to continuing to work together to represent the people of Vermont.

#### WELCOMING PRESIDENT TSAI INGWEN TO COLORADO

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, today I wish to welcome President Tsai Ingwen of Taiwan to my home State of Colorado.

On Friday, July 19, President Tsai will land in Denver as she transits through the United States on to her way home from official visits with diplomatic allies in the Western Hemisphere.

President Tsai will be the first sitting Taiwan head of state to visit the beautiful State of Colorado. It will indeed be a historic occasion.

This visit to Colorado will highlight the special relationship that our State shares with Taiwan. Colorado exports \$222.7 million in goods to Taiwan, making it the 10th largest export market for the Centennial State, the sixth largest in Asia. It is estimated that over 2,400 jobs in Colorado support the export of services to Taiwan.

Our relationship extends well beyond trade ties. Denver recently became the new home for the Taipei Economic and Cultural Office in 2015. Colorado Springs and Kaohsiung City have been sister cities since 1983.

The shared values of freedom, democracy, and prosperity provide for the strong basis of the longstanding friendship between our two nations. Taiwan is a shining example to its neighbors. In 2019, Taiwan was ranked the second freest country in Asia by Freedom House. It was also ranked the 10th freest economy in the world by the Heritage Foundation.

The strength and vitality of Taiwan's democratic and economic system has made it a beacon of democracy in the Indo-Pacific and throughout the world. The relationship between our two countries is critical for the United States, as we continue to advance the goal of a free and open Indo-Pacific and to promote our shared values in that region.

This is why, during my time in the Senate, I have championed the ties between the United States and Taiwan. On December 31, 2018, President Trump signed into law the Asia Reassurance Initiative Act, which declares that it is the "policy of the United States to support the close economic, political, and security relationship between Taiwan and the United States" and requires regular U.S. arms sales and endorses high-level reciprocal visits between our nations.

President Tsai has graciously welcomed me to Taiwan on four occasions, including a memorable visit several

months ago, when she graciously took me on a tour of Taipei's iconic Dadaocheng neighborhood. It is now my pleasure to return the favor this weekend when she visits my home State.

Welcome, President Tsai, to the Centennial State, and may we continue to strengthen the bonds of friendship between our nations and our peoples.

#### TRIBUTE TO PHIL AND JODY SCHMIDT

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I rise today in celebration of Phil and Jody Schmidt, the Boys and Girls Club of Central Wyoming's 2019 honorees.

Since 1978, the Boys and Girls Club of Central Wyoming has committed itself to making a positive difference in the lives of children. Their mission is to inspire all youth, especially those who need them most. The goal is to help these children to reach their full potential as productive, responsible, and caring citizens. Their activities provide the children in our community a sense of dedication, purpose, and belonging.

The Boys and Girls Club will host its annual awards and recognition breakfast on August 28, 2019. This event celebrates the outstanding efforts by individuals who have made remarkable and significant contributions to the Boys and Girls Club mission and to the City of Casper.

Phil and Jody Schmidt will be honored at this year's breakfast. Their lifelong commitment toward bettering the lives of youth in the Casper community is remarkable. Their dedication to Wyoming's young people embodies the Boys and Girls Club of Central Wyoming's charge to better the lives of children in Casper.

Phil is a devoted family man, successful businessman, and selfless community member. After graduating from high school, Phil attended Black Hills State University, earning a bachelor's degree in business administration with an emphasis in accounting. Phil and Jody moved to Casper in 1982, immersing themselves in the community. Phil began his career as a CPA. In 1988, he became the president and owner of Greiner Motor Companies. Under his guidance, Greiner Motors grew from one dealership to three, employing almost 300 people. Phil received the Ford Motor Company's "Salute to Dealers" award in 2009. The award commends dealers "exhibiting unparalleled dedication to their communities." Phil was one of six recipients, selected from almost 6,000 dealers.

Remarkably, Phil's hard work and contributions to the Casper community extend far beyond his business successes. Phil and the employees of Greiner Motor Companies led a cleanup effort of Casper Skate Park in 2004. Phil recognized a clean, safe park would give Casper youth an area where they could safely socialize and develop athletic skills. Greiner Motor Companies also helped to host the "Fill-A-

Ford" food drive, parking Ford pickups at various bank branches to collect canned good and donations for food banks. They raised \$26,000 and collected enough canned goods to fill up three pickup trucks.

Phil also devotes much of his time and energy serving on the boards of many outstanding organizations. Any group lucky enough to have Phil on its board is destined for success. The Boys and Girls Club of Central Wyoming, Casper Family YMCA, Wyoming Medical Center, Wyoming Auto Dealers, the Natrona County Library Foundation, and the Wyoming Transportation Commission have all benefited from his servant leadership. Phil credits Jody for his great success. Her support and strength during times of both hardship and good fortune allowed Phil to thrive with his ventures.

Jody is a dedicated mother and caring wife. Raised in Fruitdale, SD, alongside five siblings, Jody learned the values of hard work and community involvement from her parents. They ran the family's beekeeping business, McIntire Honey. Her father, Russell, served on the board of directors for their local hospital, delivered Meals on Wheels to his neighbors in need, and served as a member and Grand Knight in their local council of the Knights of Columbus. Her mother, Betty, served in the local community club and was honored for her work as a hospital auxiliary volunteer. Their values of kindness and generosity were instilled in Jody, who then brought them to the Casper community.

Jody also supports their neighbors and community with volunteer work and service efforts. She serves on the boards of the National Alliance on Mental Issues and Interfaith of Natrona County. She volunteers at Holy Cross Center with the food bank ministry and helps St. Anthony Tri-Parish School in countless areas, including coordinating charity runs and auction galas. Like my wife Bobbi, Jody is a strong, resilient breast cancer survivor. She is a pillar of courage and perseverance.

Phil and Jody have been married 37 years and were blessed with six children: Allyson, Madelyn, Reid, Evan, James, and Nathan. The family persevered through tremendous pain; their sons Evan and Reid passed away at the ages of 11 and 29, respectively. In the wake of this tremendous personal challenge, Phil and Jody chose to continue their commitment to others. They looked past their pain, turning tough times into a means to assist and help care for those in need. They believe their difficult experiences give them the ability to come alongside others who face similar challenges. This mindset of perseverance demonstrates just how deserving they are of this award.

There is no doubt the work and endless hours given by Phil and Jody will continue to shape and improve countless lives for years to come. Together,

the couple represent Wyoming's characteristic strength, resilience and determination. Their generosity is exceptional. In the midst of enormous challenges the pair find the courage to not only push on, but to help others do the same.

It is with great honor that I recognize these exceptional members of our Wyoming community. My wife, Bobbi, joins me in extending our congratulations to Phil and Jody Schmidt for this special acknowledgement.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### TRIBUTE TO MAJOR GENERAL MARK BERRY

• Mr. BOOZMAN. President, today I wish to pay tribute to MG Mark Berry for his exemplary dedication to duty and service as the adjutant general for the Arkansas National Guard. General Berry is retiring from his position on August 10, 2019.

A Texas native, General Berry enlisted in the Air Force in August 1974. He also furthered his education while serving, receiving a bachelor of aeronautics from Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University and earning a masters of public administration from Golden Gate University.

Major General Berry has served the United States in a broad capacity during his 45-year career with the Armed Forces. Upon completion of basic training, he began technical training as an air traffic controller. In 1985, he attended officer training school with follow-on training as an air traffic control officer. General Berry separated from his Active-Duty role in September 1992 to join the Arkansas Air National Guard as a public affairs officer.

During his time in the National Guard, he served as a communication flight commander, mission support group commander, and maintenance group commander. In the State of Arkansas, Berry served as the vice-chairman of the Air National Guard A-10 Aircraft Maintenance Council until receiving the honor of becoming the president of the National Guard Association of Arkansas. In 2015, General Berry was given his most distinguished assignment when he was appointed adjutant general for the Arkansas National Guard.

Throughout his time in Arkansas, I have worked closely with General Berry to ensure our National Guard not only meets but exceeds the standards needed to protect our State and country. During times of crisis or disaster in the State, General Berry made certain the National Guard was prepared and able to respond quickly and effectively. He has represented himself, the Arkansas Guard, and our Armed Forces with consistent professionalism, diligence, and commitment. I have nothing but respect and gratitude for the job he has done as the leader of our State's National Guard.

Major General Berry has received numerous awards and recognitions for his service to the United States during his career, including the Legion of Merit for exceptional conduct in the performance of his services to our Nation, and has had a positive impact on the lives of many servicemembers, peers, and superiors. His accomplishments reflect highly not only on himself, but also on the men and women of our Nation's military. As his time in uniform comes to an end, we honor his dedication to our country and his invaluable service to the U.S. Air Force and Arkansas National Guard.

It was a genuine pleasure to have worked with MG Mark Berry throughout his years serving his country and our State. I commend General Berry for his exceptional service and decorated career and greatly appreciate his friendship of many years. We wish him all the best as he begins his retirement from the U.S. Armed Forces.●

#### RECOGNIZING LEVATAS

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, it is my honor to recognize a small business that exemplifies innovation, entrepreneurship, and hard work. This week, it is my privilege to name Levatas of Palm Beach Gardens, FL, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

Levatas is a strategic marketing and consulting firm that uses artificial intelligence—AI—and machine learning technologies to develop solutions for their clients. They utilize AI technology to help the manufacturing industry and other companies better understand their customers. Levatas was started 13 years ago by Chris Nielsen in his Jupiter, FL, garage. Nielsen and his team have since expanded to become one of south Florida's leader in AI solutions.

Moving from Jupiter, FL, Levatas expanded to their current office in Palm Beach Gardens and recently announced a second expansion, headquartered in Rosemary Square, where an additional 50 new jobs will be created.

A large part of their success lies in Levatas's excellent company culture. In fact, Levatas was recently honored by Entrepreneur magazine in the "2018 Top Company Cultures" for the "Small Companies" category. They have also been recognized by the Florida community as well. In 2018, Palm Beach Tech Association awarded Chris Nielsen, Ryan Gay, CEO of Levatas, and Levatas Golden Palm awards for excellence. In addition to numerous accolades, Levatas has made significant contributions to their community. Through Levatas's GenerosiTeam initiative, employees have supported local philanthropic organizations including the Big Heart Brigade, Sheridan House, One Blood Organization Blood Drive, Children's Miracle Network donation drive, and other nonprofits.

Levatas has cemented themselves as a local hub for innovation in the Palm

Beach community. Levatas's extensive clientele spans many industries and includes companies such as Royal Caribbean Cruise Line, Orangetheory Fitness, SunTrust Bank, HSBC, Dell, IBM, Discover the Palm Beaches, Duffy's Sports Grill, and more. Renowned for their phenomenal quality of service, Levatas's innovative solutions for digital transformation showcase their significant experience in building technology and bringing products to market.

Levatas has remained true to their core values by focusing on quality service with an expert ability to provide innovative, creative, and experienced solutions to shape brands and build technology. Furthermore, Levatas is a phenomenal example of how hard work can lead to success. It is with great pleasure that I extend my congratulations to Chris Nielsen and all of the members of the Levatas community. Levatas has an exciting future ahead, and I look forward to watching your continued success.●

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Roberts, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

#### MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 1327. To extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2092, and for other purposes.

#### EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC-1992. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Mid-Session Review of the Budget of the U.S. Government for Fiscal Year 2020"; to the Committees on Appropriations; and the Budget.

EC-1993. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of three (3) 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 frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1994. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removal of Transferred OTS Regulations Regarding Lending and Investment; and Conforming Amendments to Other Regulation" (RIN3064-AE22) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 12, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1995. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the Filing Process for Commission Forms" ((RIN1902-AF58) (Docket No. RM19-12-000)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2019; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1996. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act: 2018 Report to Congress"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1997. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the hurricane storm surge damage risk reduction and ecosystem restoration in Calcasieu, Cameron, and Vermillion Parishes in southwest Louisiana; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1998. A communication from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Priorities, Requirements, Definitions, and Selection Criteria—Expanding Opportunity Through Quality Charter Schools Program; Grants to Charter School Developers for the Opening of New Charter Schools and for the Republication and Expansion of High-Quality Charter Schools" (RIN1855-AA14) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 12, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1999. A communication from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Program Integrity: Gainful Employment" (RIN1840-AD31) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 12, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2000. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "New Animal Drugs; Updating Tolerances for Residues of New Animal Drugs in Food" ((RIN1910-AG17) (Docket No. FDA-2012-N-1067)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2001. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the Department's 2017 FAIR Act Inventory of Inherently Governmental Activities and Inventory of Commercial Activities; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2002. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report

on D.C. Act 23-70, "Fair Elections Temporary Amendment Act of 2019"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2003. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-71, "Adams Morgan Business Improvement District Temporary Amendment Act of 2019"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2004. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-73, "Florida Avenue Multimodal Project Completion Temporary Amendment Act of 2019"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2005. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-74, "Fiscal Year 2019 Revised Local Budget Temporary Adjustment Act of 2019"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2006. A communication from the Acting Chief Privacy Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Department of Homeland Security Privacy Office's Fiscal Year 2019 Semiannual Report to Congress"; to the Committees on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; Select Committee on Intelligence; and the Judiciary.

EC-2007. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the activities of the Department of Justice to investigate and prosecute unsolved civil rights-era homicides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2008. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River, Miles 483 to 484, Rock Island, IL" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0513)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 11, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2009. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Lake of the Ozarks, Sunrise Beach, MO" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0525)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 11, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2010. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River, Chester, IL, Thebes, IL" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0416)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 11, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2011. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway, Atlantic City, NJ" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0537)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 11, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2012. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled

"Safety Zone; Fireworks Display, Delaware River, Chester, PA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0403)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 11, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2013. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Fireworks Display, Delaware River, Philadelphia, PA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0338)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 11, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2014. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Vallejo Independence Day Fireworks Display; Mare Island Strait, Vallejo, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0379)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 11, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2015. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; City of Benicia Fourth of July Fireworks Display, Carquinez Strait, Benicia, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0393)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 11, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2016. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Redwood City Independence Day Fireworks Display; Port of Redwood City, Redwood City, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0467)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 11, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2017. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Newport 4th of July Fireworks, Yaquina Bay, Newport, OR" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0520)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 11, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2018. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "San Francisco Waterfront Celebration Fireworks Display; San Francisco Bay, San Francisco, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0492)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 11, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2019. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone, Fourth of July Fireworks Patriots Point, Charleston, SC" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0372)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 11, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2020. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone, City of North Charleston Fireworks, North Charleston, SC" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0371)) received

in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 11, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2021. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Columbia River, Fireworks Kennewick, WA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0323)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 11, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2022. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Columbia River, Fireworks Umatilla, OR" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0324)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 11, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-117. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Maine urging the President of the United States and the United States Congress to enact legislation to allow the importation of safe, affordable prescription medications from Canada and other Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development nations; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

#### HOUSE PAPER NO. 1184

Whereas, Maine residents have a high median age and a low median income and are especially vulnerable to high prescription drug costs; and

Whereas, in Canada, within walking distance of Maine's border, the same medications used by Maine residents, manufactured by the same companies in the same factories, are available for a fraction of the price charged in the United States; and

Whereas, Maine has previously allowed the personal importation of safe prescription medications, which saved residents and businesses as much as half the cost of their medications, significantly decreasing their health care and insurance costs; and

Whereas, Maine's ability to import such medications has since been blocked by federal law, thus inserting the Federal Government between Maine people and potentially lifesaving medications while also preventing free-market competition from working to benefit consumers; and

Whereas, in 2014, Americans spent \$1,112 per person on prescription drugs while Canadians spent \$772 and Danes spent \$325, and nearly one in three Americans have been unable to afford the medicine they were prescribed at some point in their lives; and

Whereas, multiple members of Congress from both major political parties, including Maine's delegation, have introduced legislation to allow wholesalers, pharmacies and individuals to import qualifying prescription drugs from licensed sellers in Canada and other member nations of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, using standards for the approval and sale of such medications comparable to those in the United States, that are purchased from an entity certified by the United States Food and Drug Administration and that have the same active ingredient, strength and route of administration as drugs approved in the United States; and

Whereas, the President's health care proposal prior to his election read as follows: "Congress will need the courage to step away from the special interests and do what is right for Americans . . . Allowing consumers access to imported, safe and dependable drugs from overseas will bring more options to consumers"; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That We, your Memorialists, on behalf of the people we represent, take this opportunity to respectfully request that the President of the United States and the United States Congress enact legislation to allow the importation of safe, affordable prescription medications from Canada and other Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development nations; and be it further

*Resolved*, That suitable copies of this resolution, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be transmitted to the Honorable Donald J. Trump, President of the United States; the President of the United States Senate; the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; and each Member of the Maine Congressional Delegation.

### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 2135. A bill to require U.S. Customs and Border Protection to perform an initial health screening on detainees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 2136. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the ability of veterans to receive in-state tuition using educational assistance administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 2137. A bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 2138. A bill to waive participant fees on small-dollar and veteran Express loans in the largest loan program of the Small Business Administration to close the capital gap for underserved business owners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 2139. A bill to prohibit the award of Federal Government contracts to inverted domestic corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 2140. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the rules relating to inverted corporations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 2141. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to supplement the reporting require-

ments applicable to the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 2142. A bill to allow remote participation on review panels under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 2143. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to expand the eligibility of students to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 2144. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to prepare a threat and operational analysis of the use of remittances by drug kingpins, crime syndicates, and other persons to finance terrorism, narcotics trafficking, human trafficking, money laundering, and other forms of illicit financing, domestically or internationally; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. ERNST (for herself, Mr. BRAUN, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 2145. A bill to prohibit the payment of bonuses to contractors for unsatisfactory performance; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 2146. A bill to enable incarcerated persons to petition a Federal court for a second look at sentences longer than 10 years, where the person is not a danger to the safety of any person or the community, and has shown they are ready for reentry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. PETERS, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 2147. A bill to double the existing penalties for the provision of misleading or inaccurate caller identification information, and to extend the statute of limitations for forfeiture penalties for persons who commit such violations; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 2148. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide additional awards for disaster recovery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 2149. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to create a program to provide funding for organizations that support startup businesses in formation and early growth stages by providing entrepreneurs with resources and services to produce viable businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 2150. A bill to establish a regional high-growth collaborative pilot program in the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 2151. A bill to amend section 287 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to prohibit immigration officers and agents of the Department of Homeland Security from wearing clothing or other items bearing the word "police"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 2152. A bill to require a study and report on Coast Guard interdiction of illicit drugs in the transit zones, and for other purposes;

to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 2153. A bill to require a report on the effects of climate change on the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 2154. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to carry out a program to enhance the preparation of students in the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps for careers in computer science and cybersecurity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 2155. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to issue rules requiring private funds to publicly disclose certain information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

### SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. Res. 277. A resolution remembering the 25th Anniversary of the bombing of the Argentine Israelite Mutual Association (AMIA) Jewish Community Center in Buenos Aires, Argentina, and recommitting to efforts to uphold justice for the 85 victims of the attacks; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. WARREN, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. Con. Res. 22. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that there is a climate emergency which demands a massive-scale mobilization to halt, reverse, and address its consequences and causes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 27

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 27, a bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to transfer certain funds to the 1974 United Mine Workers of America Pension Plan, and for other purposes.

S. 116

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 116, a bill to address maternal mortality and morbidity.

S. 229

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 229, a bill to provide advance appropriations authority for certain accounts of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Bureau of Indian Education of the Department of the Interior and the Indian

Health Service of the Department of Health and Human Services, and for other purposes.

S. 256

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 256, a bill 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.

S. 521

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 521, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 638

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 638, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to designate per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, Liability Act of 1980, and for other purposes.

S. 651

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 651, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the age requirement with respect to eligibility for qualified ABLE programs.

S. 944

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 944, a bill to enhance the security operations of the Transportation Security Administration and the stability of the transportation security workforce by applying a unified personnel system under title 5, United States Code, to employees of the Transportation Security Administration who are responsible for screening passengers and property, and for other purposes.

S. 976

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 976, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act to combat campus sexual assault, and for other purposes.

S. 983

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 983, a bill to amend the Energy Conservation and Production Act to reauthorize the weatherization assistance program, and for other purposes.

S. 1027

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota

(Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1027, a bill to clarify the status of the North Country, Ice Age, and New England National Scenic Trails as units of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

S. 1166

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1166, a bill to direct the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information to make grants for the establishment or expansion of internet exchange facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 1188

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 1188, a bill to promote United States-Mongolia trade by authorizing duty-free treatment for certain imports from Mongolia, and for other purposes.

S. 1203

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1203, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to improve the public service loan forgiveness program, and for other purposes.

S. 1219

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1219, a bill to provide for the discharge of parent borrower liability if a student on whose behalf a parent has received certain student loans becomes disabled.

S. 1236

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1236, a bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to clarify the composition of the membership of the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board, and for other purposes.

S. 1243

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1243, a bill to provide standards for facilities at which aliens in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security are detained, and for other purposes.

S. 1273

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1273, a bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to establish an alternative dispute resolution program for copyright small claims, and for other purposes.

S. 1338

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1338, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to direct the Secretary of Education to issue guidance

and recommendations for institutions of higher education on removing criminal and juvenile justice questions from their application for admissions process.

S. 1350

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1350, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to limit the liability of health care professionals who volunteer to provide health care services in response to a disaster.

S. 1383

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1383, a bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to provide a guarantee of residency for registration of businesses of spouses of members of the uniformed services, to improve occupational license portability for military spouses through interstate compacts, and for other purposes.

S. 1421

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1421, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 23d Headquarters Special Troops and the 3133d Signal Service Company in recognition of their unique and distinguished service as a "Ghost Army" that conducted deception operations in Europe during World War II.

S. 1572

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1572, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require additional reporting on crime and harm that occurs during student participation in programs of study abroad, and for other purposes.

S. 1701

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1701, a bill to address foreign threats to higher education in the United States.

S. 1703

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1703, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the low-income housing credit, and for other purposes.

S. 1728

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms.



CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1728, a bill to require the United States Postal Service to sell the Alzheimer's semipostal stamp for 6 additional years.

S. 1791

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1791, a bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of religion, sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity), and marital status in the administration and provision of child welfare services, to improve safety, well-being, and permanency for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer or questioning foster youth, and for other purposes.

S. 1936

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1936, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to protect coverage for screening mammography, and for other purposes.

S. 1979

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1979, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for the minimum size of crews of freight trains, and for other purposes.

S. 2011

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2011, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reduce the credit hour requirement for the Edith Nourse Rogers STEM Scholarship program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 2054

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 2054, a bill to posthumously award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to Glen Doherty, Tyrone Woods, J. Christopher Stevens, and Sean Smith, in recognition of their contributions to the Nation.

S. 2080

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2080, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the number of permanent faculty in palliative care at accredited allopathic and osteopathic medical schools, nursing schools, social work schools, and other programs, including physician assistant education programs, to promote education and research in palliative care and hospice, and to support the development of faculty careers in academic palliative medicine.

S. 2083

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2083, a bill to amend chapter 2205 of title 36, United States Code, to ensure pay equity for amateur athletes, and for other purposes.

S. 2110

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2110, a bill to address food and housing insecurity on college campuses.

S.J. RES. 50

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 50, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, relating to "Contributions in Exchange for State or Local Tax Credits".

S. CON. RES. 19

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 19, a concurrent resolution celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Apollo 11 Moon landing.

S. RES. 120

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 120, a resolution opposing efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel and the Global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions Movement targeting Israel.

S. RES. 234

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 234, a resolution affirming the United States commitment to the two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and noting that Israeli annexation of territory in the West Bank would undermine peace and Israel's future as a Jewish and democratic state.

S. RES. 263

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 263, a resolution honoring the 100th anniversary of The American Legion.

S. RES. 274

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cospon-

sors of S. Res. 274, a resolution expressing solidarity with Falun Gong practitioners who have lost lives, freedoms, and other rights for adhering to their beliefs and practices, and condemning the practice of non-consenting organ harvesting, and for other purposes.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 2139. A bill to prohibit the award of Federal Government contracts to inverted domestic corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2139

*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 "American Business for American Companies Act of 2019".

#### SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON AWARDING CONTRACTS TO INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.

(a) CIVILIAN CONTRACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 47 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

#### "§ 4714. Prohibition on awarding contracts to inverted domestic corporations

“(a) PROHIBITION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of an executive agency may not award a contract for the procurement of property or services to—

“(A) any foreign incorporated entity that such head has determined is an inverted domestic corporation or any subsidiary of such entity; or

“(B) any joint venture if more than 10 percent of the joint venture (by vote or value) is held by a foreign incorporated entity that such head has determined is an inverted domestic corporation or any subsidiary of such entity.

“(2) SUBCONTRACTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The head of an executive agency shall include in each contract for the procurement of property or services awarded by the executive agency with a value in excess of \$10,000,000, other than a contract for exclusively commercial items, a clause that prohibits the prime contractor on such contract from—

“(i) awarding a first-tier subcontract with a value greater than 10 percent of the total value of the prime contract to an entity or joint venture described in paragraph (1); or

“(ii) structuring subcontract tiers in a manner designed to avoid the limitation in paragraph (1) by enabling an entity or joint venture described in paragraph (1) to perform more than 10 percent of the total value of the prime contract as a lower-tier subcontractor.

“(B) PENALTIES.—The contract clause included in contracts pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall provide that, in the event that the prime contractor violates the contract clause—

“(i) the prime contract may be terminated for default; and

“(ii) the matter may be referred to the suspension or debarment official for the appropriate agency and may be a basis for suspension or debarment of the prime contractor.

“(b) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, a foreign incorporated entity shall be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if, pursuant to a plan (or a series of related transactions)—

“(A) the entity completes on or after May 8, 2014, the direct or indirect acquisition of—

“(i) substantially all of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation; or

“(ii) substantially all of the assets of, or substantially all of the properties constituting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership; and

“(B) after the acquisition, either—

“(i) more than 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of the entity is held—

“(I) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic corporation, by former shareholders of the domestic corporation by reason of holding stock in the domestic corporation; or

“(II) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership; or

“(ii) the management and control of the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity occurs, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States, as determined pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and such expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities.

“(2) EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATIONS WITH SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRY OF ORGANIZATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A foreign incorporated entity described in paragraph (1) shall not be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if after the acquisition the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity has substantial business activities in the foreign country in which or under the law of which the entity is created or organized when compared to the total business activities of such expanded affiliated group.

“(B) SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary’s delegate) shall establish regulations for determining whether an affiliated group has substantial business activities for purposes of subparagraph (A), except that such regulations may not treat any group as having substantial business activities if such group would not be considered to have substantial business activities under the regulations prescribed under section 7874 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as in effect on January 18, 2017.

“(3) SIGNIFICANT DOMESTIC BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(B)(ii), an expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities if at least 25 percent of—

“(i) the employees of the group are based in the United States;

“(ii) the employee compensation incurred by the group is incurred with respect to employees based in the United States;

“(iii) the assets of the group are located in the United States; or

“(iv) the income of the group is derived in the United States.

“(B) DETERMINATION.—Determinations pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall be made in the same manner as such determinations are made for purposes of determining substantial business activities under regulations referred to in paragraph (2) as in effect on January 18, 2017, but applied by treating all ref-

erences in such regulations to ‘foreign country’ and ‘relevant foreign country’ as references to ‘the United States’. The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary’s delegate) may issue regulations decreasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute significant domestic business activities for purposes of this paragraph.

“(c) WAIVER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of an executive agency may waive subsection (a) with respect to any Federal Government contract under the authority of such head if the head determines that the waiver is—

“(A) required in the interest of national security; or

“(B) necessary for the efficient or effective administration of Federal or federally funded—

“(i) programs that provide health benefits to individuals; or

“(ii) public health programs.

“(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The head of an executive agency issuing a waiver under paragraph (1) shall, not later than 14 days after issuing such waiver, submit a written notification of the waiver to the relevant authorizing committees of Congress and the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

“(d) APPLICABILITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), this section shall not apply to any contract entered into before the date of the enactment of this section.

“(2) TASK AND DELIVERY ORDERS.—This section shall apply to any task or delivery order issued after the date of the enactment of this section pursuant to a contract entered into before, on, or after such date of enactment.

“(3) SCOPE.—This section applies only to contracts subject to regulation under the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

“(e) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ‘expanded affiliated group’, ‘foreign incorporated entity’, ‘person’, ‘domestic’, and ‘foreign’ have the meaning given those terms in section 835(c) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 395(c)).

“(2) SPECIAL RULES.—In applying subsection (b) of this section for purposes of subsection (a) of this section, the rules described under 835(c)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 395(c)(1)) shall apply.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 47 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 4713 the following new item:

“4714. Prohibition on awarding contracts to inverted domestic corporations.”

(b) DEFENSE CONTRACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 2339. Prohibition on awarding contracts to inverted domestic corporations

“(a) PROHIBITION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of an agency may not award a contract for the procurement of property or services to—

“(A) any foreign incorporated entity that such head has determined is an inverted domestic corporation or any subsidiary of such entity; or

“(B) any joint venture if more than 10 percent of the joint venture (by vote or value) is owned by a foreign incorporated entity that such head has determined is an inverted domestic corporation or any subsidiary of such entity.

“(2) SUBCONTRACTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The head of an executive agency shall include in each contract for

the procurement of property or services awarded by the executive agency with a value in excess of \$10,000,000, other than a contract for exclusively commercial items, a clause that prohibits the prime contractor on such contract from—

“(i) awarding a first-tier subcontract with a value greater than 10 percent of the total value of the prime contract to an entity or joint venture described in paragraph (1); or

“(ii) structuring subcontract tiers in a manner designed to avoid the limitation in paragraph (1) by enabling an entity or joint venture described in paragraph (1) to perform more than 10 percent of the total value of the prime contract as a lower-tier subcontractor.

“(B) PENALTIES.—The contract clause included in contracts pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall provide that, in the event that the prime contractor violates the contract clause—

“(i) the prime contract may be terminated for default; and

“(ii) the matter may be referred to the suspension or debarment official for the appropriate agency and may be a basis for suspension or debarment of the prime contractor.

“(b) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, a foreign incorporated entity shall be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if, pursuant to a plan (or a series of related transactions)—

“(A) the entity completes on or after May 8, 2014, the direct or indirect acquisition of—

“(i) substantially all of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation; or

“(ii) substantially all of the assets of, or substantially all of the properties constituting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership; and

“(B) after the acquisition, either—

“(i) more than 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of the entity is held—

“(I) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic corporation, by former shareholders of the domestic corporation by reason of holding stock in the domestic corporation; or

“(II) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership; or

“(ii) the management and control of the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity occurs, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States, as determined pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and such expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities.

“(2) EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATIONS WITH SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRY OF ORGANIZATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A foreign incorporated entity described in paragraph (1) shall not be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if after the acquisition the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity has substantial business activities in the foreign country in which or under the law of which the entity is created or organized when compared to the total business activities of such expanded affiliated group.

“(B) SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary’s delegate) shall establish regulations for determining whether an affiliated group has substantial business activities for purposes of subparagraph (A), except that such regulations may not treat any group as having substantial business activities if such

group would not be considered to have substantial business activities under the regulations prescribed under section 7874 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as in effect on January 18, 2017.

“(3) SIGNIFICANT DOMESTIC BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(B)(ii), an expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities if at least 25 percent of—

“(i) the employees of the group are based in the United States;

“(ii) the employee compensation incurred by the group is incurred with respect to employees based in the United States;

“(iii) the assets of the group are located in the United States; or

“(iv) the income of the group is derived in the United States.

“(B) DETERMINATION.—Determinations pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall be made in the same manner as such determinations are made for purposes of determining substantial business activities under regulations referred to in paragraph (2) as in effect on January 18, 2017, but applied by treating all references in such regulations to ‘foreign country’ and ‘relevant foreign country’ as references to ‘the United States’. The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary’s delegate) may issue regulations decreasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute significant domestic business activities for purposes of this paragraph.

“(C) WAIVER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of an agency may waive subsection (a) with respect to any Federal Government contract under the authority of such head if the head determines that the waiver is required in the interest of national security or is necessary for the efficient or effective administration of Federal or federally funded programs that provide health benefits to individuals.

“(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The head of an agency issuing a waiver under paragraph (1) shall, not later than 14 days after issuing such waiver, submit a written notification of the waiver to the congressional defense committees.

“(d) APPLICABILITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), this section shall not apply to any contract entered into before the date of the enactment of this section.

“(2) TASK AND DELIVERY ORDERS.—This section shall apply to any task or delivery order issued after the date of the enactment of this section pursuant to a contract entered into before, on, or after such date of enactment.

“(3) SCOPE.—This section applies only to contracts subject to regulation under the Federal Acquisition Regulation and the Defense Supplement to the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

“(e) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ‘expanded affiliated group’, ‘foreign incorporated entity’, ‘person’, ‘domestic’, and ‘foreign’ have the meaning given those terms in section 835(c) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 395(c)).

“(2) SPECIAL RULES.—In applying subsection (b) of this section for purposes of subsection (a) of this section, the rules described under 835(c)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 395(c)(1)) shall apply.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2338 the following new item:

“2339. Prohibition on awarding contracts to inverted domestic corporations.”

(c) REGULATIONS REGARDING MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary’s delegate) shall, for purposes of section 4714(b)(1)(B)(ii) of title 41, United States Code, and section 2339(b)(1)(B)(ii) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsections (a) and (b), respectively, prescribe regulations for purposes of determining cases in which the management and control of an expanded affiliated group is to be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States. The regulations prescribed under the preceding sentence shall apply to periods after May 8, 2014.

(2) EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND SENIOR MANAGEMENT.—The regulations prescribed under paragraph (1) shall provide that the management and control of an expanded affiliated group shall be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States if substantially all of the executive officers and senior management of the expanded affiliated group who exercise day-to-day responsibility for making decisions involving strategic, financial, and operational policies of the expanded affiliated group are based or primarily located within the United States. Individuals who in fact exercise such day-to-day responsibilities shall be treated as executive officers and senior management regardless of their title.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 2140. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the rules relating to inverted corporations; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2140

*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 “Stop Corporate Inversions Act of 2019”.

**SEC. 2. MODIFICATIONS TO RULES RELATING TO INVERTED CORPORATIONS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 7874 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(b) INVERTED CORPORATIONS TREATED AS DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 7701(a)(4), a foreign corporation shall be treated for purposes of this title as a domestic corporation if—

“(A) such corporation would be a surrogate foreign corporation if subsection (a)(2) were applied by substituting ‘80 percent’ for ‘60 percent’, or

“(B) such corporation is an inverted domestic corporation.

“(2) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—For purposes of this subsection, a foreign corporation shall be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if, pursuant to a plan (or a series of related transactions)—

“(A) the entity completes after May 8, 2014, the direct or indirect acquisition of—

“(i) substantially all of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation, or

“(ii) substantially all of the assets of, or substantially all of the properties consti-

tuting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership, and

“(B) after the acquisition, either—

“(i) more than 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of the entity is held—

“(I) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic corporation, by former shareholders of the domestic corporation by reason of holding stock in the domestic corporation, or

“(II) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership, or

“(ii) the management and control of the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity occurs, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States, and such expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities.

“(3) EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATIONS WITH SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRY OF ORGANIZATION.—A foreign corporation described in paragraph (2) shall not be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if after the acquisition the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity has substantial business activities in the foreign country in which or under the law of which the entity is created or organized when compared to the total business activities of such expanded affiliated group. For purposes of subsection (a)(2)(B)(iii) and the preceding sentence, the term ‘substantial business activities’ shall have the meaning given such term under regulations in effect on January 18, 2017, except that the Secretary may issue regulations increasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute substantial business activities for purposes of this paragraph.

“(4) MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL.—For purposes of paragraph (2)(B)(ii)—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations for purposes of determining cases in which the management and control of an expanded affiliated group is to be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States. The regulations prescribed under the preceding sentence shall apply to periods after May 8, 2014.

“(B) EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND SENIOR MANAGEMENT.—Such regulations shall provide that the management and control of an expanded affiliated group shall be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States if substantially all of the executive officers and senior management of the expanded affiliated group who exercise day-to-day responsibility for making decisions involving strategic, financial, and operational policies of the expanded affiliated group are based or primarily located within the United States. Individuals who in fact exercise such day-to-day responsibilities shall be treated as executive officers and senior management regardless of their title.

“(5) SIGNIFICANT DOMESTIC BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—For purposes of paragraph (2)(B)(ii), an expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities if at least 25 percent of—

“(A) the employees of the group are based in the United States,

“(B) the employee compensation incurred by the group is incurred with respect to employees based in the United States,

“(C) the assets of the group are located in the United States, or

“(D) the income of the group is derived in the United States,

determined in the same manner as such determinations are made for purposes of determining substantial business activities under regulations referred to in paragraph (3) as in effect on January 18, 2017, but applied by treating all references in such regulations to ‘foreign country’ and ‘relevant foreign country’ as references to ‘the United States’. The Secretary may issue regulations decreasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute significant domestic business activities for purposes of this paragraph.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Clause (i) of section 7874(a)(2)(B) of such Code is amended by striking “after March 4, 2003,” and inserting “after March 4, 2003, and before May 8, 2014.”.

(2) Subsection (c) of section 7874 of such Code is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii)” and inserting “subsections (a)(2)(B)(i) and (b)(2)(B)(i)”;

(ii) by inserting “or (b)(2)(A)” after “(a)(2)(B)(i)” in subparagraph (B);

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting “or (b)(2)(B)(i), as the case may be,” after “(a)(2)(B)(i)”;

(C) in paragraph (5), by striking “subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii)” and inserting “subsections (a)(2)(B)(i) and (b)(2)(B)(i)”;

(D) in paragraph (6), by inserting “or inverted domestic corporation, as the case may be,” after “surrogate foreign corporation”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after May 8, 2014.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. PETERS, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 2147. A bill to double the existing penalties for the provision of misleading or inaccurate caller identification information, and to extend the statute of limitations for forfeiture penalties for persons who commit such violations; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the “Anti-Spoofing Penalty Modernization Act of 2019” with my colleague, Senator SINEMA, who serves with me on the Senate Committee on Aging, which I chair. I am also pleased that Senators HAWLEY, PETERS, and MCSALLY have joined as original cosponsors.

This morning, the Senate Aging Committee held its 23rd hearing in the past six years to examine scams targeting our Nation’s seniors. Scams the Committee has examined include the infamous IRS imposter scam the Jamaican Lottery scam, computer tech support scams, grandparent scams, elder financial exploitation, identity theft, and the notorious “Drug Mule” scam—where seniors are tricked into unwittingly serving as drug couriers.

Two things are central to nearly all of these scams: first, the scams are initiated by robocallers who cast a wide net in their hunt for potential victims, and second, the scammers “spoof” the victim’s Caller-ID to mask their identity, a key to the success of their outrageous frauds. When victims see the “Internal Revenue Service” or the “local Sheriff’s Department” pop-up on

their Caller-ID, they are understandably worried, scared, and often easily hustled into doing whatever the scammers demand.

Last year, robocallers generated more than 26 billion unwanted calls that reached American mobile phones. When landlines are included, the number soars to 48 billion. In Maine alone, our residents received an astonishing 93 million robocalls last year. That averages out to 73 calls to every person in Maine. So far this year, scammers are on pace to generate more than 58 billion unwanted, illegal robocalls targeting Americans.

Putting a stop to these illegal robocalls requires a coordinated approach from all levels of our government, working in coordination with the private sector. Recently, this body overwhelmingly passed the bipartisan “TRACED Act,” which makes a number of important changes to our law that will help make it easier to fight illegal robocalls, such as increasing civil penalties on robocallers and extending the statute of limitations for violations to three years. The TRACED Act also requires telecommunications carriers to implement the so-called SHAKEN/STIR technology to verify whether Caller-IDs that appear on incoming calls are authentic. When fully implemented, this technology will be a major advance against illegal spoofing. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the TRACED Act, and I am hopeful it will soon become law.

The bipartisan bill we are introducing today complements the TRACED Act by doubling the penalties on illegal spoofing. Except for inflation adjustments, the penalties on illegal spoofing have not been updated since they were first passed into law through the Truth in Caller ID Act of 2009. Our bill also extends the statute of limitations to three years for spoofing violations to match the extension for robocalling violations included in the TRACED Act.

Mr. President, putting an end to the scourge of illegal robocalls will take an aware public, aggressive action by regulators and law enforcement agencies, and a coordinated effort at every level of our telecommunications industry. The enhanced penalties called for by the “Anti-Spoofing Penalty Modernization Act” are an important tool in the fight. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 277—REMEMBERING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BOMBING OF THE ARGENTINE ISRAELITE MUTUAL ASSOCIATION (AMIA) JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER IN BUENOS AIRES, ARGENTINA, AND RECOMMITTING TO EFFORTS TO UPHOLD JUSTICE FOR THE 85 VICTIMS OF THE ATTACKS

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. YOUNG) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 277

Whereas, on July 18, 1994, a car bomb detonated at the Argentine Israelite Mutual Association (AMIA) Jewish Community Center building in Buenos Aires, killing 85 people and wounding more than 300 others, rendering it the deadliest terrorist attack in Argentina’s history;

Whereas Argentina is home to the largest Jewish community in Latin America—and the sixth largest in the world, outside Israel;

Whereas, for 25 years, the investigation into the bombing has been stymied by international inaction, political interference, investigative misconduct, and allegations of cover-ups, including the removal of the federal judge in charge of the case in 2005 for “serious” irregularities in his handling of the case;

Whereas, in November 2005, a joint investigation by the Argentine Secretariat of Intelligence (SIDE) and the Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI) concluded that the attack against AMIA was a suicide bombing carried out by Ibrahim Hussein Berro, a 21-year-old operative of Hezbollah, which is based in Lebanon and sponsored by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran;

Whereas, in October 2006, Argentine prosecutors Alberto Nisman and Marcelo Martín Burgos formally accused the Government of Iran of directing Hezbollah to carry out the AMIA bombing;

Whereas the Argentine prosecutors charged the following Iranian nationals as suspects in the AMIA bombing:

(1) Ali Fallahjani, Iran’s former intelligence minister;

(2) Mohsen Rabbani, Iran’s former cultural attaché in Buenos Aires;

(3) Ahmad Reza Asghari, a former Iranian diplomat posted to Argentina;

(4) Ahmad Vahidi, Iran’s former defense minister;

(5) Ali Akbar Velayati, Iran’s former foreign minister;

(6) Mohsen Rezaee, former chief commander of the Iranian Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps;

(7) Ali Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani, former President of Iran; and

(8) Hadi Soleimanpour, former Iranian ambassador to Argentina;

Whereas, in November 2007, the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL) published Red Notices on 5 of the Iranian nationals and Hezbollah operative Ibrahim Hussein Berro;

Whereas, in January 2013, the Administration of then-President Cristina Fernandez de Kirchner signed a Memorandum of Understanding with Iran to set up a “truth commission” to investigate who was responsible for the AMIA bombing, despite Iran and its proxies’ status as the only suspects in the attack;

Whereas, in January 2013, Argentina's then-Minister of Foreign Relations, Hector Timerman, and his Iranian counterpart, Ali Akbar Salehi, sent a joint notice to INTERPOL that led the general secretariat to issue a "caveat" that in effect relaxed implementation of the Red Notices;

Whereas, in May 2013, Argentine prosecutor Alberto Nisman published a 500-page report accusing the Government of Iran of establishing terrorist networks throughout Latin America, including in Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay, Chile, Colombia, Guyana, Suriname, and Trinidad and Tobago, dating back to the 1980s;

Whereas, in January 2015, Mr. Nisman released the results of an investigation alleging that then-President Fernandez de Kirchner and then-Foreign Minister Timerman conspired to cover up Iranian involvement in the 1994 AMIA bombing and that they had agreed to negotiate immunity for Iranian suspects and secure the removal of the INTERPOL Red Notices;

Whereas Mr. Nisman's investigation had uncovered evidence, including wire-taps of phone calls "between people close to Mrs. Kirchner" and a number of Iranians such as Iran's then Cultural Attaché Mohsen Rabbani, of a secret 2013 deal between the Governments of Argentina and Iran to normalize relations and trade Iranian oil for Argentine grain;

Whereas Mr. Nisman was scheduled to present his findings to a commission of the Argentine National Congress on January 19, 2015, but on January 18, 2015, was found dead as the result of a gunshot wound to his head in his apartment in Buenos Aires;

Whereas officials in the Administration of then-President Fernandez de Kirchner sought to discredit Mr. Nisman after his suspicious death, and in May 2015, an Argentine federal court dismissed Mr. Nisman's findings against Ms. Fernandez de Kirchner and other officials;

Whereas, in March 2015, an independent investigation launched by Mr. Nisman's family released its own report by forensic experts and forensic pathologists showing that his death was not an accident or suicide, and that his body had been moved after he was shot;

Whereas, in September 2017, forensic investigators of the Argentine National Gendarmerie submitted a new report to a federal court concluding that Mr. Nisman did not commit suicide, but that he was drugged, beaten, and fatally shot in the head on January 18, 2015;

Whereas, in November 2017, Argentine media revealed that Iranian foreign minister Mohammad Javad Zarif had sent a letter to the Argentine foreign minister, Jorge Faurie, confirming that included in the 2013 oil-for-grain deal were efforts to have INTERPOL terminate the Red Notices for the Iranian nationals;

Whereas, in March 2018, Argentine authorities indicted former President Fernandez de Kirchner on charges that she helped cover up Iran's role in the 1994 AMIA bombing;

Whereas no one yet has been brought to justice for the death of Argentine prosecutor Alberto Nisman, nor have any of the named Iranian suspects faced prosecution for their role in the 1994 AMIA bombing;

Whereas the suspects continue to travel globally with impunity, as demonstrated by the refusal of Russian and Chinese officials in July 2018 to comply with an Argentine Federal judge's request that they arrest and extradite former Iranian foreign minister Ali Akbar Velayati on the grounds he ordered the bombing, and previous attempts by Argentina to arrest Velayati in Singapore and Malaysia in 2016 that were also unsuccessful;

Whereas, in September 2018, Argentine Vice President Gabriela Michetti repeated the pleas of previous Argentine officials seeking help from the international community to bring the Iranian suspects to justice;

Whereas, in March 2019, the former Argentine judge removed for misconduct in the early days of the AMIA bombing investigation, Juan Jose Galeano, was sentenced to 6 years in prison and former Argentine Intelligence (SIDE) chief Hugo Anzorreguy was sentenced to 4½ years for their roles in a cover-up of Iran's complicity; and

Whereas in the days leading up to July 18, 2019, 25 years after the AMIA bombing, the Government of Argentina indicated it would list Hezbollah as a terrorist entity: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) reiterates its strongest condemnation of the 1994 attack on the Argentine Israelite Mutual Association (AMIA) Jewish Community Center in Buenos Aires, Argentina;

(2) honors the victims of the 1994 AMIA bombing and expresses its sympathy to the relatives of the victims, who are still waiting for justice;

(3) expresses serious concern about Iran's influence networks in the Western Hemisphere and urges the President of the United States to continue to monitor Iran's activities in the region as mandated by the Countering Iran in the Western Hemisphere Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-220);

(4) recognizes the work of Argentine Prosecutor Alberto Nisman and his dedication to investigating the AMIA bombing and expresses serious concern regarding attempts by former President Cristina Fernandez de Kirchner and her government to discredit Mr. Nisman's findings on the AMIA bombing;

(5) commends Argentine President Mauricio Macri's continued call for a swift, transparent, and independent investigation into Mr. Nisman's death, recognizes the Argentine National Gendarmerie's extensive work to produce credible, evidence-based findings, and urges an independent inquiry into Mr. Nisman's findings on the 2013 oil-for-grain deal between Argentina and Iran;

(6) underscores the concern of the United States regarding the continuing, 25-year-long delay in resolving the bombing case and urges the President of the United States to offer technical assistance to the Government of Argentina to support the ongoing investigation and determine responsibility for the death of Argentine prosecutor Alberto Nisman;

(7) commends the Government of Argentina for formally recognizing Hezbollah's role in the AMIA bombing and taking steps to hold the organization accountable for the attack; and

(8) commemorates the 25th anniversary of the AMIA bombing by recommitting to hold accountable those who planned and executed the 1994 AMIA bombing until justice is served.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 22—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THERE IS A CLIMATE EMERGENCY WHICH DEMANDS A MASSIVE-SCALE MOBILIZATION TO HALT, REVERSE, AND ADDRESS ITS CONSEQUENCES AND CAUSES

Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. WARREN, and Ms. HARRIS) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works:

S. CON. RES. 22

Whereas 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018 were the 4 hottest years on record and the 20 warmest years on record have occurred within the past 22 years;

Whereas global atmospheric concentrations of the primary heat-trapping gas, or greenhouse gas, carbon dioxide—

(1) have increased by 40 percent since preindustrial times, from 280 parts per million to 415 parts per million, primarily due to human activities, including burning fossil fuels and deforestation;

(2) are rising at a rate of 2 to 3 parts per million annually; and

(3) must be reduced to not more than 350 parts per million, and likely lower, "if humanity wishes to preserve a planet similar to that on which civilization developed and to which life on Earth is adapted," according to former National Aeronautics and Space Administration climatologist, Dr. James Hansen;

Whereas global atmospheric concentrations of other greenhouse gases, including methane, nitrous oxide, and hydrofluorocarbons, have also increased substantially since preindustrial times, primarily due to human activities, including burning fossil fuels;

Whereas current climate science and real-world observations of climate change impacts, including ocean warming and acidification, floods, droughts, wildfires, and extreme weather, demonstrate that a global rise in temperatures of 1 degree Celsius above preindustrial levels is already having dangerous impacts on human populations and the environment;

Whereas the 2018 National Climate Assessment found that climate change due to global warming has caused, and is expected to cause additional, substantial interference with and growing losses to infrastructure, property, industry, recreation, natural resources, agricultural systems, human health and safety, and quality of life in the United States;

Whereas the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration has determined that climate change is already increasing the frequency of extreme weather and other climate-related disasters, including drought, wildfire, and storms that include precipitation;

Whereas climate-related natural disasters have increased exponentially over the past decade, costing the United States more than double the long-term average during the period of 2014 through 2018, with total costs of natural disasters during that period of approximately \$100,000,000,000 per year;

Whereas the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention have found wide-ranging, acute, and fatal public health consequences from climate change that impact communities across the United States;

Whereas the National Climate and Health Assessment of the United States Global Change Research Program identified climate change as a significant threat to the health of the people of the United States, leading to increased—

(1) temperature-related deaths and illnesses;

(2) air quality impacts;

(3) extreme weather events;

(4) numbers of vector-borne diseases;

(5) waterborne illnesses;

(6) food safety, nutrition, and distribution complications; and

(7) mental health and well-being concerns;

Whereas the consequences of climate change already disproportionately impact frontline communities and endanger populations made especially vulnerable by existing exposure to extreme weather events,

such as children, the elderly, and individuals with pre-existing disabilities and health conditions;

Whereas individuals and families on the frontlines of climate change across the United States, including territories, living with income inequality and poverty, institutional racism, inequity on the basis of gender and sexual orientation, poor infrastructure, and lack of access to health care, housing, clean water, and food security are often in close proximity to environmental stressors or sources of pollution, particularly communities of color, indigenous communities, and low-income communities, which—

(1) experience outsized risk because of the close proximity of the community to environmental hazards and stressors, in addition to colocation with waste and other sources of pollution;

(2) are often the first exposed to the impacts of climate change; and

(3) have the fewest resources to mitigate those impacts or to relocate, which will exacerbate preexisting challenges;

Whereas, according to Dr. Robert Bullard and Dr. Beverly Wright, “environmental and public health threats from natural and human-made disasters are not randomly distributed,” therefore a response to the climate emergency necessitates the adoption of just community transition policies and processes available to all communities, which include policies and processes rooted in principles of racial and socio-economic equity, self-determination, and democracy, as well as the fundamental human right of all people to clean air and water, healthy food, health care, adequate land, education, and shelter;

Whereas climate change holds grave and immediate consequences not just for the population of the United States, including territories, but for communities across the world, particularly those communities in the Global South on the frontlines of the climate crisis, which are at risk of forced displacement;

Whereas communities in rural, urban, and suburban areas are all dramatically affected by climate change, though the specific economic, health, social, and environmental impacts may be different;

Whereas the United States Department of State, Department of Defense, and intelligence community have identified climate change as a threat to national security, and the Department of Homeland Security views climate change as a top homeland security risk;

Whereas climate change is a threat multiplier—

(1) with the potential to exacerbate many of the challenges the United States already confronts, including conflicts over scarce resources, conditions conducive to violent extremism, and the spread of infectious diseases; and

(2) because climate change has the potential to produce new, unforeseeable challenges in the future;

Whereas, in 2018, the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change projected that the Earth could warm 1.5 degrees Celsius above preindustrial levels as early as 2030;

Whereas the climatic changes resulting from global warming above 1.5 degrees Celsius above preindustrial levels, including changes resulting from global warming of more than 2 degrees Celsius above preindustrial levels, are projected to result in irreversible, catastrophic changes to public health, livelihoods, quality of life, food security, water supplies, human security, and economic growth;

Whereas, in 2019, the United Nations Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services found

that human-induced climate change is pushing the planet toward the sixth mass species extinction, which threatens the food security, water supply, and well-being of billions of people;

Whereas, according to climate scientists, limiting warming to no more than 1.5 degrees Celsius above preindustrial levels, and likely lower, is most likely to avoid irreversible and catastrophic climate change;

Whereas, even with global warming up to 1.5 degrees Celsius above preindustrial levels, the planet is projected to experience—

(1) a significant rise in sea levels;

(2) extraordinary loss of biodiversity; and

(3) intensifying droughts, prodigious floods, devastating wildfires, and other extreme weather events;

Whereas, according to climate scientists, addressing the climate emergency will require an economically just and managed phase-out oil, gas, and coal to keep fossil fuels in the ground;

Whereas the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has determined that limiting warming through emissions reduction and carbon sequestration will require rapid, and immediate, acceleration and proliferation of “far-reaching, multilevel, and cross-sectoral climate mitigation” and “transitions in energy, land, urban and rural infrastructure (including transport and buildings), and industrial systems”;

Whereas, in the United States, massive, comprehensive, and urgent governmental action is required immediately to achieve the transitions of those systems in response to the severe existing and projected economic, social, public health, and national security threats posed by the climate crisis;

Whereas the massive scope and scale of action necessary to stabilize the climate will require unprecedented levels of public awareness, engagement, and deliberation to develop and implement effective, just, and equitable policies to address the climate crisis;

Whereas failure to mobilize to solve the climate emergency is antithetical to the spirit of the Declaration of Independence in protecting “unalienable Rights” that include “Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness”;

Whereas the United States has a proud history of collaborative, constructive, massive-scale Federal mobilizations of resources and labor in order to solve great challenges, such as the Interstate Highway System, the Apollo 11 Moon landing, Reconstruction, the New Deal, and World War II;

Whereas the United States stands uniquely poised to substantially grow the economy and attain social and health benefits from a massive mobilization of resources and labor that far outweigh the costs of inaction;

Whereas millions of middle class jobs can be created by raising labor standards through project labor agreements and protecting and expanding the right of workers to organize so that workers in the United States and the communities of those workers are guaranteed a strong, viable economic future in a zero-emissions economy that guarantees good jobs at fair union wages, with quality benefits;

Whereas frontline communities, Tribal governments and communities, people of color, and labor unions must be equitably and actively engaged in the climate mobilization and prioritized through local climate mitigation and adaptation planning, policy, and program delivery so that workers in the United States, the communities of those workers, are guaranteed a strong, viable economic future;

Whereas a number of local jurisdictions and governments in the United States, including New York City and Los Angeles, and across the world, including the United King-

dom, the Republic of Ireland, Portugal, and Canada, have already declared a climate emergency, and a number of State and local governments are considering declaring a climate emergency in response to the massive challenges posed by the climate crisis;

Whereas State, local, and Tribal governments must be supported in efforts to hold to account actors whose activities have deepened and accelerated the climate crisis and who have benefitted from delayed action to address the climate change emergency and to develop a fossil fuel-free economy;

Whereas a collaborative response to the climate crisis will require the Federal Government to work with international, State, and local governments, including with those governments that have declared a climate emergency, to reverse the impacts of the climate crisis; and

Whereas the United States has an obligation, as a driver of accelerated climate change, to mobilize at emergency speed to restore a safe climate and environment not just for communities of the United States, including territories, but for communities across the world, particularly those on the frontlines of the climate crisis who have least contributed to the crisis, and to account for global and community impacts of any actions it takes in response to the climate crisis: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),* That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the global warming caused by human activities, which increase emissions of greenhouse gases, has resulted in a climate emergency that—

(A) severely and urgently impacts the economic and social well-being, health and safety, and national security of the United States; and

(B) demands a national, social, industrial, and economic mobilization of the resources and labor of the United States at a massive-scale to halt, reverse, mitigate, and prepare for the consequences of the climate emergency and to restore the climate for future generations; and

(2) nothing in this concurrent resolution constitutes a declaration of a national emergency for purposes of any Act of Congress authorizing the exercise, during the period of a national emergency or other type of declared emergency, of any special or extraordinary power.

#### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have 9 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

#### COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 17, 2019, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

#### COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 17, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.



## COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 17, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Michelle A. Bekkering, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, and Richard K. Bell, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Cote d'Ivoire, Jessica E. Lapenn, of New York, to be Representative of the United States of America to the African Union, with the rank and status of Ambassador, Mary Beth Leonard, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Nigeria, and Lana J. Marks, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of South Africa, all of the Department of State.

## COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 16, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

## COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 17, 2019, at 2:30 p.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 Wednesday, July 17, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing following nominations: Halil Suleyman Ozerden, of Mississippi, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit, David B. Barlow, to be United States District Judge for the District of Utah, John Fitzgerald Kness, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, and Eleni Maria Roumel, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims.

## SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 17, 2019, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC POLICY

The Subcommittee on Economic Policy of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 17, 2019, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON REGULATORY AFFAIRS AND FEDERAL MANAGEMENT

The Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 17, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

## PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Abigail Brown, an intern in my office, be

granted floor privileges through August 2, 2019.

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

## DEFENDING THE INTEGRITY OF VOTING SYSTEMS ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 95, S. 1321.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title. The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1321) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit interference with voting systems under the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 1321) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

S. 1321

*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 "Defending the Integrity of Voting Systems Act".

## SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON INTERFERENCE WITH VOTING SYSTEMS.

Section 1030(e) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking "or" at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by adding "or" at the end; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(C) that—

"(i) is part of a voting system; and

"(ii) is used for the management, support, or administration of a Federal election; or

"(II) has moved in or otherwise affects interstate or foreign commerce;"

(2) in paragraph (11), by striking "and" at the end;

(3) in paragraph (12), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

"(13) the term 'Federal election' means any election (as defined in section 301(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101(1))) for Federal office (as defined in section 301(3) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101(3))); and

"(14) the term 'voting system' has the meaning given the term in section 301(b) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081(b))."

## RESTORE THE HARMONY WAY BRIDGE ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Sen-

ate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 120, S. 1833.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1833) to transfer a bridge over the Wabash River to the New Harmony River Bridge Authority and the New Harmony and Wabash River Bridge Authority, and for other purposes.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 1833) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

S. 1833

*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 "Restore the Harmony Way Bridge Act".

## SEC. 2. TRANSFER OF BRIDGE AND LAND.

Notwithstanding any provision of the Act of April 12, 1941 (55 Stat. 140, chapter 71), not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the White County Bridge Commission shall convey, without consideration, to the New Harmony River Bridge Authority and the New Harmony and Wabash River Bridge Authority, any and all right, title, and interest of the Commission in and to the bridge across the Wabash River at or near New Harmony, Indiana, the approaches to the bridge, and the land underneath or adjacent to the bridge and the approaches to the bridge.

## SEC. 3. REPEAL.

The Act of April 12, 1941 (55 Stat. 140, chapter 71), is repealed effective on the date that the White County Bridge Commission completes the conveyance described in section 2.

## ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 18, 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, July 18; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, morning business be closed, and the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Corker nomination.

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

## ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the

previous order following the remarks of our Democratic colleagues and Senator SULLIVAN.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, for a long time, people opposed to climate action said that tackling climate change would be too costly, would harm economic growth, would be bad for American businesses, and would kill jobs. It turns out these were phony arguments peddled by fossil fuel interests. It turns out they are flat wrong. It turns out that actually the true economic hazard is not climate action but climate inaction.

We have recently seen an explosion of warnings from economic regulators, central banks, insurers, investment firms, and risk analysts that we face economic peril if we fail to address climate change. These are not green groups; these are neutral business and economic experts—the people whose job it is to protect us from risks to financial stability and the people who make a business calculation about what we stand to lose from unabated climate change.

Their warnings are many, and their warnings are serious. One example: Just last month, Moody's warned that climate change will increasingly disrupt and damage critical infrastructure and property and will hurt worker health and productivity across the globe. Moody's, the credit rating giant, estimated—hang on—\$69 trillion. We talk about millions around here pretty readily. We talk about billions when we are talking about really big money. Moody's estimated \$69 trillion of economic damage globally by 2100, even if we limit global warming to only 2 degrees Celsius. The Presiding Officer and I are probably not going to pay a lot of that. The pages will. We are not currently on track for only 2 degrees Celsius; we are currently on track for around 3 degrees of warming, which Moody's said would put us at further risk of hitting tipping points beyond which lurk far larger, more lasting, and more ominous dangers.

Here is another example: In May, the European Central Bank warned that climate change presents significant economic risks to the economy, to asset values, and to financial stability.

The longer we wait, the longer we fiddle around in this Chamber not doing anything, the more it will cost to protect ourselves in the future. That old saying about a stitch in time saving nine applies here as well.

The ECB said that these risks could cause what they called “systemic issues,” especially where markets do not price climate-related risks correctly. “Systemic issues” is a bland term. It is central banker-speak. What it means is something pretty serious.

Systemic issues means this is so bad that it could take down the entire economy. The European Central Bank is not alone. The Bank of England has been warning of systemic risk from climate change or from not doing anything about climate change for some time now. I think there are now over 30 sovereign banks that have made or adopted such warnings.

Just last week, Senator SCHATZ asked Federal Chairman Powell whether severe weather is increasing due to climate change. Powell did not equivocate. He said simply: “I believe it is, yes.” That is the leader of the most influential bank in the world accepting without hesitation a major threat to our financial system, echoed also by a Federal Reserve report out of California. Climate change, they point out, is a major threat to our financial system, to everything from coastal real estate values, which Freddie Mac predicts will crash, to stock market share prices, about which there are numerous adverse predictions if this goes unchecked.

America's biggest financial institutions see what is coming. In the House Financial Services Committee hearing in April, CEOs from six of America's biggest banks agreed that climate change is a serious risk to the financial system, and they said they are trying to take action to address that risk.

There is an unfortunate sidebar, however. Big American banks that claim to support climate action include four of our biggest banks: JPMorgan Chase, Wells Fargo, Citigroup, and Bank of America. These banks all supported the Paris Agreement. In 2017, the CEOs of JPMorgan Chase, Citigroup, and Bank of America even signed a letter urging President Trump not to withdraw from the Paris Agreement.

These banks are all trying to reduce their own emissions, and all have commitments to get to 100 percent renewable electricity—all good steps. But the biggest direct impact these banks have on climate is not through the promises they make but through the investments they make. On that score, these four banks are steering us to climate calamity.

A group of environmental organizations released a report in March adding up fossil fuel financing by 33 large, private sector banks from around the world. These four American banks—JPMorgan Chase, Wells Fargo, Citigroup, and Bank of America, which all support the Paris Agreement and are all reducing their own carbon emissions—they are the four largest funders of fossil fuel projects. Combined, they invested over \$580 billion in new fossil fuel projects over the past 3 years. JPMorgan was the worst, with \$196 billion of fossil fuel funding in 3 years. JPMorgan was also the top U.S. funder of tar sands, Arctic oil and gas, and coal mining—the most emissions-intensive fuels.

The big American banks accounted for over a third of the surveyed global

fossil fuel financing since the Paris Agreement was signed in 2015. Worse, their investment in fossil fuel projects actually increased after the Paris Agreement. Wells Fargo nearly doubled its fossil fuel financing from 2016 to 2018. Obviously, these investments in new fossil fuel projects do not align with the banks' stated support of the Paris Agreement. The math doesn't work. The Paris Agreement aims to limit warming to well below 2 degrees Celsius and to try to limit warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius.

A study just published by Nature shows that the world's existing fossil fuel infrastructure will emit enough carbon pollution to blow us past 1.5 degrees of warming. The authors wrote that little or no additional CO<sub>2</sub>-emitting infrastructure can be commissioned. Little or no additional CO<sub>2</sub>-emitting infrastructure can be commissioned if we are to meet the Paris Agreement climate goals.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the article titled “How Much Global Warming Is Fossil Fuel Infrastructure Locking In?” from Inside Climate News be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

That is the math. If the banks are true to their stated support of the Paris Agreement, they should not finance any new fossil fuel projects—unless, of course, they also finance capturing all the carbon emissions, and they are not doing that.

It is true that these banks have announced goals to increase their financing of clean and sustainable projects, but they are only goals, and combined, even their goals only amount to around \$100 billion per year, which is about half of what they have actually invested in fossil fuel projects each year since Paris.

Citi even released a report finding that maintaining our current fossil fuel-heavy economy would cost more than moving to clean, low-carbon economy—cost more to stay in the fossil fuel economy than to move to a clean energy economy—and they said that is not including factoring in the economic damage from climate change, which Citi reckons could total \$72 trillion—\$72 trillion under business as usual. Citi projects that transitioning away from the projects they are investing in to a low-carbon economy will save money on its own and it will help avoid tens of trillions of dollars in further economic damages. Yet they aren't investing consistent with their principles.

According to the International Monetary Fund, fossil fuels are subsidized to the tune of \$650 billion per year in the United States. So there is no question that this massive subsidy—probably the biggest subsidy in the history of the planet—makes investing in fossil fuels profitable. But the contradiction remains. These banks all say they support the Paris Agreement. They all recognize that it is economically vital to

reach the goals of the Paris Agreement. Yet their investments would ensure that the Paris Agreement fails.

It would help banks change their ways if companies had to disclose their climate risks better. I just joined Senator WARREN in a bill we have done to require publicly traded companies to reveal their exposure to climate-related risks.

But we have a proposal—Senator SCHATZ, Senator HEINRICH, and I—to help resolve the very root of the banks' contradiction: that Congress put a price on carbon emissions and an end to fossil fuel subsidies. Indeed, JPMorgan Chase CEO Jamie Dimon recommended this in the House Financial Services Committee hearing in April. When asked whether his bank will phase out fossil fuel funding and align its investments with the goals of the Paris Agreement, he said: "If you want to fix this problem, you are going to have to do something like a carbon tax."

So, bankers, help us do that. If these bankers think climate is a serious problem—and they say they do—and that putting a price on carbon pollution is the solution, which virtually every economist agrees with—hello, you need to come here and fight to make it happen. Banks have political influence. Lord knows, they never stop throwing their influence around here when it comes to financial regulations or tax giveaways. Where are they in Congress on climate? It is a long pause waiting for them to show up. So, guys, talk is cheap. Come on. Put a little effort into this. Pretend it is a financial regulation.

The carbon fee bill of Senators SCHATZ, HEINRICH, and GILLIBRAND would help these banks align their investments with their stated goals. Our bill meets the key standards of being effective on carbon emissions, driving far more reductions than the Clean Power Plan, revenue neutral in the economy, and border adjustable for trade. It meets all three. Plus, it will help avoid the dreadful economic warnings now so frequently heard from very responsible sources about doing nothing—warnings of coastal property values collapsing, warning of a carbon asset bubble crash, even warnings of big storms breaking the bank of the insurance system.

To Citi's credit, it is a member of the newly formed CEO climate dialogue group which will, I hope, become a strong advocate for a Federal price on carbon pollution. That is the place where essentially every economist—huge numbers of Nobel Prize winning economists, many Republicans, former economic advisers to Presidents, former Treasury Secretaries, former EPA Administrators, former Members of Congress—have all come down.

It is pretty clear what the solution is: It is a price on carbon that is revenue neutral and border adjustable and will reduce emissions enough to keep us under 1.5 degrees. That is not hard

to figure out. It is getting there that is hard because, so far, the net pressure of corporate America in Congress remains hostile to climate action, whether from indifference by companies themselves or, worse, from the hostile presence of corporate trade associations like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, two leading business lobby groups recently outed as the two worst climate obstructors in Congress.

The last I checked, a clean and green economy involved a lot of commerce. And building a new clean grid and new clean technologies, whether wind or solar or batteries or storage or distributed generation, was a lot of manufacturing.

We still await the explanation from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers why they are 100 percent aligned with the denial and obstruction of the fossil fuel industry and 0 percent aligned with their membership who, in many cases, are leaning in to climate action.

There is a separate flotilla of front groups doing the dirty work of the fossil fuel industry. The fossil fuel industry doesn't want to show up and identify itself as the fossil fuel industry; then the game is too obvious. So they put up all these front groups with ridiculous names about Heartlands and Heritages and famous figures, and they are front groups for fossil fuel. All those groups add to the corporate pressure against climate action from the Chamber and from NAM.

So for banks like these, who claim to take climate change very seriously, it would really make a difference if they would take an interest in climate change, not just on their websites, not just in their talking points, but in their investments in the market and steered away from fossil fuel and into clean energy and in their influence here in Congress.

We have to crack this nut here in Congress. There is no pathway to avoiding climate calamity that does not require Congress to act. Congress must act if we are going to get ahead of this problem. It is not optional. You can't shrug as a business leader who cares about climate and say: No, we are just going to do our thing; we don't need to worry about what happens in Congress.

There is no pathway to avoiding the climate crisis without action in Congress. The fossil fuel industry knows that. That is why they are here, red in tooth and claw. The sensible, honorable parts of the business community that want to do something about climate change need to show up and push back because, otherwise, the hydraulics are against us.

At this point, the science is clear. The economics are clear. The warnings are serious—systemic risks—and they are many. Neither our planet nor our economy can afford massive investments in new fossil fuel projects, not by them, not by anyone. Time is short.

We can no longer afford corporate America to be AWOL on climate in Congress.

It is time for these banks and the rest of corporate America who want to see progress and avoid what all those warnings are telling us to wake up and to show up.

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

[From Inside Climate News, July 1, 2019]

HOW MUCH GLOBAL WARMING IS FOSSIL FUEL INFRASTRUCTURE LOCKING IN?

(By Phil McKenna)

All the power plants, vehicles and other fossil fuel-burning infrastructure operating today will lock the world into 1.5 degrees Celsius of global warming, exceeding the Paris climate agreement goals, unless the biggest polluters are shut down early or are retrofitted to capture their carbon emissions, a new study shows.

And that's just the infrastructure already built. When the researchers factored in the future emissions of coal- and gas-fired power plants that are currently planned or under construction, they found the total lifetime emissions would shoot past 1.5 °C (2.7 °F) warming and put the world on pace to burn about two-thirds of the remaining carbon budget for staying under 2 °C (3.6 °F) warming compared to pre-industrial times.

The findings imply profound changes for the planet and many of its inhabitants in this century. As global temperatures rise, heat waves continue to intensify, extreme precipitation increases, and an additional 10 million people face greater risks from sea level rise in just the half degree between 1.5 °C and 2 °C, among other threats, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) wrote last fall.

We have already built enough to take us over 1.5," said Ken Caldeira, an atmospheric scientist at the Carnegie Institution for Science and a co-author of the study. "For these 1.5 scenarios you would either need to retire CO2 emitting infrastructure early or have carbon dioxide removal strategies which are generally thought to be expensive."

Nine years ago, Caldeira co-authored a similar study that found the planet had already locked in about 496 gigatonnes of carbon dioxide with existing infrastructure, emissions that would result in about 1.3 °C of warming above pre-industrial levels.

Since then, China and India have been on power plant construction sprees. The average age of their coal-fired power plants are 11 and 12 years, respectively, compared to nearly 40 years in the United States, according to the new study. The historical average lifespan of a power plant, and the age used for calculations in the study, is about 40 years.

"What we see now is a lot more carbon-emitting infrastructure than we saw a decade ago," Caldeira said. "The trajectory is not going to where we would like it to go to."

FUTURE EMISSIONS LIKELY TO BE EVEN HIGHER

The new study found that existing energy infrastructure would emit about 658 gigatons of carbon dioxide over the rest of its expected lifetime, and that the future fossil fuel power plants that are currently planned would boost that to about 846 gigatons. The IPCC has determined that to have a 50 percent chance of keeping surface air temperature warming under 1.5 °C, the world would need to limit emissions from all human activities to about 580 gigatons of carbon dioxide.

The future emissions are likely even higher than the study estimates. It does not take

into account future emissions from other sectors including shipping, aviation and heavy industry that will be hard to wean off of fossil fuels. Nor does it account for emissions related to fossil fuels extraction and pipelines or non-energy emissions such as from agriculture.

Emissions from yet-to-be-built ships, planes, factories and other fossil fuel-powered infrastructure will likely outweigh emissions saved from the early retirement of existing fossil fuel power plants, said Gunnar Luderer, head of the Energy Systems Group at the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research in Germany, who reviewed the study.

For the new study, the researchers used detailed datasets of fossil fuel-burning energy infrastructure operating in 2018 or planned. They found some progress, including “substantial” cancellations of proposed fossil fuel power plants in the past two years, which cut the expected emissions from future power plants by as much as half from studies conducted just a few years earlier.

In the U.S., utilities have been announcing plans to shut down coal-fired power plants and add more renewable energy as the costs of solar and wind power generation fall, but other types of fossil fuel infrastructure have been expanding—particularly natural gas drilling and pipelines to carry oil and gas, both for domestic use and for export to other countries. On June 20, for example, Energy Transfer LP announced it planned nearly double the capacity the Dakota Access oil pipeline, a project that was highly contested over both climate and environmental concerns when it was approved in 2017.

#### NO TIME FOR DEBATE OR DELAY

Other studies have used different methods to estimate emissions growth.

One study, published in *Nature Communications* in January, determined there was a 64 percent chance that existing energy infrastructure wouldn't commit the planet to passing 1.5 °C warming, provided construction of additional fossil fuel energy infrastructure stopped immediately and other measures were taken to dramatically reduce emissions from all other sectors of the economy.

Such measures would have to happen in the immediate future, said Joeri Rogelj, a lecturer at the Grantham Institute at Imperial College London and a co-author of the January study.

“Both studies are really clear,” Rogelj said. “If we wait another 5 to 10 years with being serious about emissions reductions and addressing climate change then indeed we will have no discussion anymore whether we can still make it to 1.5. It will be very clear and obvious that we will run past it.”

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

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

#### STOP CRUELTY TO MIGRANT CHILDREN ACT

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, tonight I am rising to talk about legislation that I have introduced that now has 40 Senators sponsoring it. It is called the Stop Cruelty to Migrant Children Act.

I think all of us in America have seen so many stories of refugee children being treated in a horrific manner at the border or beyond the border in a system of child migrant prisons.

Just recently, we have had the story about 3-year old Sofia and her parents—Tania and Joseph—proceeded to experience horrific circumstances in which a gang killed Tania's mother and her sister-in-law. A note was posted on the door that they would be killed, that they had 45 minutes to leave. I imagine all of us would flee with our children under those circumstances.

They made it to the border of the United States. They did get through an initial hearing which is designed to determine if there is credible fear of return, and that sets the stage then for an asylum hearing.

But we are shipping folks back into Mexico to await that asylum hearing. In this case, the little girl in the family—she has a heart problem, and she had suffered a heart attack—a 3-year old girl—yet we sent that family back into Mexico without friends, without family, without funds.

It is only because a Member of Congress heard about it—a Member in the House, Congresswoman ESCOBAR—and intervened, that the little girl was allowed to remain in the United States. Even then, the administration said you—the little girl, the 3-year old—you have to choose between which parent will be in the U.S. and which one will be sent back without funds, family, and friends into Mexico with the rest of the children.

It is a horrific situation to split the family in this process, horrific to ask a little girl to have to decide who would be in the safety of the U.S. and which parent would be sent back into very dangerous territory across the border. This is just one example out of thousands.

President John F. Kennedy said: “This country has always served as a lantern in the dark for those who love freedom but are persecuted, in misery, or in need.”

If President Kennedy were speaking today, he couldn't say those words because today our country, under the current leadership, is not conducting itself in a manner that serves as a “lantern in the dark for those who love freedom but are persecuted, in misery, or in need.”

Instead, we have a new policy. It is a policy that was articulated by John Kelly just weeks after the administration took office. The policy was that if we inflict pain and suffering on refugees, it will deter immigration. The strategy of deliberately inflicting pain on refugees is not supportable under any moral code, under any religious tradition, or under any system of ethics.

Shortly after John Kelly, who was then head of Homeland Security, expressed this, there was a reaction. This was in the early months of 2017. As a result, they took the program under-

ground for a little more than a year, until June of 2018, when then-Attorney General Jeff Sessions gave a speech called “Zero Tolerance.” Six months out from an election, it is not unusual to have an Attorney General give a speech in which getting tough on crime is emphasized. But as you read the details of that speech, you realize this wasn't about getting tough on crime. This was about returning explicitly to the vision that John Kelly had laid out originally of tormenting refugees in order to discourage immigration. That is a whole different thing. It is not zero tolerance; it is zero humanity.

Every one of us can picture relatives coming to this country and to this border and would want them to be treated with respect and decency as they pursue asylum.

Most people do not win their asylum hearings. The rate of success is different in different districts. In some, it is 15 percent. In some, it is 20 percent. In some, it is 30 percent. But the burden of proof is on the refugee. The burden of proof is difficult to establish, so most people do not succeed if they do not have extensive evidence to make their case on the fear of return.

The initial hearing is easy in the sense that you simply have to assert that you have a credible fear based on your story, but in the asylum hearing, you have to prove it. You carry the burden of proof. Is it too much for us to continue the vision of treating those fleeing war and those fleeing famine, those fleeing conflict and violence—is it too much for this America that we love to treat them with decency and respect as they go through the adjudication process for asylum? It is not. In fact, that has been the vision of America; that has been the process in America to say that if you are truly fleeing these horrific circumstances, then we light a torch to shine your way forward.

I cannot understand how it is possible that the administration persists in this strategy of traumatizing children. It starts at the border, where Customs and Border Protection has been instructed to set up a blockade and block children who arrive right at the line on the middle of the pedestrian bridge or the pathway and then block them from entering while they call up Mexican officials to come and drag them away.

I saw this down in McAllen a year ago June. Three CBP officers were stretching across the bridge. Anyone who did not have a passport or a visa was sent back into Mexico in violation of international law and our domestic law. I asked why we would do this to refugees fleeing persecution. Basically, the answer was this: We are too busy. We are too crowded.

The only thing was, there was no crowding, not at that time. There was no crowding at all. The interview rooms were empty. The processing center at McAllen was empty. It was simply a strategy of slamming the door shut.

For these families sent back across the border without friends and family and extension funds to support them, it is very dangerous across the border. This is happening with children at Tijuana. I was told of numerous circumstances where unaccompanied children would come to the border, and they would be blocked at the entry, and then the CBP would say: Well, we can't let you step across that line until we consult with the manager. Then the U.S. side would call up the Mexican side to come drag these kids away.

I got a phone call. I was in my office here, working late at night. I think it was about 11 p.m. at night. I got a phone call from a group that has helped escort children. They said: We have three French-speaking children on the border in Tijuana. They are at the line with the U.S. gate, and the U.S. Customs and Border Protection officer is blocking them from stepping across that line, and they are very worried because if the Mexican officials come and apprehend them, they could be sent back to the horrific circumstances—the life-and-death challenges that they were fleeing from.

I had spoken previously to the head of that sector. I had a phone conversation, and he said: No, our policy is to facilitate the movement. Our instructions to our officers are to facilitate the children in crossing that line as if they were our own children.

I said: Well, do you have training for this, because I keep hearing reports of the blockade at the border.

He said: Yes, we have musters.

I said: Well, do you have training documents that say that it is your policy to treat these kids as if they were your own and facilitate bringing them across?

He said: Yes, absolutely.

The Legislative Affairs Director cut in on the phone call to say: I will have that for you tomorrow. I will have those for you tomorrow.

We are still waiting for those documents. I don't know that they exist. I don't know that the training exists. What I do know is that after I had that conversation, I got a call from the border with this volunteer group, and they had these three French children who were being denied entry. I asked the volunteer who was with the children—I said: Hand your phone to the American officer. I will explain the conversation I had with the head of the sector and the policies that he says are in place and the training that is supposed to be in place that says you are supposed to treat these children as if they were your own and facilitate their passage across the border.

The CBP officer said: No, I am not talking to a U.S. Senator. I will talk only to the President of the United States.

I said: Turn on the loud speaker on the phone. Hold your phone up so that they can hear what I am saying.

I told them the same thing—that I had met with their supervisors for the

sector, and their bosses had said: These are the guidelines. Your guidance is to treat these children who are in front of you as if they were your own and to facilitate their passage across that line to safety and not leave them stranded in Tijuana.

Realize that being stranded in Tijuana for any child is horrific. Imagine it is your child. Whether your child is 17 or whether your child is 5, Tijuana is an incredibly dangerous place. There are all kinds of sex industry operators there who thrive on pulling little kids and teenagers into that sex industry. Do you want your child there with no friends and family or funds on the street in that setting? There are gangs who prey on the children who are on the street. Do you want your children in that setting? No, of course you would never want them left in that situation.

This border blockade is the first piece of traumatizing children to discourage immigration. It is morally wrong, and it needs to end.

Then there is the metering program. Basically, metering says that if you come to the border, we will not let you cross. But if you come the following day to a square near the border, there will be a book, and you can put your name in the book and get on a wait list. That is called metering.

So I went to the square in Tijuana where this is done to watch the metering process. People arrive with the book, and they place it on a little table under a little canopy. They start calling out names. That day, the United States was taking about 30 people, and when all of the spaces were full, that was it.

Then everyone else on the wait list is waiting. If I recall right, the wait had been about 6 or 7 weeks for people to be able to get just a credible fear interview, which is the very first step. Realize that a credible fear interview is not complicated. It can be done expeditiously. It means 6 to 7 weeks with no money on the streets of some hostile city across the border.

I want to show you a picture that perhaps you have seen. It is a picture that deeply, profoundly disturbs me. This is a father and little girl swimming the Rio Grande. They didn't just try to swim the Rio Grande. They came to a port of entry of the United States of America. They did what the President of the United States, President Trump, said to do. They came to the port of entry, and they asked for asylum. They were metered and sent back to Mexico to fend for themselves for who knows how long—as long as the wait list ends.

It is dangerous to have a mother, a little girl, or a father on the streets of a hostile city. If you wouldn't send your child into that, if you wouldn't send your sister and your sister's child into it, then we shouldn't be sending others into this perilous circumstance. It is so perilous there, and you have no way to even buy food. You certainly

don't have money for a hotel. You have been stripped of your funds during your journey. You fled suddenly to begin with and probably didn't have resources on the front end of the journey. So what do you do? You say: Well, I can starve and be beaten up—or who knows what horrific treatment here—or I can go and cross between the ports of entry and ask for asylum.

That is what they did. It was because they were rejected at the port of entry—the very place President Trump said to come—that they lie dead on the banks of the Rio Grande, trying to get out of the incredibly hostile situation across the border. This is the deliberate infliction of trauma, and for every situation like this, there are life-and-death decisions.

This is not the end of it.

Let's say they had made it across the border and had been taken into a processing center. What would happen in those processing centers? Well, in the first one I went to in McAllen, there wasn't room to sit down. There certainly wasn't room to lie down. You had little kids in there who were crying and mothers who were crying, and the fathers were in cells that were across the aisle on the other side. They were holding these Mylar blankets. There were no cushions on the ground, and there were lights left on all night long.

We have heard the reports of all of the various things we have done to children in these processing centers—of our not providing diapers, showers, soap; of our making it difficult for them to go to the bathroom; of our making it difficult for them to get water; of our not providing three meals a day; and of our not providing medical aid.

What kind of country treats children in this manner? Who does this with our tax money, on our land, and by our government? This is more than wrong. This is cruel. This is evil. This is the depth of darkness to treat children in this fashion. That is why 40 of us have introduced this Stop Cruelty to Migrant Children Act. The processing center isn't the end of it.

Then we have a for-profit prison in Homestead that is paid \$750 a day on a no-compete contract. Who is on the board of that? He is the same John Kelly who started the child separation strategy in March of 2017 and who then served as the President's Chief of Staff. He is paid to be on the board of a for-profit. He is paid to lock up children. It is the largest child prison in American history.

Now, if some other country had wanted to throw children back across the border into hostile circumstances, if some other country had set up a metering program that had left children vulnerable for weeks before their initial credible hearings, if some other country had proceeded to put children into holding cells and kept the lights on all night and had given them no mattresses to lie on and had not supplied

diapers, hygienics, food and water, or medical treatment as appropriate, and if some other country had locked up children in a child prison that had been built to a capacity of 3,200 children at a for-profit and had had no incentive to pass the children on to State-licensed care facilities or to sponsors with homes, we would have 100 Senators down here on this floor, saying we have to stop this because we stand up for children in the United States of America.

So what I want to know is: How come there aren't 100 Senators down here today, standing up against this type of treatment? I invite all 100 of my colleagues to join this bill to stop cruelty to migrant children.

I was struck by some of the comments by the kids who were being held down in Clint.

A 12-year-old boy said:

I'm hungry here at Clint all the time. I'm so hungry that I awaken in the middle of the night with hunger. Sometimes I wake up from hunger at 4 a.m. and sometimes at other hours.

A mother recounted that when she asked for medicine for her son's fever, an agent retorted: "Who told you to come to America with your baby anyway?" How about, instead, we get help for the child who has a fever.

There are children being held in cages, children being marched in single lines between Army-style huts, children who have been inflicted with trauma through child separation, children who have been locked up in a for-profit prison that has no incentive to move children to State-licensed facilities. In fact, it is the opposite. It is by a company that got a no-compete contract. Who is on the board? He is the former Chief of Staff to President Trump.

So what does this bill do?

It ensures that children are not thrown back across the border when they come up to the border of the United States. It ensures that children receive prompt medical assistance. Many children have died from fever. By just using a simple device to check the fever, it would enable you to know if this child needs additional help. It would ensure that basic hygiene and three meals a day are provided. It would allow for more caseworkers to be hired to help children to be moved quickly to State-licensed facilities or to homes, and homes are really where they should be while they await asylum. Children belong in schools and homes and on playgrounds, not behind barbed wire in a for-profit prison that is designed to hold 3,200 people down in Homestead, FL. This bill would prohibit that devilish, misdirected strategy of paying for and incentivizing the imprisonment of children.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., said: "Our lives begin to end the day we become silent about things that matter."

I hear a lot of silence in this Chamber on the horrific treatment of children. Let's have a little less silence and a little more advocacy. Let's have 100

Senators sign up for the Stop Cruelty to Migrant Children Act. America is better than the way we have been treating these children. I give thanks to all 40 Senators who have signed on to this legislation.

In our hearts, I think it is fundamentally understood that deliberately traumatizing children in order to discourage immigration is wrong. We have a responsibility to end it.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

#### TRIBUTE TO AVES THOMPSON

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, it is that time of week again. It is the time when I get to recognize a special person from a special place—the great State of Alaska—in what we call our "Alaskan of the Week." It is one of the best times of the week for me because I get to talk about Alaska's community and its individuals. I think we have new pages here, but I think the pages unanimously agree every year that this is the most exciting speech of the week. I will not disappoint because you get to learn about Alaska, and whether it is summer—right now—or winter, you get to learn about what people are doing in Alaska.

I recognize Mr. Aves Thompson today. He is one of the many people in my State who has worked diligently to ensure that Alaska runs well and that goods get properly transported from one place in Alaska to another place. We are a big State. He ensures that when delivering things, the systems that make a functional State and a functional society are in working order in Alaska. Now, I will get to what Aves has done in a minute here and will talk about him. What I always like to do is talk a little bit about what is going on in Alaska right now.

The weather is gorgeous, and the fishing is great. A couple of weeks ago, I was up on the mighty Yukon River, which is way up north. I was with my wife and three daughters and a bunch of family members. We were fishing for one of the most iconic fish on the planet—the Yukon River king. It is a time of festivals and parades all across the State.

Last week, I was at Eagle River, which is about 15 minutes north of Anchorage, for the Bear Paw Festival. Among other things, many Alaskans—myself included—partook in the Slippery Salmon Olympics. I am not going to describe exactly what happened, but as you can imagine, it involved running and obstacles with salmon. It was a lot of fun. So it is a great time to be in Alaska, and I encourage everybody who is watching on TV to come on up. You will love it. I guarantee it will be the trip of a lifetime.

As you know, events like these reflect something larger about a place. They reflect ties and commitment and, importantly, people and community. They reflect people who help each

other and spend their lives working to make things better. So let me introduce you to Aves Thompson, our Alaskan of the Week. He is someone who has definitely spent his life making Alaska better and, more fundamentally, making Alaska work well and efficiently.

I will admit it. Alaska is not the easiest place in which to live. For one, it is really far away from the rest of the lower 48. I am going to get on a plane. I try to get home every weekend, so I will go home tomorrow afternoon. It will be about 11½ hours door-to-door, one way, to get to my home in Anchorage. That is pretty far. The winter weather, of course, can be brutal. Our mountains and our tundra are beautiful, but it can be challenging, to say the least, to build on that terrain.

Getting goods in and out of Alaska is particularly vexing in a State the size of Alaska. Now, my colleagues from Texas don't always like to hear about it, but I like to say, if you were to split Alaska in half, then Texas would be the third largest State in the country because we are 2½ times the size of the State of Texas. More than that, we are a continental-wide, expansive State. When you look at communities like Ketchikan, which is down in the southeast, at communities like Barrow, which is in the north, and all the way out west to the end of the Aleutian Islands chain, you will literally cover Florida, North Dakota, and San Francisco. That is the size of Alaska. So it is a challenge to move things.

Aves Thompson is currently the head of the Alaska Trucking Association. He has spent his entire career working to make sure Alaskans get the goods they need not only to survive but to thrive. He has also worked to ensure that the goods are measured properly and that people aren't overpaying for them. This is very important.

Aves and Phyllis, his wife, came to Alaska in 1970. First, it was to visit friends, then to build a life. They love the State. They love the weather. They love the people. They love the community. Phyllis taught elementary school, and eventually Aves worked for a small trucking company. Then he worked for the State as, first, the division director of the Commercial Vehicle Enforcement Program and then as the director and the chief of the Alaska State Division of Measurement Standards. Now, that is a mouthful, but it is a really important job.

What does it mean?

It means that he was in charge of all of the scales in Alaska—everything from the scales to weigh your fruit at the grocery store and your gas at the pump to the scales that weigh huge shipments of goods that come into our State.

When she was a little girl, Kristin, who is Aves' daughter, remembers how her father used to always check the scales at the grocery store. So she told her friends that her father weighed cheese for a living. That is a family



joke; that he weighed cheese for a living.

Aves became the chairman of the 3,500-member National Conference on Weights and Measures, and he was given a lifetime achievement award for his work, particularly around his work in setting the standards for international weights and measurements, which is incredibly important for the global economy, much of which runs through Alaska.

In 2006, Aves became the head of the Alaska Trucking Association. Why? Well, his daughter said he wasn't a trucker himself but that he was always one at heart. He loves the music of Waylon Jennings and Kenny Rogers. He loves the culture. Most of all, he loves the truckers themselves. They are great, hard-working Americans who drive our trucks.

Aves said:

The thing I like most about this industry is that it is made up of hard-working, tough people who want to make a living. We are not looking for a handout; we are looking to pay our fair share. Our drivers work hard. They make a good living throughout Alaska.

Kristin, his daughter, said that as she was growing up, a trucker was always calling, and her dad was always offering to help.

Let me tell you a little bit about the trucking industry in Alaska. Trucking employs over 13,700 people in Alaska—almost 1 out of every 19 workers. They are good-paying jobs with benefits, and they are sorely needed in my State. With the exception of communities in Southeast Alaska, almost everything that we get in Alaska comes into the Port of Alaska and is delivered by truck.

The rides themselves are unlike any rides in the country. We actually had a reality show—one of the first of many reality shows about Alaska—called “Ice Road Truckers.” These were the guys—the men and the women—who drove the haul road, as we call it. I was just on it going up to our fish camp on the Yukon. In the winter and on ice, they drive these trucks hundreds of miles up the haul road to Prudhoe Bay. That show ran for 10 years. Americans loved it. Those were our truckers.

As Aves puts it, “in Alaska, if you got it, a truck brought it. It's absolutely essential to our economy. If trucking in Alaska stopped,” the entire Alaskan economy “would stop.”

Now, Aves is going to be retiring from the Alaska Trucking Association at the end of this month, but he sits on so many other boards and associations and he is involved in so many other elements of his community, his State, and his country, that I guarantee you there is not going to be much time for him to rest during his well-deserved retirement.

He is the kind of guy—and we all know him—who when people call on him to do things, he gets things done.

But one project he is passionate about, as am I, and it is still ongoing,

and he is still leading on it and he is absolutely determined to finish—let me explain what this is.

Like so many Alaskans, Aves is a veteran. I like to brag about Alaska. We have more veterans per capita than any State in the United States of America. He is one of them.

He served in the Army from 1964 to 1966, in the 2nd Infantry Division. He was stationed at the DMZ in Korea. Like so many of our veterans in America and Alaska, these experiences never left him.

In 2002 he read about a 2nd Infantry Division reunion, and he thought he would go. He found kinship among his fellow veterans and got talked into becoming an officer, eventually becoming the chair of the 2nd Indianhead Division Association and chair of the association's Memorial Foundation Board of Trustees.

As I said, this guy is a doer and a leader. Among other things, he has led and raised money for two trips for veterans from the Korean conflict and who have served in Korea to go to Korea, and he has been working diligently to update the U.S. Army 2nd Division Memorial, which is located here at 17th and Constitution in Washington, DC.

The memorial was first erected in 1936 to honor the 2nd Division fallen soldiers in World War I. It was then modified to honor the 2nd Division fallen soldiers in both World War II and Korea. This is a very highly decorated Army division.

Aves and other veterans of the 2nd Division thought that the memorial should be expanded even further to honor even more of the members of the 2nd Division who have lost their lives and to leave space for future modifications of this important memorial for soldiers from the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Like so much of what happens here, none of this was easy. When he first started to work on the memorial, he went to the Park Service, which gave him a firm “No, we are not going to help you. We are not going to let you move it. We are not going to let you expand it.”

Eventually, he came to us, his congressional delegation from Alaska, and we gave him a firm “Yes, we will help.”

We were able last year to include a provision in the 2018 National Defense Authorization Act to allow for the expansion of the 2nd Division Infantry Memorial.

Aves has been working hard at this ever since—working with agencies, raising private money for this memorial, and getting design approval.

Aves has been married to Phyllis for almost 51 years. Kristin is a wonderful daughter who has two sons of her own. Aves is proud of his grandsons, Logan and Aaron Michael, and we are all very grateful for his work on the economy of Alaska, on the logistics, on the supply, and for his work for veterans. He is someone who cares so much and so

deeply about his State, about his community, about his industry, about his country.

So, Aves, happy retirement, although we know you are going to continue to work hard. Thanks for all you have done for Alaska, for America, and thank you for being our Alaskan of the Week.

I yield the floor.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:17 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, July 18, 2019, at 10 a.m.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

##### IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS AND 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., SECTIONS 601 AND 8033:

##### To be admiral

VICE ADM. MICHAEL M. GILDAY

##### NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

ROBERT L. SUMWALT III, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM OF THREE YEARS. (REAPPOINTMENT)

##### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

AURELIA SKIPWITH, OF INDIANA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE, VICE DANIEL M. ASHE, RESIGNED.

##### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

CARMEN G. CANTOR, OF PUERTO RICO, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA.

MICHAEL GEORGE DESOMBRE, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF THAILAND.

SUNG Y. KIM, OF CALIFORNIA, 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 INDONESIA.

##### EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

CHARLOTTE A. BURROWS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2023. VICE CHAI RACHEL FELDBLUM, TERM EXPIRED.

KEITH E. SONDERLING, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2024. VICE CHARLOTTE A. BURROWS, TERM EXPIRED.

#### DISCHARGED NOMINATION

The Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs was discharged from further consideration of the following nomination under the authority of the order of the Senate of 01/07/2009 and the nomination was placed on the Executive Calendar:

\*MARK LEE GREENBLATT, OF MARYLAND, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

\*Nominee has committed to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.