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

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

Let us pray.
Eternal God, our shelter in the time of storms, we thank You for this land we love. We are grateful for its history, government, discoveries, knowledge, creativity, and vision. As our lawmakers seek to keep our Nation strong, may they act and speak in ways that make us proud to be Americans. Use our Senators to banish hate and bigotry, inspiring our citizens to live together in peace. May the words of our legislators’ mouths and the meditations of their hearts receive Your approval.

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.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

The Senator from Iowa.
Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask permission to speak in morning business for 1 minute.

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

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT
Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Trade Agreement will be a very big boon to the American worker. In my State, one out of every four American manufacturing firms export to Canada and Mexico. Seventy percent of these are very small or medium-sized businesses. More than 25,400 Iowans depend on manufacturing jobs.

By encouraging auto manufacturers to use more U.S. content in our cars and high-wage labor, the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement will help American workers compete on a level playing field and benefit from selling to two of our largest trading partners.

IOWA
Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, on another matter, at the website ThisIsIowa.com, you can view a video of people visiting a fake real estate office in New York advertising modern, spacious properties. You can see the astonishment, then, on the faces of New Yorkers as they are shown beautiful, modern apartments, as well as homes near art museums and award-winning restaurants.

The prices and the neighborhood amenities seem too good to believe. The details are real and so are the job opportunities real. Only the location is not New York. The location is Iowa. Check it out on ThisIsIowa.com. I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

BUDGET AGREEMENT
Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, earlier this week the President pro tempore and Speaker PELOSI reached an agreement to avoid a government funding crisis and provide for our Armed Forces. In the tough circumstances of divided government, they achieved the kind of deal that our national defense actually needs. The 2-year funding agreement will secure the resources we need to continue restoring the readiness of our Armed Forces and modernizing them to meet the 21st-century challenges that face our country.

As I mentioned yesterday, I always find it curious when our Democratic colleagues take the negotiating position that funding critical Pentagon missions and providing for the common defense is not a partisan Republican priority. They act like only Republicans want a modern, ready military, such that our spending on national defense needs to be matched up with other spending in order to make it palatable to Democrats.

In one sense, my Republican colleagues and I will probably say, “guilty as charged.” Yes, we absolutely prioritize the national defense and the U.S. military. Yes, we prioritize keeping Americans safe. This is the fundamental obligation of the U.S. government.

Over the past 2½ years, it has been a Republican President who has sought to reverse the previous 8 years of decline in defense. It has been Republicans in Congress who prioritized rebuilding our national defense after the Obama administration’s neglect and atrophy. Thanks to the Trump administration’s tough negotiating, this deal will secure a larger increase in defense funding than in nondefense programs relative to current law. Better than parity for defense.

I doubt Members need any reminding about why these investments are so critical, but if they do, every day’s newspapers make the case loud and clear. For years, our adversaries have methodically stepped up their incursions and their aggressions. They want to chip away at the peaceful, rules-based international order that American leadership has helped to establish and preserve.

Between 2009 and 2018, the Chinese Communist Party increased its military spending—listen to this—by 83 percent. Between 2010 and 2018, the Chinese Communist Party increased its military spending—listen to this—by 83 percent. The Chinese Communist Party increased its military spending—listen to this—by 83 percent. As I mentioned yesterday, I always find it curious when our Democratic colleagues take the negotiating position that funding critical Pentagon missions and providing for the common defense is not a partisan Republican priority. They act like only Republicans want a modern, ready military, such that our spending on national defense needs to be matched up with other spending in order to make it palatable to Democrats.

In one sense, my Republican colleagues and I will probably say, “guilty as charged.” Yes, we absolutely prioritize the national defense and the U.S. military. Yes, we prioritize keeping Americans safe. This is the fundamental obligation of the U.S. government.

Over the past 2½ years, it has been a Republican President who has sought to reverse the previous 8 years of decline in defense. It has been Republicans in Congress who prioritized rebuilding our national defense after the Obama administration’s neglect and atrophy. Thanks to the Trump administration’s tough negotiating, this deal will secure a larger increase in defense funding than in nondefense programs relative to current law. Better than parity for defense.

I doubt Members need any reminding about why these investments are so critical, but if they do, every day’s newspapers make the case loud and clear. For years, our adversaries have methodically stepped up their incursions and their aggressions. They want to chip away at the peaceful, rules-based international order that American leadership has helped to establish and preserve.

Between 2009 and 2018, the Chinese Communist Party increased its military spending—listen to this—by 83 percent.
percent—83 percent. Talk about a buildup. The Chinese nearly doubled their military spending in less than a decade. This is just the PRC’s publicly acknowledged funding.

These numbers have very real implications. China gets a leg up in terms of readiness or technology, they are able to hold a greater number of U.S. and allied forces at risk. They are able to push their air and maritime control further into the Indo-Pacific region, increasing hegemonic control and challenging the United States and our allies back.

So the importance of this funding agreement is not simply our ability to provide for the upkeep and regular maintenance on our military as it currently exists. We are also talking about building the U.S. military of the future—research, development, and modernization—so that our Nation and our service members are equipped to keep Americans safe and project power as necessary for years and decades to come.

In my view, this grave responsibility should be a top, top priority on both sides of the aisle, and this funding agreement will allow us to get it done. I am committed to making the necessary investments needed to meet the growing needs of servicemembers stationed at installations around the country, like Ft. Campbell, Ft. Knox, and the Blue Grass Army Depot in Kentucky. The deal will secure sorely needed investment in the national defense, and it contains none of the far-left poison pills that House Democrats had sought, like going backward on the issue of life or stripping away rightful Presidential authorities. In divided government, that is what we call a good deal. The Senate will vote on it before the end of next week.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, on another matter, first, the Senate will confirm several more impressive nominations. We are currently considering Stephen Dickson, of Georgia, to lead the Federal Aviation Administration. After him, we will turn our attention to two district court nominees. Wendy Williams Berger is the President’s choice for the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Florida. She is a two-time graduate of Florida State University, with nearly three decades of courtroom experience, half of which has come on the bench.

Brian Buescher has been tapped for a vacancy in the District of Nebraska, where he has spent nearly two decades practicing law. Throughout his career, he has gained experience in a wide array of legal areas and has earned admiration within the Nebraska legal community and beyond.

Those who know Mr. Buescher praise his “integrity, integrity, professionalism, attentiveness, and character.” The mayor of Omaha, where he has spent his entire legal career said: “Mr. Buescher would be an impartial judge capable of setting aside personal opinion.”

Despite his objective qualifications and all this praise, our Senate Democratic colleagues were not satisfied. Here was the bombshell that offended some of our colleagues with respect to this nominee. Listen to this. The nominee is a practicing Catholic.

My goodness, imagine that—in the United States of America, a person of faith, serving in government. Really? In particular, some of our Democratic colleagues raked him over the coals in committee for his membership in the Knights of Columbus. It is shocking that a nominee for Federal district court would be a member of the Knights of Columbus.

Of course, we all know the Knights—a noted worldwide “extremist sect” of Catholics, which is about 2 million men strong, known among other things for their love of their Catholic faith, their unparalleled commitment to charitable work, annual fundraising barbecues and pancake breakfasts.

Outrageous. I can’t believe I need to repeat it in the U.S. Capitol, but there is nothing about living out one’s faith that is disqualifying for public service—what the Constitution does forbid is imposing any kind of religious test for public office.

It is the Democrats’ opposition to this nominee’s faith, not his faith itself, that has raised the grumblings of our Constitution. Fortunately, this tactic didn’t fly. Our colleagues on the Judiciary Committee saw this tactic for what it is and voted to report Mr. Buescher favorably to the floor. I will be proud to vote to confirm him later today.

| OPIOID EPIDEMIC |

| Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, on another matter, the epidemic of opioid and substance abuse has wreaked havoc throughout our country. More than 2 million Americans suffer from opioid addiction. For years, the situation only seemed to get worse and worse. Unfortunately, my home State of Kentucky saw the pain first-hand. We are among the hardest hit States by this crisis.

Last week, both Kentucky and the entire Nation received a glimmer of hope. Preliminary figures from the National Center for Health Statistics show that last year, 2018, saw the first—the first—nationwide decline in drug overdose deaths since 1999. For 26 straight years, overdose deaths climbed. But in 2018, that tragic number finally dropped. It was approximately a 5-percent decline nationwide.

In Kentucky, the Bluegrass State saw overdose deaths fall by nearly 15 percent last year, the largest drop in our State in more than a decade. After years of working and waiting, we are finally seeing progress in the fight to save lives. These numbers didn’t happen on their own. Our comprehensive response involves countless law enforcement officers, medical professionals, educators, community leaders, and family members and friends of those affected.

I am proud of that. Several times in recent years, this Senate has done our part to bolster this fight with sweeping—sweeping—bipartisan action. We passed wide-ranging legislation to backstop the work on the frontlines with new programs, new funding for research, and new Federal resources for the communities most in need.

Just last year, we passed another landmark bill to attack the crisis of abuse from every single angle. Among its many features, the legislation makes it harder to traffic illegal drugs across the border; it supports mothers and babies struggling with opioid withdrawal; and it even includes one of my provisions to help those in recovery find good job and stable housing as they work toward long-term recovery.

I am particularly proud of Kentucky’s own role in leading in this recovery. Researchers at the University of Kentucky received a Federal grant in the school’s history to fight opioid abuse all across our State. I was pleased to help them secure these resources as they aim to achieve a 40-percent reduction of opioid overdose deaths in 3 years.

In my hometown of Louisville, a private sector research facility received FDA approval for a medicine to ease withdrawal symptoms. I have worked to ensure the inclusive support in Kentucky counties under the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area Program and increase coordination among local, State, and Federal law enforcement on drug interdiction.

This tireless work by Kentuckians has helped write the headlines we are celebrating today, but, of course, there is still much more to do. We know this is not the end of the battle against addiction—not even close—but it is encouraging to see the steps of progress, prevent and treat addiction, and ultimately save lives.

| ISRAEL |

| Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, on one final matter yesterday, the Democratic House of Representatives took a small step—small—to denounce the scourge of anti-Semitism. They passed a symbolic resolution opposing the BDS movement.

It is too bad all of this, of all things, couldn’t have been a unanimous vote. It is too bad that 16 Democrats voted against condemning BDS. Sixteen Democrats voted against condemning BDS over in the House yesterday.

It is regrettable that some of the Democrats who claim to represent the
future of their party lobbied against the measure that should be completely without controversy.

Even more broadly, I am sorry the bipartisan Senate-passed bill that would actually do something about BDS—in other words, action, not merely rhetoric—is still languishing over in the House without a vote, bipartisan legislation that passed with the support of 77 Senators, including my friend the Democratic leader—77 votes in the Senate, thoroughly bipartisan, but the Democratic House has found a way to fumble the ball.

Several months back, it took days of throat-clearing and a whole lot of water before they could even halfway condemn anti-Semitic remarks by one of their own Members. Now this symbolic BDS resolution is held up as a major victory, while Senate-passed legislation that would actually take action—actually do something against BDS—doesn’t even get a vote, whether not even give it a vote over there in the House.

House Republicans have called for a vote on S. 1 over and over and over again, but the Speaker of the House doesn’t seem interested.

I understand that picking fights with the President seems to be a higher priority across the Capitol than joining with the Senate to get bipartisan legislation actually made into law, but surely taking action to combat anti-Semitic efforts to delegitimize Israel shouldn’t be too much to ask.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Stephen M. Dickson, of Georgia, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration for the term of five years.

TAX REFORM

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, last week, Senator CARDIN and I introduced our S Corporation Modernization Act. That brings the total of tax reform bills I have introduced so far this year to six.

Obviously, 2017 was a banner year for tax reform. In December of 2017, we passed the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, a historic, comprehensive reform of our Tax Code that put more money in American families’ pockets and helped spur growth in our businesses.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act has been a great success for our economy and for hard-working Americans, but there are still things we can do to strengthen our Tax Code even further.

As I mentioned last week, Senator CARDIN and I introduced our S Corporation Modernization Act. S corporations are the most common formal business structure in the United States. There are nearly 5 million of these businesses throughout the United States, including large numbers in rural America.

Despite the popularity of S corporations, however, there have been few S corporation-related changes to the Tax Code since this business structure was created.

There are things we can do to make it easier for these businesses to operate and raise capital. That is why Senator CARDIN and I developed the S Corporation Modernization Act. Our legislation makes pro-growth reforms that will make these businesses easier to grow and create new jobs and opportunities in their communities.

Change is a human constant, but with modern technology, the pace of change has seemed to accelerate. American businesses face very different situations than they did even a decade ago. It is important that our Tax Code keeps pace with the 21st century economy.

In February, I reintroduced my Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Simplification Act along with Senator SHERROD BROWN. Today substantial numbers of workers travel to different States for temporary work assignments on a regular basis, and they end up subject to a bewildering variety of State laws governing State income tax.

Senator BROWN’s and my legislation would create an across-the-board standard for mobile employees who spend a short period of time working across State lines. It would ensure that States receive fair tax payments while substantially simplifying tax requirements for employees and employers.

In March, I introduced two other bills focused on updating the Tax Code for the 21st century. For the last decade or so has seen the rise of the gig economy—services provided by individuals through apps and websites like Uber, Lyft, TaskRabbit, Postmates, Grubhub, and many others. These arrangements have stretched the boundaries of current tax law.

My New Economy Works to Guarantee Independence and Growth Act, or the NEW Gig Act, as we call it, updates our tax law to provide clear guidance on the classification of this new generation of workers. It will ensure that Uber drivers, Postmates, Taskers, and others are treated as independent contractors for purposes of tax law if they meet a set of objective criteria. The certainty my bill provides will benefit not only these workers but also traditional independent contractors like freelance writers and delivery drivers.

I also introduced the Digital Goods and Services Tax Fairness Act in March with Senator WYDEN. Our legislation is designed to prevent consumers from being faced with multiple taxes for downloading digital products.

For example, right now, a digital purchase of a television series could hypothetically be taxed in up to three States, depending on the circumstances of the purchase. The Digital Goods and Services Tax Fairness Act would provide rules of the road for taxing digital goods and services and ensure that digital purchases could only be taxed in one State—the State in which the consumer resides.

We would also prohibit States and local governments from taxing digital goods at higher rates than tangible goods. In other words, under our bill, that season of “The Office” that you want to buy digitally shouldn’t be taxed at a higher rate than what you were purchasing the season on DVD.

We have a proud history of charitable giving in this country. Americans care about a lot of worthy causes and are committed to helping those in need. That is why I have routinely introduced amendments to the Tax Code to make charitable giving easier, several of which have been signed into law.

This year, I again introduced the Charities Helping Regularly Throughout the Year Act, or CHARITY Act, with Senator CASEY. This year’s version of our bill builds on some of the provisions we succeeded in getting passed over the past few years and will continue to help make it easier for Americans to give—and charities to receive—money.

Finally, this year I once again introduced legislation to repeal the punitive double tax on inheritances hypothetically be taxed in up to three States, depending on the circumstances of the purchase. The Digital Goods and Services Tax Fairness Act would provide rules of the road for taxing digital goods and services and ensure that digital purchases could only be taxed in one State—the State in which the consumer resides.

CHARITY Act, with Senator CASEY. This year’s version of our bill builds on some of the provisions we succeeded in getting passed over the past few years and will continue to help make it easier for Americans to give—and charities to receive—money.

Finally, this year I once again introduced legislation to repeal the punitive double tax on inheritances—money.

I am proud of the progress we have made for American businesses and American families with the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, and I will continue working on these bills to further refine the Tax Code to spur economic growth and to address the realities of the 21st century economy.

TRIBUTE TO LYNN TJEERDSMA

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, the resolution before us is close. I would like to take a couple of minutes to recognize a staffer of mine who will be retiring at the end of this work period.
Lynn Tjeerdema first came to work for me in 2007 to help out on the 2008 farm bill. After the bill passed, he headed back to the Farm Service Agency at the U.S. Department of Agriculture to serve as Assistant Deputy Administrator for Farm Programs, but I asked him back in 2011 to work with me on the 2012—which actually ended up being the 2014—farm bill, and he has been with me ever since.

I suppose it is possible that there is someone who knows the ins and outs of farm policy better than Lynn, but I have yet to meet that person.

After working with Lynn in 2007 and 2008, I asked him back for the 2012 farm bill because I wanted the best for South Dakota’s farmers and ranchers, and Lynn is the best. There is a reason for that.

Lynn has an impressive farm policy résumé that isn’t just the administrative and the legislative side. In addition to working for me, he worked for Senator Larry Pressler on the 1990 farm bill, and he has extensive experience in the executive branch of our government.

He worked for the Farm Service Agency at the Department of Agriculture for years as a county executive director in Moody, SD; as a county executive director in Cass County, ND; as a program specialist and later a branch chief; and then, as I mentioned, as Assistant Deputy Administrator for Farm Programs. He also worked for the non-profit Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership. As impressive as his farm policy résumé is, that is not all Lynn has been with me ever since.

Lynn is a farmer—although he farmed a large farm near Platte, SD. So he has a deep connection to farm policy and farmers and ranchers and how we can meet their needs here in Washington, DC.

Lynn is not just an agricultural policy expert; Lynn is a farmer—not was a farmer—although he farmed a large spread for 15 years before going to work for the Department of Agriculture as a farmer. Lynn still owns and operates a corn and soybean farm near Platte, SD. So he has a deep insight into the challenges facing farmers and ranchers and how we can meet their needs here in Washington, DC.

I have talked a lot about Lynn’s agricultural expertise. I have relied on it for almost a decade. South Dakota’s farmers and ranchers are better off today because of the knowledge and insight Lynn has brought to the table. I also want to talk about Lynn personally.

Every one of us in the Senate wants smart and knowledgeable staffers, but in an ideal world, our staffers aren’t just smart and knowledgeable; they also have the kind of character that Lynn displays—dedicated, hard-working, cheerful, generous, humble, and unfailingly kind.

He is the kind of public servant we all aim to be and a gentleman in the very truest sense of the word.

I am not the only one who is going to miss Lynn. Every one of my staffers is going to miss him as well. He has been a mentor to many in the office, and, perhaps more importantly, he has been supplying the staff with doughnuts every Friday for years.

After a tough week, everyone looked forward to Lynn’s Friday morning email letting them know Krispy Kreme were in the office. The doughnut notification email always included a list of things Lynn was thankful for that week, whether it was the weather or the fact that South Dakota farmers had gotten all their soybeans in the ground.

Lynn and his wife Mary were generous hosts, as well, inviting staffers over for Easter egg hunts and cookouts. We will miss other distinctly Lynn things, too, like his impressive cowboy boot collection or how we had to prevent him from biking home in a torrential downpour. Lynn has logged more than 5,000 miles on his bike while working for me, traveling from his home in Averill to the Dirksen Building on a daily basis.

And, of course, everyone will miss Lynn’s stories—like the one about the day that a younger Lynn tried to bring a rattlesnake home in a burlap bag. As you can imagine, the snake did not appreciate the accommodations, so he got loose, slithering under the driver’s seat of Lynn’s car. Lynn’s abrupt exit from the vehicle created quite a hazard that day, with the snake as the only occupant of the now driverless vehicle rolling down the driveway near his childhood home.

When I talk about missing Lynn, I also have to talk about the farmers and ranchers in my State who will miss having him here in Washington. More than once, agricultural groups in South Dakota have asked Lynn to keynote during annual banquets. On one occasion, I offered to give a speech but was told that Lynn was the preferred speaker.

Lynn will be sorely missed, but he has more than earned his retirement. I know how much he is looking forward to spending more time with his wife Mary and their 5 children and 10 grandchildren. I know he and Mary plan to travel to Hawaii and Alaska that it is a goal of Lynn’s to visit as many national parks as he possibly can.

I know he will enjoy sitting, watching the waves with Mary at their house in Arizona and, of course, continuing to farm his corn and soybeans in South Dakota.

Lynn, thank you for your service and your friendship. May God bless you in your retirement.

I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). The clerk will call the roll. The 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.
The union movement always protects its workers. We need them to be stronger in America. That is one of the reasons income is going up to the top and not going to the middle class anymore—because we don’t have as strong unions as we should. But the unions, when they get behind something, God bless them.

Finally, I want to thank the first responders who came here themselves and who delayed cancer treatments to testify. Those who wheeled the Halls of Congress in their wheelchairs to chase down legislators, who gifted lawmakers their NYPD badges and FDNY patches—the sacred totems of their service—to remind those public servants to do the right thing. Many are no longer with us: James Zadroga, Luis Alvarez, and my dear friend Ray Pfeifer. Wherever they may now be, let them breathe a final sigh of relief knowing their friends are cared for and the job is well done.

Mr. President, on another issue, all eyes are no doubt on the House Judiciary Committee, where, as I speak, former Special Counsel Robert Mueller is testifying. His testimony is unquestionably of great interest and importance to the Nation. But even without the special counsel’s testimony today, Congress must grapple with the report he has already written.

The principal conclusion of the first section of the Mueller report was that Russia interfered in our 2016 elections, in his words, in a “sweeping and systematic” fashion. What he described in that section of his report constitutes nothing less than an attack on our democracy. It is almost like going to war and hurting our men and women in the Armed Forces.

This administration and this Chamber frankly have done not enough—not nearly enough—to respond to that attack and to prevent such an attack from taking place again.

I know we are going to have a great deal of debate on the obstruction of justice—I am appalled by what the President did there—but there should be no debate on A. Russian interference in our election—that is unequivocal—and, B, that we must do a lot more about it to prevent it from happening in 2020.

The Trump administration has been horrible—unpatriotic, un-American, and almost letting America fall prey to a nasty, brutal foreign power: Russia. This administration has watered down or failed to fully implement sanctions against Russia for what they did in 2016, and in the Senate, as usual, our Republican colleagues bow down in obeisance.

Leader McCONNELL—shame on him—has stymied progress and consigned bipartisan bill after bill to his legislative graveyard. These are bipartisan bills. There are many Republicans who want to do something here. Leader McCONNELL doesn’t. And that has nothing to do with Democrat, Republican, liberal, conservative; that has to do with patriotism and defending America. Bipartisan bills to harden our election structure are languishing. The Republican majority has even blocked Democratic requests to provide additional election security funding to the States.

Just yesterday, the FBI Director confirmed that President Putin remains intent on interfering in our elections, and we haven’t done enough to deter that. Even the bravest of President Putin’s assault on our democracy in 2016, the response of the Republican majority in the Senate has been tepid.

I know there were great divisions about certain parts of the Mueller report. We are seeing it in the hearings going on now. But there can be no division—and I haven’t heard any Republican on that panel so far contest the fact that Russia interfered in our elections in a strong way in 2016. Why aren’t we doing something about it now? It’s not forget the political divisions. Let’s forget the petition of President Trump, who says: Well, my election may not be legitimate if I admit that the Russians interfered.

President Trump, the Russians have interfered, and every American knows it. Let’s not let it happen in 2020. Let’s work together on this. It is vital to the future of American democracy.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll. The yeas and nays are mandatory. vote on Stephen M. Dickson nomination

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Dickson nomination?

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.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 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).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) would have voted “aye.”

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

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

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 225 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Alexander
Barrasso
Blackburn
Hunt
Boozman
Brown
Burr
Capito
Colony
Collins
Corzine
Craney
Cramer
Crapo
Cruz
Daines
Rani
Ernst
Peyser
Gardner
Grassley
Hawley
Hoven
Hurst
Inhofe
Johnson
Kennedy
Lee
Lankford
Lee
McConnell
McConkey
Merkley
Murray
Nelson
Reed
Rosen

Portman
Risch
Roberts
Romney
Rounds
Rubio
Sasse
Scott (FL)
Scott (RC)
Shelby
Sullivan
Thune
Tillis
Toomey
Wicker
Young

NAYS—40

Baldwin
Bennet
Bruno
Brown
Butler
Carson
Carper
Casey
Cocce
Cortez Masto
Corker
Durbin
Fenestern
Hassan
Heinrich

Jones
Kaine
King
Leahy
Manchin
Markley
Menendez
Merkle
Murray
Nelson
Reed
Rosen

Schumer
Shaheen
Sinema
Stabenow
Tester
Udall
Van Hollen
Warner
Whitehouse
Wyden

NOT VOTING—8

Bennet
Booker
Gillibrand
Gillum

Harris
Isakson
Klobuchar

Sanders
Warren

The nomination was confirmed.

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

CLOUTING 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 bill clerk read as follows:

CLOUTING 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 Wendy Williams Berger, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida.

Mitch McConnell, Bill Cassidy, David Perdue, John Thune, Roy Blunt, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Braun, James E. Risch, Mike Rounds, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Johnny Isakson, John Boozman, Marco Rubio, Kevin Cramer, Pat Roberts.

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 Wendy Williams Berger, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida, 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.
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 New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 55, nays 37, as follows: [Rollcall Vote No. 226 Ex.]

**YEAS—55**

Alexander ... Wasserlauf

Bennet ... Rosen

Booker ... Sanders

Gillibrand ... Klobuchar

UNEQUAL CONSENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 55, the nays are 37. The motion is agreed to.

**EXECUTIVE CALENDAR**

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 New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 29, as follows: [Rollcall Vote No. 227 Ex.]

**YEAS—52**

Alexander ... Wasserlauf

Bennet ... Sanders

Booker ... Warren

Gillibrand ... Klobuchar

UNEQUAL CONSENT

The PRESSING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 29. The motion is agreed to.
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is a necessary part of effective gov-
erning. There is no doubt that there are other pri-
orities I would have liked to have seen included in the deal. I
wish we had done something to reform our entitle-
ment programs, which will continue to outpace inflation and in-
crease our deficits. Someday, we are going to have to deal with our deficits and debt; I just hope it is not during the time of a national emer-
gency. But as a practical matter, Speaker PELOSI wasn't going to agree with me. One of the most encouraging reforms in the context of this spending deal and debt limit provision. Thankfully, the Presi-
dent was able to secure half of the spending cuts he asked for—roughly equal to next year's increase in non-
defense spending. Above all, this deal carries out the most critical responsibilities of the Federal Government, which is to sup-
port our national defense and fully fund the government's operation.

I applaud the President's efforts here and particularly those in his administration who helped negotiate this bipartisan deal—particularly Secretary MNUCHIN. I look forward to supporting it.

OPIOID EPIDEMIC

Mr. President, last week, the National Center for Health Statistics released preliminary data showing that drug overdose deaths in America declined by about 5 percent last year. Before my colleagues to applaud, let me point out that drug overdoses killed more than 70,000 Americans the year before. So a 5-percent reduction is wel-
come, but obviously it is still very alarming. This 5-percent decline is the first national drop in three decades, though, and for communities across the country that continue to battle the opioid epidemic, it is a small indica-
tion that our efforts here in Congress are having an impact. We certainly have a long fight ahead of us, but this is an encouraging turn.

If you look closer, the data shows that the decline is due almost entirely to a decrease in prescription opioid-related deaths. Those caused by other opioids—particularly fentanyl and her-
oin—remain on the rise.

The cruel reality is that the more we step up our efforts to limit prescription opioid diversion, the higher the de-
mand is for other illegal drugs, many of which come across our southern bor-\nder. We can't limit our efforts to what can be done here at home. In order for our work to be successful and for us to save more lives, we have to stop this poison from entering our country in the first place.

I have the honor of cochairing the Senate Caucus on International Nar-
cotics Control with Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN of California, where we are working on ways to do exactly that—to slow down the poison coming across our border.

If you look at many of the challenges we face here at home—whether it is the opioid epidemic, the humanitarian cri-
sis at the border, the criminal gangs on our streets—much of that can be di-
rectly traced to the violence that ex-
ists in Central America and Mexico.

This morning, I had the pleasure of speaking at the Hudson Institute about my proposal to attack this crisis from an interagency ap-
proach, something we call the New Americas Recommitment to Counter-
narcotics Operations and Strategy. As the Presiding Officer knows, we love a good acronym here in Washington, DC, and we will commonly refer to this initiative as the NARCOS Initiative.

First, it takes aim at the dangerous substances that are crossing our south-
ern border. Customs and Border Pro-
tection officers are incredibly well-
trained and equipped to find illegal drugs, and seize an average of 5,800 pounds of narcotics each day. By the way, on June 16, Customs and Border Protection seized 20 tons of cocaine—which is the largest seizure in the 230-
year history of Customs and Border Protection—with an estimated street value of $1.3 billion. So good for them. They are extremely professional and well-trained law enforcement officers.

As we know, many of these drugs make their way into the interior of our country and into local communities, causing untold misery and grief. Stopping their production and movement is not a fight we can win alone. It will take a bipartisan, long-term commitment from the Fed-
eral Government, as well as our foreign partners. An important step is to strengthen law enforcement coopera-
tion by improving intelligence-sharing and providing training for some of our foreign partners. It is an important force multiplier and a necessary com-
ponent of our counternarcotics efforts.

In addition to attacking the drugs themselves, the NARCOS Initiative goes after the cartels and transnational criminal organizations that profit from this business. These groups are what I call commodity-ag-
nostic. They really don't care who they hurt or what they ply. The only thing they care about is making money. It is not just narcotics they are dealing; it is human trafficking, migrant smugg-
ling, money laundering, counterfeit goods, public corruption. The list of crimes is long, indeed, and they do all of it. These transnational criminal organiza-
tions turn an enormous profit from their corrupt dealings, and then they have to launder the money they use to finance their operation. We know that one of the most effective ways to suf-
focate criminal networks is to cut off the money, so that is precisely where we should aim.

The Senate Judiciary Committee recently passed legislation to combat money laundering and other illicit fi-
ancing, which includes a provision that I offered that has to do with the role of remittances. According to the United Nations, over $300 billion in il-
licit transnational crimes proceeds likely flows through the U.S. financial system. The provision included on re-
imittances requires Treasury to submit an analysis of the use of remittances by drug kingpins and crime syndicates and develop a strategy to prevent them from using that remittance system in criminal enterprises.

It is also time for us to reevaluate our current strategy and to determine how to update the Bank Secrecy Act, which are attracted by the easy access to criminal enterprises.

In addition to fueling violence and instability, the conditions in Central Amer-
cica serve as a push factor. As human beings, we all understand people fleeing violence and poverty. So en-
couraging those countries to provide safety and stability for their own peo-
ple so they can stay in their homes and live their lives ought to be one of the Ag-
goals that we define. These push factors encourage migrants to take the same routes used by cartels and criminal organizations to reach the United States. As we know, some of them simply don't make it. They die in the process. Young women are routinely sexually assaulted. It is a miserable alternative to staying at home and living in safety and security.

We know all of this has contributed to the humanitarian crisis at our southern border. We all know but have not yet had the political will to reform our broken laws and prevent these smugglers and criminal organizations from gaming the system.

I know the Presiding Officer was at the border earlier this week. I have tried to figure out how we crack this nut. How do we take this polarized en-
vironment and provide the tools nec-
essary to begin to staunch the flow of humanity coming across our border? Those are attracted by the easy access to the United States through our bro-
ken laws but also the push factors, like the violence and poverty in their coun-
tries.

I am working with a Democratic col-
league of mine from Laredo, TX, HENRY CUELLAR. Together, we introduced the HUMANAE Act, which made great strides to help fix our broken asylum system in a way that would give legiti-
mate asylees an opportunity to present themselves on a timeliness of an immigration judge. It would also make sure the conditions of their cus-
tody while they are here in the United States are something we can be proud of. Specifically, what this bill does is close a loophole in the law known as the Flores settlement, which is often used by smugglers to gain entry into the United States. It would streamline the processing of migrants and improve standards of care for individuals in cus-
tody.

If we want to restore law and order and make it sustainable, we need to look at ways to invest in economic de-
velopment to help these countries build
stronger economies. But I share some of the concerns expressed by the President and others. We need some metrics. We need a strategy. We need reliable foreign partners that can work with us.

The one effort I can think of where we are successful working with foreign partners and strong leaders to really effect a dramatic change is the nation of Colombia, so-called Plan Colombia. Obviously, Mexico and the region are much more complex, and Plan Colombia isn’t solely about drug war. It’s part of that region. I think the concept is a sound one, one in which we come together on a bipartisan basis, develop a strategy, help train our foreign partners, and seek out strong leaders who can help us work through these challenges, because there is a multiplicity of challenges, as I have indicated.

One of the things that would help is to ratify the new and improved NAFTA, known as the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement, or the USMCA. Obviously, a strong economy in Mexico means people don’t have to come to the United States in order to provide for their families. The International Trade Commission’s analysis of the agreement shows some positive indicators for North American workmen, farmers, ranchers, and businesses. About 5 million American jobs depend on the binational trade with Mexico alone, which is some indication of how important this is.

We can strengthen public-private partnerships in other ways to help add to the effort to provide, a clean environment, and a positive relationship with our colleagues in Mexico. One example is the North American Development Bank. For every one NAD Bank dollar that has been invested in a project, it has successfully leveraged $20 in total infrastructure investment in using both private- and public-sector dollars. To that end, I have introduced legislation with Senator Feinstein, of California, to authorize the Treasury Department to increase NAD Bank’s capital and provide additional authority that is specifically related to port infrastructure.

We know the ports of entry are not only avenues of commercial trade and traffic but are where a lot of the high-end or expensive illegal drugs are smuggled through. We need to modernize those systems of entry. We need to expand the infrastructure and make sure they are adequately staffed, not only to facilitate the flow of legitimate trade and travel but also to stop these drugs from coming through the ports of entry.

I just want to say a few words about this NARCOS Initiative. I believe that we do need an all-government approach that would address the broad range of problems across Central America and Mexico, including successful working transnational criminal organizations themselves, with the products and services they provide, as well as with the corruption they fuel and the means by which they stay in business, but we are going to need responsible partners in this effort.

As our own experience with nation-building in the Middle East has demonstrated, we can’t want something for them and do nothing to help them do it for themselves. That is why it is so important to have a clear understanding about what the strategy is, what the goals are, and to have strong, reliable leaders in those countries who will work with us in a bipartisan way to accomplish our collective goal.

We have both the responsibility and the opportunity to make meaningful changes to stabilize the region, and I believe the time to act was yesterday. I hope our colleagues will join me in supporting this legislation to promote a secure and prosperous Western Hemisphere.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

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

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

29TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise to celebrate one of the seminal moments in American civil rights history. This week marks the 29th anniversary of the signing of the Americans with Disabilities Act. On July 26, 1990, President George H. W. Bush signed a sweeping, bipartisan bill that acknowledged and affirmed the rights of people with disabilities.

The passage of the so-called ADA promised that people with disabilities would be included in the guarantee of fundamental rights—just by way of examples, the right to petition the court when discriminated against; the right to apply for and be considered for a job; the right to have and the access to reading materials; the right to vote; the right to live, the right to travel. The ADA changed the lives of millions of individuals.

One of those voices belongs to Jean Searle from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Jean works at Disability Services Pennsylvania, where she protects the rights of people with disabilities so they may live the lives they choose—free from abuse, neglect, discrimination, and segregation.

As a child and young adult, Jean was forced to live in an institution. In that institution, she faced many indignities, the worst of which may have been having her infant child taken from her without her consent. Simply because Jean lived with a disability, it was often assumed that she was not capable of making her own decisions, but she worked hard to find a way out of that institution. When she finally succeeded, she chose to live independently in her community and has found a fulfilling career in Harrisburg.

The rights affirmed by the ADA and the services and supports Medicaid and other programs have provided much more for Jean, for her to be a full citizen of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and, yes, even of the United States of America. Jean has dedicated her life to protecting the rights of people with disabilities.

During this ADA anniversary week, it is also fitting that today is Jean’s birthday.

So, Jean, in looking at your picture on my left, I say happy birthday. I also want to wish the same to those people whom I referred to earlier, was taken from her, Jean had the opportunity recently to meet him for the first time. Jean often says that to make the world a better place, we need to spend our time listening to people with disabilities and learning from the disability community.

Well said, Jean.

When I listen, I hear about the greatness of the ADA and, at the same time, about much more that still needs to be done. One of those things is to protect what we have. That includes protecting access to healthcare, preventing the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, and ensuring that Medicaid remains intact. We also need to continue to fight against threats to people with disabilities.

Over the past 2 years, we have seen a systemic and concerted effort to sabotage supports that are necessary for equality, opportunity, and the full participation of people with disabilities. What this administration has failed to do with legislation it is trying to accomplish through regulation and court cases. Cutting Medicaid is contrary to the ADA’s goals, and it makes it difficult—or even potentially impossible—for people with disabilities to work, to go to school, or to be engaged in their communities.

While we protect the hard-fought rights the disability community has earned and all of us can build upon the ADA’s promises. As we celebrate the ADA’s 29th anniversary, we can do at least three things—one honor the great advancements that have been made because of the ADA; remain vigilant to see that those who protect the ADA’s goals are realigned for all people with disabilities. I believe Jean’s own words make the point clearer than I can.

We must never go back. We must never forget the struggle that people with disabilities have gone through and are still going through today.
We must never go back, as Jean said. So, as we celebrate the ADA’s 29th anniversary, I promise—and I know it is the promise of many Members of Congress—to never forget that struggle. I also promise to stand side by side with the disability community to fully accomplish the ADA’s goals.

Mr. BROWN. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CASEY. I yield to Senator BROWN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I appreciate Senator CASEY’s advocacy for disabled Americans and for children especially.

I just want to make a brief comment, for I know he has some other comments to make, on his support for Medicaid and on the efforts that we have made together on the Finance Committee in fighting against President Trump’s attacks on Medicaid and the Affordable Care Act.

I know, in my State, the expansion of Medicaid and what came out of that meant that 900,000 more people had insurance, including a whole lot of people who were disabled. I know that Pennsylvania is the same way. So I thank Senator CASEY.

Mr. CASEY. I thank the senior Senator from Ohio, who makes the point broadly about the importance of Medicaid in the context of healthcare but especially with regard to Americans with disabilities. I thank him for his comments, and I thank him for his advocacy.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. President, my second topic involves a visit that I and a delegation of Senators made just a week ago—it will be a week ago on Friday—to McAllen, TX. I guess there were 13 of us in total. During that visit and throughout the course of the day, we toured DHS detention facilities—DHS is the Department of Homeland Security—including the McAllen Detention Facility in McAllen, TX, and the processing centers in both Donna and Ursula, TX.

I saw children who needed better care. I saw the overcrowding of adults, who were packed into cages or glass-enclosed rooms, and you couldn’t hear the voices of those behind the glass. I saw the need for hygiene products and better access to showers. At the same time, we also saw Catholic Charities—the Respite Center, run by Sister Norma Pimentel, known to so many as just “Sister Norma”—where migrants were welcomed, where migrants were cared for, and where migrants were treated with compassion.

I believe the White House’s policies take the opposite approach—that of not welcoming migrants but of pushing them away. I believe several of those policies make it bad not only for the migrants or immigrants but also for the DHS personnel who have to do the work. It is also bad for the security of our Nation.

I know, last Friday, that our delegation met a number of dedicated persons who work hard and who care about the families, but I cannot say that about all of those who work there. So, when there is mistreatment or when there is abuse, we need to make sure there is full accountability. At the same time, there are folks who work in our Border Patrol who agree with the White House’s policy on immigration or asylum or on its migration policy in general but who have difficult work to do. To those who are doing good work and showing compassion and respect, I commend them for that.

Instead of closing the door on asylum seekers who flee terrible violence and persecution, we should adopt policies that are more humane and that will help alleviate instead of exacerbate the humanitarian crisis. We should utilize effective alternatives to detention, like the Family Case Management Program—a pilot program that began in the last administration and pretty much ended in this administration. It had a 99-percent attendance rate—or success rate—at immigration court proceedings. The Family Case Management Program also had 99-percent compliance with ICE’s monitoring requirements.

We should ensure that migrant children are cared for by child welfare workers and have their medical needs fully met. We should also work to address the violence, poverty, and persecution that are causing so many to flee. I am a cosponsor of the Central American Reform and Enhancement Act, which is legislation that would address the root causes of migration by increasing aid to the Northern Triangle, creating new options for refugees to apply for entry from Mexico and Central America, and, of course, increasing the number of immigration judges to reduce court backlogs and creating new criminal penalties for the smuggling and defrauding of immigrants.

We know that some of the dollars recently appropriated will help on some of these priorities, but we have to make sure the dollars are spent wisely and appropriately and in full compliance with the law.

We are indeed a nation of laws, and we are also a nation of immigrants. These two principles are intertwined in our values, and they are not—they are not—competing values.

We shot the shot over and over again—both parties, both Chambers, and the administration—to pass something comparable to the comprehensive immigration reform bill that this body passed in 2013 that did not get a vote in the House.

Let me conclude this part of my remarks with this: The problem is not that we must choose between principles like being a rule-of-law country and being a nation of immigrants; the problem is that our immigration system is not working. There are suggestions to be made to improve the asylum process, we should be open to that, but pushing immigrants away and ending or short-circuiting or undermining the asylum process is not in the interest of the country.

It is entirely possible to have an immigration system that both respects the rule of law and treats all individuals with human dignity. I will continue to press this with the White House and the House and the Senate to work on bipartisan solutions so our immigration system again reflects those American values.

Mueller Report

Mr. President, I will conclude my remarks by raising the third topic, and it is timely for today. I want to do two things with regard to the service and the work of former Special Counsel Robert Mueller but also talk about the report he issued.

There is a reference in a narrative about Robert Mueller’s service in Vietnam that I won’t add to the RECORD because it is very long, but I will quote from it for just a couple of minutes. This is an account by the publication Wired. It is a long account, but I will just briefly read the beginning of it about his service.

Just imagine this: someone who grew up with probably not too many concerns about economic security; someone who had the benefit of a great education and then volunteered to serve in Vietnam.

This particular vignette says:

After [serving] nine months at war, he was finally due—

“Have to name Robert Mueller—

for a few short days of R&R outside the battle zone. Mueller had seen intense combat since he last said goodbye to his wife. He’d received the Bronze Star with a distinction for valor for his actions in one battle, and he’d been airlifted out of the jungle during another firefight after being shot in the thigh. [Robert] Mueller and [his wife] Ann had been spoken only twice since he had left for South Vietnam.

Then it goes on to say why he wanted to keep serving in the Marine Corps: I didn’t relish the US Marine Corps’ combat.

Then it goes on to talk about his decision to go to law school after being in Vietnam, with the goal of serving his country as a prosecutor. He went on to lead the Criminal Division of the Justice Department and to prosecute a lot of bad guys—my words, not words from the publication—and then “became director of the FBI before September 11, 2001, and stayed on to become the bureau’s longest-serving director since J. Edgar Hoover. And yet, throughout his five-decade career, that year of combat experience with the Marines has loomed large in Mueller’s mind. I’m most proud the Marine Corps deemed me worthy of leading other Marines;” he said in . . . 2009.

So that is his background—just some of his background: service to his country in Vietnam, service as a Federal prosecutor for many, many years, and then called upon to serve his country again. He is the embodiment of public service. He gives integrity and meaning...
and value to what President Kennedy called us all to do—to not ask what our country can do for us but what we can do for our country. Robert Mueller has answered that call over and over again. He is a person of integrity and ability. 

For the last few minutes before I yield the floor, I want to talk about some of his work. 

One of the points then—Special Counsel Mueller made in a statement I guess back in May was—he first of all outlined how the Russian Federation interfered with our election and point ed to the serious consequences of that, but then he also talked about how—when the second volume of the report deals with obstruction, he reminded us in that statement—at least I took from it, my impression of the statement—of not just the seriousness of what Russia did but the seriousness and the gravity of obstructing that kind of an investiga
tion. 

So if someone wanted to read just a portion of the report—the almost 500 pages—if you wanted to just zero in on some key parts of volume II about ob struction, you could start on page 77. That is a section titled “The President’s Efforts to Remove the Special Counsel.” Then there are other in stances—several instances of obstruction—alleged obstruction there. So if you read between pages 77 and 120 of volume II, you are going to learn a lot about obstruction. Let me read a couple of the lines that the report sets forth. 

When the special counsel walks through the factual predicate of what happened in the first instance where the President calls the White House Counsel, Mr. McGahn, and says some things that the special counsel con cluded were a directive to fire or have fired the special counsel, they say in the report on page—that is volume II, page 88: 

Substantial evidence, however, supports the conclusion that the President went fur ther and in fact directed McGahn to call Rosenstein to have the Special Counsel re moved. 

Page 89: 

Substantial evidence indicates that by June 17, 2017, the President knew his conduct was under investigation by a federal prose cutor who could present evidence of federal crimes to a grand jury. 

It goes on from there in the “Intent” section, where the special counsel has to lay out the evidence to prove intent because if you can’t prove intent, you can’t go much further. 

Substantial evidence indicates that the President’s attempts to remove the Special Counsel were linked to the Special Counsel’s oversight on investigations that involved the President’s conduct and, most immediately, to reports that the President was being in vestigated for potential obstruction of jus tice. 

So those are just three vignettes from page 88 and 89, of operative world there being “substantial evidence.” In other parts of the report, evidence is laid out. Sometimes they say there is not enough evidence, but I think “sub stantial evidence” is a compelling part of what we saw. 

Let me just quickly—because I know I am over time. I will now move to page 113. This is a separate section. This section is titled “The President’s Order to Fire the Special Counsel.” 

So referring back to the earlier section, and then, when they go through the evidence, they again get back to the consideration or the weighing of the evidence. 

I am looking at volume II, page 118—again, those words: 

Substantial evidence supports McGahn’s account that the President had directed him to have the Special Counsel removed, includ ing the timing and context of the President’s directive; the manner in which McGahn re acted; and the fact that the President had been told conflicts were substantial, were being considered by the Department of Justice, and should be raised with the Presi dent’s personal counsel rather than brought to McGahn. 

So you get the message I am sending. And the last one is on page 120—“Sub stantial evidence indicates” the fol lowing facts: 

So I raise all that because there is a lot of discussion about volume II and what the conclusion might have been. The reason I refer to those areas of substantial evidence is that in May of this year, there was a statement by former Federal prosecutors. We were told that McGahn—the chair of the special counsel—McGahn—sent letters to both parties signed a letter, and I will read just one sentence from the letter: “Each of us”—meaning these Republican and Democratic former prosecutors—“believes that the conduct of President Trump described in Special Counsel Robert Mueller’s re port would, in the case of any other person not covered by the Office of Legal Counsel’s policy against indicting a sitting President, result in multiple felony charges for obstruction of justice.” 

I think those prosecutors—I believe those prosecutors are resting that de termination that they each made indi viduality on those areas of the report that begin with the words “substantial evidence indicates.” 

I yield the floor. 

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROM ney). The Senator from Iowa.

EB-5 PROGRAM

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I come to the Senate floor to advise my colleagues about a new rule that the Department of Homeland Security published in the Federal Register this very day to finally bring some needed re form to the EB-5 green card program. 

As I mentioned in my remarks on this topic last week, this rule was first proposed in January 2017. Those of us who want to reform the EB-5 program have been working 2½ years for this rule to become final, and we have been waiting more than that for some meaningful reforms to this fraudulent-laden program that we tried to get enacted into law in previous Congresses and couldn’t get done be cause of being up against these very powerful, moneyed interests. I think the President and his team deserve a lot of credit for pushing these reforms across the finish line and getting a big win for rural America again. 

As I have said on numerous occa sions, Congress intended for the EB-5 program to help spur investment in rural and high-unemployment areas when this program was established in 1990. Unfortunately, over the last 30 years, big-moneyed interests have been able to gerrymander EB-5 targeted em ployment areas in a way that redirected investment away from our rural and economically deprived communities and towards major development projects in Manhattan and other big cities. Therefore, instead of providing much needed investment for rural America, as originally intended, EB-5 has become a source of cheap foreign capital for development projects in already prosperous areas. 

For the first time, this rule will bring much needed change so that condition cannot continue. Under the rule, States will no longer be allowed to game and gerrymander targeted em ployment areas. Instead, the Depart ment of Homeland Security will make targeted employment area designations directly based on revised requirements that will help to ensure rural and high-unemployment areas get much the investment they have been deprived of for far too long under this program, as it has been misdirected. 

Again, this is a major win for rural America and high-unemployment areas, and I want to sincerely thank President Trump and the people in the administration who worked on this rule for making this happen and looking out for the interests of my con stituents in Iowa and other rural States and for areas of high unemploy ment nationwide. 

This rule also addresses the min imum investment threshold amounts that are required for the EB-5 projects around the country. 

This is the very first time the investment thresholds have been adjusted since the program was created in 1990. Think of the inflation since that time. 

For projects that are outside of tar geted employment areas, the threshold will be raised from $1 million to $1.3 million. For projects in targeted employment areas, that will be raised from $500,000 to $900,000. The minimum investment amount will be automatically adjusted for inflation every 5 years. 

It is ridiculous that our country’s major green card program for investors has been operating with investment amounts that haven’t been adjusted a single time in 30 years. That makes no sense, and I am glad the President and his team have taken necessary action to give a little common sense to the EB-5 program. 

There is more work that needs to be done on the EB-5 program, and we will
have to do that by legislation, but the President and his administration deserve a lot of credit for finally implementing these first reforms that I and several other colleagues have championed for years. I hope we all understand, the President and the Members of the Senate, that it is very important for us to work together to get this done.

The real push to get this done is to really understand the power and influence that big-moneyed interests have historically had in Washington, and how they have used that power and influence to consistently thwart any attempt to reform this program in such an obvious way that it is really hard to believe.

Their unrelenting efforts to stymie EB-5 reform over the years absolutely epitomize the swamp culture so many voters rejected in the last Presidential election, and getting rid of that swamp culture is exactly what the President campaigned on. This is a perfect example of his carrying out a campaign promise.

They are also representative of a culture that is too often regarding the interests of the little guy in rural Iowa in favor of the interests of the rich and the powerful. Again, I applaud the President and his team for standing up to these rich and powerful interests.

I am happy to say that, with the publication of this rule, the little guys in rural America finally got a win in the EB-5 program. I now look forward to working with the President and my colleagues to build off of this win and bring further reform to the EB-5 program in the future. Thank you, President Trump.

**BUDGET AGREEMENT**

On another subject, for the past week there have been ongoing discussions between congressional leadership and the administration relating to an agreement on budget caps and raising the debt limit. Those discussions produced an agreement that was announced Monday night.

While these understand reaching an agreement was important to ensure the full faith and credit of the United States, I am disappointed the final agreement does not address a subject that has been causing heartache for millions of taxpayers for at least the past 6 months. The subject is what is known around Capitol Hill and Washington, DC, as tax extenders, things that come up every 2 or 3 years that need to be reauthorized.

For years, Congress has routinely acted on a bipartisan basis to extend a number of expired or expiring provisions. Typically, their extension would be included as part of a larger spending package or budget deal at the end of the year. Unfortunately, this never occurred at the end of last year. Now, here we are almost 7 months into the end of 2018 and 3 months after the close of the regular tax filing season, and taxpayers still have no answers.

The budget and debt limit agreement announced Monday night is yet another missed opportunity to provide answers for millions of taxpayers—both individuals and businesses—who are waiting on Congress so they can finalize their 2018 taxes and, in some cases, it may even mean whether or not they can stay in business.

While Finance Committee Ranking Member Wyden and I, working as a team, have long worked to address tax extenders since early on in this Congress, the new Democratic majority in the House of Representatives has been reluctant to act. It seems as though the House Democrats are unaware of the historic bipartisan, bicameral agreement that exists to ensure that provisions even apply to taxpayers, to industries, and maybe helping the entire economy. This is evidenced from the characterization of these provisions by some of these Members as ‘just tax breaks for corporations and businesses.’ So I want to tell you how these are not just tax breaks for corporations and businesses.

In fact, the overwhelming majority of the tax extenders either benefit individuals and families directly or they benefit our communities by giving a boost to local businesses that many people directly rely on for jobs and to support their local economies.

For illustration purposes, I have broken the tax extenders that expired in 2017 into four categories: tax relief for individuals, green energy incentives, employment and economic incentives for distressed areas, and general business incentives.

If you look at this chart, you will see that these four categories are broken down by the relative costs of the extension of the tax extender in each category. As you can see, based upon Joint Committee on Taxation estimates—of a 2-year extension of these provisions for 2018 and 2019, the largest cost associated with extending them is for what is termed ‘green energy incentives.’

These green energy incentives account for nearly 60 percent of the cost of this extension. These incentives include provisions to encourage the use and production of clean and renewable fuels, to promote electricity generation from certain clean and renewable sources, and tax incentives for more energy efficient buildings and homes.

Here I would have thought the new Democratic majority in the House would be all about what we call green jobs, creating new jobs, combating carbon emissions through alternative energy sources, and tax incentives for more energy efficient buildings and homes.

Yet the new Democratic majority has been reluctant to embrace a bipartisan tax package with nearly 60 percent of the cost dedicated to green energy incentives.

The long delay in addressing these provisions is needlessly putting thousands of good-paying green jobs at risk, costing about 40 employees their jobs. Just this very day, a renewable energy group announced it is closing a Texas plant due to the uncertainty of the biodiesel tax credit. Should we fail to extend the biodiesel tax credit soon, many more will be closed. That would put the 60,000 jobs supported by the biodiesel industry nationwide in jeopardy.

Going to another one, after this green jobs provision expires, the other provisions the Bipartisan Conference Committee discussed, individual provisions represent the second largest component of tax extenders, totaling nearly one-third of the cost. These provisions include relief for homeowners who obtained debt forgiveness on home mortgages, a deduction for mortgage insurance premiums, and a provision that allows college students to deduct tuition and related expenses. In regard to college students, wouldn’t you think the new Democratic majority would be interested in helping college students?

They also include incentives for individual consumers to purchase energy-efficient products for their homes, as well as certain types of alternative vehicles.

To highlight just one of these provisions, in 2017, over 1.5 million taxpayers took advantage of the college tuition deduction. You can think of this as over 1.5 million people who have been left dangling for last year and this year as Congress continues to consider whether or not to extend this college tuition deduction. For some, this deduction of up to $1,000 for educational expenses can make the difference between continuing their education or waiting another year to finish a degree and to move up to a better job.

The remaining two categories are small in terms of cost in comparison to the first two. The provisions relating to employment and economic initiatives for distressed areas makes up only 4.1 percent of the overall cost and consists of two provisions. One would be the Indian employment credit, and the other would be the empowerment zone incentives.

Now, this is really odd. It is really hard to believe the new House Democratic majoritydicatosinable to incentivize employers to hire Native Americans or, for the second part of it, to provide incentives to encourage businesses to locate and bring jobs to low-income areas. I hear the new majority in the other body talking that we don’t do enough to help low-income people. What is better than providing them with jobs and doing it through the empowerment zone incentives? So you can get capital in there to build jobs in low-income areas?

If we can’t address these two employment and economic incentives, how are we going to deal with two much larger business incentives, that the House Democratic majority must find objectionable because it falls into the category that we are only trying to help
big business or big corporations. That is their accusation.

These provisions make a whopping 4.5 percent of the total cost of extending provisions that expired at the end of 2017. Most of these provisions have very minimal tax costs, yet they days ago accelerate a business may deduct certain deductions and not whether the costs are deductible in the first place.

However, the most costly of what I term general business incentives is also likely the least popular. I am going to show you in just a minute. It is the most popular because it has such an overwhelming number of cosponsors in both bodies. That is the short line tax credit. This provision offers a tax credit to short line railroads for qualified maintenance expenditures. This credit isn’t available to the largest railroads, which we call the class I railroads. This credit benefits smaller railroads that are critically important for farmers and many manufacturers to get their products to market around the world. For example, in my State of Iowa, according to recent data from the American Short Line and Regional Railroad Association, there are nine short line and regional railroads.

This credit isn’t just supported by and important to the railroads themselves; it is also supported by the users of short line railroads who depend on these railroads to get their products to market. For example, Midwest soybean farmers selling to the Asian market typically must ship their crops by rail to the Port of Seattle, and the short line railroads are part of that railroad system and are critical to that transportation network.

The fact is, this provision is far more than some sort of giveaway to business. It is a provision that is important to whole communities. This is probably a big reason why legislation making short line tax credit permanent currently has 56 cosponsors in this body of the Senate and 226 cosponsors in the House of Representatives.

I hope I have been able to clear up some of the misunderstanding regarding tax extenders for the new Democratic majority in the House, not only on the substance of these tax extenders but also on the fact that extending these tax credits has been both bicameral and bipartisan for at least a couple of decades. Extenders are not just something that large corporations want. This overwhelmingly benefits individuals—individuals. It benefits green energy and promotes job creation in urban and rural communities alike.

In order to provide certainty—and you need certainty in tax law. If you want to provide certainty to the people who relied on these provisions in 2018 and potentially this year, we should extend them at least through 2019 as quickly as possible. This could have been done as part of the bipartisan agreement that I think that I agree with those points of view. That is why the Finance Committee, which I chair, created a series of task forces to examine these policies for the long term.

The task forces were charged with examining each of these provisions to determine if we can reach a consensus on a long-term resolution so that we don’t have to have an extended debate every 2 years about extending extenders or tax credits.

I look forward to receiving the summaries of the task forces that I have appointed later this week. Hopefully, these submissions will provide a basis for the Finance Committee to put together an extenders package before the end of the year that includes longer term solutions for as many of these temporary provisions as possible.

This is important so that we can stop the annual exercise of kicking the can down the road. However, in the meantime, I remain committed to acting as soon as possible so that taxpayers who have relied on these provisions in 2018 don’t end up feeling like Charlie Brown after Lucy pulls the football away.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The PRESIDENT.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today, as I have week after week, to highlight the healthcare policy disaster the Democrats have labeled as Medicare for All. This mislabeled, one-size-fits-all approach takes health insurance away—it is a giveaway to big business or big corporations. That is the short line tax credit permanent.

This is important so that we can stop the annual exercise of kicking the can down the road. However, in the meantime, I remain committed to acting as soon as possible so that taxpayers who have relied on these provisions in 2018 don’t end up feeling like Charlie Brown after Lucy pulls the football away.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The PRESIDENT.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, in legislative session, I asked unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2249, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2249) to allow the Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration on the date of enactment of this Act to continue to serve as such Deputy Administrator.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I asked unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2249, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The PRESIDENT.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I asked unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2249, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The PRESIDENT.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I asked unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2249, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The PRESIDENT.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I asked unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2249, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The PRESIDENT.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I asked unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2249, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The PRESIDENT.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I asked unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2249, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The PRESIDENT.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I asked unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2249, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The PRESIDENT.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I asked unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2249, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The PRESIDENT.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I asked unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2249, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The PRESIDENT.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I asked unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2249, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The PRESIDENT.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I asked unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2249, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The PRESIDENT.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I asked unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2249, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The PRESIDENT.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I asked unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2249, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The PRESIDENT.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I asked unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2249, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The PRESIDENT.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I asked unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2249, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The PRESIDENT.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I asked unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2249, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The PRESIDENT.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I asked unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2249, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The PRESIDENT.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I asked unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2249, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The PRESIDENT.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I asked unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2249, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The PRESIDENT.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I asked unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2249, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The PRESIDENT.
newspaper, the Guardian, and it is enlightening. It says this: “NHS cancer scans left unread for weeks.” The cancer scans have been left unread for weeks.

The Guardian reports: “Cancer scans showing the presence or spread of the disease are going unread for as long as six weeks.” Think about that. You are a patient. It is cancer. It is ongoing, and it is spreading. You have had a scan and have been waiting 6 weeks to know what is happening with your own body.

Cancer scan reports used to take a week; then, about a month and now, 6 weeks. As a result, according to one of the right, American patients shouldn’t have to foot all of the bill for global cures. Still, U.S. patients will surely suffer if Washington bureaucrats start blocking new innovations.

As I said last week, the Congressional Budget Office came out and talked about their report on what Medicare for All would mean, and they said that there would be a delay—a delay in treatment, as well as a delay in technologies. As a result, patients in the all healthcare system and 190 million Americans lost the insurance they get from work.

Patients in England have bureaucrats as judge and as jury weighing the value of every advancement, seeing if they can even have it in that country. What we see is that the bureaucrats are denying lifesaving treatment, much of it invented in the United States.

British patients, recently protested their National Health Service. They protested because the National Health Service refused to permit the use of a cutting-edge drug to treat cystic fibrosis. The protesters ended up placing T-shirts in Parliament Square, representing the 35 people in England who have died as a result of the refusal of England to approve the use of a drug that exists and that works.

We need to get the cost of care down. We also need to protect innovation because that is the future of healthcare. Doctors and scientists need the freedom to give us the next generation of lifesaving drugs. That is why I am concerned that under the Democrats’ plan such medicines are threatened.

Clearly, Democrats have taken a hard-left turn when it comes to healthcare and when it comes to the role of imposing more government in our lives. They want to take away your freedom to save your wealth from taxes and from work, and in place of on-the-job insurance, they want one expensive, new, government-run program for everyone.

Democrats’ extreme scheme is expected to cost $32 trillion. It is so expensive, in fact, that even doubting everyone’s taxes wouldn’t cover it. That means Washington bureaucrats will be restricting your care. You will lose the freedom to choose your doctor. You will lose the freedom to choose your hospital. You will lose the freedom to make choices about your own life, and bureaucrats will limit your access to new treatments as well as cutting-edge technologies.

It is hard to know how many months you will have to wait for urgently needed care. We have seen it in Canada. We have seen it in England. We do not want to see it here in the United States. Delayed care becomes denied care.

Why should you pay more, which is what this so-called Medicare for All does? You will be paying more to wait longer for worse care. Why would America want that? That is exactly what the Democrats are proposing.

Meanwhile, Republicans are focused on real reforms—reforms that lower costs without lowering standards. That is the key difference. We want to lower costs but not standards.

In England, they say: Well, it is free, but you are going to have to wait for a long time. As I reported last week, people have actually gone blind while waiting and others have died while waiting.

The Democrats’ proposal actually lowers standards while limiting your choices and raising your costs. It is time to reject the Democrats’ one-size-fits-all healthcare scheme. Instead, let’s ensure our patients get the innovative care they need from a doctor they choose at lower costs.

Thank you. 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. SASSE. 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. SASSE. Mr. President, today is a good day for this body, for the State of Nebraska, and for every American who is committed to the rule of law, including our first freedom, which is religious liberty.

In a few minutes, we will be voting to confirm Brian Buescher to be the U.S. Federal district judge for the District of Nebraska. Brian is a born-and-raised Nebraskan. He is a father of five; for nearly two decades he has served his home State admirably in the legal profession. His nomination is an honor for our State, and it is a testament to his integrity and to his tireless service. At the same time, Brian’s confirmation process provides an occasion for one of the most baffling displays of constitutional confusion and prejudice I have seen in my time here.

Brian is a Catholic, and he is a member of the Knights of Columbus. The Knights of Columbus is the largest Catholic fraternal organization in the world. The organization has 1.6 million members. It raises millions and millions of dollars every year for charity, and they contribute millions—literally millions and millions—of hours of volunteer and charitable service for their neighbors.

Like a lot of Catholic men in Nebraska, Brian joined the Knights of Columbus as a way to give back to his community. This is actually just really basic—sometimes really boring—love of neighbor, but it is the kind of stuff that makes communities work. According to some of my colleagues on the Senate Judiciary Committee, Brian’s association with this extraordinary charitable organization—again, really mundane, the Knights of Columbus, the largest Catholic fraternal organization in the world—according to some of my colleagues, the Knights of Columbus is an extremist outfit. One of my colleagues suggested that Brian needs to resign his membership in the Knights if he were confirmed to the Federal bench to avoid the appearance of conflict and bias—really bizarre stuff.

To be clear, the Knights of Columbus is not some shadowy organization from a Dan Brown novel. The Knights is a bunch of guys who organize fish fries, and sometimes they sell Tootsie Rolls, but basically what they are doing is helping to fund organizations like the Special Olympics. That is what they do in Omaha, in Lincoln, across Nebraska, and across the country. It is really weird that we are talking about the Knights of Columbus as an extremist organization.

In this weird rebirth of McCarthyism, it seems that the Catholics are to replace the Communists. This isn’t just Brian. We have had other nominees come before the Senate Judiciary Committee this year being asked questions laughably close to: Are you now or have you ever been involved in the organization of a fish fry?

Therefore, my questions that sound like they are going to be called to account for what their prayer may have been at the last pancake feed: Have you or your colleagues ever been...
involved in any plot to overthrow the government at a fish fry?

One of our nominees was asked: How long has the dogma lived loudly within you, and if you had to rank the dogma on a volume scale from 1 to 10, just how loud is the dogma?

This stuff seems almost laughable, unless you pause and recognize that the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee is asking nominees questions like this. This may think I have my own personal politics, but it is just silly.

Again, just so we are clear, a U.S. Senator, who has taken an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution, asked Brian, as a faithful Catholic, to resign his membership in the Knights of Columbus to “avoid the appearance of bias.”

The implication in these questions is really straightforward. It is that Brian’s religious beliefs and his affiliation with his Catholic religious fraternal organization might make him unfit for service.

Let’s put it bluntly: This is plain, unadulterated anti-Catholic bigotry. This isn’t a new thing in U.S. history; it is just a new thing. John F. Kennedy, 60 years ago, was asked, as he was running for President, some really similar questions.

It is also plainly unconstitutional. Every Member of this body, all 100 of us, has raised our hands and took an oath to defend the Constitution, which in article VI states in language so clear that even a politician has to acknowledge that it does what it says: “No religious test shall ever be required as qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.”

I just want to say this again. This is just straight out of the Constitution, article VI. “No religious test shall ever be required as qualification to any public office or public trust under the United States.”

That is why—because this was happening in the Senate Judiciary Committee—in January, I led a charge on the floor through a resolution to reaffirm our oath of office to the Constitution that rejects religious bigotry. I called on every Member of this body to affirm that we respect the freedom of every American to worship as he or she sees fit and to live out their faith in the public square.

Fortunately, the Federal Government and politics, more broadly, is not in the business of trying to resolve questions of Good and Evil. This is not what we use politics for in this country. Here, we are only in this worldly business of trying to maintain the peace and the public order necessary so every individual can make their own decisions about ultimate matters. The last things for themselves under the dictates of conscience, not trying to submit to the whims of politicians or political movements.

This is a great American blessing and we need to reaffirm it and we need to redouble every occasion we have that opportunity.

Happily, the unanimous support for that resolution was an encouraging step. Today, in a few minutes, when Brian Buescher is going to be confirmed as a U.S. district judge for the District of Nebraska, we will see another important step, which is a reaffirmation and a confirmation to the American people that people of every faith are our Provincials and Catholics, Jews and Muslims, HIndus and Buddhists, agnostics, atheists, and otherwise—that in America, you have a place in the life of this Nation.

We don’t have to resolve every conflict, every argument and debates about things more important than politics. We don’t have to resolve every conflict to agree that we will live peacefully today in this colony. This should be a reaffirmation of the basic American belief that there is room in this country to disagree.

In fact, so much of what makes this country exceptional is that we do disagree about some of the most important things and some of the ultimate things. Yet we do it without severing all the temporal bonds that bring us together as friends, neighbors, citizens, and patriots.

Brian is a good man, and I am convinced Brian is going to be a great judge. I suspect that he and many of his other fellow Knights of Columbus in Omaha are going to be organizing fish fries together again next spring, and I look forward to joining them at those fish fries.

So today I am pleased to celebrate with Brian and his family and the whole State of Nebraska his confirmation to the Federal bench, and I celebrate, too, this victory for our principled American commitment to religious liberty for each and every American.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

BUDGET AGREEMENT

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, thank you for your accommodation today. I rise to talk about another responsibility we have in the Senate; that is, to fund the government.

Our Nation was built on debate and compromise. If you read what the Founding Mothers and Founding Fathers debated in Chambers just like this and then later in this Chamber through the first 100 years of our existence, there was hot debate and many disagreements, but somehow they found a way to find a compromise.

Our Founding Mothers and Founding Fathers believed rightly that to get the best results, both sides had to come to the table to make a deal. This week, the Trump administration and congressional leaders, including Speaker Pelosi, reached a critical 2-year compromise on spending levels and the debt ceiling.

Like any compromise, this funding agreement is not perfect. Neither side got everything it wanted. It accomplishes three important things, however.

First, it will provide certainty to our military. This is critical after the last decade, when 2 years ago, two-thirds of our F/A teams couldn’t fly. Only 3 of the Army’s 5 infantry brigades could fight at that night out of the 58 Army brigades we have. Our readiness was terrible. This deal will continue to reestablish readiness for our military, provide our troops with the compensation and benefits they deserve, and take care of our veterans here at home.

Before this, three Democratic Presidents disinvested in the military. That is just historic fact. It was done in the seventies, it was done in the nineties. It was done by the prior administration.

Second, none of the liberal poison pills or riders actually ended up in this final bill. Going forward, President Trump and congressional Republicans will ensure that we keep those out but in the spirit of compromise and hard negotiation.

Third, and most importantly, this deal keeps the ball moving on the procuring the funding the military and veterans need to avoid another devastating shutdown or continuing resolution. However, despite these benefits, this deal highlights two significant problems. These are not new.

Washington’s funding process is broken. The current system is inefficient and time-consuming. It has actually only funded the government on time four times in the last 45 years since the 1974 Congressional Budget Act was put into place. We now have just 13 working days between now and the end of this fiscal year. We are supposed to have 12 appropriations bills and $1.3 trillion of funding appropriated by the end of this year by September 30. Good luck with that.

So here we are in the eleventh hour. We just made a big agreement, and I believe now the pressure is on to get defense and some of the domestic spending appropriations done certainly by September 30 so we can avoid the draconian impact of continuing resolutions on our military.

The lack of time means that for the second year in a row, Congress has had to rush through a resolution to fund the government in the last moments of the fiscal year. Last year, we stayed here in August during the work period, and we went from 12 percent funding to 75 percent funding, and this year we have the opportunity to do that.

I believe the plan is in place, when we come back this September, that we can actually get upward of two-thirds done by the end of September, which would include the military, which would mean we would have a plan.

This process has been the norm in Washington for decades, however, this
is nothing new. Since the Budget Act of 1974 was put in place, we have only done this four times, as I said. We cannot allow this process to continue this way.

Last year, we had a joint select committee. I believe I may have four things that we can move on this year in terms of bills and possibly change this going forward. The American people sent us here to get this job done. It is time we break through all this—these logjams of politics—and face the fact that next year, our No. 1 priority is to fund the government.

The second problem this budget deal has highlighted is the most important issue facing our country, in my opinion—the $2 trillion debt crisis. While this deal provides for all discretionary spending, the current budget deal does not include mandatory spending, nor does any other prior spending bill include mandatory.

By law, all the budget does and all the appropriations do is deal with the discretionary budget, which is only $1.3 trillion of $4.6 trillion in total money that we spend as the Federal Government. So you say: Well, what is the difference? Well, we spend $1.3 trillion. Well, that is $34 billion less. That is military, Veterans’ Administration, and all domestic discretionary spending. Well, what is in mandatory? Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, pension benefits, and the interest on the debt, which, by the way, has gone up over $450 billion in the last 2½ years.

Let me put this into perspective. This budget deal only increases discretionary spending from last year’s level over the next 2 years by $54 billion. That is 2 percent per year for the next 2 years. That is lower growth in spending on discretionary items than the growth of our economy at the moment. That means that in 2 years, the spending on discretionary spending items will be less as a percentage of our economy than it is today.

This is an incredibly important point and was a major goal of President Trump’s going into this process. The problem is, the CBO projects that mandatory spending and interest payments will grow in that same period over the next 2 years by $420 billion. That is our problem. This is what is driving the huge increases on our debt over the next two decades. In these 2 years, ironically, there is an increase in the mandatory spending is in interest expense. Even with interest rates being historically low, that is the case. Imagine what we would have if interest rates were at their 30-year average of 5 to 6 percent.

Right now, 70 percent of what the government spends is made up of mandatory spending, as I said: Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, pension benefits for Federal employees, and the interest on the debt. Many of these programs are in dire need of reform. The Social Security Trust Fund goes to zero in 16 years. The Medicare trust fund goes to zero in 7 years. It is imperative that we save these important programs. Yet nothing is being done when we deal with the discretionary part of this budget.

Instead, Congress has been wrangling over the discretionary budget, which makes up just under 20 percent of all spending. The whole situation shows just how shortsighted Washington is. Rather than address the long-term problems facing the country, Congress keeps kicking the can down the road. Fortunately, there are five steps, ultimately, we can take to address this long-term fiscal problem.

First is we have to grow the economy. Check that box because the economy is moving. Regulatory work, energy, taxes, and Dodd-Frank have kick-started this economy, creating 6 million new jobs. The economy is growing at about twice the rate it did under the prior administration, so the economy is growing.

Second is to root out redundant spending; third, fix the funding process; fourth, save Social Security and Medicare; and lastly, we have to finally address the underlying drivers of our healthcare costs.

Thanks to President Trump’s leadership, we already have the first part covered. Unemployment is the lowest it has been in 50 years. Our energy potential has been unleashed. The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act has brought new investment to the Nation. This budget has carried some of the highest per-judge criminal caseloads in the country, which surpasses judicial districts that include New York City, Chicago, and Los Angeles. That is why it is critical to both Nebraska and our Nation that the Senate delivers an exceptional judge to fill this vacancy without further delay.

In this spirit, both Senator Sasse and I worked quickly to begin the application process. Nebraska is the proud home of many brilliant legal minds, and we thoroughly studied every application and interviewed qualified candidates. After an extensive search spanning the course of a few months, Senator Sasse and I came to a conclusion. We would recommend to President Trump that Brian Buescher be nominated as the next judge on Nebraska’s Federal district court.

Brian Buescher is a proud husband and father of five children who have been his biggest cheerleaders throughout this confirmation process. He grew up in Clay County, NE. There he learned the importance of hard work at a young age on his family’s farm, where they raised corn, milo, wheat, alfalfa, hogs and cattle. It is also from this upbringing that he developed a keen appreciation for how the law directly affects the everyday lives of Americans and even more so for those who live and work in America’s heartland.

After receiving his undergraduate degree from the University of Nebraska-
Lincoln, Brian was accepted into law school at Georgetown University. He thrived both in and out of the classroom. He was editor-in-chief of the Georgetown Journal of Ethics and vice president of the Georgetown Law Student Association.

Mr. Buescher is currently a partner at Nebraska’s largest law firm, Kutak Rock. He is chairman of the firm’s agribusiness litigation team and oversees large, complex commercial litigation, which includes environmental law, food law, class action, intellectual property, product liability, and banking.

He has gained invaluable experience as a litigator, and his resume speaks for itself. His success includes favorable rulings in cases heard by Nebraska and Iowa’s State and Federal courts, the U.S. Court of Federal Claims, and the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the District of Nebraska. Time after time, case after case, he has demonstrated his commitment to upholding the Constitution and the rule of law.

In 2017, the American Agricultural Law Association awarded him the award for Excellence in Agricultural Law in Private Practice. The American Bar Association rated Mr. Buescher as “qualified” by an overwhelming major- ity. His 20 years of litigation experience has unquestionably prepared him for his next life chapter as a U.S. district court judge.

Nebraska’s former secretary of State, John Gale, recruited Brian to serve on the Nebraska State Records Board. Secretary Gale noted that “Mr. Buescher reflects the highest level for the qualities needed for a district judge, ranging from intelligence, integrity, professionalism, attentiveness, character, and skillful articulation to a deep understanding of the rules and procedures of the courtroom.”

While everyone who has worked with him praises his legal acumen, those who know him on a personal level speak to his integrity and his character. One of his friends from college who has known Brian for a quarter of a century praised his commitment to serving the community and his qualities as a husband and father. His friend concluded: “I can say with complete confidence what kind of person Brian is and that there is nothing that should give you hesitation about his confirmation.”

By all accounts Brian Buescher has enthusiastic support in Nebraska for his superb legal work and fairminded disposition.

I was proud to introduce Mr. Buescher at his confirmation hearing before the Senate Judiciary Committee last November. I sincerely hoped that my Democratic colleagues would see Mr. Buescher for who he was—a sharp legal mind and a man of high character. However, my Democratic friends on the Judiciary Committee deployed unjustified attacks, instead using reason and open-mindedness. They could not criticize his solid record nor his judicial philosophy. So they reverted to attacking his personal religious beliefs. Both the junior Senator from California and the junior Senator from Hawaii questioned Mr. Buescher’s membership in the Knights of Columbus.

For anyone who may be unaware, the Knights of Columbus is not a radical group. It is not political at all. The Knights of Columbus is the world’s largest Roman Catholic fraternal organization. They have pledged “service to one, service to all,” and they are founded on the core principles of charity, unity, and patriotism.

Over the last decade, the Knights of Columbus have donated $1.1 billion to charities and performed more than 88 million hours of volunteer service. In 2017 alone, local councils donated and distributed over 105,000 winter coats for underprivileged children through their “Coats for Kids” program. They have celebrated their centennial in the past three decades to help groups and programs that support the intellectually and physically disabled. Whether it is providing food and shelter for refugees, rebuilding homes for families that are struck by natural disasters, or simply having pancake breakfasts to raise money for local schools, the acts of charity and kindness are inspiring.

That is why I was shocked to hear that Mr. Buescher received a letter from the junior Senator from Hawaii following his confirmation hearing that suggested he leave the Knights of Columbus to “avoid an appearance of bias.” The notion that being a Knights of Columbus member is disqualifying to serve on the Federal bench is disturbing on its own, but holding religious tests that nominating judges altogether ignores the Constitution and tears at the fabric of our core American values—the freedom to worship and pray as we choose.

Fortunately, the Senate passed a resolution earlier this year that condemned unconstitutional religious tests for nominees.

President Kennedy endured anti-Catholic attacks throughout his 1960 campaign, and for me it was exceptionally troubling to see that rhetoric re- turn to the Senate in 2019. Now we will have another chance here in the Senate to send a clear message that we share our Founding Fathers’ contempt for religious tests for public office by confirming Brian Buescher for the Federal bench.

In closing, I think it is important to reiterate that reverence for our Constitution and our laws is part of what makes us great. When we apply the laws fairly to all. When we do must respect our Constitution and laws. Only reverence for our Constitution and our laws can crumble, everything else in our Nation can crumble with it.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of his nomination.

I yield the floor.

**NOMINATION OF WENDY WILLIAMS BERGER**

Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. President, Judge Wendy Williams Berger has honorably served the State of Florida for several years, and I proudly support her confirmation as a district judge for the Middle District of Florida today. Throughout her distinguished legal career, she has committed to upholding the rule of law, prosecuting criminal offenses as an Assistant State Attorney for Florida’s Seventh Judicial Circuit, and subsequently presiding as a circuit court judge for that same judicial circuit. As Governor of Florida, I was honored to appoint Judge Berger to the Fifth District Court of Appeal in 2012, and I am proud to support her confirmation to the Federal bench, where she will continue her exemplary service to our State and Nation.

Mrs. FISCHER, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas, Mr. COTTON, Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
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The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Wendy Williams Berger, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Berger nomination?

Mr. COTTON. 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 PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

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

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

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 229 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Alexander  Parker
Barrasso  Perdue
Blackburn  Grassley
Blunt  Rogers
Boozman  Hoeven
Braun  Rounds
Burr  Hoeven
Cassidy  Johnson
Collins  Scott (FL)
Cornyn  Scott (SC)
Cotton  Shelby
Cramer  Sinema
Crapo  Sullivan
Cruz  Thune
Daines  Tillis
Erect  Wicker
Fischer  Young

NAYS—40

Baldwin  Schatz
Blumenthal  Jones
Brown  Kaine
Cassell  King
Cardin  Leahy
Carper  Manchin
Cochs  Menendez
Cortez Masto  Merkley
Duckworth  Murphy
Durbin  Peters
Feinstein  Reed
Hassan  Rosen

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to consider are considered made and laid on the table. The President will be immediately notified of the Senate’s action.

ALEXANDER, Fischer
Barrasso, Gardner
Blackburn, Graham
Blunt, Grassley
Boozman, Hawley
Braun, Hoeven
Burr, Hyde-Smith
Cassidy, Hinson
Collins, Johnson
Cornyn, Kennedy
Cotton, Lankford
Cramer, Lee
Crapo, McConnell
Cruz, McSally
Daines, Moran
Ernest, Murkowski
Young

THE SENATE PROCEEDED TO EXECUTIVE SESSION.

RECOGNIZING SHELDON WHITEHOUSE’S 250TH CLIMATE CHANGE SPEECH

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I rise in recognition of a friend and colleague, Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, on this special occasion of his 250th speech in his “Time to Wake up” series, a series of speeches, as far as I know, unparalleled in the history of the Senate for addressing a major national issue, a major world issue—the issue of carbon pollution and climate chaos.

As we take in a breath of air at this very moment, when you are sitting on the dais or at one of the desks or sitting on the benches, that breath of air contains air very different from the air when I was born. The air contains 33 percent more carbon. This has never happened over the lifetime of any individual in the history of the human species on this planet, and it means big changes because every molecule of carbon is grabbing heat and holding on to it.

Out in Oregon that means there are warmer winters, which is wonderful for the pine beetles and bad for the pine trees. It means there is a smaller snowpack that melts earlier, on average, resulting in less irrigation water for our farmers and ranchers. It also means less healthy streams for salmon and trout. It means that a lot of the carbon will be absorbed into the ocean and become carbonic acid, and now we have to artificially buffer the Pacific Ocean seawater in order for baby oysters to survive.

The list goes on, but the point is that these changes are happening not just in my State but all over our country, and not just in our country but all over the world. Most of these changes have manifested themselves within the last 10 years, that is, when we actually see what is happening. Just a couple of years ago, the sea started off the coast of Oregon started dying, and off the coast of Washington and off the coast of California. In fact, in some areas they have been completely wiped out. The result of that is the rapid disappearance of big kelp forests that harbor thousands of species. Who knows what impact that will have on
the chain of life in the ocean or on the fisheries that are such an important part of our economy. In place after place, effect after effect, effects can be measured with a thermometer or with litmus paper for acidity or with a ruler. Money can be seen by our ranchers, farmers, fishermen, and the forests and timber economy; effects that are felt by the 180 million Americans who suffered through an extraordinary heat wave in what is now expected to be the hottest month in human recorded history, this year, as I like to call them, and in rural parts of Oregon, in our rural communities, in our fossil fuel communities. Our former fossil fuel workers who did the hard work, took the risks, and suffered black lung should be in line for new energy jobs in our economy.

But we have no time to wait. This needs to be bipartisan. This is not blue or red. This is planet Earth. We are all on it together. We are all on this little remote planet, a long distance to our next planet, a long distance between our star and the next star. There are an estimated 2 trillion galaxies in the universe with perhaps a billion stars each, perhaps a trillion planets, and perhaps an estimated 2 trillion galaxies in the universe with perhaps a billion stars each, perhaps a trillion planets, and perhaps a billion planets that could support life. We are all on this one little blue-green orb. Let’s save it.

Can human civilization rise to the task? That hangs in the balance. We are not doing very well so far. But my colleague from Rhode Island has given his attention to this analysis, bringing everything to bear, saying: Pay attention and work hard. So I yield the floor. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Today is a marker because he has made 250. Is it 250 or did the Senator already do it?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. This is 250. I yield the floor. Mr. SCHATZ. He is number 249, and he is about to do 250, and I will let him get to it. But it will be 250 individual speeches on the Senate floor. Sometimes there are people in the Chamber, and sometimes it is empty and you are talking to these incredible young men and women who serve as pages and who really deserve it and who have accomplished something probably prior in their life and just to be here right now. But Sheldon Whitehouse is the single most fearless individual in politics that I ever have met. He is the single most tireless individual in politics that I have ever met, and it is not just with speechmaking.

Today is a marker because he has made 250. Is it 250 or did the Senator already do it?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. This is 250. Mr. SCHATZ. He is number 249, and he is about to do 250, and I will let him get to it. But it will be 250 individual speeches on the Senate floor. Sometimes there are people in the Chamber, and sometimes it is empty and you are talking to these incredible young men and women who serve as pages and the Presiding Officer, who has no choice but to sit there politely. But Sheldon Whitehouse will give his 250th speech on climate. It is because of the Senator’s speech that brings a good cop “aloha” sensibility and who really deserves it and who has accomplished something probably prior in their life and just to be here right now. But Sheldon Whitehouse will give his 250th speech on climate. It is because of the Senator’s speech and his leadership that brings a good cop “aloha” sensibility and who really deserves it and who has accomplished something probably prior in their life and just to be here right now. But Sheldon Whitehouse will give his 250th speech on climate. It is because of the Senator’s speech and his leadership.

I will just say a couple more things about my partnership with Sheldon. You know, I was a very happy Lieutenant Governor of the State of Hawaii, and I was leading the Hawaii Clean Energy Initiative, which is our effort to get to 100 percent clean energy by the year 2040. The very unfortunate death of Daniel K. Inouye made a vacancy on the Senate seat, and I decided to pursue this Senate seat because I wanted to do something about climate. I didn’t know most of the Members except for the famous ones.

When I came to the Senate, everybody told me to talk to Sheldon Whitehouse, and we became fast friends. He comes from the Ocean State, even though that sounds weird to me. I come from the Aloha State, and he comes from the Ocean State, and we have been working together ever since.

But I want to report to whomever is watching that I never felt such momentum on this issue. It is because of the young people who have sort of stormed the castle over the last year or so and demanded change and demanded action and demanded the kinds of change and action that are equal to the scale of this problem. People will quibble with the political tactics and the messaging and all that, but when something happens in the United States of America, it is led by young people, and that is what happened. They stormed the castle. Even those of us who have been working on climate for a long time felt a jolt of energy in a positive way. That is No. 1.

No. 2 is a little unfortunate, but it is changing, and the politics, and that is events—weather events. Climate change is no longer talking about climate change as a near-term future issue or a long-term future issue; climate change is now. It is happening across the country. It is not just happening to conservation areas or places where you might enjoy the outdoors; it is happening to communities from coast to coast and everywhere in between. There are record heat waves, record floods, record snowstorms, coral bleaching events. It is very difficult to describe something as a 100-year flood or a 500-year flood—which means it is supposed to happen, statistically speaking, about every 100 or 500 years—if that flood is happening every year.

It is very difficult to ignore the reality of climate change when the last 8 years have been the hottest years on record since the last 9 years. The weather is absolutely getting weirder and more unpleasant, and our storms are getting more frequent and more severe.

Public opinion is moving. Now you have a majority of Republicans, a huge, vast majority of Independents, and pretty much every single Democrat wanting climate action. The other part of that, which is encouraging, is that Senator Whitehouse has a strategy. He understands it is not enough just to marshal public opinion.

Look at what is happening with gun safety. We are not there yet, even though public opinion is absolutely on our side. Sometimes you have to look at what is structurally happening in politics, especially in the U.S. Congress.

Senator Whitehouse understands that we have to deal with the structural aspects of the campaigns that are funded, the way information and misinformation is propagated, and we need to engage on that battlefield, as well.

I will close with this. A, I have never been so hopeful about the prospect for climate action in 2021, and B, I have never been so thankful to have a partner who can lead this effort as Senator Sheldon Whitehouse can.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, let me first thank my friend Senator Schatz for his incredibly kind remarks. He is an outstanding colleague. We work together extremely well. He brings a good cop “aloha” sensibility to a conversation, whereas I tend to lean more toward the bad cop, and he has a remarkable vision for how this can be solved. I am incredibly honored that he is here.

For the 2nd week that the Senate has been in session, I rise to call this Chamber to wake up to the threat of climate change. In April of 2012, I delivered the first of these speeches.
began: ‘I know that many in Washington would prefer to ignore this issue, but nature keeps sending us messages—messages we ignore at our peril.”

It was a cry of frustration—frustration that the Supreme Court’s infamous Citizens United decision had killed the bipartisan work that I saw here on climate for 3 years; frustration that the fossil fuel industry’s death grip had tightened around this Chamber; prevention action; frustration that our Democratic administration had abandoned leadership on climate change and would barely even talk about it.

It has been a run, and here I am, still at it, 7 years on. Some things have changed; some things have not.

Let’s start with what has not changed. What has not changed is the scientific certainty about what is happening in our climate and oceans. Scientists have understood that burning fossil fuels has caused our planet to heat up since the days when Abraham Lincoln was riding around Washington, DC, in his top hat. This is not new news.

Nearly four decades ago, Exxon’s own scientists reported to Exxon management that there is “little doubt” that atmospheric CO₂ concentrations were increasing due to fossil fuel burning. They said back in 1982 that the resulting greenhouse effect “would warm the Earth’s surface, causing changes in climate affecting atmospheric and ocean temperatures, rainfall patterns, soil moisture, and possibly even melting the polar ice caps.”

There was no legitimate debate over the science when I started in 2012, and there is no legitimate debate over the science today. Indeed, the science has only strengthened. With each passing science today. Indeed, the science has there is no legitimate debate over the temperatures, rainfall patterns, soil mate affecting atmospheric and ocean increasing due to fossil fuel burning. The opening in our atmosphere and oceans.

near scientific certainty about what is hap- pening in our atmosphere and oceans.

That is central banker speak for something that poses a risk to the entire economy, all from stranded fossil fuel assets called the carbon asset bubble.

One other thing I have spent a lot of time on is oceans—the heating, the acidification, the lost and shifting fisheries, the collapse in coral and expanding dead zones, and, of course, the rising sea levels. Our terrestrial species needs a lot more attention to those seas. There has been a real shift in attention in these intervening years.

Then you have Standard & Poor’s, Moody’s, Citigroup, and more economists warning that the costs of climate change will not be measured in the hundreds of billions or even in the trillions but will be measured in the tens of trillions of dollars. That is a penalty worth avoiding and worth the attention in the Senate.

So here I am, 7-plus years later, giv- ing my 250th speech be- tween persistent, tiresome, and, I suppose, foolishly on where you will find me. I never thought I would still be at it well into 2019, but the fossil fuel indus- try, with all of its wretched dark money, is still carrying the torch in Congress while the rest of corporate America still sits on its hands. The U.S. Senate still is not seriously considering any legislation to reduce carbon pollution, and I am still frustrated, but I am optimistic because the denial wall is cracking.

Bankers and asset managers and fi- nancial titans recognize the massive
economic risks of a fossil fuel-based economy and see the huge economic potential of a low-carbon economy. They now see real business incentive to push back on the fossil fuel denial apparatus. They now see real business peril in allowing the fossil fuel denial apparatus.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks the “Economists’ Statement on Carbon Dividends” that was published in the Wall Street Journal, which illustrates that exact point.

I am also optimistic because people are talking about climate change again, and colleagues are talking about climate change. Americans everywhere are talking about climate change. Most Republicans want action on climate change. Voters are engaged on climate change, and more than anyone else, young people especially are engaged. From young hero Greta Thunberg to the young people the Jumbotron is featuring, it is starting to young people are engaged. Any politician who wants a long career had better care about what young people think. Any political party that wants to matter in a decade had better care.

Over in the House, it is starting to show. A few Republicans have actually introduced legislation to put a price on carbon emissions. Even President Trump—the guy who handed over the carbon emissions. Even President Trump—the guy who handed over the

I. A carbon tax offers the most cost-effective lever to reduce carbon emissions at the scale and speed that is necessary. By correctly pricing a well-known market failure, a carbon tax will send a powerful price signal that harnesses the invisible hand of the marketplace to steer economic actors towards a low-carbon future.

II. A carbon tax should increase every year until emissions reductions goals are met and be revenue neutral to avoid debates over the size of government. A consistently rising carbon price will encourage technological innovation and large-scale infrastructure development. It will also accelerate the diffusion of carbon-efficient goods and services.

III. A sufficiently robust and gradually rising carbon tax will replace the need for various carbon management tools and result in a cleaner, more efficient economy. Substituting a price signal for cumbersome regulations will promote economic growth and provide the regulatory certainty that American businesses need for long-term investment in clean-energy alternatives.

IV. To prevent carbon leakage and to protect U.S. competitiveness, a border carbon adjustment system should be established. This system would enhance the competitiveness of American firms that are more energy-efficient than their global competitors. It would also create an incentive for other nations to adopt similar carbon pricing.

V. To maximize the fairness and political viability of a rising carbon tax, all the revenue should be returned directly to U.S. citizens through equal lump-sum rebates. The majority of American families, including the most vulnerable, will benefit financially by receiving more money than they pay in increased energy prices.


Paul Volcker is a former Federal Reserve chairman. Martin Baily, Michael Baskin, Martin Feldstein, Jason Furman, Austan Goolsbee, Glenn Hubbard, Alan Krueger, Edward Lazear, N. Gregory Mankiw, Christina Romer, Harvey Rosen and Laura Tyson are former chairmen of the president’s Council of Economic Advisers.

Ben Bernanke, Greenspan and Janet Yellen have chaired both the Federal Reserve and the Council of Economic Advisers.

Sheldon Whitehouse, who has come onto the Senate floor 250 times to say to the Senate and to say to our country that it is time to wake up. His voice is inspiring. His voice cuts through all the obfuscation and propaganda for the special interests. It ensures that we hear the truth about the danger climate change poses to our country and to the planet. I came out here just to say how special it is for me. I am proud to be a Member who partners with Sheldon Whitehouse on this issue. This is somebody who has dedicated his career to solving this problem. He knows all issues go through three phases—political education, political activation, and political implementation. He has been a one-man tutor in his educating of the American public and the U.S. Senate on not only the technical aspects of climate change but on the political aspects of it because, ultimately, it is not a technical problem; it is a political problem we have. The technologies are ready to go.

What Senator Whitehouse has done is to have served as this inspirational center point. He has ensured that the voice of truth has been heard. Why is it important for him to be this incredible leader? It is that climate change—or the climate crisis—is the national security, economic, environmental, healthcare, and moral issue of our time, of this century. Everything he has been saying is something that, in my opinion, is going to wind up putting him in the history books for the incredible leadership he has shown.

There are a lot of times in which you can be right but too soon. People are not ready to hear it. Yet what we are finding across the country is that more and more people are ready to hear it, especially the younger generation, especially people who recognize right now they are going to live their entire lives with this crisis.

How do we know that? Back in November, our scientists—13 Federal agencies—who were mandated by a 1990 law, had to present a report to the President on climate change. All 13 agencies—the Department of Energy, the EPA, the Department of State—had to come together. Here is what they concluded. If we do not change what we are doing today, the planet will warm by 9 degrees Fahrenheit by the year 2100. Let’s say that again. The planet will warm by 9 degrees Fahrenheit between now and 2100—81 years from now.

In other words, the pages who are here in the well of the Senate right now will live through this entire story as it unfolds if we continue with business as usual. Interestingly, the consequences are not those who the deniers want to know. For all 13 agencies concluded that, based on special analysis, the 11-foot rise in the ocean in the Northeastern part of the United States. Think about that—
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11 feet higher. The impact would be catastrophic. Our pages will live through this entire story unless we change what we are doing in our country, unless we change what the U.S. Senate does to put preventive measures in place.

What Senator WHITEHOUSE is saying is: Wake up. The science is clear, and it is unchallengeable.

Our problem is that too many Republican senators, especially the denier in chief who sits in the Oval Office—are nostalgic for a time that never existed. They pretend, somehow or other, that all of these climate-related problems are going to magically be solved by policies that don’t exist and perhaps we are just in some kind of cycle on our planet that will go away and that these young people will not have a legacy of climate change to have to deal with in their lives. Of course, every scientist in America, with the exception of those who are bought by the Koch brothers, bought by ExxonMobil, bought by the fossil fuel companies, agrees that this is going to happen.

From my perspective, what we are seeing is something that is deadly—the forest fires, the extreme heat waves, the supercharged hurricanes, the Biblical flooding. All of it is happening as a result of what human beings are doing to our own planet. Global temperatures are rising like a runaway freight train. This month is on track to be the hottest month on Earth ever recorded. May I say that again? The month of July in 2019 is on track to be the hottest month ever recorded in the history of our planet. Last month was the hottest June in recorded history. Every month so far in 2019 has been in the top five hottest on record. The last 5 years have been the hottest 5 years ever recorded, and 20 of the 22 years have been the hottest ever recorded.

This is not a drill; this is an emergency, and it is an emergency that has an answer in deploying wind and solar and new batteries and all-electric vehicles and energy efficiency and investing in new technologies that can accelerate the solution even more. It is all there for us to do.

Right now we are celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Apollo mission to the Moon. President Kennedy felt there was an existential threat to our planet that the Soviet Union was posing. He actually said at Rice University— eerily, the same words that I am about to say to you— that it is going to be much worse than that. He got on his horse, and he started riding, and he is warning of great danger. From my perspective, SHELDON WHITEHOUSE is a latter-day Paul Revere, and he is warning the American people that they walk around with. Those iPhones have more computing power than the computers on the Apollo mission. How did we do that? We are Americans. We take on these challenges, and we revolutionized the telecommunications industry to move from the black, rotary dial phone. And these young people don’t even know what that is.

We have moved from having no fax machines in our country 40 years ago to today. There are no fax machines in America. That is how quick the revolution goes when you put a plan together to accomplish it.

Well, the same thing is true in the clean energy sector, and what Senator WHITEHOUSE has been leading us on is this explication to the Senate that we can do it. You can’t let the special interests dictate it, though. You can’t let the dark money control it. That is his lesson to today. It is incredibly important for us to ignore it. In the same way we ignored the monopolies in telecommunications, we have to ignore the monopolies and the duopolies that exist in the energy sector as well.

So I thank the Senator from Rhode Island again, and I will repeatedly do so because he will reach 300 speeches out here on the floor and 500 speeches out here on the floor. You might as well put an infinity sign behind the number because that is how many speeches he has on the Senate floor to wake up this institution. That day is going to come, and I just wanted to come out here and thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his incredible leadership and to let him know that I am honored to be his partner in this effort.

I will be by your side the entire time it takes for us to get a solution for the young people in our country that they deserve and they expect from this institution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, may I propose to my wonderful colleague, the Senator from Massachusetts, that the Good Lord forbid that I have to get to 500 such speeches before we solve this problem.

Mr. MARKEY. The Good Lord and MITCH MCCONNELL.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I would note that if we look back to 2009, there are some very important signs of optimism.

On the legislative side, Senator MARKEY, then-Representative Waxman with his colleague Representative Waxman—successfully ushered, with significant industry and popular support, a serious climate bill through the House of Representatives, proving that it can be done, proving that real climate legislation can pass in this body.

In that same year, in 2009, a gentleman named Donald Trump—the same Donald Trump who is President now at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue in the White House—look out New York Times, and in his advertisement, Donald Trump and his children—Donald, Eric, and Ivanka—as well as the Trump Organization, all said that the science of climate change was incontrovertible. They further said that if we did not act, the consequences of climate change would be catastrophic and irreversible.

So we have the living experience of legislation passing, led by then-Representative Markey and Representative Waxman, and all we need, really, is to bring back that 2009 Donald Trump. Come on back, buddy. We want you because you were right in 2009.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, you know, Massachusetts is the Bay State, and Rhode Island is the Ocean State.

Back 240 or so years ago, Paul Revere got on his horse, and he is warning of great danger. From my perspective, SHELDON WHITEHOUSE is a latter-day Paul Revere, and he is warning that the climate crisis is coming and that it is going to be much worse than it is today.

So from my perspective, this latter-day Paul Revere, who is SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, represents the best of New England and the best of our country and the best of our planet because we have to be all in this together, and we can’t be leaders by sitting on the sidelines, which is where Donald Trump wants to have us. The Indians, the Chinese, and others—they won’t
listen to us. You cannot preach temperance from a barstool. You can’t tell the rest of the world to do something while you have a cigar in one hand and a beer in the other. That is where we are now with pollution under President Trump.

We have to be leaders, not laggards. That is what SHELDON WHITEHOUSE is all about. That is why it is my great honor to be up here with him, and for as long as it takes, he will be out here. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Cramer). The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—VETO

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the veto messages on S. J. Res. 36, 37, and 38 be considered as having been read en bloc, that they be printed in the RECORD and spread on the Journal en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the veto message with respect to S. J. Res. 36, S. J. Res. 37, and S. J. Res. 38 be considered at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Democratic leader prior to August 2; that they be debated concurrently for up to 2 hours, with 15 minutes reserved for the majority leader and ranking member, respectively; that the Senate vote on passage of the joint resolutions, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding, in the order listed; and, finally, that the unanimous consent order of June 19 for the remaining joint resolutions of disapproval of arms sales remain in effect.

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

The Senator from Oklahoma.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, in April of this year, Border Patrol agents in South Texas, in McAllen—one of the most crossed areas for illegal traffic in the entire southern border—saw a group of individuals walking north who had already crossed the border, and they broke and ran. They assumed these individuals were illegally present, but when they saw them, they started moving to try to interdict them. They searched through a very large and very overgrown field.

I can tell you that that area is very, very rough terrain. It is very isolating, and the brush is exceptionally heavy. On a day in April, even in South Texas, it is extremely hot.

As they searched through the field looking for individuals, they happened to hear a child crying in their search. They encountered a 3-year-old boy who had been abandoned by human smugglers when they broke and ran. This young boy, 3 years old, had these shoes on, and on his shoes were written a name and a phone number across them. That is the only identifying thing they have. They tested the phone number, by the way, and the phone number didn’t work.

Those human smugglers—moving people from Central America, using children as the vehicle—are prone to just cast that child aside if they slow them down.

The Border Patrol agents who encountered this child wearing those shoes, took him to the office. Those Border Patrol agents personally bought him new clothing. The fellow agents entertained him. You can see him playing PAW Patrol back in the station. They spent time comforting him and trying to figure out who he was and where he was from. Border Patrol agents alternated taking care of him, personally buying supplies for him until they can transition him into Health and Human Services’ care. That is what is really happening on the border every day.

Border Patrol agents are dealing with children that cartels are using to move adults into the United States. Yes, there are some family units who are moving in, but every single family that enters the United States is being ushered in by a cartel that works the border, and they are choosing the time and the place to move those individuals.

These agents are risking their lives every single day. They are working with families every single day to try to figure out who is a family unit and who is a child that is just being smuggled to be used as a vehicle to get across the border and how to separate the two. Then, once they identify the child, they try to figure out this: What do we do now with this child that we have? Where are you from?

Several months ago, most of the children who were moving across were 10, 11, and 12 years old, and they could interview those children. The cartels have figured that out now, and they are sending more and more children who are infants, 1, 2, and 3 years old, who don’t know where they are from and don’t know their names or their background or any other details. It is becoming more and more difficult for the Border Patrol agents to figure this out.

In fact, Border Patrol agents just like this are now actually bringing their own cars, finding other people from their churches and other places that would donate car seats because when HHS needs to transport them out of a bus, they don’t have car seats there. So they are paying for car seats to help some of these abandoned children be able to get to a place of safety.

These are the folks who are being criticized. These are the folks who some of my colleagues, even as recently as this week, asked the United States to get 40 hours of sensitivities training because they are so insensitive to what is happening on the border. These are the folks putting their own personal fi-

nances and their lives on the line and who are working every day to solve some of the problems that we have.

For the past several years, there have been disagreements on the solutions and wide disagreements on Federal law enforcement and on the President, instead of actually trying to figure out what the problem is at the border. Why is this happening? Why have our numbers so rapidly accelerated?

This past weekend, I visited the border with some of my colleagues. I went with Senator JONI ERNST of Iowa and Dr. BILL CASSIDY of Louisiana. We went to the Rio Grande Valley Sector. That area of the border is a thin slice of the border between the United States and Mexico, but in that area, in that one zone, 40 percent of all illegal traffic moves across the border. The most heavily trafficked area of that zone is the McAllen Sector, and that is where we went.

Across that one area, in that one small segment of the border, they have between 1,500 and 2,000 individuals illegally crossing the single day. That is one small sector of a 2,000-mile-long border. Just this year, in that one small sector, they have had individuals from 63 different countries cross the border illegally—63 different countries.

I hear a lot of folks say: It is all people from Central America who are crossing across the border to flee. That is not true. There are 63 countries just this year, just around McAllen, TX, not including the whole rest of the border.

You see, the cartels sort individuals by country and by background. They send Indians in one direction. They send Pakistanis in another direction. They send individuals from Bangladesh in another direction. They send kids from Honduras and Guatemala in another direction.

When I walked into one of the five stations that we visited all through that area this weekend, just to do a quick pop-in to see who was there at that moment, half of the adults who were there—these were single adults—were there from Venezuela and half of them were from Cuba, because that is how the cartels sort individuals.

That is why we in McAllen, and nationally, we have had individuals from Pakistan, Yemen, China, Venezuela, Bangladesh, and Syria, in addition to many countries from Africa and Asia, and obviously much of Central America as well. Those individuals are moving across the border by very high numbers. Ninety percent of the apprehensions that have happened this year—90 percent—have been from countries other than Mexico.

Since the data recently as 2014, only 1 percent of men who crossed the border had a child with them. Now the number is 50 percent of the men crossing the border have a child with them—50 percent.
The numbers have dramatically changed, and what is happening along our border is significant.

The men and women who are actually working every single day to protect what is happening at the border are almost too many for the trade that is happening. These same individuals are processing 650,000 trucks coming into this area, 2.2 million pedestrians, and 9.3 million passengers coming across in different personal vehicles. There is a lot going on. So when I went down to the border this weekend and visited the five different facilities and then spent much of the evening and deep into the night riding along with Border Patrol, where one set of agents switched vehicles to go with a separate set of agents to ride along through the border just to get a feel for what was happening, what I experienced was exceptionally painful.

What I saw were places that were crowded, Spartan situations, and in my mind it echoed that for months the administration and the committee that I serve on—members of the Homeland Security Committee—have said for months that there is a humanitarian crisis on this border. But it didn’t seem that anyone was listening until recently. Now, all of this had been created recently.

Now, suddenly, people are turning their attention to what is happening along this border and saying that there is a serious humanitarian problem. And we said: “Welcome to the dialogue because we have been saying it for months.”

Cartels are making millions and millions of dollars exploiting children. They are smuggling children and families across the border. It now costs $8,000 to cross a single individual across the border. You pay a toll to the cartels, both to the traffickers and smugglers who are moving people—that $8,000 and, then, an additional fee to actually cross that border. The greater likelihood they can move the more they can cause chaos inside, the greater likelihood they can move drugs across the border freely.

How does this happen? This happens because Customs and Border Protection is spending all their time on humanitarian work now. Now 60 percent of the work of each individual agent is spent on humanitarian work processing people. Some are doing the work; they are engaged in the process; and they are committed to taking care of people.

When 60 percent are in town taking care of the humanitarian work, that leaves a lot of room for cartels to control the border. Where there used to be literally 60 people who would travel in this region of the border, now there are 20 to cover all of those miles. The cartels know it.

So the more they can send families up through this section and the more they can cause chaos inside, the greater likelihood they can move drugs across the border freely.

How does this happen? This happens because the cartels can work to get a child, and they have been able to do this to Central America and say: We have a way to get you into the United States, and we can get you in quickly. Bring a child with you—you pay them $8,000 or $4,000 if you bring a child—and we will work you up. They make promises to them of what will happen. Many of these people are from high poverty areas of Central America, and they will work them toward the border and drop them off at that spot.

It costs even more if you are not from there. Some of the cartels, Chinese individuals who have been moved across our border paid as much as $30,000 to the cartels—$30,000 to pay the price to move them through Mexico and then cross the border at a time of their choosing.

This is something that is making a tremendous amount of money for the cartels, and if we don’t engage on solving this issue, we are allowing it. We need to realize our laws are broken. They are not only breaking for immigration and what is happening, they are also not only breaking our hearts for what is happening with the humanitarian crisis and what is actually occurring, but it is becoming a critical issue that we have to respond to, and we should.

Let me show you this next shot. This is what it looks like now along the border. As I traveled through the different Border Patrol—some of them have also become places that are gut-wrenching and difficult for the Border Patrol, they are a police station, basically, along the border—when Border Patrol—they don’t do detention. When you go to a police station—and I hope you only go legally to a police station—but when you go to a police station, they are not there to hold people. They are there to write up all the reports. They are there to go through processing, but they are not set up to hold people for long periods of time. That is not what a police station does.

Border Patrol stations are like police stations along the border. They are really offices, and they manage that, but now they have also become places where they have to hold children and adults by the thousands. Thousands of people are crossing the border, and they are trying to figure out how to manage all these people.

There is a facility that many people have seen the pictures of. They effectively call it the “kids in cages” facility. I will tell you more about that in a little bit. That location was designed for 1,500 people total. It had 1,590 the day I was there. It has had as many as 3,000 in that facility, though, within the last couple of months. It is miserably overcrowded. There are people packed in together. These individuals are getting meals, showers, toilets, access to supplies, and snacks. All the basics are being provided. The Border Patrol is trying to figure out how they manage this many people when none of these are trained for it. They are committing to children because that is not their task.

Border Patrol has now set up this facility called a soft-sided facility, where they have moved 1,000 family units away from that larger, what they call the processing facility. They moved it away from the central processing facility a few miles away, and they set up a massive series of tents—air-conditioned and a lot more space. This happens to be in one of those places. It was actually teenage boys in this particular area.

This is what detention looks like now along the border. They are sitting there watching, actually, “Puss n Boots” on the TV. There are people lying around and getting a chance to sit in some space; to recoup some space; and plenty of activity that is going on there. This is what Border Patrol is currently doing to try to manage it.

What does that look like, and how will things work? When you check in at the Border Patrol station, wherever it may be, whether it is in the central processing facility that is so overcrowded or whether it is out at the
soft-sided facility, when you get there, the first thing they do is they actually swap clothes with you. They have clothes they bought with their budgets. They allow you to pick different types of clothes to wear. The Border Patrol and their families take the clothes to those individuals. There were washing machines there set up, and they will personally wash all their clothes for them while they get a shower and they get cleaned up because many of these folks have not showered and cleaned up for a month.

So the first step is, they help them get all cleaned up and put fresh clothes on, a fresh shower, and hot meals. They have hot meals every single day. They also have snacks and supplies. This is, again, in that same soft-sided facility. This is just one of their supply rooms where you get a feel for snacks and drinks and water and toiletries. Back over in this area are large quantities of hygiene products and clothes—all kinds of stuff, if I am all piled up that they have gathered to help take care of individuals.

One of the things I heard so many times is, these kids can’t even brush their teeth because Americans are so mean and because the Border Patrol is so ruthless to them. I went to five different facilities, and in every facility, I asked to see their supply room. In every facility, I saw these. That looks like toothbrushes to me. In fact, in the central processing facility that has had so much attention in the media, I asked the director there, and they said they actually have had 87,000 toothbrushes there. There has always been toothbrushes and toothpaste. There has always been soap and water and ways to clean up.

The challenge is, some of these folks come from very remote villages, and guess what, they are not used to brushing their teeth every day. That is not a normal hygiene habit for all people in some places they come from. So when the media comes to them and says: Have you brushed your teeth today, and they say no, it is not because they didn’t have a toothbrush available. It is because, no, they didn’t brush their teeth today.

I actually watched an interview where they went to a child and said: Have you brushed your teeth, and they said no. Their response on Twitter was: How atrocious. We are better than this as Americans. This is what was in the storeroom and what they have been offered.

Interestingly enough, even as I walked through the central processing facility that is way overcrowded, I saw people lined up at the sinks brushing their teeth. We are providing supplies and resources to these individuals. That is a normal habit.

This was interesting to me. As I walked through the facility—and this was in the central processing facility that was so crowded. As I walked through, there was a Coast Guard individual here because, yes, the Coast Guard is coming to help the Border Patrol because they need additional manpower. This is a Coastie who was coming through the facility that found a young girl who was just crying on her own. She was alone—one of these kids who has just been dropped off. He was just walking, he was walking up to her around, holding her while she cried, and they had just stopped for a moment to watch TV. This is what is actually going on at the border.

Now, are there facilities that are overwhelmed, that are all piled up? Yes, there were. Obviously, when the media comes to them and says: I am asking for asylum, they walk across the border, they say: "I am asking for asylum." They walk across the border on the international bridge and are taken into an air-conditioned room to start processing their asylum request. That is happening every day right now.

Yet everyone in the media is saying that is not happening. The first thing we can do is stop getting out accurate information of what is actually occurring at the border.

The second thing we can do is—one of the primary issues the Border Patrol asked for over and over again, fund ICE. Now, why would the Border Patrol ask for more funding for somebody else? Because ICE is the primary entity that actually does detention. Border Patrol is the police station. ICE does detention.

When individuals are picked up at the border by Border Patrol, they are processed and immediately delivered to ICE. Then, does detention for those individuals. They have facilities scattered all over the country where they can house individuals in consistent housing, with plenty of space and set up perfectly for that with well-trained individuals to detain folks to go through that process.

Border Patrol’s No. 1 request is: Please stop asking us to do detention. We don’t have facilities for it. Clearly, that is why everyone is packed in. Allow ICE to do this.

Now, why doesn’t ICE have funding? Well, because it has been one of our biggest battles with our Democratic colleagues who are obsessed with defunding ICE. Over and over again they say they want to abolish ICE, defund ICE, and get rid of ICE. What is really being stated there is there is no place to do detention when that occurs.

Let me give you an example. In 2018, the request for ICE was $3.6 billion. Actually, what we could get at the end of it was just over $3 billion. They were $600 million down from what they said they needed. In 2019, the request was $3.5 billion. What they got was $3.1 billion—again, much less than what they needed.

When the crisis began to hit in its highest proportion and we finally got a humanitarian relief package to these individuals on the border to try to get additional support, including building the soft-sided facility, my Democratic colleagues held out and refused to do any funding for ICE. In the humanitarian package, there was zero funding for ICE detention—none.

Border Patrol said that is the prime thing we need to actually solve this problem. What we need, more than anything else, is to allow these folks to move out of these temporary facilities...
into long-term facilities so we can actually get them in better housing situations, but when we debated our way through this, our Democratic colleagues held firm and said: No funding for ICE detention. That perpetuates this problem on the border.

We have to solve this. They should be able to have the additional funding that they need so that we can get these kids and families into better locations for their housing and not temporary, stopgap locations.

The next issue we need to address is, we should move asylum officers to the border. This is one of the prime things that Border Patrol wanted. Many of these individuals come and say: I want asylum. Let’s walk them through the process. Let’s get there. The problem is that the vast majority of individuals who request asylum do not qualify for asylum. They come into the United States because they want to connect with family members who are here or for economic opportunities. They do not completely understand that. We have a legal process to do that. But someone can’t just come across the border and say: I have a cousin who lives here and I want to come, and that qualifies as asylum but asylum. Only 5 percent of the people crossing the border who are asking for asylum actually qualify, but individuals wait up to 2 years for a hearing to find out if they qualify. So the legitimate individuals who desperately need asylum who have to get through that process as rapidly as they can, cannot do so because 85 percent of the people are clogging up the system, asking for things that are not asylum.

We should move asylum officers closer to the border to do faster processing so we can help individuals who are seeking asylum to get it and also identify people who are gaming the system and say: You cannot just game the system; you have to go through the process legally.

Additionally, we have to deal with this 20-day release issue. Right now, the rule is that a family with a child or a child can only be held for 20 days total. They can be held for only 20 days, and after that, they have to be released into the country. The cartels and human smugglers know that rule, and that is why we have seen an increase from 2014 from only 1 percent of the men bringing a child to now 50 percent of the men bringing a child because they know that if they bring a child, they will be released within 20 days.

Here is what is different, though. In 20 days, we can do our record checks in the United States to see whether this person has a criminal record, but when we contact any of the 63 other countries that these individuals are coming from, just in that sector, most of those countries can’t respond to us with their country’s criminal record within 20 days.

What is really happening on the border is individuals are coming across with a child. They are being detained for 20 days while we request criminal records from their home country. They are still there when on the 21st day we have to release them, and 10 to 15 days later, we get word that the individual actually had a murder warrant in their home country that really happened just a few days ago.

Also, a few days ago, we released an adult with a child and then found out a few days later that their home country was seeking them because they were a sexual predator in their country. But we had just released that adult with a child into our country because we have a 20-day restriction and we can’t wait until we get criminal records from another country. That is absurd.

We are encouraging the trafficking of children by saying that you can get into our country no matter what if you just bring a child, and we are encouraging people with a criminal record to come in and bring a child because they know they will be able to get in, because their home country can’t fulfill our request fast enough. Why would we do that as a country? Why would we knowingly, willingly do that?

We can solve this problem. It is a horrible humanitarian crisis. We need to pay attention to it and be logical about this. Stop saying “abolish ICE” when what we really need is ICE facilities to help us detain people in the best possible of environments while we find out who they are, what their records are, who is related to whom, and what their background is.

Stop ignoring the obvious things. We have some people coming due to poverty. We have some people coming to smuggle drugs. Until we can sort that out, we should figure out who is who. That doesn’t seem irrational to me.

We should also find a way to process asylum requests faster than we are so that individuals pursuing asylum can go through the system and get processed and individuals who are gaming the system do not get to game the system.

We can do better, and we have to do better. I would encourage us to be serious about immigration in the days ahead. This Congress can solve this issue, but it won’t because it is just a political game. When it is about scoring political points rather than solving a humanitarian crisis, people in this body have to decide which one they want to do more.

I will never forget last year, sitting with a bipartisan group of my colleagues, and as we discussed solutions to immigration, one of my Democratic colleagues said out loud: I haven’t decided what I want to do on this yet. There is an angel on one shoulder saying this problem needs to be solved, and there is a devil on my other shoulder saying this is the greatest political strategy for President. Why would I give that up? And I haven’t decided which way I am going to go yet.

I looked at them and said: Here is a basic rule of thumb I live by. When there are an angel and a devil talking to you, go with the angel every time. This is something we should do, and we should stop playing political games and trying to hurt the President and ignoring the obvious solutions we all should see. This is not a partisan issue; this is a humanity issue. Let’s solve it together.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the Republicans be rescinded.

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

**Providing for Congressional Disapproval of the Proposed Transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Kingdom of Spain, and the Italian Republic of Certain Defense Articles and Services—S. J. Res. 36—Veto**

**Providing for Congressional Disapproval of the Proposed Export to the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Republic of France of Certain Defense Articles and Services—S. J. Res. 37—Veto**

**Providing for Congressional Disapproval of the Proposed Export to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of Certain Defense Articles and Services—S. J. Res. 38—Veto**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the Republicans be rescinded.

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

**Providing for Congressional Disapproval of the Proposed Transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Kingdom of Spain, and the Italian Republic of Certain Defense Articles and Services—S. J. Res. 36—Veto**

**Providing for Congressional Disapproval of the Proposed Export to the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Republic of France of Certain Defense Articles and Services—S. J. Res. 37—Veto**

**Providing for Congressional Disapproval of the Proposed Export to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of Certain Defense Articles and Services—S. J. Res. 38—Veto**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The previous order, the Senate having received the veto messages on S.J. Res. 36, S.J. Res. 37, and S.J. Res. 38, the messages are considered read and spread upon the Journal in full, en bloc.

The veto messages are ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

I am returning herewith without my approval S.J. Res. 36, a joint resolution that would prohibit the issuance of certain licenses with respect to several proposed agreements or transfers to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Kingdom of
Spending, the Italian Republic. This resolution would weaken America's global competitiveness and damage the important relationships we share with our allies and partners.

In particular, S.J. Res. 36 would prohibit the transfer of Paveway II Enhanced Paveway II, Paveway III, and Paveway IV munitions. The misguided licensing prohibitions in the joint resolution directly conflict with the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States, which include strengthening defense alliances with friendly countries throughout the world, deepening partnerships that preserve and extend our global influence, and enhancing our competitiveness in key markets. Apart from negatively affecting relationships with our allies, the resolution would hamper the ability of the United States to sustain and shape critical security cooperation activities. S.J. Res. 36 would also restrict the creditworthiness of the United States as a reliable partner by signaling that we are willing to abandon our partners and allies at the very moment when threats to them are increasing.

The United States is providing the licenses that the joint resolution seeks to prohibit for many reasons. First and foremost, it is our solemn duty to protect the safety of the more than 80,000 United States citizens who reside in Saudi Arabia and who are imperiled by Houthi attacks from Yemen. The Houthis, supported by Iran, have attacked civilian and military facilities using missiles, armed drones, and explosive boats, including in areas frequented by United States citizens such as the airport in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. Second, the joint resolution would degrade Saudi Arabia’s military preparedness and ability to protect its sovereignty, directly affecting its ability to defend United States military personnel hosted there. Third, Saudi Arabia is a bulwark against the malign activities of Iran and its proxies in the region, and the licenses the joint resolution would prohibit enhance Saudi Arabia's ability to deter and defend against these threats.

In addition, S.J. Res. 36 would negatively affect our NATO Allies and the transatlantic defense industry. It could, for example, produce unintended consequences for defense procurement and interoperability with and between our partners. It could also create diplomatic and security opportunities for our adversaries to exploit.

Finally, by restricting the ability of our partners to produce and purchase precision-guided munitions, S.J. Res. 37 would likely prolong the conflict in Yemen and deepen the suffering it causes. By undermining bilateral relationships of the United States and impeding our ability to support key partners at a critical time, the joint resolution would harm—not help—efforts to end the conflict in Yemen. And without precision-guided munitions, more—not fewer—civilians are likely to become casualties, including training and advising the Saudi-led Coalition forces to improve their targeting processes.

The United States is very concerned about the conflict’s toll on innocent civilians and is working to bring the conflict in Yemen to an end. But we cannot end it through ill-conceived and time-consuming resolutions that fail to address its root causes. Rather than expend time and resources on such resolutions, I encourage the Congress to direct its efforts toward supporting our allies and partners at a critical time, the joint resolution would prohibit for many reasons. First and foremost, it is our solemn duty to protect the safety of the more than 80,000 United States citizens who reside in Saudi Arabia and are imperiled by Houthi attacks from Yemen. And without precision-guided munitions, more—not fewer—civilians are likely to become casualties of this conflict, the United States has taken and will continue to take action to minimize such casualties, including training and advising the Saudi-led Coalition forces to improve their targeting processes.

The United States is very concerned about the conflict’s toll on innocent civilians and is working to bring the conflict in Yemen to an end. But we cannot end it through ill-conceived and time-consuming resolutions that fail to address its root causes. Rather than expend time and resources on such resolutions, I encourage the Congress to direct its efforts toward supporting our allies and partners at a critical time, the joint resolution would prohibit for many reasons. First and foremost, it is our solemn duty to protect the safety of the more than 80,000 United States citizens who reside in Saudi Arabia and are imperiled by Houthi attacks from Yemen. And without precision-guided munitions, more—not fewer—civilians are likely to become casualties of this conflict, the United States has taken and will continue to take action to minimize such casualties, including training and advising the Saudi-led Coalition forces to improve their targeting processes.

The United States is very concerned about the conflict’s toll on innocent civilians and is working to bring the conflict in Yemen to an end. But we cannot end it through ill-conceived and time-consuming resolutions that fail to address its root causes. Rather than expend time and resources on such resolutions, I encourage the Congress to direct its efforts toward supporting our allies and partners at a critical time, the joint resolution would prohibit for many reasons. First and foremost, it is our solemn duty to protect the safety of the more than 80,000 United States citizens who reside in Saudi Arabia and are imperiled by Houthi attacks from Yemen. And without precision-guided munitions, more—not fewer—civilians are likely to become casualties of this conflict, the United States has taken and will continue to take action to minimize such casualties, including training and advising the Saudi-led Coalition forces to improve their targeting processes.
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The United States is very concerned about the conflict’s toll on innocent civilians and is working to bring the conflict in Yemen to an end. But we cannot end it through ill-conceived and time-consuming resolutions that fail to address its root causes. Rather than expend time and resources on such resolutions, I encourage the Congress to direct its efforts toward supporting our allies and partners at a critical time, the joint resolution would prohibit for many reasons. First and foremost, it is our solemn duty to protect the safety of the more than 80,000 United States citizens who reside in Saudi Arabia and are imperiled by Houthi attacks from Yemen. And without precision-guided munitions, more—not fewer—civilians are likely to become casualties of this conflict, the United States has taken and will continue to take action to minimize such casualties, including training and advising the Saudi-led Coalition forces to improve their targeting processes.
To the Senate of the United States:

I am returning herewith without my approval S.J. Res. 38, a joint resolution that would prohibit the issuance of export licenses for the proposed transfer of defense articles, defense services, and technical data for the manufacturing of the Aurora Fuzing System for the Paveway IV Precision Guided Bomb Program in regard to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The joint resolution would weaken America’s global competitiveness and damage the important relationships we share with our allies and partners.

In particular, S.J. Res. 38 would prohibit the issuance of export licenses for the proposed transfer of defense articles, defense services, and technical data for the manufacturing of the Aurora Fuzing System for the Paveway IV Precision Guided Bomb Program in regard to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The proposed transfer would enhance our partners. It could also create diplomatic and security opportunities for our adversaries to exploit.

Finally, by restricting the ability of our partners to produce and purchase precision-guided munitions, S.J. Res. 38 would likely prolong the conflict in Yemen and thereby the suffering it causes. By undermining bilateral relationships of the United States and impeding our ability to support key partners at a critical time, the joint resolution would harm—rather than support—our efforts to end the conflict in Yemen. And without the precision-guided munitions, more—not fewer—civilians are likely to become casualties of the conflict. While I share concerns that certain Members of Congress have expressed about civilian casualties of this conflict, the United States has taken and will continue to take action to minimize such casualties, including training and advising the Saudi-led Coalition forces to improve their targeting processes.

The United States is very concerned about the conflict’s toll on innocent civilians and is working to bring the conflict in Yemen to an end. But we cannot end it through ill-conceived and time-consuming resolutions that fail to address its root causes. Rather than expedite the process, such resolutions would undermine our security objectives of the United States and imperil the safety of the more than 80,000 United States citizens who reside in Saudi Arabia and who are imperiled by Houthis attacks from Yemen. The Houthis, supported by Iran, have attacked civilian and military facilities using missiles, armed drones, and explosive boats, including in areas frequented by United States citizens, such as the airport in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia.

Second, the joint resolution would degrade Saudi Arabia’s military capability and ability to protect its sovereignty, directly affecting its ability to defend United States military personnel stationed there. Third, Saudi Arabia is a bulwark against the malign activities of Iran and its proxies in the region, and the licenses the joint resolution would prohibit enhance Saudi Arabia’s ability to deter and defend against these threats.

In addition, S.J. Res. 38 would negatively affect our NATO Allies and the transatlantic defense industry. It could, for example, produce unintended consequences for defense procurement and interoperability with and between our partners. It could also create diplomatic and security opportunities for our adversaries to exploit.

I am not here to reiterate the 2016 election or, for that matter, to second-guess the special counsel’s findings. This is more a question of how we defend our democracy on a going-forward basis.

The reason we need to do this—amongst a host of reasons—is that just a little more than a month ago, the President of the United States sat in the Oval Office, and by dismissing this threat, effectively gave Russia the green light to interfere in future elections. Since then, unfortunately, my Republican colleagues have done nothing to prevent further future attempts at undermining our democracy.

Let me be clear. If a foreign adversary sees to your campaign, your response should not be ‘thank you’; your response should be a moral obligation to tell the FBI. Mr. Mueller, the former FBI Director and arguably the straightest arrow in public service, said as much this afternoon.

So if the President or other members of his family or his campaign can’t be trusted to do the right thing and report their foreign contacts and foreign offers of assistance to their political activities, then we need to make it a legal requirement.

That is what my legislation, the FIRE Act, is all about. The FIRE Act is a simple, narrowly targeted bill. All it does is make sure that attempts to interfere in future Presidential elections are promptly reported to the FBI and the FEC.

Let me be clear. The FIRE Act is not about prohibiting innocent contacts or the exercise of First Amendment rights. Contrary to some of the mistaken rhetoric we have heard, it does not require the reporting of contacts with foreign journalists or with Dreamers or of official meetings with foreign governments. It is simply about preserving Americans’ trust in our democratic process. If a candidate is receiving or welcoming help from the Kremlin or its spy services, I think the American people should have a right to know before they head to the polls.

Consequently, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be discharged from further consideration of S. 2242, the FIRE...
Act; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be 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 an objection?

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An objection is heard.

The Senator from Connecticut.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— S. 1247

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I thank my colleague Senator WARNER, and we will hear shortly from Senator WYDEN.

These two great colleagues are championing election security. Senator WARNER, at the helm as vice chairman of the Intelligence Committee, has done as much as any American and any Member of this body to uncover the serious Russian threat to our election system. It is a threat not just from Russia but from other countries as well. I have time limited and will ask unanimous consent for the passage of S. 1247, the Duty To Report Act.

This legislation, like Senator WARNER’s, is based on a very simple idea: If you see something, say something. The Duty To Report Act would require campaigns, candidates, and family members to immediately report to the FBI and the Federal Election Commission any offers of illegal foreign assistance. It differs in some technical aspects—for example, with regard to family members—from Senator WARNER’s proposed FIRE Act. Yet it is the same idea because it codifies into law what is already a moral duty, a patriotic duty, and basic common sense. It is already illegal to accept foreign assistance during a campaign. It is already illegal to solicit foreign assistance during a campaign. All this bill does is require campaigns and individuals to report such illegal foreign assistance directly to the FBI.

Special Counsel Robert Mueller came before Congress today to answer questions about his very comprehensive and powerful report that documents the sweeping and systematic interference in our democracy, to benefit, principally, Donald Trump’s campaign. Yet this is the same issue that he brought to light that is currently the subject of a number of challenges to our democracy. This report outlines the most serious attack on our democracy by a foreign power in our history. It tells the story of more than 150 contacts between the Trump campaign and Russian agents. It tells about the overt efforts to influence the outcome of our election by helping one candidate and hurting another, and it shows—perhaps most importantly for the purpose of this measure—that the Trump campaign knew of it, welcomed it, and happily accepted it.

Mueller testified this morning:

Over the course of my career, I have seen a number of offenses to our democracy. The Russian Government’s efforts to interfere in our election is among the most serious. As I said on May 29, this deserves the attention of every American.

Equally important is that, just yesterday, FBI Director Christopher Wray came before the Committee on the Judiciary and warned that the Russians are still actively trying to interfere in our election, which is what Mueller said today when he was asked about some of the remarks and some of the efforts in the Trump campaign. He was referring to Donald Trump, Jr., when he said, “I love it,” in welcoming Russia’s offer of assistance to the Trump campaign in the June 9 meeting, Director Mueller said, “I would take it.” That is why we need the Duty To Report Act. If that kind of assistance is offered, there is an obligation to report it, not to take it.

The election of 2016 was simply a dress rehearsal. With the 2020 election upon us, we must stop this kind of foreign interference and ensure that it is the American people, not Russia or any other foreign power like China or Iran, who decide who the leaders of this country will be and the direction of our democracy.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An objection is heard.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I yield to another great colleague who has been a champion of this cause of election security, Senator WYDEN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— S. 890

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues, Senator BLUMENTHAL and Senator WARNER, who have spoken forcefully on the issue at hand, which is to protect our great country and our extraordinary 200-year experiment in self-governance. To do it, we have to add a new tier—a strong protection—for the sanctity of our elections.

I thank Senator BLUMENTHAL. He is a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, where he is doing important work on these issues. I thank our colleague Senator WYDEN, who is the vice chairman of the Intelligence Committee, on which I serve. I also thank my colleague who is still on the floor, Senator BLUMENTHAL, for all of his leadership. I look forward to partnering with Senator WARNER in the days ahead.

In a moment, I will ask for unanimous consent to adopt a bipartisan bill that I have proposed with Senator COTTON. It is S. 890, the Senate Cybersecurity Protection Act. Before I ask, however, for that unanimous consent request, I will give some brief background as to why Senator COTTON and I are working on this issue and putting ahead a proposal that is important.

In the 2016 election, obviously, the Russians inflicted damage on our democracy by hacking the personal accounts of political parties and individuals and then by dumping emails and documents online. They generated massive amounts of media coverage that was based on those stolen documents. It is clear, in my view, that the Russians and other hostile foreign actors are going to continue to target the personal devices and accounts, which are often less secure than official government devices. You don’t have to take my word for it. Top national security officials in the Trump administration have said virtually the same thing.

Last year, the Director of National Intelligence—our former colleague, Senator Coats—told the Senate Intelligence Committee: “The personal accounts of government officials can contain information that is useful for our adversaries to target, either directly or indirectly, these officials and the organizations with which they are affiliated.”

Likewise, in a letter to me last year, the then-Director of the National Security Agency, MIKE ROGERS, said that the personal devices and accounts belonging to senior U.S. government officials “remain prime targets for exploitation.”

These foreign intelligence threats are not just aimed at the executive branch. Last year, a bipartisan Senate working group examined cybersecurity threats against the Senate. In its 2018 report, the working group revealed there was “mounting evidence that Senators are being targeted for hacking, which could include exposure of personal data.” Likewise, Google has publicly confirmed that it has quietly warned specific Senators and Senate staff that their personal email accounts were targeted by state-sponsored hackers.

Unfortunately, the Sergeant at Arms—the office that is tasked with protecting the Senate’s cybersecurity—is currently barred from using its resources to protect the personal devices.
and accounts of Senators and their staff, even if Senators and their staff are being targeted by foreign spies and hackers.

That is why, on a bipartisan basis, I and Senator COTTON, who also serves on the Intelligence Committee with me and with Senator WARNER, who spoke earlier, introduced legislation to permit the Sergeant at Arms to provide 100-percent voluntary cybersecurity assistance to Senators and their staff. Our bill is modeled after a provision in the recently passed Senate Intelligence Authorization bill, which permits the Director of National Intelligence to provide voluntary cyber help to protect the personal devices and accounts of intelligence community employees.

Fighting against foreign interference means securing every aspect of our democracy, including the personal accounts and devices of elected officials. I feel strongly that the majority leader, our colleague from Kentucky, must now consider this common-sense legislation and allow this body to better defend itself against foreign hackers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be discharged from further consideration of S. 890, the Senate Cybersecurity Protection Act; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be read a third time and passed; and that the motion to invoke cloture on Brian Berger to support the needs of today’s veterans. I and our colleague from Arkansas, Senator COTTON—a military veteran—have joined in an effort, which I would just say to the Senators who are on the floor, is going to be one of the great threats of our time.

We know that hostile foreign actors are going to target the personal accounts and devices of government officials. Russia clearly demonstrated the opportunities for meddling in the last election. Now, we know that those opportunities are going to grow exponentially in the days and months ahead. So I only want to pass on that I think this is regrettable, and there has been an objection, and I just hope we will be able to pass this bill before more people are hacked and their stolen data is exploited by hostile foreign actors. I yield the floor.

REMEMBERING EVA YEH CHANG
Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I am sorry to note today the recent passing of a dear friend to many and the ending of her quintessentially American story.

On July 13, Mrs. Eva Yeh Chang of San Francisco died peacefully at the age of 100. Eva was born in 1919 in Shanghai during a different era for China. Though she was born into a well-to-do banking family, her first three decades involved significant hardship: the Chinese Civil War, the Japanese occupation in the late 1930s, the Second World War, and the beginning of the Communist Revolution. That final event led Eva and her husband, Fu-Yun Chang, a Harvard-educated diplomat, statesman, and scholar, to leave their lives behind and depart for American shores. They essentially started anew in a new country with three young children under the age of 10.

What followed was the kind of entrepreneurial "start-up life" that would sound impossible in today's lands but has been the building block of our Nation from the beginning. Eva worked multiple jobs, from retail to waiting tables. Eventually, she saved enough to strike out on her own. First she opened a diner in Chinatown of San Francisco’s early Northern Chinese restaurants—a big success—and then came more investments in enterprise and real estate in the city.

Eva didn’t just keep what she had built for her community. Eva worked multiple jobs, from retail to waiting tables. Eventually, she saved enough to strike out on her own. First she opened a diner in Chinatown of San Francisco’s early Northern Chinese restaurants—a big success—and then came more investments in enterprise and real estate in the city.

This remarkable woman may have left us, but the positive effects of her life continue to ripple out. For example, she worked to help a number of her relatives back in China complete the same journey she had made and follow in her footsteps to America.

The Senate stands with the entire American Nation. That final event led Eva and her husband, Fu-Yun Chang, a Harvard-educated diplomat, statesman, and scholar, to leave their lives behind and depart for American shores. They essentially started anew in a new country with three young children under the age of 10.

What followed was the kind of entrepreneurial "start-up life" that would sound impossible in today's lands but has been the building block of our Nation from the beginning. Eva worked multiple jobs, from retail to waiting tables. Eventually, she saved enough to strike out on her own. First she opened a diner in Chinatown of San Francisco’s early Northern Chinese restaurants—a big success—and then came more investments in enterprise and real estate in the city.

Eva didn’t just keep what she had built for her community. Eva worked multiple jobs, from retail to waiting tables. Eventually, she saved enough to strike out on her own. First she opened a diner in Chinatown of San Francisco’s early Northern Chinese restaurants—a big success—and then came more investments in enterprise and real estate in the city.

This remarkable woman may have left us, but the positive effects of her life continue to ripple out. For example, she worked to help a number of her relatives back in China complete the same journey she had made and follow in her footsteps to America.

The Senate stands with the entire American Nation. That final event led Eva and her husband, Fu-Yun Chang, a Harvard-educated diplomat, statesman, and scholar, to leave their lives behind and depart for American shores. They essentially started anew in a new country with three young children under the age of 10.

What followed was the kind of entrepreneurial "start-up life" that would sound impossible in today's lands but has been the building block of our Nation from the beginning. Eva worked multiple jobs, from retail to waiting tables. Eventually, she saved enough to strike out on her own. First she opened a diner in Chinatown of San Francisco’s early Northern Chinese restaurants—a big success—and then came more investments in enterprise and real estate in the city.

Eva didn’t just keep what she had built for her community. Eva worked multiple jobs, from retail to waiting tables. Eventually, she saved enough to strike out on her own. First she opened a diner in Chinatown of San Francisco’s early Northern Chinese restaurants—a big success—and then came more investments in enterprise and real estate in the city.

This remarkable woman may have left us, but the positive effects of her life continue to ripple out. For example, she worked to help a number of her relatives back in China complete the same journey she had made and follow in her footsteps to America.

With local posts in each State, various territories, and overseas, the Administration for our Nation’s largest wartime Veterans’ service organization. The Legion embodies its commitment of upholding the Constitution of the United States of America and promoting peace and goodwill through its volunteerism in the communities it represents.

The American Legion created various organizations to support the Nation’s veterans and youth, including the Veterans and Children Foundation and Sons of the American Legion. Since its creation in 1919, the Legion has given over $30 million in financial assistance for disabled veterans and military families. Through scholarships and programming, the Legion also invests in the future of our Nation’s youth.

Today, with 386 posts in Michigan and more than 12,000 posts nationwide with nearly 2 million members, the American Legion continues to grow to meet the needs of veterans. Whether it is drafting the first version of the GI Bill, organizing our flag code, or donating to the construction of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, DC, the Legion has been at the forefront of monumental changes to our military and veterans policy and overall patriotism.

It is my great pleasure to congratulate the American Legion on the lasting impact it has made throughout our Nation’s history and for the work it continues to do. As the American Legion celebrates this centennial milestone, I ask all my colleagues to join
me in congratulating its members its growth and prosperity in the years ahead.

TRIBUTE TO SERGEANT MAJOR DANIEL A. DAILEY

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize SMA Daniel A. Dailey, the fifteenth Sergeant Major of the Army, SMA, for his extraordinary 30 years of faithful service to our Army and our Nation.

Sergeant Major Dailey’s impressive and distinguished career has been characterized by his diligent work, compassionate leadership, and focus on taking care of and advocating to improve the lives of soldiers and their family members.

In the next few weeks, Sergeant Major Dailey will transition his responsibilities as the U.S. Army’s senior enlisted leader, and he will retire from the army after a long and distinguished career of military service at home and abroad. While Sergeant Major Dailey may transition his official duties, his heart and soul is that of a soldier. I know that, as a Soldier for Life, Sergeant Major Dailey will continue his life’s work to love our Army and to take care of our soldiers.

A native of Palmerton, PA, Sergeant Major Dailey began his journey of service when he enlisted in the Army in 1989 and successfully completed basic training at Fort Jackson. He was assigned individual training as an infantryman at Fort Benning, GA. During his career, Sergeant Major Dailey has held every enlisted leadership position in the mechanized infantry, ranging from Bradley Fighting Vehicle commander to command sergeant major.

Sergeant Major Dailey has served with the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th Infantry Divisions stateside and overseas. In March 2009, he was selected as the 4th Infantry Division command sergeant major, where he served as both the command sergeant major of Fort Carson, CO, and U.S. Division-North, Iraq. In 2011, Sergeant Major Dailey was selected to serve as the Command Sergeant Major of the United States Army Training and Doctrine Command, TRADOC.

In addition to four deployments supporting Operations IRAQI FREEDOM and NEW DAWN, where he earned the Bronze Star with Valor for his leadership during the 4th Infantry Division’s 2-month “Battle for Sadr City” in 2008, he also deployed in support of Operations DESERT STORM and DESERT SHIELD during the first Gulf War.

Sergeant Major Dailey’s tenure as the 15th Sergeant Major of the Army began on January 30, 2015. As Sergeant Major of the Army, Sergeant Major Dailey serves as the senior enlisted advisor to the Army’s Chief of Staff on all matters affecting enlisted soldiers and their families. In addition to being the soldier’s voice through his membership on multiple councils, boards, and commissions and frequently testifying before Congress, Sergeant Major Dailey has also traveled the world to hear and tell the soldier’s story, spearheaded initiatives to enhance Army readiness and increase soldier opportunity, and routinely met with business and industry leaders, and State and local government officials to improve Dailey’s quality of life for Soldiers and their families.

Sergeant Major Dailey is the public face of the U.S. Army’s noncommissioned officer corps, representing the corps to the American people in the media and through business and community engagements. Sergeant Major Dailey is a shining example of Army values, and he exemplifies the noncommissioned officer’s creed. He has remained technically and tactically proficient, and he has consistently provided outstanding leadership. He is the personification of what it means to be a professional soldier, and his service is an example of how the Army’s NCO corps is the “Backbone of the Army.”

It has been a pleasure to know, work, and serve with Sergeant Major Dailey during his time as the Sergeant Major of the Army. On behalf of a grateful Nation, it is my honor to recognize the selfless service and sacrifice of Sergeant Major Dailey and his family. I wish Sergeant Major Dailey and his family the very best in all of their future endeavors as he and they begin this new chapter. May God continue to bless Sergeant Major Dailey, his family, and the United States of America.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO GILLIAN AIKEN

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Gigi for her hard work as an intern in the Environment and Public Works Committee. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Gigi is a native of Virginia. She will attend the University of the South: Sewanee. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Gigi for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her journey.

TRIBUTE TO MADISON ANDERSON

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Madison for her hard work as an intern in the Environment and Public Works Committee. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Madison is a native of Ten Sleep. She is a student at Sheridan College, where she is studying agricultural business. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Madison for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her journey.

TRIBUTE TO AVERY DOUGLAS

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Avery for her hard work as an intern in the Environment and Public Works Committee. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Avery is a native of Florida. She is a student at the University of South
TRIBUTE TO PRESTON GROMER
- Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Preston for his hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC, office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Preston is a native of Casper. He is a student at Pepperdine University, where he is studying economics. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Preston for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his journey.

TRIBUTE TO GARRETT HARTIGAN
- Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Garrett for his hard work as an intern in my Cheyenne office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Garrett is a native of Cheyenne. He is a student at the University of Wyoming, where he is studying political science and Spanish. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Garrett for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his journey.

TRIBUTE TO SKYLAR HOLMQUIST
- Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Skylar for her hard work as an intern in my Casper office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Skylar is a native of Baggs. She is a student at Casper College, where she is studying art education. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Skylar for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.

TRIBUTE TO KAITLYN MAHAR
- Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Kaitlyn for her hard work as an intern in the Senate Republican Conference. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Kaitlyn is a native of Colorado. She is a student at the University of Wyoming, where she is studying political science and Spanish. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Kaitlyn for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her journey.

TRIBUTE TO TREVOR MERRIFIELD
- Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Trevor for his hard work as an intern in the Environmental and Public Works Committee. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Trevor is a native of North Carolina. He is a graduate of Auburn University, where he studied political science. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Trevor for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his journey.

TRIBUTE TO CHANDLER PAULING
- Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Chandler for her hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC, office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Chandler is a native of Laramie. She is a student at the University of Wyoming, where she is studying political science and Spanish. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Chandler for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her journey.
science and communication. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Chandler for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.

TRIBUTE TO BRIANNA SIMS

• Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Brianna for her hard work as an intern in my Casper office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Brianna is a native of Casper. She is a student at the University of Wyoming, where she is studying physiology. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Brianna for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.

RECOGNIZING THE SPRINGDALE TYSON SCHOOL OF INNOVATION ROBOTICS TEAM

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to congratulate Root Negative One, Springdale’s Don Tyson School of Innovation Robotics Team, on qualifying for the FIRST Global Challenge in Dubai, Arkansas is proud to have a team from our State represent the United States in the robotics competition in October.

Root Negative One has achieved much success in the team’s 4-year history. It won the Inspire Award, the top award given at the FIRST Tech Challenge tournament, in its first year. During the 2017–2018 season, the team earned the Inspire Award at the Arkansas FIRST Tech Challenge Championship, and it was an Inspire Award Finalist at the FIRST Tech Challenge World Championship in Houston, TX. This past season, the team won the Inspire Awards at the Alabama FIRST Tech Challenge Championship and the FIRST Tech Challenge World Championship in Houston. This award recognizes Root Negative One as one of the top two teams worldwide.

For Inspiration and Recognition of Science and Technology—FIRST—empowers students to develop skills in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) and provides opportunities for youth to make connections with professionals in these areas. University of Arkansas College of Engineering professors Richard Cassidy and Chase Rainwater volunteer as team coaches, serving as excellent mentors to the students. Since day one, the team has worked hard to build a world-class, high-school robotics program to compete at the highest level.

The numerous benefits these Springdale students get from participating in the FIRST program will have a long lasting impact on team members. By having the opportunity to learn from professional engineers and master STEM skills before they enter college, they are well on their way to successful futures.

I am very proud of the team’s accomplishments as its members continue their journey to develop such relevant, in-demand skills. Congratulations to Root Negative One Robotics Team on all of these accomplishments on earning a spot to compete in the FIRST Global Challenge. I wish the team the best of luck as it represents our country in the fall.

TRIBUTE TO TIM MORGAN

• Mr. ROUND. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Tim Morgan, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all the hard work he has done on behalf of myself, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Tim is a graduate of Mitchell High School in Mitchell, SD. Currently, he is attending South Dakota State University in Brookings, SD, where he studies political science and journalism. Tim is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience and has been a true asset to the office.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Tim for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO ANNELIESE TAGGART

• Mr. ROUND. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Anneliese Taggart, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all the hard work she has done on behalf of myself, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Anneliese is a graduate of Vermillion High School in Vermillion, SD. Currently, she is attending the University of Alabama in Tuscaloosa, AL, where she studies political science and communications studies. Anneliese is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience and has been a true asset to the office.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Anneliese for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Roberts, one of his secretaries.

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE


The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, spread in full upon the Journal, and held at the desk:

To the Senate of the United States:

I am returning herewith without my approval S.J. Res. 36, a joint resolution that would prohibit the export of certain licenses with respect to several proposed agreements or transfers to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Kingdom of Spain, and the Italian Republic. This resolution would weaken America’s global competitiveness and damage the important relationships we share with our allies and partners.

In particular, S.J. Res. 36 would prohibit licensing for manufacturing in Saudi Arabia of Guidance Electronics Detector Assemblies, Aircraft Control Groups, Airfoil Groups, Aircraft Umbilical Interconnect Systems, Fuses, and other components to support the production of Paveway II, Enhanced Paveway II, and Paveway IV munitions. The misguided licensing prohibitions in the joint resolution directly conflict with the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States, which include strengthening defense alliances with friendly countries throughout the world, deepening partnerships that preserve and extend our global influence, and enhancing our competitiveness in key markets. Apart from negatively affecting our bilateral relationships with Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom, Spain, and Italy, the joint resolution would hamper the ability of the United States to sustain and shape critical security cooperation activities. S.J. Res. 36 would also damage the credibility of the United States as a reliable partner by signaling that we are willing to abandon our partners and allies at the very moment when threats to them are increasing.

The United States is providing the licenses that the joint resolution seeks to prohibit for many reasons. First and foremost, it is our solemn duty to protect the safety of the more than 80,000
United States citizens who reside in Saudi Arabia and who are imperiled by Houthi attacks from Yemen. The Houthis, supported by Iran, have attacked civilian and military facilities using missiles, armed drones, and explosive boats, including in areas frequented by United States citizens, such as the airport in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. Second, the joint resolution would degrade Saudi Arabia’s military preparedness and ability to protect its sovereignty, directly affecting its ability to defend United States military personnel hosted there. Third, Saudi Arabia is a bulwark against the malign activities of Iran and its proxies in the region, and the licenses the joint resolution would prohibit enhance Saudi Arabia’s ability to deter and defend against these threats.

In addition, S.J. Res. 36 would negatively affect our NATO Allies and the transatlantic defense industry. It could, for example, produce unintended consequences for defense procurement and interoperability with and between our partners. It could also create diplomatic and security opportunities for our adversaries to exploit.

Finally, by restricting the ability of our partners to produce and purchase precision-guided munitions, S.J. Res. 36 would likely prolong the conflict in Yemen and deepen the suffering it causes. By undermining bilateral relationships of the United States and impeding our ability to support key partners at a critical time, the joint resolution would harm—not help—efforts to end the conflict in Yemen. And without precision-guided munitions, more—not fewer—civilians are likely to become casualties of the conflict.

While I share concerns that certain Members of Congress have expressed about civilian casualties of this conflict, the United States has taken and will continue to take action to minimize such casualties, including training and advising Saudi-led Coalition forces to improve their targeting processes.

The United States is very concerned about the conflict’s toll on innocent civilians and is working to bring the conflict in Yemen to an end. But we cannot end it through ill-conceived and time-consuming resolutions that fail to address its root causes. Rather than expend time and resources on such resolutions, I encourage the Congress to direct its efforts toward supporting our work to achieve peace through a negotiated settlement to the conflict in Yemen.

For these reasons, it is my duty to return S.J. Res. 36 to the Senate without my approval.

Donald J. Trump
report, which was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, spread in full upon the Journal, and held at the desk:

To the Senate of the United States:
I am returning herewith without my approval S.J. Res. 38, a joint resolution that would prohibit the issuance of export licenses for the proposed transfer of defense articles, defense services, and technical data to support the manufacture of the Aurora Fuzing System for the Paveway IV Precision Guided Bomb Program in regard to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. This resolution would weaken America’s global competitiveness and damage the important relationships we share with our allies and partners.

In particular, S.J. Res. 38 would prohibit the issuance of export licenses for the proposed transfer of defense articles, defense services, and technical data for the manufacturing of the Aurora Fuzing System for the Paveway IV Precision Guided Bomb Program. The misguided licensing prohibition in the joint resolution directly conflicts with the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States, which include strengthening defense alliances and relationships with friendly countries throughout the world, deepening partnerships that preserve and extend our global influence, and enhancing our competitiveness in key markets. Apart from negatively affecting our bilateral relationships with Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom, the joint resolution would hamper the ability of the United States to sustain and shape critical security cooperation activities.

S.J. Res. 38 would also damage the credibility of the United States as a reliable partner by signaling that we are willing to abandon our partners and allies at the very moment when threats to them are increasing.

The United States is providing the licenses that the joint resolution seeks to prohibit for many reasons. First and foremost, it is our solemn duty to protect the safety of the more than 80,000 United States citizens who reside in Saudi Arabia and who are imperiled by Houthi attacks from Yemen. The Houthis, supported by Iran, have attacked civilian and military facilities using missiles, armed drones, and explosive boats, including in areas frequented by U.S. citizens, such as the airport in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. Second, the joint resolution would degrade Saudi Arabia’s military preparedness and ability to protect its sovereignty, directly affecting its ability to defend United States military personnel hosted there. Third, Saudi Arabia is a bulwark against the malign activities of Iran and its proxies in the region, and the licenses the joint resolution would prohibit enhance Saudi Arabia’s ability to deter and defend against these threats.

In addition, S.J. Res. 38 would negatively affect our NATO Allies and the transatlantic defense industry. It could, for example, produce unintended consequences for defense procurement and interoperability with and between our partners. It could also create diplomatic and security opportunities for our adversaries to exploit.

Finally, by restricting the ability of our partners to produce and purchase precision-guided munitions, S.J. Res. 38 would likely prolong the conflict in Yemen and deepen the suffering it causes. By undermining bilateral relationships and impeding our ability to support key partners at a critical time, the joint resolution would harm—not help—efforts to end the conflict in Yemen. And without precision-guided munitions, more—not fewer—civilians are likely to become casualties of the conflict. While I share concerns that certain Members of Congress have expressed about civilian casualties of this conflict, the United States has taken and will continue to take action to mitigate such casualties, including training and advising the Saudi-led Coalition forces to improve their targeting processes.

The United States is very concerned about the continued targeting of innocent civilians and is working to bring the conflict in Yemen to an end. But we cannot end it through ill-conceived and time-consuming resolutions that fail to address its root causes. Rather than expend time and resources on such resolutions, I encourage the Congress to direct its efforts toward supporting our work to achieve peace through a negotiated settlement to the conflict in Yemen.

For these reasons, it is my duty to return S.J. Res. 38 to the Senate without my approval.

DONALD J. TRUMP,
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 24, 2019.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED
At 9:32 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled joint resolutions:

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

S.J. Res. 37. Joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Republic of France of certain defense articles and services.

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

The enrolled joint resolutions were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

At 11:49 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

H.R. 3504. An act to amend title 36, United States Code, to authorize The American Legion to determine the requirements for membership in The American Legion, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 94. An act to ensure consideration of water intensity in the Department of Energy’s energy research, development, and demonstration programs to help guarantee efficient, reliable, and sustainable delivery of energy and clean water resources.

H.R. 36. An act to provide for research to better understand the causes and consequences of sexual harassment affecting individuals in the scientific, technical, engineering, and mathematics workforce and to examine policies to reduce the prevalence and negative impact of such harassment, and for other purposes.

H.R. 617. An act to authorize the Department of Energy to conduct collaborative research with the Department of Energy’s national laboratories on nuclear waste in the United States, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1665. An act to direct the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act to make changes to the implementation of the Manufacturing USA Network, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2397. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide tax credits to certain veterans who were victims of sexual harassment while on active duty, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2893. An act to provide for grants to the Department of Veterans Affairs to carry out the Women’s Health Transition Training pilot program through at least fiscal year 2020, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2945. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make all fact sheets of the Department of Veterans Affairs in English, Spanish, and Tagalog.

H.R. 3155. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make all fact sheets of the Department of Veterans Affairs in English, Spanish, and Tagalog.

H.R. 3166. An act to direct the Department of Veterans Affairs to support research on opioid addiction, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3196. An act to exempt from the calculation of monthly income certain benefits paid by the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense.

H.R. 3242. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out the Women’s Health Transition Training pilot program through at least fiscal year 2020, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3245. An act to direct the Department of Veterans Affairs to make all fact sheets of the Department of Veterans Affairs in English, Spanish, and Tagalog.

H.R. 3276. An act to provide for grants to the Department of Veterans Affairs to carry out the Women’s Health Transition Training pilot program through at least fiscal year 2020, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3304. An act to exempt for an additional 4-year period, from the application of the means-test presumption of abuse under chapter 7, qualifying members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces and members of the National Guard who, after September 11, 2001, are called to active duty or to perform a homeland defense activity for not less than 90 days.

H.R. 3311. An act to amend chapter 11 of title 11, United States Code, to address reorganization of small businesses, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3504. An act to amend title 36, United States Code, to provide for improvements to the specially adapted housing program and educational assistance programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.
At 12:26 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 1237. An act to authorize the Secretary for the Center for 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2002, and for other purposes.

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

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

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

H.R. 34. An act to ensure consideration of water intensity in the Department of Energy’s energy research, development, and demonstration programs to help guarantee efficient, reliable, and sustainable delivery of energy and clean water resources; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 36. An act to provide for research to better understand the causes and consequences of sexual harassment affecting individuals in the scientific, technical, engineering, and mathematics workforce and to examine policies to reduce the prevalence and negative impact of such harassment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 617. An act to authorize the Department of Energy to conduct collaborative research with the Department of Veterans Affairs in order to improve healthcare services for veterans in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 1655. An act to direct the National Science Foundation to support STEM education research focused on early childhood; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 1837. An act to make improvements to the National Institute of Science and Technology Act and to authorize assistance for Israel, certain defense and security assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 1866. An act to impose sanctions with respect to foreign support for Palestinian terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 1869. An act to impose sanctions with respect to foreign support for Palestinian terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 1870. An act to direct the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act to make changes to the implementation of the Manufacturing USA Network, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 2368. An act to provide anti-retaliation protections for antiblack whistleblowers.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 24, 2019, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled joint resolutions:

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

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

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

J. Res. 36. Joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Italian Republic of certain defense articles and services.

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

J. Res. 38. Joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of certain defense articles and services.

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–2008. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Review Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval: Kentucky: Jefferson County Definitions and Federally Enforceable District Origin Operating Permits" (FRL No. 9965–63–OCSP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 19, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2009. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Sulfoxaflor; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9995–63–OCSP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 19, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2010. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Review Group, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Sulfoxaflor; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9996–63–OCSP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 19, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2011. A communication from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of General Robert B. Brown, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2012. A communication from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Steven L. Kwast, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2013. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuation of the national emergency with respect to significant transnational criminal organizations that was established in Executive Order 13581 on July 24, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2014. A communication from the Program Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Liquidity Coverage Ratio: Treatment of Certain Municipal Obligations as High-Quality Liquid Assets" (RIN1557–AE36) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 19, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2015. A communication from the Program Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revised Depository Institutions" (RIN1557–AE39) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 19, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2096. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Maryland; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference" (FRL No. 9992–15–Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 19, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2097. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Protection of Human Research Subjects" (FRL No. 9996–48–ORD) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 19, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.


EC–2103. A communication from the Director, White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Education, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2104. A communication from the Director, White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of...
of Assistant Secretary, Office of Postsec-
ondary Education, Department of Education,
received in the Office of the President of the
Senate on July 22, 2019; to the Committee on
EC-2105. A communication from the Chief
Financial Officer of the National Tropical
Botanical Garden, transmitting, pursuant to
law, a report of an audit of the Garden for the
period from January 1, 2018, through December 31, 2018; to the Committee on
Transportation.
EC-2106. A communication from the Dep-
uty Chief, Auctions Division, Federal Com-
munications Commission, transmitting, pur-
suant to law, a report of a rule entitled “Auction of Construction Permits for Low
Power Television and TV Translator Sta-
tions Scheduled for September 10, 2019;
Notice and Comment Period, Minimum
Opening Bids, Upfront Payments, and Other
Procedures for Auction 101” (DA-19-477)
received in the Office of the President of the
Senate on July 22, 2019; to the Committee on
Commerce, Science, and Transportation.
EC-2107. A communication from the Direc-
tor, Office of National Marine Sanctuaries,
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Admin-
istration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the
report of a rule entitled “Mallows Bay-Poto-
mac Maritime National Sanctuary Design-
ation” (RIN0646–BG26) received in the Of-
fice of the President of the Senate on July
22, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce,
Science, and Transportation.
EC-2108. A communication from a Deputy
Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Pro-
grams, National Marine Fisheries Serv-
vice, Department of Commerce, transmitting,
pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled
“Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone
Off Alaska; Gulf of Alaska; Final 2018 and
2019 Harvest Specification for Groundfish
to the Committee on Commerce, Science,
and Transportation.
EC-2109. A communication from the Deputy
Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Pro-
grams, National Marine Fisheries Service,
Department of Commerce, transmitting,
pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled
“Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone
Off Alaska; Gulf of Alaska; Final 2018 and
2019 Harvest Specification for Groundfish”
(RIN0646–BF24) received in the Office of
the President of the Senate on July 22, 2019;
to the Committee on Commerce, Science,
and Transportation.
EC-2110. A communication from the Direc-
tor, Office of National Marine Sanctuaries,
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Admin-
istration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the
report of a rule entitled “Vessel and Aircraft
Discharges from United States Coast Guard
in Greater Farallones and Cordell Bank Na-
tional Marine Sanctuaries” (RIN0646–BG73)
received in the Office of the President of the
Senate on July 22, 2019; to the Committee on
Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of
ominations were submitted:

By Mr. WICKER for the Committee on
Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

* Coast Guard nomination of Rear Adm.
Todd C. Wiemers, to be Rear Admiral (Lower
Half).

* Robert M. Duncan, of Kentucky, to be a
Governor of the United States Postal Service
for a term expiring December 8, 2025.

* Chad F. Wolf, of Virginia, to be Under
Secretary for Security, Policy, and Plans,
Department of Homeland Security.

* Rainey R. Brandt, of the District of Col-
umbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Su-
perior Court of the District of Columbia for
the term of fifteen years.

* Shana Frost Matini, of the District of Col-
umbia, to be Judge of the Superior Court of the
District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

* Catherine Bird, of Texas, to be General
Counsel and Assistant Federal Labor Relations Au-
thority for a term of five years.

* Ann C. Fisher, of the District of Colum-
bia, to be a Commissioner of the Postal Reg-
latory Commission for a term expiring Oc-
tober 14, 2024.

* Ashley Jay Elizabeth Poling, of North
Carolina, to be a Commissioner of the Postal Reg-
latory Commission for a term expiring November 22, 2024.

* Nomination was reported with rec-
ommendation that it be confirmed sub-
ject to the nominee’s commitment to
respond to requests to appear and tes-
tify before and the Senate-constituted com-
mittee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND
JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolu-
tions were introduced, read the first
and second times by unanimous con-
sent, and referred as indicated:

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

S. 2241. A bill to amend the Higher Edu-
cation Act of 1965 to establish State and
Indian tribe grants for community colleges
and grants for Historically Black Colleges and
Universities, Tribal Universities, and Minority-Serving Insti-
tutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr.
LEAHY, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 2242. A bill to amend the Recess
Act of 1965 to provide for the terms of office
of States to suspend, rather than terminate,
their participating teachers, for the term of any age; to the
Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WICKER:

S. 2249. A bill to allow the Deputy Admin-
istrator of the Federal Aviation Administra-
tion on the date of enactment of this Act to
continue to serve as such Deputy Admin-
istrator, and to be considered as atty
By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr.
LEAHY, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 2250. A bill to amend the Recess
Act of 1965 to provide for the terms of office
of States to suspend, rather than terminate,
their participating teachers, for the term of any age; to the
Committee on Finance.

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

S. 2252. A bill to amend title IX of the So-
cial Security Act to expand the permitted
uses of drugs purchased through the Medicaid drug benef-
program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mrs.
SHARER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. GILLIBAND,
and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 2253. A bill to amend chapter 2206 of title
36, United States Code, to provide pay equity
for amateur athletes and other personnel,
and for other purposes; to the Committee on
Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Ms. BALD-
WIN, Mr. WINKER, Mr. CASEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DUR-
BIN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICHI, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. JONES, Mr. KAIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MANCHIN,
Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERRICK, Mr. PETERS, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS,
Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. SHARER, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. VAN HOL-
LEN, Mr. WARREN, and Ms. WHIT-
HOUSE):

S. 2254. A bill to amend the Internal Rev-
enue Code of 1986 to provide for a deduction
for States to suspend, rather than terminate,
their participating teachers, for the term of any age; to the
Committee on Finance.

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

S. 2255. A bill to amend title XIX of the So-
Social Security Act to expand the requirement
for States to suspend, rather than terminate,
an individual’s eligibility for medical assist-
ance under the State Medicaid plan while the
individual is an inmate of a public institu-
tion; to apply to incarcerated individuals of any age; to the
Committee on Finance.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself, Ms. CORTEZ
MASTRO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. Kaine,
Mr. CASHEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MAR-
KEY, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. DUCKWORTH,
Mr. WYDEN, Mr. REED, Ms. HIRONO,
Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. UDALL, Ms.
BALDWIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MERRICK,
Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 2256. A bill to protect children affected
by immigration enforcement actions; to the
Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. BALD-
WIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr.
BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. COONS,
Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. GILLIBAND,
Ms. HARRIS, Mr. HEINRICHI, Ms.
At the request of Mr. Durbin, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. Brown) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. Braun) were added as cosponsors of S. 551, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require manufacturers of single-dose viral drugs payable under part B of the Medicare program to provide rebates with respect to amounts of such drugs discarded, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Young, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Hoeven) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations relating to commercial motor vehicle drivers under the age of 21, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Carper, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Whitehouse) 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.

At the request of Mr. Heinrich, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. Barrasso) was added as a cosponsor of S. 681, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on high-cost employer-sponsored health coverage.

At the request of Mr. Casey, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Murphy) was added as a cosponsor of S. 931, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit and make the credit fully refundable.

At the request of Mr. Markley, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. Cardin) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1088, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to require the President to set a minimum annual goal for the number of refugees to be admitted, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. Blackburn, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. McSally) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1116, a bill to require providers of broadband internet access service and edge services to clearly and conspicuously notify users of the privacy policies of those providers, to give users opt-in or opt-out approval rights with respect to the use of, disclosure of, and access to user information collected by those providers based on the level of sensitivity of the information, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Blumenthal, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. Cortez Masto) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1247, a bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require reporting to the Federal Election Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation of offers by foreign nationals to make prohibited contributions, donations, expenditures, or disbursements, and for other purposes.
BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

At the request of Mrs. Fischer, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. Sass) was added as a cosponsor of S. 180, a bill to establish certain requirements for the small refineries exemption of the renewable fuels provisions under the Clean Air Act, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Smith, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Casey) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1907, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to prohibit the stigmatization of children who are unable to pay for school meals, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Boozman, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. Collins) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1918, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require alternative options for summer food service program delivery.

At the request of Mrs. Blackburn, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Ms. Fischer) 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.

At the request of Mr. Collins, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. King) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1949, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make loan guarantees and grants to finance certain improvements to school lunch facilities, to train school food service personnel, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. Stabenow, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. Duckworth) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2001, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Willie O’Ree, in recognition of his extraordinary contributions and commitment to hockey, inclusion, and recreational opportunity.

At the request of Mr. King, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Gardner) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2018, a bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a demonstration initiative focused on the development of long-duration energy storage technologies, including a joint program to be established in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Portman, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. Hassan) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2065, a bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to publish an annual report on the use of deepfake technology, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. Rosen, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Bennet) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. Daines) were added as cosponsors of S. 2085, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants to eligible entities to carry out educational programs about the Holocaust, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Wicker, the name of the Senator from Massachussetts (Mr. Markey) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2166, a bill to designate Regional Ocean Partnerships of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Mark, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. Schatz) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 14, a resolution condemning the Government of the Philippines for its continued detention of Senator Leila de Lima, calling for her immediate release, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. Feinstein, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Bennet) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 222, a resolution designating September 2019 as National Democracy Month as a time to reflect on the contributions of the system of government of the United States to a more free and stable world.

At the request of Mrs. Collins, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. Rosen) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 260, a resolution recognizing the importance of sustained United States leadership and global progress against maternal and child malnutrition and supporting the commitment of the United States Agency for International Development to global nutrition through the Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Strategy.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. Wicker:
S. 2249. A bill to allow the Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration on the date of enactment of this Act to continue to serve as such Deputy Administrator; considered and passed.
to women’s teams. The inequities in women’s sports recently came to light in a gender discrimination lawsuit filed by the U.S. Women’s National Soccer Team against the U.S. Soccer Federation.

Although the U.S. Women’s National Soccer Team consistently outperforms the Men’s Team—having won four FIFA Women’s World Cup titles and four Olympic gold medals—the lawsuit alleges that the Women’s Team is paid an average of 38 cents on the dollar compared to the men.

The gender pay gap isn’t limited to players, either. Jill Ellis, the coach of the U.S. Women’s National Soccer Team, is paid less than half of what the Men’s Team coaches are paid. This is despite the fact that the Men’s Team failed to even qualify for the last World Cup.

Unfortunately, the disparate treatment of women in sports is not limited to pay. Megan Rapinoe, a captain of the U.S. Women’s National Soccer Team, said in a recent interview with CNN: “It’s really more about the investment in the game. Is the investment equal? We’re talking marketing dollars and branding, investment in the youth, investment in the players, investment in the coaching staff. I don’t think that that’s there. I don’t think that’s ever been there.”

It is clear that we must do more to promote and protect women in sports. This legislation is a step towards that goal by making critical updates to the Ted Stevens Olympic and Amateur Sports Act.

First, the bill would require the U.S. Olympic Committee to provide female athletes with wages, investment and working conditions equal to their male counterparts.

Second, the bill would clarify that national governing bodies for amateur sports must provide investment, working conditions, wages and other compensation for amateur athletes, coaches, trainers, managers, administrators and officials that is free from discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, age or national origin.

Third, the bill would further clarify that national governing bodies for amateur sports must provide equitable support and encouragement for participation by women in sports, including investment, working conditions, wages, and other compensation.

Finally, the bill would mandate that national governing bodies submit regular reports to Congress on their compensation practices by race and gender. I hope my colleagues will consider and support this legislation.

I thank the chair, and I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill was referred to the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) Short Title.—This Act may be cited as the “Fair Elections Now Act of 2019.”

(b) Table of Contents.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Title I—Small Dollar Financing of Senate Election Campaigns

Title II—Improving Voter Information

Title III—Responsibilities of the Federal Election Commission

Title IV—Revenue Provisions

Title V—Miscellaneous Provisions

SEC. 2257. Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, ...
"(i) $200 per election; or
"(ii) the amount per election determined by the Commission under section 531.

"(14) QUALIFYING MULTICANDIDATE POLITICAL COMMITTEE CONTRIBUTIONS.—
"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualifying multicandidate political committee contributions’ means any contribution to a candidate from a qualified account of a multicandidate political committee (within the meaning of section 315(a)(2)).

"(B) QUALIFIED ACCOUNT.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term ‘qualified account’ means, with respect to a multicandidate political committee, a separate, segregated account of the committee that consists solely of contributions which meet the following requirements:

"(i) All contributions to such account are made by individuals who are not prohibited from making contributions under this Act.

"(ii) The aggregate amount of contributions from each individual to such account does not exceed the amount described in paragraph (13)(C).

"SEC. 502. FAIR ELECTIONS FUND.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury a fund to be known as the ‘Fair Elections Fund’.

"(b) AMOUNTS HELD BY FUND.—The Fund shall consist of the following amounts:

"(1) APPROPRIATED AMOUNTS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts appropriated to the Fund.

"(B) SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING APPROPRIATIONS.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

"(i) there should be imposed on any payment made to any person (other than a State or local government or a foreign nation) who has a contract with the Government of the United States in excess of $10,000,000 a tax equal to 0.50 percent of amount paid pursuant to such contract (except that the aggregate tax on each contract for any taxable year shall not exceed $500,000); and

"(ii) the revenue from such tax should be appropriated to the Fund.

"(2) VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS.—Voluntary contributions to the Fund.

"(3) OTHER DEPOSITS.—Amounts deposited into the Fund under—

"(A) section 513(c) (relating to exceptions to contribution requirements);

"(B) section 522 (relating to remittance of allocations from the Funds);

"(C) section 532 (relating to violations); and

"(D) any other section of this Act.

"(4) INVESTMENT RETURNS.—Interest on, and the proceeds from, the sale or redemption of, any obligations held by the Fund under subsection (c).

"(5) INVESTMENT.—The Commission shall invest portions of the Fund in obligations of the United States in the same manner as provided under section 9602(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

"(d) USE OF FUND.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The sums in the Fund shall be available—

"(i) for remittance of allocations from the Funds;

"(ii) for contributions to participating candidates as provided in subtitle C;

"(2) INSUFFICIENT AMOUNTS.—Under regulations established by the Commission, rules similar to those set forth in section 906(c) of the Internal Revenue Code shall apply.

"Subtitle B—Eligibility and Certification

"SEC. 511. ELIGIBILITY.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—A candidate for Senator file a statement of intent to seek certification as a participating candidate under this title during the period beginning on the Fair Elections start date and ending on the last day of the Fair Elections qualifying period.

"(b) The candidate must meet the following requirements:

"(1) The candidate files with the Commission a statement of intent to seek certification as a participating candidate under this title during the period beginning on the Fair Elections start date and ending on the last day of the Fair Elections qualifying period.

"(2) The candidate makes the qualifying contribution described in section 512.

"(3) Not later than the last day of the Fair Elections qualifying period, the candidate files with the Commission an affidavit signed by the candidate’s principal campaign committee declaring that the candidate—

"(A) has complied and, if certified, will comply with the contribution and expenditure requirements of section 513;

"(B) if certified, will not run as a non-participating candidate during such year in any election for any office; and

"(C) has either qualified or will take steps to qualify under State law to be on the ballot.

"(b) GENERAL ELECTION.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), a candidate shall not be eligible to receive an allocation from the Fund for a general election or a general runoff election unless the candidate’s party nominated the candidate to be placed on the ballot for the general election or the candidate otherwise qualified to be on the ballot under State law.

"SEC. 512. QUALIFYING CONTRIBUTION REQUIREMENT.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—A candidate for Senator meets the requirement of this section if, during the Fair Elections qualifying period, the candidate obtains—

"(1) a number of qualifying contributions equal to the greater of—

"(A) the sum of—

"(i) $200; and

"(ii) 2,000; plus

"(ii) 500 for each congressional district in the State with respect to which the candidate is seeking election;

"(B) the amount determined by the Commission under section 531; and

"(2) a total dollar amount of qualifying contributions equal to the greater of—

"(A) 10 percent of the amount of the allocation such candidate would be entitled to receive for the primary election under section 522(c)(1) (determined without regard to paragraph (5) thereof) if such candidate were a participating candidate; or

"(B) the amount determined by the Commission under section 531.

"(b) REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO RECEIPT OF QUALIFYING CONTRIBUTION.—Each qualifying contribution—

"(1) may be received by means of a personal check, money order, debit card, credit card, or electronic payment account;

"(2) shall be accompanied by a signed statement containing—

"(A) the contributor’s name and the contributor’s address in the State in which the contributor is registered to vote; and

"(B) an oath declaring that the contributor—

"(i) understands that the purpose of the qualifying contribution is to show support for the candidate’s campaign; and

"(ii) has made the contribution willingly;

"(3) makes no expenditures from personal funds or the funds of any immediate family member (other than funds received through qualified small dollar contributions and qualifying contributions).

"For purposes of this subsection, a payment made by a political party in coordination with a participating candidate shall not be treated as a contribution to or as an expenditure made by the participating candidate.

"(c) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), a candidate shall not be treated as having failed to meet the requirements of this section if any contributions that are not qualified small dollar contributions, qualifying contributions, qualifying multicandidate political committee contributions, or contributions that meet the requirements of subsection (b) and that are accepted before the date the candidate files a statement of intent under section 511(a)(1) are—

"(1) returned to the contributor; or

"(2) submitted to the Commission for deposit in the Fund.

"SEC. 514. CERTIFICATION.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 5 days after a candidate for Senator files an affidavit under section 511(a)(3), the Commission shall—

"(1) certify whether or not the candidate is a participating candidate; and

"(2) notify the candidate of the Commission’s determination.

"(b) REVOCATION OF CERTIFICATION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may revoke a certification under subsection (a) if—

"(2) the candidate fails to qualify under State law to be on the ballot at any time after the date of certification; or
"(B) a candidate otherwise fails to comply with the requirements of this title, including any regulatory requirements prescribed by the Commission.

"(2) EFFECT OF BENEFITS.—If certification is revoked under paragraph (1), the candidate shall repay to the Fund an amount equal to the value of benefits received under this title plus interest (at a rate determined by the Commission) on any such amount received.

"Subtitle C—Benefits

"SEC. 521. BENEFITS FOR PARTICIPATING CANDIDATES.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—For each election with respect to which a candidate is certified as a participating candidate under section 514, such candidate is entitled to receive for such election to a participating candidate in an amount equal to 67 percent of the base amount with respect to such participating candidate.

"(1) PRIMARY ELECTION ALLOCATION; INITIAL ALLOCATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (5), the Commission shall make an allocation from the Fund for a primary election to a participating candidate in an amount equal to 67 percent of the amount that the participating candidate was eligible to receive under this section for the primary election.

"(2) PRIMARY RUNOFF ELECTION ALLOCATION.—The Commission shall make an allocation from the Fund for a primary runoff election to a participating candidate in an amount equal to 67 percent of the amount that the participating candidate was eligible to receive under this section for the primary runoff election.

"(b) RESTRICTION ON USES OF ALLOCATIONS FROM THE FUND.—Allocations from the Fund received by a participating candidate under section 522, matching contributions under section 523, and enhanced matching contributions under section 524 may only be used for campaign-related costs.

"(c) REMITTING ALLOCATIONS FROM THE FUND.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the date that is 45 days after an election in which the participating candidate appeared on the ballot, each participating candidate shall remit to the Commission for deposit in the Fund an amount equal to the lesser of—

"(A) the amount of money in the candidate’s campaign account; or

"(B) the sum of the allocations from the Fund received by the candidate during the election.

"(2) EXCEPTION.—In the case of a candidate who qualifies to be on the ballot for a primary runoff election, a general election, or a general runoff election, the amounts described in paragraph (1) may be retained by the candidate and used in such subsequent election.

"SEC. 522. ALLOCATIONS FROM THE FUND.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall make allocations from the Fund under section 521(a)(1) to a participating candidate—

"(1) in the case of amounts provided under subsection (c)(1), not later than 48 hours after the date on which such candidate is certified as a participating candidate under section 514;

"(2) in the case of a general election, not later than 48 hours after—

"(A) the date of the certification of the results of the primary election or the general runoff election; or

"(B) in any case in which there is no primary election, the date the candidate qualifies to be placed on the ballot; and

"(3) in the case of a primary runoff election or a general runoff election, not later than 48 hours after the certification of the results of the primary election or the general election, the amount determined by the Commission to be the appropriate amount to be allocated to the candidate from amounts so received by the Commission.

"(b) METHOD OF PAYMENT.—The Commission shall distribute funds available to participating candidates under this section through the use of electronic funds transfer or a debit card.

"(c) AMOUNTS.—

"(1) BASE AMOUNT.—(1) In general.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the base amount for any candidate is an amount equal to the greater of—

"(A) the sum of—

"(i) $750,000; plus

"(ii) $150,000 for each congressional district in the State in which the candidate is seeking election; and

"(2) INDEXING.—In each even-numbered year after the year in which the Commission made an allocation under paragraph (1)(A), the amount determined by the Commission under section 531.

"(2) PRIMARY RUNOFF ELECTION ALLOCATION.—The Commission shall make an allocation from the Fund for a primary runoff election to a participating candidate in an amount equal to 67 percent of the amount that the participating candidate was eligible to receive under this section for the primary runoff election.

"(3) GENERAL ELECTION ALLOCATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (5), the Commission shall make an allocation from the Fund for a general election to a participating candidate in an amount equal to 67 percent of the amount that the participating candidate was eligible to receive under this section for the general election.

"(4) GENERAL RUNOFF ELECTION ALLOCATION.—The Commission shall make an allocation from the Fund for a general runoff election to a participating candidate in an amount equal to 67 percent of the amount that the participating candidate was eligible to receive under this section for the general runoff election.

"(b) RESTRICTION ON USES OF ALLOCATIONS FROM THE FUND.—Allocations from the Fund received by a participating candidate under section 522, matching contributions under section 523, and enhanced matching contributions under section 524 may only be used for campaign-related costs.

"(c) REMITTING ALLOCATIONS FROM THE FUND.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the date that is 45 days after an election in which the participating candidate appeared on the ballot, each participating candidate shall remit to the Commission for deposit in the Fund an amount equal to the lesser of—

"(A) the amount of money in the candidate’s campaign account; or

"(B) the sum of the allocations from the Fund received by the candidate during the election.

"(2) EXCEPTION.—In the case of a candidate who qualifies to be on the ballot for a primary runoff election, a general election, or a general runoff election, the amounts described in paragraph (1) may be retained by the candidate and used in such subsequent election.

"SEC. 523. MATCHING PAYMENTS FOR QUALIFIED SMALL DOLLAR CONTRIBUTIONS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall pay to each participating candidate an amount equal to 600 percent of the amount of qualified small dollar contributions received by a participating candidate from a resident of the State in which such participating candidate is seeking election after the date on which such candidate is certified under section 514.

"(b) LIMITATION.—The aggregate payments under subsection (a) with respect to any candidate shall not exceed $15,000 for each congressional district in the State with respect to the election.

"(1) PRIMARY ELECTION ALLOCATION; INITIAL ALLOCATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (5), the Commission shall make an allocation from the Fund for a primary election to a participating candidate in an amount equal to 67 percent of the base amount with respect to such participating candidate.

"(2) PRIMARY RUNOFF ELECTION ALLOCATION.—The Commission shall make an allocation from the Fund for a primary runoff election to a participating candidate in an amount equal to 67 percent of the amount that the participating candidate was eligible to receive under this section for the primary runoff election.

"(3) GENERAL ELECTION ALLOCATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (5), the Commission shall make an allocation from the Fund for a general election to a participating candidate in an amount equal to 67 percent of the amount that the participating candidate was eligible to receive under this section for the general election.

"(4) GENERAL RUNOFF ELECTION ALLOCATION.—The Commission shall make an allocation from the Fund for a general runoff election to a participating candidate in an amount equal to 67 percent of the amount that the participating candidate was eligible to receive under this section for the general runoff election.

"(1) GENERAL ELECTION ALLOCATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (5), the Commission shall make an allocation from the Fund for a general election to a participating candidate in an amount equal to 67 percent of the amount that the participating candidate was eligible to receive under this section for the general election.

"(2) PRIMARY RUNOFF ELECTION ALLOCATION.—The Commission shall make an allocation from the Fund for a primary runoff election to a participating candidate in an amount equal to 67 percent of the amount that the participating candidate was eligible to receive under this section for the primary runoff election.

"(3) GENERAL ELECTION ALLOCATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (5), the Commission shall make an allocation from the Fund for a general election to a participating candidate in an amount equal to 67 percent of the amount that the participating candidate was eligible to receive under this section for the general election.

"(d) REPORTS.—

"(1) GENERAL.—Each participating candidate shall file reports of receipts of qualified small dollar contributions at such times and in such manner as the Commission may by regulations prescribe.

"(2) CONTENTS OF REPORTS.—Each report under this subsection shall disclose—

"(A) the amount of each qualified small dollar contribution received by the candidate;

"(B) the amount of each qualified small dollar contribution received by the candidate from a resident of the State in which the candidate is seeking election; and

"(C) the name, address, and occupation of each individual who made a qualified small dollar contribution to the candidate.

"(3) FREQUENCY OF REPORTS.—Reports under this subsection shall be made no more frequently than—

"(A) once every month until the date that is 90 days before the date of the election;

"(B) once every week after the period described in subparagraph (A) and until the date that is 21 days before the election; and

"(C) once every day after the period described in subparagraph (B).

"(4) LIMITATION ON REGULATIONS.—The Commission may not prescribe any regulations with respect to reporting under this subsection with respect to any election after the date that is 180 days before the date of such election.

"(e) APPEALS.—The Commission shall provide a written explanation with respect to any denial of any payment under this section and shall provide the opportunity for review and reconsideration within 5 business days of such denial.

"SEC. 524. ENHANCED MATCHING SUPPORT.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the payments made under section 523, the Commission shall make an additional payment to an eligible candidate under this section.

"(b) ELIGIBILITY.—A candidate is eligible to receive an additional payment under this section if the candidate meets each of the following requirements:

"(1) The candidate is on the ballot for the general election for the office the candidate is seeking.

"(2) The candidate is certified as a participating candidate under this title with respect to the election.

"(3) During the enhanced support qualifying period, the candidate receives qualified small dollar contributions in a total amount of not less than the sum of $15,000 for each congressional district in the State with respect to the election.

"(d) REPORTS.—

"(1) GENERAL.—The candidate submits to the Commission a request for the payment which includes—

"(A) a statement of the number and amount of qualified small dollar contributions received by the candidate from residents of the State in which such participating candidate is seeking election after the date on which such candidate is certified under section 514;
"(b) a statement of the amount of the payment the candidate anticipates receiving with respect to the request; and
"(c) such other information and assurances as the candidate may require.

"(5) After submitting a request for the additional payment under paragraph (4), the candidate does not submit any other application for an additional payment under this title.

"(c) AMOUNT.—(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the amount of the additional payment made to an eligible candidate under this subsection shall be an amount equal to 50 percent of—

"(A) the amount of the payment made to the candidate under section 523 with respect to a qualified small dollar contributions which are received by the candidate during the enhanced support qualifying period (as included in the request submitted by the candidate under (b)(4)(A)); or

"(B) in the case of a candidate who is not eligible to receive a payment under section 523 with respect to such qualified small dollar contributions because the candidate has reached the limit on the aggregate amount of payments under section 523, the amount of the payment that would have been made to the candidate under section 523 with respect to such qualified small dollar contributions if the candidate had not reached such limit.

"(2) LIMIT.—The amount of the additional payment determined under paragraph (1) with respect to a candidate may not exceed the sum of $150,000 for each congressional district in the State with respect to which the candidate is seeking election.

"(3) NO EFFECT ON AGGREGATE LIMIT.—The amount of the additional payment made to a candidate under this section shall not be included in determining the aggregate amount of payments made to a participating candidate with respect to an election cycle under section 523.

"SEC. 525. POLITICAL ADVERTISING VOUCHERS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall establish and administer a voucher program for the purchase of broadcast airtime for political advertisements in accordance with the provisions of this section.

"(b) CANDIDATES.—The Commission shall only disburse vouchers under the program established under subsection (a) to participants certified pursuant to section 514 who have agreed in writing to keep and furnish to the Commission such records, books, and other information as it may require.

"(c) AMOUNTS.—The Commission shall disburse vouchers to each candidate certified under subsection (b) in an aggregate amount equal to the greater of—

"(1) $100,000 multiplied by the number of congressional districts in the State with respect to which such candidate is running for office; or

"(2) the amount determined by the Commission under section 531.

"(d) EXCLUSIVE USE.—Vouchers disbursed by the Commission under this section may be used only for the purchase of broadcast airtime for political advertisements relating to a general election for the office of Senate by the participating candidate to which the vouchers were disbursed, except that—

"(A) a candidate may exchange vouchers with a political party under paragraph (2); and

"(B) a political party may use vouchers only for the purchase of broadcast airtime for political advertisements for generic party advertising (as defined by the Commission in regulations), to support candidates for State or local political campaigns, and to support participating candidates of the party in a general election for Federal office, but only if it discloses the value of the voucher used as an expenditure under section 315(d).

"(2) EXCHANGE WITH POLITICAL PARTY COMMITTEE.—(A) IN GENERAL.—A participating candidate who receives a voucher under this section may transfer the right to use all or a portion of the value of the voucher to a political party committee if the individual is a candidate (or, in the case of a participating candidate who is not a member of any political party, to a committee of the political party of the candidate’s choice) in exchange for money in an amount equal to the cash value of the voucher or portion exchanged.

"(B) CONTINUATION OF CANDIDATE OBLIGATIONS.—The transfer of a voucher, in whole or in part, to a political party committee under this paragraph shall not release this candidate from any obligation under the agreement made under subsection (b) or otherwise modify that agreement or its application to that candidate.

"(C) PARTY COMMITTEE OBLIGATIONS.—Any political party committee to which a voucher or portion thereof is transferred under subparagraph (b) shall—

"(i) account fully, in accordance with such requirements as the Commission may establish, for the receipt of the voucher; and

"(ii) may not transfer a voucher or portion thereof for any purpose other than a purpose described in paragraph (1)(B).

"(2) EXCHANGE WITH POLITICAL PARTY COMMITTEE.—If a candidate exchanges a voucher or any portion thereof to a political party committee under subparagraph (A)—

"(i) the value of the voucher or portion thereof transferred shall be treated as a contribution from the candidate to the committee, and from the committee to the candidate, for purposes of section 302 and 304;

"(ii) the committee may, in exchange, provide to the candidate only funds subject to the prohibitions, limitations, and reporting requirements of title III of this Act; and

"(iii) the amount, if identified as a voucher exchanged, shall not be considered a contribution for the purposes of sections 315 and 531.

"(e) VALUE; ACCEPTANCE; REDEMPTION.—

"(1) VOUCHER.—Each voucher disbursed by the Commission shall have a value in dollars, redeemable upon presentation to the Commission, together with such documentation and other information as the Commission may require for the purchase of broadcast airtime for political advertisements in accordance with this section.

"(2) ACCEPtANCE.—A broadcasting station shall accept vouchers in payment for the purchase of broadcast airtime for political advertisements in accordance with this section.

"(3) REDEMPTION.—The Commission shall redeem vouchers accepted by broadcasting stations under paragraph (2) upon presentation of such documentation and other information as the Commission may require to ensure the accuracy and integrity of the voucher redemption system.

"(4) EXPIRATION.—

"(A) CANDIDATES.—A voucher may only be used to pay for broadcast airtime for political advertisements to be broadcast before midnight on the day before the date of the Federal election in connection with which it was issued and shall be null and void for any other use or purpose.

"(B) EXCEPTION FOR POLITICAL PARTY COMMITTEES.—A voucher held by a political party committee may be used to pay for broadcast airtime for political advertisements to be broadcast before midnight on December 31st of the odd-numbered year following the year in which the voucher was issued by the Commission.

"(f) VOUCHER AS EXPENDITURE UNDER FECA.—The use of a voucher to purchase broadcast airtime for political advertisements shall be treated as an expenditure as defined in section 301(9)(A).

"(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) BROADCASTING STATION.—The term ‘broadcasting station’ has the meaning given that term by section 301(9) of the Communications Act of 1934.

"(2) POLITICAL PARTY.—The term ‘political party’ means a major party as defined in section 9002 (3) or (4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 9002 (3) or (4)).

"Subtitle D—Administrative Provisions

"SEC. 531. DUTIES OF THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION.

"(a) DUTIES AND POWERS.—

"(1) ADMINISTRATION.—The Commission shall have the power to administer the provisions of this title and shall prescribe regulations to carry out the purposes of this title, including regulations—

"(A) to establish procedures for—

"(i) verifying the amount of valid qualifying contributions with respect to a candidate;

"(ii) effectively and efficiently monitoring and enforcing the limits on the raising of qualified small dollar contributions;

"(iii) effectively and efficiently monitoring and enforcing the limits on individual contributions to qualified accounts of multimcandidate political committee contributions through effectively and efficiently monitoring and enforcing the limits on individual contributions to qualified accounts of multimcandidate political committees;

"(iv) effectively and efficiently monitoring and enforcing the limits on the use of per- sonal funds by participating candidates;

"(v) monitoring the use of allocations from the Fund and matching contributions under this title through audits or other mechanisms; and

"(vi) the administration of the voucher program under section 525; and

"(B) regarding the conduct of debates in a manner consistent with the best practices of States that provide public financing for elections.

"(2) REVIEW OF FAIR ELECTIONS FINANCING.—The Commission shall conduct a comprehensive review of the Fair Elections financing program under this title, including—

"(i) the maximum dollar amount of qualified small dollar contributions under section 501(13); and

"(ii) the maximum and minimum dollar amounts for qualifying contributions under section 501(12);

"(iii) the number and value of qualifying contributions a candidate may receive under section 522;

"(iv) the maximum amount of matching contributions a candidate may receive under section 522; and

"(v) the overall satisfaction of participating candidates and the American public with the Federal elections financing program;

"(vi) such other matters relating to financing of Senate campaigns as the Commission determines are appropriate.

"(b) CREATION OF REVIEW.—In conducting the review under subparagraph (A), the Commission shall consider the following:
"(1) QUALIFYING CONTRIBUTIONS AND QUALIFIED SMALL DOLLAR CONTRIBUTIONS.—The Commission shall consider whether the number and dollar amount of qualifying contributions and qualified small dollar contributions strikes a balance regarding the importance of voter participation, the need for adequate incentives for participating, and fiscal responsibility, taking into consideration the number of primary and general election participants in the electoral performance of those candidates, program cost, and any other information the Commission determines is appropriate.

(ii) REVIEW OF PROGRAM BENEFITS.—The Commission shall consider whether the totality of the amount of funds allowed to be raised by participating candidates (including through qualifying contributions and small dollar contributions), allocations from the Fund under section 522, matching contributions under section 523, enhanced matching contributions under section 524, and vouchers under section 525 are sufficient for voters in each State to learn about the candidates to cast an informed vote, taking into account the amount of spending by winning candidates, media costs, primary election dates, and any other information the Commission determines is appropriate.

(iii) AMOUNT OF FUNDS.—(i) In General.—Based on the review conducted under paragraph (A), the Commission shall provide for the adjustment of the following amounts:

(I) The maximum dollar amount of qualified small dollar contributions under section 501(12)(A).

(II) The maximum and minimum dollar amounts for qualifying contributions under section 501(12)(A).

(III) The number and value of qualifying contributions a candidate is required to obtain under section 512(a)(1).

(iv) The base amount for candidates under section 522(d).

(v) The maximum amount of matching contributions a candidate may receive under section 523(b).

(vi) The maximum amount of enhanced matching contributions a candidate may receive under section 524(c).

(vii) The dollar amount for vouchers under section 524.

(ii) REGULATIONS.—The Commission shall promulgate regulations providing for the adjustments made under clause (i).

(b) REPEAL.—The provisions of this section shall not preclude enforcement proceedings by the Commission in accordance with section 309(a), including a referral by the Commission to the Attorney General in the case of an apparent knowing and willful violation of this title.

SEC. 102. PROMOTIONS BY JOINT FUNDRAISING COMMITTEES.

Section 302(e) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 3102(e)) is amended by striking at the end of the following:

"(6) No authorized committee of a participating candidate (as defined in section 501) may establish a joint fundraising committee with a political committee other than an authorized committee of a candidate.

SEC. 103. EXCEPTION TO LIMITATION ON COORDINATED EXPENDITURES BY POLITICAL PARTY COMMITTEES WITH PARTICIPATING CANDIDATES.

Section 312(a)(7) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 312(a)(7)) is amended—

(i) by striking "his candidacy'' and inserting "the candidacy of the candidate, under circumstances beyond control of the station, any candidate or party advertising spot scheduled to be broadcast during that program shall be treated in the same fashion as a comparable commercial advertising spot.

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) (as redesignated by subsection (b)(1))—

(A) the term "licensee; station license'' and inserting "the candidacy of the candidate, under the same terms, conditions, and business practices as apply to the most favored advertiser of the licensee;''

(2) by redesignating the existing subsection (e) as subsection (c); and

(c) REVOCATION OF LICENSE FOR FAILURE TO PERMIT ACCESS.—Section 312(a)(7) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 312(a)(7)) is amended—

(i) by striking "or repeated''; and

(ii) by inserting after subsection (b)(1)—

(A) the term "licensee; station license'' and inserting "the candidacy of the candidate, under the terms'' and inserting "The term;'' and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking "(the term);'' and inserting "(the terms);'' and

(c) by striking "his candidacy'' and inserting "the candidacy of the candidate, under the terms'' and inserting "The terms;'' and

(2) in subsection (g), as redesignated by subsection (b)(1), by striking "The Commission and inserting "The Commission.''

SEC. 202. BROADCAST RATES FOR PARTICIPATING CANDIDATES.

Section 310(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 310(b)), as amended by section 201, is amended—

(i) by striking "the term'' and inserting "Broadcasting Station -- The term;'' and

(ii) by striking ";'' and inserting a period; and

(iii) by striking "the terms'' and inserting "Licensee; station licensee; The terms;'' and

(2) in subsection (g), by striking "The Commission and inserting "The Commission.''

TITLE II—IMPROVING VOTER INFORMATION

SEC. 201. BROADCASTS RELATING TO ALL SENATE CANDIDATES.

(a) LOWEST UNIT CHARGE.—National Committees.—Section 315(b)(1) of the Commu-
(3) Participating candidates.—In the case of a participating candidate (as defined in section 501 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971), the charges made for the use of any broadcasting station for a television broadcast shall not exceed 80 percent of the lowest charge described in paragraph (1)(A) during—

(A) the 45 days preceding the date of a primary or primary runoff election in which the candidate is opposed; and

(B) the 60 days preceding the date of a general or special election in which the candidate is opposed.

(4) Rate cards.—A licensee shall provide to a candidate for Senate a rate card that discloses—

(A) the rate charged under this subsection; and

(B) the method by which the licensee uses to determine the rate charged under this subsection.

SEC. 203. FCC TO PRESCRIBE STANDARDIZED FORM FOR REPORTING CANDIDATE CAMPAIGN ADS.

(a) In General.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Communications Commission shall require any broadcasting station to report to the Federal Election Commission, at a minimum—

(1) the station call letters and mailing address;

(2) the name and telephone number of the station’s sales manager (or individual with responsibility for advertising sales);

(3) the name of the candidate who purchased the advertising time, or on whose behalf the advertising time was purchased, and the Federal elective office for which he or she is a candidate;

(4) the name, mailing address, and telephone number of the person responsible for purchasing broadcast political advertising for the candidate;

(5) notation as to whether the purchase agreement for which the information is being submitted is a draft or final version; and

(6) with respect to the advertisement—

(A) the date and time of the broadcast;

(B) the program in which the advertisement was broadcast; and

(C) the length of the broadcast airmere.

(b) Internet Access.—In its rulemaking under subsection (a), the Federal Communications Commission shall require any broadcasting station required to file a report under this section that maintains an Internet website to make available a link to each such report on that website.

TITLE III—RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

SEC. 301. PETITION FOR CERTIORARI.

Section 301(a) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30107(a)(6)) is amended by inserting "(including a proceeding before the Supreme Court on certiorari)" after "appeal.

SEC. 302. ELECTRONIC FILING OF FEC REPORTS.

Section 304(a)(11) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30104(a)(11)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking "under this Act—" and all that follows and inserting "under this Act shall be required to main-
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Mr. CORKY. Mr. President, I have 10 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), the Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 24, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the nomination of David L. Norquist, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

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 24, 2019, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a business meeting and hearing on the following nominations: Theodore Rokita, of Indiana, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors; Jennifer L. Homendy, of Virginia, and Michael Graham, of Kansas, both to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board; Carl Whitney Bentzel, of Maryland, to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner; Michael J.K. Kratsios, of South Carolina, to be an Associate Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy; and Ian Paul Steff, of Indiana, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Director General of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service.

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 24, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 24, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Brent James McIntosh, of Michigan, to be an Under Secretary; Brian Callanan, of New Jersey, to be General Counsel, and Brian McGuire, of New York, to be a Deputy Under Secretary, all of the Department of the Treasury, and Travis Greaves, of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 24, 2019, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

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 Wednesday, July 24, 2019, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Chad F. Wolf, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Strategy, Policy, and Plans, and William Bryan, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Science and Technology, both of the Department of Homeland Security; Robert M. Duncan, of Kentucky, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service; Ann C. Fisher, of the District of Columbia, and Ashley J. Poling, of North Carolina, both to be a Commissioner of the Postal Regulatory Commission; Catherine Bird, of Texas, to be General Counsel of the Federal Labor Relations Authority; and Rainey R. Brandt, and Shana Frost Matini, both to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 24, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a business meeting and the nomination of E. Sequoyah Simermeyer, of Maryland, to be Chairman of the National Indian Gaming Commission.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

The Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 24, 2019, at 11 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 24, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON AFRICA AND GLOBAL HEALTH POLICY

The Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health Policy of the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 24, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my fellow, Dan Becerra, have privileges of the floor for the balance of his fellowship and that Luchanna Sagoo, my intern, have privileges for the balance of the day.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my fellow, Michele Bustamante, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of this session.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2258

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2258) to provide anti-retaliation protections for antitrust whistleblowers.

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, I now ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will receive a second reading on the next legislative day.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF 2019 AS THE "INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF THE PERIODIC TABLE OF CHEMICAL ELEMENTS"

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 283, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 283) expressing support for the designation of 2019 as the “International Year of the Periodic Table of Chemical Elements”.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 283) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 1:45 p.m. tomorrow, the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of Calendar No. 375; that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the nominee be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD, the President pro tempore of the Senate notify the Senate of the President pro tempore’s decision and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 25, 2019.

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, July 25, 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, and the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. 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.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:33 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, July 25, 2019, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 24, 2019:

THE JUDICIARY

WENDY WILLIAMS BERGER, OF FLORIDA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA.

BRIAN C. BUBSCHER, OF NEBRASKA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

STEPHEN M. DICKSON, OF GEORGIA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS.