



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

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

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 29, 2019

No. 128

## House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Tuesday, July 30, 2019, at 11:30 a.m.

## Senate

MONDAY, JULY 29, 2019

The Senate met at 3 p.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, the same yesterday, today, and forever, keep our lawmakers strong, patient, and true. Give them the wisdom to be just, reasonable, and courageous as they do Your will on Earth. Lord, teach them how to conduct themselves in contentious situations, as they seek to glorify Your name. Bless them in all they do.

May they remember Your promise to always be with them, inspiring them to live in harmony, peace, and love. Lord, give them the creativity needed to build a better nation and world.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 30 seconds.

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

### PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, there is a bad practice in pharmaceutical pricing called spread pricing. Spread pricing has historically siphoned money from the State Medicaid Programs and given it to pharmacy benefit managers or what we call PBMs. Drug payments and Medicaid should focus on the beneficiary, not the PBMs.

The bipartisan prescription drug legislation I introduced this month with Senator WYDEN bans spread pricing. This will refocus the system on paying for costs associated with prescribing a drug instead of gaming the system to reap a profit at the expense of the taxpayers.

Medicaid funding should go to patients, not to the pockets of healthcare middlemen.

I yield the floor.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

### MUELLER REPORT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I welcome all Members back to the Senate for a busy week, but first there is something I need to address.

Over the last several days, I was called unpatriotic, “un-American,” and essentially treasonous by a couple of leftwing pundits on the basis of bold-faced lies. I was accused of “aiding and abetting” the very man I have singled out as an adversary and opposed for

nearly 20 years: Vladimir Putin. This was less than 24 hours after the outraged industrial complex was disappointed yet again by Special Counsel Mueller.

Partisan Democrats and their media allies were crushed a few months ago, when Mueller’s report cleared the President of conspiring with Russia during the 2016 campaign. Now their frantic hyping of the special counsel’s congressional testimony has fallen flat once again, but the conspiracy theories and reckless accusations had to continue. Too many people had invested too much time in the hysterical echo chamber to simply wind it down and join the rest of us in the real world.

### MEDIA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the outraged industrial complex needed a new target, and that is where I come in—MITCH MCCONNELL—the hawkish foreign policy conservative who has spent decades pushing back on Russia every way I can think of, was accused of what amounts to treason by multiple media outlets within a couple of hours.

These absurd smears weren’t thrown out there by anonymous Twitter accounts or fringe bloggers. Oh, no. This modern-day McCarthyism was pushed by big-time outlets. The smear that I am “a Russian asset” ran in the opinion pages of the Washington Post. The accusations that I am “un-American” was broadcast on MSNBC.

This is the state of leftwing politics in 2019. It is like an inflationary crisis but with outrage instead of dollars.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S5121

These people have worn out the volume knob so badly that they have nothing left but the most unhinged smears. Welcome to modern-day McCarthyism—McCarthy-like tactics out in the open for everyone to see—in Dana Milbank's column in the Washington Post and on a major cable channel run by NBC.

What started all this? Here was my crime—bless me, for I have sinned: Last week, I stopped Democrats from passing an election law bill through the Senate by unanimous consent, a bill that was so partisan it only received one Republican vote over in the House. My Democratic friends asked for unanimous consent to pass a bill that everyone knows isn't unanimous and never will be unanimous, so I objected.

These theatrical requests happen all the time in the Senate. I promise that nobody involved, including my friend the Democratic leader who made the request, actually thought he would get a Republican Senate to instantly unanimously pass a bill that got one Republican vote over in the House. This kind of objection is a routine occurrence in the Senate. It doesn't make the Republicans traitors or un-American; it makes us policymakers with a different opinion, but the outraged industrial complex doesn't let a little thing like reality get in their way. They saw the perfect opportunity to distort, tell lies, and fuel the flames of partisan hatred, and so they did.

It started with the angry lies on MSNBC. The host lied and said I have dismissed Russia's interference in our 2016 election as "a hoax." Of course, I have never said any such thing—ever. I have spoken extensively and often about Russia's unacceptable interference in 2016. I have constantly discussed all we have been doing to correct the Obama administration's failures to respond more assertively to the Russian threat, including on election security.

So let me make this crystal clear for the hyperventilating hacks who haven't actually followed this issue. Every single Member of the Senate agrees that Russian meddling was real and is real. We all agree that the Federal Government, State governments, and the private sector all have obligations to take this threat seriously and bolster our defenses.

Claims to the contrary—claims that anybody here denies what Russia did on President Obama's watch—are just lies. They are not partisan distortion, not clever spin, just total fabrications.

At least this show is honest about what it offers—and it isn't journalism. Immediately after the host finished his angry string of false claims and calling me "un-American," another panelist chimed in to applaud the remarks, and here is what he said:

We are at war. It's time for the Democrats to wake up. . . . [And] we're not necessarily going to play fair.

"Not necessarily going to play fair"—well, I should say not. Let's re-

member how deep MSNBC waded into the conspiratorial fever swamp over the past 2 years.

They gave airtime to individuals like one guest who has publicly tweeted, among other things, that a former White House adviser was close to being executed for espionage and that Chief Justice Roberts had sent the Marshal of the Supreme Court to the White House to threaten the President. That is utter nonsense. They hosted these kinds of conspiratorial voices.

Just a few days ago, one former host at the network pointed out that "MSNBC built segment after segment, show after show on building anticipation for a big reveal," but then the Mueller report took some of their most unhinged stories right off the table.

Then, just last week, the special counsel's in-person testimony disappointed the political left yet again, so the conspiracy theories needed a new target.

A few hours later came the Washington Post column. It was authored by Dana Milbank, a pundit who spent much of the Obama administration carrying water for its failed foreign policies and excusing President Obama's weakness on Russia. Here is the headline: "Mitch McConnell is a Russian asset"—a shameful smear and based on more lies.

Mr. Milbank repeatedly claims that I have blocked all efforts to raise our defenses against Russian meddling. The truth is, I have championed the coordinated work between Congress, the administration, and the States, which are primarily responsible for our elections, and the Senate has passed several major provisions on this subject this year. I have spoken frequently on the floor about the need to keep up the progress and to stay vigilant. What is more, one of the specific pieces of legislation he claims I have blocked is something I literally have never opposed. His online column links directly to a bill, and it is something I have never opposed.

You would think a columnist leveling these kinds of smears would at least consult a fact checker before accusing an elected official of "aiding and abetting" Vladimir Putin, but, alas, it is not even a competent hit piece, just sloppy work.

Ironically, Mr. Milbank has frequently written pieces lecturing Republicans who he feels has impugned others' patriotism. Back in 2013, the same guy wrote a piece insisting that "in America, a political opponent is not the enemy." In 2015, he criticized "nutters" for questioning the President's patriotism and said that "such beyond-the-pale-rhetoric" had to be thrown out "to have a civilized debate." So you get the picture.

When a liberal politician is being criticized, these leftwing pundits become choir boys calling for civility and decency and high mindedness, but when it is time to smear somebody on the other side, oh, they are delighted to lead the charge.

As recently as 2017, this very columnist wrote:

[L]et's pause to remember: We are all the American people. And we all love our country.

As all of our colleagues know, I have spoken at length about Russia's attack on American democracy. I worked to ensure that Congress sent hundreds of millions of dollars to the States to improve their defenses and applauded the whole-of-government efforts that the administration continues to carry out with States and localities.

Good news may not sell any newspapers, boost ratings, or help with Democratic fundraising, but the facts are the facts. The facts are that this administration has made huge strides—huge—on election security since 2016. They made a noticeable impact in securing the 2018 election and are vigilant and proactive as we head into 2020.

A few weeks ago, every Senator had the opportunity to attend an all-Members classified briefing that I helped to organize detailing the major work that has been underway since 2016. I have been in a lot of classified briefings over the years. It is not exactly common for Members to break out in spontaneous applause, let alone bipartisan applause, but that is exactly what happened in that classified briefing. Behind closed doors, Democrats joined Republicans in applauding the progress made since 2016.

This administration—thanks in large part to our friend and former colleague, DNI Dan Coats, whom I was very sorry to hear is stepping down—has increased and improved our intelligence collection on these threats. It has built better and more functional relationships with State election authorities. It has enlisted more help from the private sector to identify and counter foreign influence campaigns. It has worked more closely with foreign allies and partners who face similar threats from Russia. It has imposed real costs on Russia for its misdeeds and cut down on the ability of Russian intelligence to operate inside our country.

In particular, the Department of Homeland Security has employed special capabilities in all 50 States for detecting malign cyber activity. It has deployed cyber security advisers all across our country. It operates the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center and supports the Elections Infrastructure Information Sharing and Analysis Center.

Among its many offerings to the States, DHS offers cyber security assessments, detection and prevention tools, training, and career development for election officials, all free of charge. Using the hundreds of millions of dollars Congress sent to the States, which I proudly voted for and supported, the authorities who actually conduct our elections on the frontlines have gotten themselves better prepared.

This is a long list of significant achievements—achievements that my

Democratic colleagues applauded and cheered behind closed doors when the administration briefed us a few weeks ago. But in public? In public and in front of the cameras, some of my colleagues quickly pivoted right back into hysterical accusations that only fan the flames of this modern-day McCarthyism.

These pundits are lying when they dismiss the work that has been done. They are lying when they insist I have personally blocked actions, which in fact I have championed and the Senate has passed. They are lying when they suggest that either party is against defending our democracy. This work is essential, and it will continue.

Over 2 years ago, I asked Chairman BURR and the Intelligence Committee to take a hard bipartisan look at all aspects of the Russian threat in 2016 and the steps the Obama administration took or failed to take to defend against it. Here was the headline in December 2016 from NBC news: "McConnell Backs Senate Investigations of Russian Hacking." We wanted a serious, detailed investigation, and not a political sideshow. I am impressed and grateful for the nonpartisan work of the committee staff under the leadership of Chairman BURR and Vice Chairman WARNER. The committee's reports on the various aspects of the threat are now being released. They will add vital context and analysis and inform on what to do about this ongoing threat.

I am sure all of us will be open to discussing further steps that Congress, the executive branch, the States, and the private sector might take to defend our elections against foreign interference. Any further legislation must be informed by this detailed report and by all the steps the government has already taken.

At the same time, you can be sure that I have spoken out against Democrats' efforts to seize on the crisis and use it to advance their other long-held partisan goals for the political process. Some of these changes they have sought since long before the 2016 meddling—long before it. So, no, I am not going to let Democrats and their water-carriers in the media use Russia's attack on our democracy as a Trojan horse for partisan wish list items that would not actually make our elections any safer. I am not going to do that.

My opposition to nationalizing election authorities that properly belong with the States is not news to anybody who has followed my career or knows anything about Congress. Even the New York Times' editorial board noted over the weekend that while they certainly don't agree with all my views, they are principles going back decades, and the Times had to admit the Democrats are "playing politics" by introducing legislation with—listen to this—"no chance of passing the Senate [that] serves only to harden partisan divisions." That is the New York Times this weekend.

So my differences with Democrats on complicated matters of election law are the kind of disagreements we used to be able to have without mainstream media outlets screaming that one side is traitorous. This Congress and this entire country only works when we refuse to let baseless smears displace real debate.

Benjamin Franklin said we have this Republic if we can keep it, and, among other things, keeping our Republic means we can't let modern-day McCarthyism win.

So here is my commitment: No matter how much they lie and no matter how much they bully, I will not be intimidated. For decades, I have used my Senate seat to stand up to Russia and protect the United States of America. I am proud of my record. I am proud that it is right there in black and white, and liars cannot gaslight it away.

In the 1980s, as a freshman Senator, I proudly stood with President Reagan on missile defense and other aspects of his Soviet policy. While the liberal media was shrieking that the Reagan-Bush foreign policy wouldn't work, I was honored to support them with my vote and then watch communism crumble.

Then, in the 1990s, I used my place on the State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Subcommittee to sound the alarm when President Clinton was too soft on Russia. Here is the Wall Street Journal on December 1994: "Kentucky Senator, Handed Keys to Foreign Aid, To Be Most Potent Foe of Clinton's Russia Policy." Here is what that article said: "But the real challenge to the administration's policy is [McConnell's] plan to attach stiff political conditions to that aid. . . . threatening a cutoff unless Russia stops meddling in its neighbor's affairs."

Let me say that again. As early as the 1990s, I was on record as laser-focused on Russia's meddling beyond its borders and making sure the Russians were held accountable.

I ask unanimous consent that the December 13, 1994, article from the Wall Street Journal entitled "Kentucky Senator, Handed Keys to Foreign Aid, To Be Most Potent Foe of Clinton's Russia Policy" be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From The Wall Street Journal, Dec. 13, 1994]  
KENTUCKY SENATOR, HANDED KEYS TO FOREIGN AID, TO BE MOST POTENT FOE OF CLINTON'S RUSSIA POLICY

(By Carla Anne Robbins)

WASHINGTON—Jesse Helms may breathe more fire, but the comparatively understated Mitch McConnell is the senator who will be the most potent foe of the Clinton administration's Russia policy.

As new Republican chairman of the key Senate appropriations subcommittee overseeing Russian aid, Sen. McConnell will have his hands on the foreign-aid money levers. He brings to that task a deep mistrust of Russia's Boris Yeltsin matched only by his

skepticism of Deputy Secretary of State and Russia policy architect Strobe Talbott, whom he describes as "the brightest, best-educated man I've ever met [who's] been most consistently wrong."

The senator from Kentucky is determined to wean the U.S. from what he dismisses as "Strobe-Talbot-Russia-First(ism)." Just yesterday, Sen. McConnell gave some idea of what he has in mind when he unveiled his plan for overhauling the American foreign-aid system. He pledged to earmark spending on the former Soviet Union to ensure that the lion's share of a shrinking aid package goes to countries other than Russia.

But the real challenge to the administration's policy is his plan to attach stiff political conditions to that aid, "linkages" in Cold War parlance, threatening a cutoff unless Russia stops meddling in its neighbors' affairs.

Sen. McConnell says that while his efforts to "write Russia policy into the foreign-aid bill" have been frustrated until now by a Democratic majority, "I think it's reasonable to assume that that's not going to happen this year." Republican skepticism about Russia will only increase because of Mr. Yeltsin's decision this week to send tanks into the separatist region of Chechnya.

In a sign of the aggressive role he now intends to play, Sen. McConnell yesterday upstaged both Sen. Helms, who will run the Foreign Relations Committee, and the Clinton administration by releasing his own version of a new foreign-aid budget. He proposed doing away entirely with the Agency for International Development, the nation's principal foreign-aid agency, and making free-market policies rather than human rights or absolute need the standard for deciding who gets help. "In the past, development assistance has focused on relieving the symptoms of poverty and despair," he said. "But by any standard, the fact is most poor countries are still poor."

#### CUTTING BACK ON AID

Overall, Sen. McConnell's program calls for cutting foreign aid by some 20%, with only the Middle East, the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe escaping cuts that deep. Sen. McConnell made clear that the only reason the former Soviet Union would get \$750 million under his plan, just \$100 million less than currently, is his intention to send a significant portion of that money to former Soviet Republics such as Ukraine and Armenia, not to Russia.

A well-described Internationalist who has supported aid to Russia in the past, Mr. McConnell is likely to have great credibility in a Republican-controlled Congress fearful of being tarred isolationist but also deeply skeptical about foreign aid and Messrs. Yeltsin and Talbott.

Mr. McConnell and the Appropriations Committee may also have more real power than Sen. Helms and his Foreign Relations Committee, which is supposed to write foreign-aid bills but hasn't succeeded in getting one passed since 1986. The job won't get easier under a divisive figure such as Sen. Helms. That leaves the task of actually parceling out foreign aid to the appropriating committees. Mr. McConnell's House counterpart, Alabama Rep. Sonny Callahan, who has tried to kill Russia aid before, will be supportive.

#### TASTE OF BATTLES TO COME

The administration got a taste last summer of battles to come with Mr. McConnell. At his urging, the Democratically controlled Senate voted to cut off all U.S. funds to Russia unless its troops pulled out of Estonia by their promised withdrawal date of Aug. 31. The provision was struck in a conference committee, but only after frantic lobbying by administration officials who warned that

brinksmanship would actually harden nationalistic feelings in Moscow and make a withdrawal less likely. The Russians pulled out on time, with both Sen. McConnell and the White House claiming victory.

Mr. Talbott says that he's puzzled by the charges of Russia-firstism. He notes that some 55% of U.S. aid to the former Soviet Union this year will be spent outside of Russia. Ukraine, in particular, will receive about \$200 million, significantly more than the \$150 million earmark proposed earlier this year by Sen. McConnell.

Mr. Talbott also makes no apologies for his enthusiastic support of Russian reform, which he says "unarguably" will make life better for Russia's neighbors and the U.S. "It's not a question of 'what's good for Russia,' but whether Russia continues to develop in a manner that's good for American interests and values and standards of international behavior," he says. "If Russia does continue to develop in that manner it will also be good for the other countries in the region."

Mr. Talbott and others also warn against "mechanistic and punitive linkages," which he says are unlikely to alter specific Russian actions and could end up souring what he describes as a fundamentally sound relationship.

#### REPUBLICAN INTERNATIONALISTS

Despite all the Russia-bashing and Talbott-bashing on Capitol Hill, and a recent bout of U.S.-bashing by Mr. Yeltsin, President Clinton shows no signs of giving up on the Russian leader. The administration's fiscal 1996 foreign-aid request for the former Soviet Union, which goes to Congress next month, will likely be close to this year's \$850 million appropriation, with Russia again receiving about 45% of the total.

To get their package through, officials say they will rely, as they have for the previous two packages, on the support of a large cadre of Republican internationalists including incoming Senate Majority Leader Robert Dole, House Speaker Newt Gingrich, Sen. Richard Lugar, and, they hope, Sen. McConnell.

But whether that support is still there is far from certain. Indeed, anti-Russian sentiment has been growing on both sides of the aisle ever since Russian nationalists scored big wins in last December's Parliamentary elections and the Central Intelligence Agency unmasked longtime Russian spy and senior CIA analyst Aldrich Ames. Ongoing quarrels with Moscow over Bosnia and the future of NATO will only feed those doubts in months to come.

Partisan jockeying may only make matters worse. The more President Clinton claims his Russia policy as a success, the more tempting it will be for presidential aspirants such as Mr. Dole to criticize the policy and Mr. Talbott, whose Brahmin manner, first-friend status and unstinting defense of the Russians makes him an easy target. Even Mr. Gingrich, who became a sudden convert to action in Bosnia after Mr. Clinton's recent retreat, may be tempted to switch sides in the Russian debate.

But even the less emotional and less partisan legislators are having serious doubts as well. Sen. Lugar, a longtime champion of Russian aid, says that three years of hard experience show that spending such money effectively in Russia is even harder than voting for it in Washington.

Pointing to a large backlog of appropriated but as yet unspent funds—of the nearly \$2 billion in economic aid promised to Russia from 1992 to 1994, less than \$500 million has so far been spent—Mr. Lugar suggests that the "appropriators may simply ask what's the point of appropriating any more."

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on the other end of the Clinton adminis-

tration, I used hearings to grill Democratic officials who were soft on President Yeltsin and optimistic about President-elect Putin. I didn't share Democrats' faith that Putin would be our friend.

I ask unanimous consent that two excerpts of my committee statement from the April 4, 2000, Senate Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations hearing be printed in the RECORD.

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

SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREIGN OPERATIONS HEARING ON USAID PROGRAMS—

Excerpts from opening statement of Sen. Mitch McConnell:

"First, we should support immediate and unrestricted access for humanitarian relief works, human rights investigators, and the media. President-elect Putin says he supports the dictatorship of law. Accepting the presence of these organizations will tell us whether the president intends to emphasize dictatorship or the accountability of laws. Based on the UN High Commissioner's trip this week, he's coming up a bit short."

"We should act with clarity, principle, and purpose. If Russia rejects that agenda, it rejects the core freedoms and virtues which define democracies. I see no wisdom in shoring up dictators, even if you do dress them up as democrats."

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, regardless of who was in the White House and regardless of which way the political winds were blowing, I have consistently treated Russia like the threat that it is. Even under a Republican administration, I spoke out when I was afraid the United States wasn't doing enough to stop the erosion of democracy and the rule of law in Russia.

A conference report that I coauthored in December 2003 stated: "The managers remain gravely concerned with the deterioration and systematic dismantling of democracy and the rule of law in Russia." We pushed President Bush's administration—a Republican administration—to do more.

And, of course, I helped lead the charge against the Obama administration's completely feckless Russia policies. President Obama mocked his 2012 opponent for taking Russia too seriously. His administration sought a naive reset with the Kremlin, and for 8 years, I helped to lead the charge against that weakness.

In 2010, I stood with John McCain and Jon Kyl to oppose the New START Treaty, a watered-down placeholder for the sort of tough stance we knew was necessary. As Vladimir Putin was building up his missile arsenal, we even had to push President Obama to commit to deploying capable missile defenses to Europe.

In 2012, I firmly supported sweeping legislation to authorize heavy sanctions following the killing of Sergei Magnitsky in a Russian prison. The Obama administration flinched and tried to tiptoe around our legislation to avoid messing up their charm offensive, but we backed him into a corner,

and the President signed the bill into law.

In 2014, I and other Republicans constantly pressed President Obama to get tougher on Russia with respect to Putin's aggression in Ukraine.

I ask unanimous consent that the news article dated March 4, 2014, entitled "McConnell: Obama's 'Passive' Foreign Policy 'Is A Mistake'" be printed in the RECORD.

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

[Mar. 5, 2014]

MITCH MCCONNELL: OBAMA'S 'PASSIVE' FOREIGN POLICY: 'IS A MISTAKE'

(By Sabrina Siddiqui)

WASHINGTON—Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) laid into President Barack Obama's grasp of foreign policy Wednesday, although he stopped just short of blaming Obama for the crisis in Ukraine.

In recent days, a growing number of Republicans have directly pointed fingers at Obama over Russian President Vladimir Putin's aggression in Ukraine. GOP Sens. John McCain (Ariz.) and Lindsey Graham (S.C.), as well as Rep. Mike Rogers (Mich.), have all said that the president's attempt to reset U.S.-Soviet relations showed he was both naive and too trusting of Putin.

McConnell was asked during his weekly press conference if he agreed with his Republican colleagues' assessment, to which he responded with a lengthy critique of Obama's overall handling of foreign policy.

"I would put it this way: Can you think of any place in the world where we're better off now than we were when he came to office?" McConnell said, before tracing Obama's global approach to his 2009 address in Cairo, Egypt, which he interpreted as "questioning American exceptionalism and the uniqueness of our own country."

"And he's acted in such a way, almost amounting to passivity in many instances," he continued. "We're not suggesting here that the use of force is appropriate on very many occasions . . . but there's a widespread kind of lack of respect of U.S. opinion."

"It's no wonder that Putin looks at the United States and sort of concludes that no matter what he does, he doesn't pay a price for it," McConnell added.

The Kentucky Republican was pressed again to state whether or not he believed Obama is to blame for Putin's move to heighten Russia's military activity in the Crimean region. Once again, McConnell implied as much without explicitly holding the president responsible.

"I think a passive approach to foreign policy, which basically means not asserting American interests, is a mistake," he said. "Some leaders are going to exercise power [and] will push limits as far as they can if they think that there's no push back."

McConnell added that he was "hard pressed to think of foreign policy successes" under the Obama administration, but nonetheless emphasized the need for Congress to work with the White House on providing economic assistance to the Ukrainian people.

"We need to work with the administration to try to undergird, if you will, reinforce the new administration in Ukraine in every way that we can," he said.

Moments after McConnell spoke, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) came to Obama's defense and pointed to former President George W. Bush's infamous declaration that he had looked into Putin's eyes and seen his soul.

"I've not heard Obama say that. In fact, I've heard Obama speak out very clearly

about that what Putin has done is wrong," Reid said.

He added that it was unclear what the "right wing" Republicans attacking Obama were seeking from the president.

"Did they think that he should do an Iraq move maybe?" Reid said. "I don't understand what they're saying. I think that the cautious direction of the president has been very good in Ukraine."

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, since 2017, I have continued reminding everyone that Putin is not our friend. Russia is going to continue trying to meddle. We need a comprehensive strategy to contest Russian aggression, and alliances like NATO are critical for standing up to our adversaries.

Once more, for good measure, I ask unanimous consent that the news article dated August 15, 2018, entitled "U.S. Senate's top Republican likens Russia to 'old Soviet Union'" be printed in the RECORD.

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

[August 15, 2018]

US SENATE'S TOP REPUBLICAN LIKENS RUSSIA TO 'OLD SOVIET UNION'

(By Joe Gould)

WASHINGTON—Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, R-Ky., isn't ready to get cozy with Russia, comparing it to "the old Soviet Union" on Tuesday.

A month after the Helsinki summit between U.S. President Donald Trump and his Russian counterpart Vladimir Putin, at which Trump discredited U.S. intelligence and American policies isolating Moscow, the powerful Senate leader showed he was on a separate track.

"The Russians are not our friends. They try to create problems in every way they can," McConnell said in a news conference at Fort Knox, Kentucky, set up to tout the \$716 billion National Defense Authorization Act that Trump signed into law Monday.

"I think the Russians are acting like the old Soviet Union used to act," McConnell said, pointing to its alleged meddling in U.S. and European elections and its 2014 annexation of Crimea from Ukraine. (Louisville-based Spectrum News posted video of the presser.)

Without mentioning it directly, McConnell displayed his differences with Trump and Sen. Rand Paul, the junior senator from Kentucky and an outlier in the Senate when it comes to Moscow. Paul, who visited Russia this month, said the politics in America around the issues are poisoning the chances for cross-Atlantic dialogue.

Trump's openness toward Russia has fueled tensions over the separation of powers. Trump issued a signing statement for the NDAA that claimed some provisions mandating tough action on Russia would actually impinge on the powers of the executive branch.

"This signing statement is troubling because, yet again, the President is showing the world he cannot be trusted when it comes to standing by U.S. commitments and promoting our interests over—his own," the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's ranking member, Sen. Bob Menendez, D-N.J., said in a statement. He called on Trump to "unequivocally stand strong for the United States and our allies and against Kremlin aggression."

The Senate has taken a few bipartisan shots at Trump on Russia, voting overwhelmingly to affirm support of NATO and unanimously to oppose giving the Kremlin

access to U.S. officials. Still, Senate GOP leaders blocked a bipartisan measure to reject Putin's denial of election interference, mandate immediate enactment of sanctions passed by Congress last year and ask Senate committees to hold hearings into the summit's private meeting between Putin and Trump.

On Tuesday, McConnell lauded the NDAA's aid for Fort Knox (home to Army Human Resources Command), its authorized end-strength boost, and its recognition of America's tense relationships with Russia and China.

"It would have been denying reality and in a sense putting our head in the sand not to have a significant increase in military spending," McConnell said, acknowledging Defense Secretary Jim Mattis' advocacy to Trump and Congress for added spending.

"In fact, we gave the Department of Defense exactly what they asked for," McConnell added. The Senate leader also praised Trump's tough stance against China on trade.

"We'd rather not be adversaries, but we don't have a perfect relationship either," McConnell said of Beijing. "The Chinese have become more aggressive on the military side, which has been unusual for them in the past."

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I don't normally take the time to respond to critics in the media when they have no clue what they are talking about, but this modern-day McCarthyism is toxic and damaging because of the way it warps our entire public discourse. Facts matter. Details matter. History matters. And if our Nation is losing its ability to debate public policy without screaming about treason, that really matters.

In the middle of the 20th century, the original McCarthyism hurt America's strength and diminished our standing in the Cold War by dividing us against ourselves and letting lies, innuendo, and baseless accusations crowd out reasonable politics. The frenetic politicized witch hunt distracted from legitimate efforts to contest the Soviet Union, including more sober efforts to root out real Soviet agents in our midsts. In short, McCarthyism did the Russian's work for them. McCarthyism did the work for the Russians.

Now, here we are in 2019. Again, Putin and the Russians seek to provoke fear and division in our country, to undermine faith in our institutions, to exacerbate our political divisions until we tear ourselves apart, and, once again, it seems there are some who blindly take the bait.

American pundits are calling an American official treasonous because of a policy disagreement. If anything is an asset to the Russians, it is disgusting behavior like that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

#### BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2019—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 165, H.R. 3877.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 165, H.R. 3877, a bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, to establish a congressional budget for fiscal years 2020 and 2021, to temporarily suspend the debt limit, and for other purposes.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. I send a cloture motion to the desk for the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 3877, a bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, to establish a congressional budget for fiscal years 2020 and 2021, to temporarily suspend the debt limit, and for other purposes.

Lamar Alexander, Thom Tillis, Martha McSally, John Cornyn, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Susan M. Collins, Tom Cotton, Roy Blunt, Roger F. Wicker, John Thune, Bill Cassidy, Richard Burr, John Barrasso, Rob Portman, Lisa Murkowski, Mitch McConnell.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 402.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Kelly Craft, of Kentucky, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Kelly Craft, of Kentucky, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

Lamar Alexander, Thom Tillis, Martha McSally, John Cornyn, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Susan M. Collins, Tom Cotton, Roy Blunt, Roger F. Wicker,

Bill Cassidy, John Thune, Richard Burr, John Barrasso, Rob Portman, Dan Sullivan, Mitch McConnell.

### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 394.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination David L. Norquist, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of David L. Norquist, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Lamar Alexander, Thom Tillis, Martha McSally, John Cornyn, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Susan M. Collins, Tom Cotton, Roy Blunt, Roger F. Wicker, Bill Cassidy, John Thune, Richard Burr, John Barrasso, Rob Portman, Dan Sullivan, Mitch McConnell.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions be waived.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session and consideration of the veto messages as under the previous order.

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

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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—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—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—VETO

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the veto messages to accompany S.J. Res. 36, 37, and 38, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Veto message to accompany S.J. Res. 36, a 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.

Veto message to accompany S.J. Res. 37, a 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.

Veto message to accompany S.J. Res. 38, a 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 PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I just listened with interest to the remarks of the majority leader and his accounting of history—his very defensive remarks, based on an attack from, I guess, some journalist. The majority leader, I would say, was liberally using words like “McCarthy” and “McCarthyism” and “liar” and how he proudly stood up to the Soviet Union in the wake of Brezhnev and Chernenko and Andropov. They are fascinating words, but you don’t need x-ray vision to notice a few things about the discussion the majority leader launched. First of all, this weekend, the Director of National Security resigned in frustration that

his boss, the President of the United States, has chosen to believe Russia instead of his own intelligence officials.

One of most embarrassing moments in my lifetime was when the President of the United States stood next to the dictator of Russia and said that he believed Putin and not his own intelligence officials and the consensus of his intelligence officials when it comes to influencing our 2016 elections.

So I hear that the majority leader always has an acute sense of history and his place in it. I am hopeful the majority leader, using his knowledge of history, understands the influence Russia continues to have in our country and on our elections and that this body will actually address that instead of denying the obvious.

#### OPIOIDS

Mr. President, America is in the middle of a public health crisis. In my State, 14 people die, on average, every single day of a drug overdose. The numbers are not much better in most of the other 49 States. We have known for a long time that addiction so often starts in the family medicine cabinet and that drug companies were all too eager to push these addictive drugs on the American people, but the evidence we have seen in the past couple of weeks is staggering.

New data from the DEA released this month reveals that drug companies flooded the country with 76 billion oxycodone and hydrocodone pills from 2006 to 2012—76 billion pills in a nation of slightly more than 323 million people. Seventy-six billion pills is enough to supply every person in the United States with 36 pills every one of those years from 2006 to 2012. This evidence makes clear these companies, these corporations knew exactly what they were doing.

One wholesale drug distributor in Ohio wrote an email that the opioid pills were “flyin’ out of there. It is like people are addicted to these things or something. Oh wait, people are.”

Can you believe that? He acknowledged they are addicted, and he joked about it. If that is not bad enough, then the drug company representative responded: “Just like Doritos, [people] keep eating. We’ll make more.”

They certainly did make more. That is what Big Pharma does. They push their drugs on the American people to line their own pockets and the cost in empty bank accounts and ruined lives be damned.

If that isn’t bad enough, these corporations can actually write off the cost of advertising these drugs on their taxes. In other words, all of us as taxpayers subsidize this drug company advertising. All those years that Big Pharma was pushing more and more opioids on the country, selling them ad after ad, they were getting a tax break to do it. Yet does this body do anything about that? Of course not.

For years, I tried to track down drug company ads. It is why I introduced an amendment at our Finance Committee



markup last week based on my legislation with Senator SHAHEEN to end taxpayer subsidies for Big Pharma's drug ads. We shouldn't be giving tax breaks to Big Pharma to sell its drugs, period.

There are a lot of other ideas many of us have to crack down on these companies and limit their power to push potentially addictive drugs on people.

Senator HASSAN filed an amendment during that same committee drug pricing markup to increase transparency on these drug companies. Big Pharma has a history of creating false grassroots organizations to do their lobbying for them. Groups supposedly made up of ordinary citizens but in reality are bought and paid for by drug companies. People have the right to know if the groups pushing drugs on them are actually bought and paid for by those pharmaceutical companies. The opioid addiction crisis is one of the greatest public health emergencies of our lifetime, and it is crystal clear Big Pharma purposefully and deliberately helped to cause it, and the Federal Government gave them tax breaks and continues to give them tax breaks to do it. We need to hold these corporations accountable, and we need to make sure they never again have the unchecked power to push addictive drugs or any other drugs on the American people just to line their executives' pockets.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

#### ELECTION SECURITY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, yesterday President Trump announced that after nearly 2½ years of dedicated service, our former Senate colleague Dan Coats would be stepping down from his post as Director of National Intelligence.

Director Coats has led the intelligence community during a turbulent time for our country, and with our country continuing to face persistent threats from rogue and hostile states, as well as the ongoing war against terror, he has done a magnificent job and one that deserves all the accolades we can possibly bestow upon him. We know he entered the job on the tail of a blatant attempt by the Russian Government to interfere with our Nation's elections, and he made it a top priority to ensure that the American people could cast a vote with confidence in 2018 and beyond.

I just happened to come in the Chamber, when the Senator from Ohio was continuing to question the majority leader's commitment to election integrity, and I must say that it is ironic to me that the Russian interference with the 2016 election was, by and large, met with inaction, really nothing that the Obama administration did, even though they knew it was ongoing as early as the summer of 2016.

The truth is, as a result of this administration's and this Congress's efforts, the 2018 election was essentially interference free, and that is because of

tremendous actions being taken by the Department of Homeland Security to work with our partners in the State election systems to provide sensors that can identify attempts to hack into their system as well as the movement of State election officials to move to paper ballots and the like.

We also know we have been much more aggressive attacking the cyber threats at their source, and while much of that is classified and can't be discussed in a public forum, suffice it to say that if we can just repeat the successes of 2018 during the Trump administration in 2020, Americans can be confident their vote will be cast and be counted as it should be.

That is not to suggest for a moment that we shouldn't remain vigilant because we know the Russian Federation is going to continue to try to sow discord and cause us to question our own institutions. They are very good at it. They have been doing it a long time, but now they have additional tools like social media and propaganda as well as the complicity sometimes of the mainstream media in writing unverified and unsourced stories that create more and more and contribute more and more to this atmosphere in which we currently live.

Let me talk again about Director Coats because his remarkable career as a public servant included, at times, a Congressman, an ambassador to Germany, a U.S. Senator twice, and Director of National Intelligence.

I know I speak for others in this Chamber in saying that we are grateful for Dan Coats' dedicated service to our country, and I am honored to be one of those who can call him a friend. I wish him and Marsha the best in whatever the next chapter brings, hopefully starting with a well-deserved vacation.

I was also glad to see that the President has chosen a worthy successor to that position, my friend JOHN RATCLIFFE. For 4½ years, JOHN has faithfully and diligently served Texas's Fourth District in Congress for the people of Texas.

Prior to that, he served with distinction as U.S. attorney, prosecuting cases that spanned a wide spectrum of issues, including counterterrorism and national security.

Mr. RATCLIFFE is a Member of the House Intelligence, Homeland Security, and Judiciary Committees, a pretty good portfolio for somebody who would be the next Director of National Intelligence. So he already has an understanding of the threats facing our country and the challenges that lie ahead. I am confident he will continue Dan Coats' strong leadership as a non-partisan strong leader for the intelligence community.

Sadly, though, we can already begin to see our Democratic colleagues beginning to play their partisan games, threatening to defeat this nomination at the expense of the American people. This position is simply too important to the security of our Nation to be

bogged down in partisan politics. Since this job was created, every single Director has been confirmed by an overwhelming bipartisan vote. In fact, none of these men received the support of fewer than 85 Senators. This one should be no different.

I look forward to the President formally nominating JOHN RATCLIFFE to be the next Director of National Intelligence.

#### JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. President, on another matter, during the first 2 years of the Trump administration, the list of vacancies across the Federal Government was a long one, particularly on the Federal bench. The administration worked swiftly to find well-qualified nominees who were eager to serve our country and our Federal judiciary. Once those nominees were submitted to the Senate, the chairman quickly held confirmation hearings and advanced the vast majority of these nominees to the floor, but from there the process came to a screeching halt. But from there, the process came to a screeching halt. Our colleagues on the other side pulled every trick in the book to bog down and slow down the nominations process. For no other purpose than delay, they forced cloture votes on nominees with broad bipartisan support. Many were confirmed without a single Senator voting against them. Our Democratic colleagues didn't do this because these men and women were unqualified or otherwise controversial, but they did so because they were willing to do whatever it took to stymie President Trump and his administration and bring the work of this body to a crawl.

The list of vacancies kept growing longer and longer until, earlier this year, we were forced to pass a modest rules change that has fortunately broken the logjam and allowed us to fill these critical positions. As the majority leader likes to say, we are now making serious headway in the personnel business. The number of vacancies has gotten smaller, and the list of public servants who are now on the job keeps getting longer.

Last week, we added more names to that impressive list. We confirmed two district judges, inspector general for the Department of Homeland Security, and both the Administrator and Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration. In addition, we approved two leaders whose experience will provide needed stability and leadership at the Pentagon.

After nearly 7 months with an Acting Secretary of Defense, Mark Esper has finally been confirmed for the position of Secretary of Defense on a permanent basis. Throughout his career, Secretary Esper has demonstrated integrity, sound judgment, and unabashed patriotism. I saw those qualities when I met with him most recently a few weeks ago and we had the chance to speak about some of the most pressing global threats we were facing as a nation today. Secretary Esper received broad

bipartisan support, with 90 Senators voting for him. I am glad he is now on the job, leading America's national security.

We also confirmed another important senior Department of Defense official last week. GEN Mark Milley was resoundingly confirmed to be Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, with only one Senator voting against him. I can't think of anyone more prepared for the job than General Milley, a former Army Ranger and Green Beret. He has a remarkable military resume, including commander officer of the III Corps in Fort Hood, TX, where I first got to know him years ago. I know he and Secretary Esper will continue to have a strong working relationship, and I look forward to continuing to work with both of them in their new roles.

This week, we intend to keep our progress on nominations going strong, and we have seven Texas district court judge nominees on the docket. Among those well-qualified nominees is a former Army paratrooper and Marine JAG officer, former and current intermediate court judges, former and current Federal and State prosecutors, and a Texas Supreme Court justice—a job I once held. They have all proudly served the Lone Star State in a variety of capacities.

I am, again, impressed by the outstanding nominees that the President has recruited to fill these important judicial vacancies. When these nominees are confirmed, we will finally break down two barriers in the Texas district courts. Ada Brown will be the first African-American woman to sit in the Northern District of Texas, and Jason Pullman will be the first African American in the Western District of Texas. Each of these nominees has shown their legal acumen, clear judgment, and unwavering commitment to the rule of law. I look forward to voting for their nominations later this week.

In addition to confirming these Texans and a dozen other district court judges, the Senate will confirm a critical Cabinet-level position in the administration. When Nikki Haley announced that after 2 years of dedicated service, she would leave her post as Ambassador to the United Nations at the end of last year, we knew it would leave a major hole in that organization. But the President didn't have far to look to find a well-qualified nominee. Two years ago, the Senate unanimously confirmed Kelly Knight Craft to serve as the U.S. Ambassador to Canada. Looking back on that 2 years now, it is safe to say it has been a dynamic time during our relationship with our neighbor to the north, a fact that made Ambassador Craft's job all that much more important.

Through each challenge and difference between our leaders, Ambassador Craft has demonstrated her tact and diplomatic skills. In addition to the usual duties of the office, Ambassador Craft facilitated the renegotiation of NAFTA—the North American

Free Trade Agreement—and helped broker the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement—the USMCA. She helped build consensus on this agreement, which will benefit North American workers, farmers, and businesses, and won friends from both countries in the process.

Once Trump nominated Ambassador Craft to represent the United States in the U.N., we heard glowing endorsements from many of those people. Canadian officials praised her role in NAFTA negotiations and border conditions, and U.S. diplomats who served under Republican and Democratic administrations spoke of their confidence in Ambassador Craft and her ability to represent our country on the world stage.

For the last 2 years, Ambassador Craft has made our country proud as the U.S. Ambassador to Canada, and I am confident her outstanding record will continue at the United Nations. I appreciate her willingness to serve in this important role and look forward to voting for her nomination later this week.

As we prepare to head home for the August recess to spend time with our constituents, I am glad to know these important positions throughout the Federal Government will not be left vacant for much longer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

(The remarks of Mr. BARRASSO pertaining to the introduction of S. 2302 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

(Mr. DAINES assumed the chair.)

Mr. BARRASSO. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

ELECTION SECURITY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, a few minutes ago, the majority leader came to the floor to express his frustration at being accused of blocking election security legislation. I would make three factual points.

First, Russia did interfere in our 2016 elections. Every intelligence agency, everyone who has looked at this is 100 percent clear Russia interfered.

Two, Russia will attempt to interfere in the 2020 elections and is already doing it. That is not only what Special Counsel Mueller said but FBI Director Wray and many other appointees in the intelligence and counterintelligence agencies appointed by President Trump.

Three, the Republican majority has done nothing—absolutely nothing—to deal with this problem.

So here is an easy way for Leader MCCONNELL to silence the critics who accuse him of blocking election security: Stop blocking.

Leader MCCONNELL doesn't have to put the bills that we Democrats have proposed or the bill the House has passed—they were bipartisan bills—and we can debate the issue.

America's democracy is at risk when a foreign power interferes. So if Leader MCCONNELL doesn't like being criticized on election security, I challenge him: Let's debate it on the floor with amendments. I challenge him: Support additional appropriations for States to harden their election systems. In both cases, Leader MCCONNELL has not done that. In fact, he has said he opposes more money to the States even though they say—I believe there are 21 attorneys general who have said they need more money.

Despite our requests, Leader MCCONNELL has not only blocked unanimous consent requests but has not put any other legislation on the floor to deal with this.

Again, I repeat, this should not be a political issue. This should not be a political issue. Whether you are a Democrat, Republican, Independent, whether you are a liberal, a conservative, in between, you should despise the fact—any American should despise the fact—that Russia has interfered in our elections and is attempting to do so again. Putin wants to disrupt our democracy. He resents that we are a free and open and wonderful democratic society. And for us to sit here with our arms folded and do nothing? Unheard of in previous years.

I still don't have a really clear idea why Leader MCCONNELL is so adamantly opposed to doing anything on election security. Maybe it is because President Trump, in his childlike way, resents the fact that people point out that Russia interfered. He thinks it delegitimizes his Presidential election. But that is not a good enough reason, if that is the case. We have an obligation. Do you know whom we have an obligation to, Mr. President? We have an obligation to the hundreds of thousands of Americans—the millions of Americans who laid down their lives to defend our right to vote in our free and open democracy throughout the centuries.

If we are going to let a foreign power interfere and not do anything about it for some kind of political reason, shame on us. Shame on this body. And it is Leader MCCONNELL who, as the majority leader, can determine what is put on the floor, and he has put nothing on the floor on elections.

When last year we attempted in the appropriations bill to add more money to help the States harden their systems against cyber attack, to make sure they have paper ballots in case someone tampers with the ballots, Leader MCCONNELL opposed it. He said it is not needed. Just recently, I heard him say it is not needed. That is not true. That



is absolutely not true. Twenty-one attorneys general say they need it. Nine States don't have backup systems with complete paper balloting.

So if Leader MCCONNELL takes umbrage at his election security critics, I challenge him: Prove them wrong. Support our amendment to the appropriations bill. Bring election security legislation to the floor because, as the Senate Intelligence Committee, which is chaired by a Republican, the FBI Director, who was appointed by President Trump, and former Special Counsel Mueller, who did an extensive investigation, have all made clear, when it comes to Russian interference in our elections, the case is certainly not closed.

#### DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE

Mr. President, yesterday the Director of National Intelligence, Dan Coats—a former Member of this Chamber who is renowned for his integrity and his bipartisanship—announced his resignation. With his departure, the circle of advisers who are unafraid to speak truth to President Trump continues to shrink. It seems that if you are going to speak truth and tell the President something he doesn't want to hear, you are fired or at least frozen out so that you quit. Coats is one of many in a long line to whom this has been done. Now, making matters worse, the President proposed replacing this longtime, fair, decent, and honorable public servant with a partisan shill—Representative JOHN RATCLIFFE of Texas.

The DNI—Director of National Intelligence—handles some of the most sensitive responsibilities in the Federal Government. It requires a high level of expertise. It requires trust from the intelligence community. And it requires a track record of independence, an ability in the closed confines of the White House to speak truth to power and tell the President what is happening, not just what the President wants to hear. On all these measures, it seems Representative RATCLIFFE falls far short of that high bar.

John Negroponte became the DNI after decades of working in the Foreign Service. Dennis Blair, James Clapper, and Mike McConnell all had decades of military experience. Dan Coats served as a diplomat, Senator, and sergeant in the Army before assuming the post. Representative RATCLIFFE, on the other hand, is a three-term tea party Congressman who, when he goes on TV, sort of appeals to the President's sense of stridency and partisanship.

Representative RATCLIFFE lacks the experience required to lead an intelligence agency, much less the entire intelligence community. His time in Congress—particularly over the past several weeks since it was rumored he might be picked for the post—has been alarmingly partisan. He has been a fierce critic of the Russia investigation. He has earned praise from deep state conspiracy theorists.

During the Mueller hearings, Representative RATCLIFFE badgered and

harassed the former special counsel with a baseless line of questioning and repeatedly interrupted him when he was trying to respond. He showed little regard for the seriousness of Putin's interference in our election and the need for election security in the future.

Watching Representative RATCLIFFE's performance in the Mueller hearing, I was reminded of how I felt watching General Flynn. In the summer of 2016, I saw this three-star general leading chants of people—"Lock her up"—at the Republican convention and at rallies. I said: Who is this guy? How does someone become a three-star and do something like this? At the time I thought: There is something seriously wrong with General Flynn here.

Well, I had the same feeling watching Mr. RATCLIFFE at the Mueller hearing. The same twisting and subversion and flatout ignorance, the same partisan demagoguery to appeal to the worst instincts of Americans all seem to be his MO. There is something wrong here. The DNI is supposed to be the least partisan member of the President's Cabinet. It would be a grave mistake for the Senate to elevate this partisan warrior to that position.

I have to wonder, are my Republican colleagues comfortable with their party's direction on national security? Are they comfortable going along with Leader MCCONNELL as he blocks legislation to protect our elections and deter foreign adversaries from interfering? Are they comfortable with a polarizing, partisan candidate taking charge of our national intelligence community? Are they comfortable knowing that this nominee may well not tell the President the truth when there is evidence from our brave intelligence operatives around the world that something we are doing is wrong?

I would hope my Republican colleagues would be deeply uncomfortable with these developments. Ten years ago, I have no doubt, Mr. RATCLIFFE wouldn't have even been nominated, let alone approved by this body. So I hope that is the case today. I hope we haven't gone so far away and in such obeisance to a President who only likes to hear what he wants to hear that we would nominate someone like this. It would be a shame and it would weaken America because if we don't know the truth, we can't act on the truth.

Will our Republican colleagues start speaking up and doing something about this? When Mr. RATCLIFFE comes before the Senate, he will have to answer for his long history of partisan statements and blind fealty to President Trump. Mr. RATCLIFFE will have to answer tough questions about Russia's meddling in our election, about his apparent disinterest in election security, and about his inability or unwillingness to show independence from the President. If he sounds anything like he did while questioning Mueller, Senate Republicans would be making a grave mistake by advancing his nomi-

nation—a mistake for the country we love.

#### CHINA

Mr. President, finally, on China, starting today, the United States will resume trade negotiations with China, which have recently stalled over Chinese equivocation on a number of issues.

Anyone who has viewed China's behavior over the past year of negotiations—or for that matter, the past decade of its behavior—knows China is always reluctant to make concessions that would put its businesses on a level playing field. China will resist, delay, and offer bare-bones concessions and then retract them in hopes that it can avoid meaningfully reforming its economy and playing fair on trade.

So, as negotiations begin again, I urge President Trump and his team not to back down but to put unrelenting pressure on China to make significant, concrete, and enduring commitments to trade fairly.

I don't agree with President Trump on much, but he has been tougher on China than any of the previous administrations, and that is needed. But to be tough on China and then surrender our leverage at the last minute for nothing in return would be terrible.

One of our greatest leverage points against China is Huawei, a state-supported Chinese telecom giant that our intelligence agencies have labeled nothing less than a national security threat. The Trump administration has correctly sought restrictions on Huawei, even while they have sometimes wavered on their severity.

Now, as negotiations are set to resume, the President must not give up leverage on Huawei in exchange for anything less than concrete commitments on market access, intellectual property theft, and forced technology transfers.

These are issues paramount to the competitiveness of American business and will cause us to lose millions of jobs and trillions of dollars in the future, as we have lost in the past and as the President correctly points out, to China's rapaciousness.

I am concerned enough now about the possibility the administration will sell out, particularly in the wake of reports that President Trump has agreed to soft pedal criticism of China over its Hong Kong policy, hoping for smoother trade talks.

The administration is wrong on two fronts. First, it is always crucial for the United States to stand up for democracy, human rights, and civil liberties everywhere. The idea that the President of the United States would sell the democratic aspirations of the brave people of Hong Kong down the river in exchange for possible progress on trade is shocking. But, second, the idea that going easy on China's human rights record will ease trade talks is backward. China responds to strength, not flattery or capitulation.

The best way to get China to do something fair is to stand tough on

Huawei. Don't sell out. Don't give Huawei half or three-quarters of what it wants. Hold tough, and the Chinese in a few months will come to us with real concessions. It is a game of who is stronger and who can last longer. I hope it is us. If it is not, all of the President's previous actions on China will be wasted and go down the drain.

#### 9/11 VICTIM COMPENSATION FUND

There are two more things, including the VCF bill signing. There are some good things that happened in the last week in Washington. People think nothing good comes out of Washington. Once in a while, we do something good. Once in a while, our Republican colleagues will go along with something that needs to be done, instead of blocking everything and putting it in a graveyard, which they usually do. That happened last week when this body finally passed the bipartisan 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund bill, and today the President signed it into law, closing the book on nearly two decades of advocacy to provide the care and compensation that 9/11 first responders deserve.

Nothing, nothing should or can get in the way of our first responders getting their due. Finally, at last, these brave first responders had to spend too much time here in Washington, often in their wheelchairs, often dying of cancer, begging Senators to give them the help they need—the same help we give to veterans who, like our first responders after 9/11, in a time of war, rushed to danger and suffered injury. We help them. We help our veterans, our soldiers, and our Armed Forces, in the same way we should be helping 9/11 first responders. At long last, we are doing that. It has been a long struggle, but because of the courage of many who joined the cause, the memory of people like James Zadroga, Ray Pfeifer, Luis Alvarez, and so many others will live on in this law. Their parents—and I know Mrs. Pfeifer and I know some of the Alvarez family; I have met them—can know, despite the pain in their hearts at their grave losses, that the deaths of their loved ones will not be in vain.

#### BIPARTISAN BACKGROUND CHECKS

Finally, my heart is filled with sadness and anger today after reports of deadly shootings at festivals on opposite coastlines, one in my hometown of Brooklyn and another across the country, in Gilroy, CA. There are no words for the senselessness of these tragedies, which continue unabated while the majority leader once again refuses to even debate commonsense gun laws.

Put the bill the House passed on the floor. We have had bipartisan efforts in this body to close the gun show loophole. Let's close the loopholes and have universal background checks. Almost no Americans object to preventing felons or spousal abusers or those adjudicated mentally incompetent from getting guns, but Leader McConnell and the Republican majority do, and we have made no progress and these awful events continue.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARPER. 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 remarks of Mr. CARPER pertaining to the introduction of S. 2302 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. CARPER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). The Senator from Montana.

(The remarks of Mr. DAINES pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 289 are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. DAINES. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Your resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The Senator from New Jersey.

#### VETO OVERRIDE

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to urge my colleagues to join me in voting to override the President's veto of three resolutions of disapproval on arms sales to Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates.

As we all know, several weeks ago, the Secretary of State attempted to bypass this body and the entire Congress on 22 separate arms sales to Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates—all on the pretext of an urgent physical threat from Iran that was, at best, ill-defined and, at worst, completely false.

Let me be clear. Iran has and will continue to pose a threat to U.S. interests and allies in the region, and I have and will continue to approve arms sales to partners and allies that address legitimate security threats and advance American interests.

From the start, this administration has failed to demonstrate what kind of national security threat or "emergency" from Iran warranted fast-tracking the sale of these weapons to Saudi Arabia and the UAE.

Indeed, Secretary Pompeo's own May 24 justification for the sales lacked any persuasive information explaining how these sales would address an Iranian threat so serious that it justified bypassing Congress on an "emergency" basis.

That is why I introduced resolutions to disapprove these sales, and that is why 6 weeks ago, this body came together in a bipartisan way to reassert the role of Congress in reviewing arms sales and passed 22 separate resolutions of disapproval.

Today I ask that we come together again. In fact, not even President Trump's own veto messages mention the word "emergency." It is clear this administration has had other motives from the start. We continue to hear officials invent new reasons for pushing

through these sales. We heard these sales are necessary for "sustaining the global supply chain," for preventing "loss of sale to peer competitors," for maintaining U.S. "credibility as an arms supplier," and so on.

So, look, many of us expected the President to use his veto powers. That is his right, but the constitutional, strategic, and moral imperatives that led the Senate to reject the sale of these arms 6 weeks ago still stand today.

Let me review three main reasons I hope we can unite today to override the President's veto.

First is how these weapons are being used. By now, we are well acquainted with what has been, at best, the incompetent, and, at worst, criminal actions of Saudi Arabia's airstrikes in Yemen. All evidence suggests that the Saudis have intentionally targeted hospitals, bridges, power stations, apartment buildings, weddings, schools, and, yes, even a schoolbus filled with children, leaving thousands of Yemeni civilians killed or maimed.

Over the years, Congress has received many assurances about how U.S. arms sales, advice, and assistance would supposedly help the Saudi Air Force and command authority better identify military targets and thereby reduce the risk to civilians. Those assurances no longer stand. We cannot brand the sale of precision-guided munitions as humanitarian weapons if the Saudis are intentionally targeting civilians in the first place.

That is why, last year, I placed an informal hold on the sale of 60,000 precision-guided munitions, or PGMs, to Saudi Arabia, requesting the administration explain how they would enhance efforts to reduce civilian casualties. They failed to do so in a fulsome and convincing way, and, believe me, I would like to be convinced.

After the slaughter of Washington Post journalist Jamal Khashoggi in October of last year, the Trump administration apparently flatout gave up trying to convince anyone that the Saudis have any regard whatsoever for human rights at home, in Yemen, or at their diplomatic consulates abroad.

Last week, recognizing the abject failures of the Yemeni campaign, the United Arab Emirates announced it was ceasing its support and largely withdrawing from Yemen. I commend that as the right decision.

I do not doubt that Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates are concerned about Iranian threats, but the indisputable reality is that these precision-guided weapon kits were always headed for this disastrous air war in Yemen. So, again, let's not delude ourselves. These sales will in no way support Saudi Arabia or the United Arab Emirates or the United States from an imminent Iranian threat. Full stop.

Second, if we fail to override the President's veto, we will allow this administration to transfer American jobs and sensitive military technology to

the Saudis. That is right. With this sale, the Trump administration has authorized Raytheon to allow the Saudis to begin manufacturing part of the electronic guidance system for these precision-guided munitions. In other words, the administration is not only selling the Saudis these weapons but also portions of the blueprints for building these weapons.

This work has always and always should be done by American workers right here in the United States. America's defense industry produces the most sophisticated systems in the world. Yet the Trump administration is opening the door for the Saudis to manufacture their own similar weapons in the future or transfer our American-made technical know-how to other countries.

Disturbingly, we also know that if the Trump administration gets its way, this transfer will not be a one-time thing. State Department officials have actually admitted to the Foreign Relations Committee staff that this will be the first of many sales authorizing the Saudis to manufacture even larger, more sensitive portions of these highly advanced weapons.

My colleagues, that is simply madness. Not only is this sale a Saudi jobs program, but it is also a giveaway of sensitive U.S. military technology. The President's own veto message claims that not giving away American jobs and sensitive military technology to Saudi Arabia would "abandon" them. I am guessing by "them," he means the royal family the President is intent on praising and courting.

I ask my colleagues who oppose stopping this sale or are thinking of allowing the President's veto to stand: Do you want to be on record supporting a Saudi jobs program? Do you want to be on the record as aiding and abetting the transfer of sensitive U.S. military technology to Saudi Arabia, a source of extremism and bloodshed in the world?

S.J. Res. 37 disapproves a sale of precision-guided munitions to the UAE at a time when the UAE is pulling its military forces out of Yemen. Yet the President's veto message says that stopping this sale would somehow prolong the suffering in Yemen, which goes against any logic with which I am familiar.

S.J. Res. 38 disapproves a sale of fuzes for Saudi bombs. Yet the President argues that stopping this sale will again prolong the suffering of the innocent in Yemen, presumably by denying the Saudis the ability to target them indiscriminately. It doesn't make sense.

Finally, I think all of my colleagues can agree that the United States and Saudi Arabia need a course correction. The brutal murder of Jamal Khashoggi, an American resident and journalist in a Saudi consulate, may have been the final, violent straw that broke the camel's back, but we must reexamine this relationship. Beyond the Khashoggi killing and the atrocities in

Yemen, the Saudi-led blockade of Qatar and the ongoing rift within the GCC are not in the interests of the United States. The Saudis kidnapping of the Lebanese Prime Minister is not in the interest of the United States.

Finally, Saudi Arabia's detention and torture of human rights activists calling for the same exact rights the Crown Prince himself pretends to support—its suppression of dissent and speech—this behavior does not reflect American values or our long-term interests.

My colleagues, America is better than this. This Senate and this Congress must continue to stand up for reason, for decency, and for the actual foreign policy and national security interests of the United States—not the personal interests of the Trump family and their misguided willingness to put profit over principle and profit over people.

This administration's willingness to turn a blind eye to the wholesale slaughter of civilians and the murder of journalists and move forward with the sale of these weapons will have a lasting implication for America's moral leadership on the world stage.

That is why, 6 weeks ago, in a bipartisan fashion, the Senate came together to approve an unprecedented 22 separate bipartisan resolutions of disapproval. That is why 5 weeks ago, the Committee on Foreign Relations approved my bipartisan bill—the Saudi Arabia False Emergencies, or SAFE Act—to prevent similar abuses of emergency authority in the future.

That is why, 3 weeks ago, the House passed several amendments to their National Defense Authorization Act to stop these same arms sales, and, 2 weeks ago, the House passed three of the Senate joint resolutions of disapproval and sent them to the President. It is the first time, since 1988, that any such resolution has passed the Congress, and it is the first time multiple resolutions of disapproval had done so.

Finally, just last week, the Foreign Relations Committee approved on a bipartisan vote the Saudi Arabia Accountability and Yemen Act, legislation I introduced with Senators YOUNG, MURPHY, GRAHAM, REED, COLLINS, and SHAHEEN that would finally impose real sanctions, including on arms sales, on Saudi Arabia for its atrocities—legislation I hope Senator MCCONNELL will swiftly bring to the floor.

I hope this administration appreciates the gravity of these actions and those to come.

Today we have an opportunity to again demonstrate to the President, the Secretary of State, and to the butchers of Saudi Arabia that the U.S. Senate will stand up for our values, will stand up for our long-term national security interests, and will put country over short-term business interests.

I urge my colleagues to take this stand today, override these vetoes, and stop the Saudi arms sales.

There are few days in this body where we can say that our votes will save lives. Today is such a day.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise today to address an important issue, that the Secretary of State did not comply with the law when he made an emergency declaration on May 24 to bypass the Congress and issue export permission for 22 separate arms sales to Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates. Because of this, a case can be made that some or all of the export licenses and the letters of offer are not valid because they did not comply with the Arms Export Control Act.

We have made clear in this body that there is strong bipartisan opposition to the President and Secretary of State's reckless disregard for the law, for common sense, for human rights, for basic human decency, and even for our national security, when it comes to matters involving Saudi Arabia. We voted to disapprove each and every one of these 22 "emergency" sales, and I have no doubt, we will continue to attempt to correct the President's self-serving myopia on Saudi Arabia and its murderous leadership.

But the Secretary of State's failure to comply with statutory obligations is a serious matter that we cannot allow to get lost in the bipartisan outcry over the Secretary's incredible contentions that these sales respond to an Iranian emergency. At the risk of losing some in the minutia, let me briefly lay out how the Secretary's "emergency" declaration fails to comply with the basic requirements of the emergency provisions in Arms Export Control Act and degrades congressional prerogatives.

The Secretary's failure to comply with the statute materially and adversely impacts the Senate's institutional interests. It undermines the clear and intentional statutory balance between Congress and the executive branch designed to govern individual arms sales, and it impedes the Senate's ability to understand, conduct oversight, and respond to each sale. As laid out below, in this instance, the blanket approach taken with regard to these 22 sales demonstrates precisely why a generalized determination and certification is insufficient to protect the Senate's role in arms sales.

Mr. President, allow me to explain further. The Secretary indicated that he determined that, pursuant to sections 36(b)(1), (c)(2), and (d)(2), an emergency exists that requires the immediate sale of defense articles and services to Saudi Arabia and UAE and thereby purported to waive the congressional review requirements for the 22 certifications. In support of this action, the Secretary submitted only one determination and one memorandum of justification. The emergency authorities cited above and upon which the Secretary relies, however, do not allow

for a blanket determination and justification covering multiple certifications. Rather, these provisions require submission of a separate determination and justification for each individual emergency certification.

This requirement is clear from both the structure and text of sections 36 (b), (c), and (d). For example, subsection (b)(1) mandates that the President submit an individual certification for each letter of offer—“before such letter of offer is issued, the President shall submit . . . a numbered certification with respect to such offer . . . .”. The emergency authority available to the President in (b)(1) is similarly limited and may be exercised only in relation to a specific letter of offer covering a specific sale, with a justification and determination required in each instance such authority is exercised. The relevant statutory references are only in the singular, and not in the plural, leaving no doubt as to what the law requires.

“If the President states in his certification that an emergency exists which requires the proposed sale in the national security interest of the United States, thus waiving the congressional review requirements of this subsection, he shall set forth in the certification a detailed justification for his determination, including a description of the emergency circumstances which necessitate the immediate issuance of the letter of offer and a discussion of the national security interests involved.”

The structure and text of 36(c)(2) and (d)(1) are analogous in requiring a specific determination and justification to accompany each emergency certification.

Mr. President, given the extraordinary nature of the emergency authority and the national security sensitivities involved in arms sales, it is not surprising that Congress did not give the President blanket authority to invoke an emergency and bypass Congress. The requirement for a case-by-case exercise of such authority protects congressional interests by ensuring that the Senate has sufficient information on each sale to understand the sale, conduct oversight, assess whether use of the emergency authority is consistent with the AECA, and determine whether a resolution of disapproval is warranted.

The case-by-case approach set out in the statute was designed to protect against the very situation the Senate faced as a result of the Secretary's blanket use of the emergency authority to cover 22 sales at once. The Secretary was abusing the emergency authority by invoking it to cover sales for which there is no actual emergency need, *e.g.*, the manufacture of F-18 fighter aircraft side panels in Saudi Arabia for export outside the region, when Saudi Arabia doesn't even own the F-18. Further, the senior State Department official responsible for arms sales, Assistant Secretary of State R.

Clarke Cooper, reinforced this concern in a briefings to Senate staff when he cited justifications other than Iran for the 22 sales, including the possible loss of arms sales to China and Russia, the need for “interoperability” of weapons systems, maintaining credibility as a reliable arms supplier, and supporting the global supply chain for weapons sales.

By lumping all 22 certifications together with only one determination and justification, the Secretary sought to mask obvious deficiencies in his position that there is an actual and articulable emergency applicable to each of the 22 sales. This tactic runs directly counter to senators' ability to conduct oversight and the body's ability to consider resolutions of disapproval in an informed manner. Unfortunately, we must conclude that the Secretary intentionally took this approach, given that he and the Department were not forthcoming with the Senate as a general matter in relation to the 22 sales. For example, just 2 days prior to the submission of the certifications, the Secretary briefed all Senators on the enhanced threat from Iran and the steps the United States is taking to counter that threat, yet did not mention the arms sales or pending emergency certifications, which he now justifies as necessary due to the Iran threat. Other Iran briefings by the administration similarly omitted this issue. The view that the omissions were purposeful is bolstered by official confirmation from State that the decision to bypass Congress had been in the works for months.

The Secretary's failure to comply with the statutory requirement for individualized justifications materially and adversely impacted the Senate's institutional interests. It undermined the clear and intentional statutory balance between Congress and the executive branch designed to govern individual arms sales, and it impedes the Senate's ability to understand, conduct oversight, and respond to each sale.

Second, Mr. President, one of the statutory provisions that the Secretary purports to use for these “emergency” sales does not provide the Secretary the very emergency authority he claims. Article 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, which covers the direct commercial sales at issue in 13 of the 22 sales, allows for emergency sales in very limited situations that do not include sales to Saudi Arabia or the UAE.

So let me be clear: To proceed under an emergency basis for 13 of the 22 sales, the Secretary had to ignore the plain language of the Arms Export Control Act and simply assume he had the power to do so. I have asked the State Department on multiple occasions their legal analysis of this provision—any legal analysis at all that would support the Secretary's authority. To date, I have received none, not even verbally. They simply do not want to talk about it. It therefore seems

clear that they know that the Secretary did not have the authority that he claimed to use.

Mr. President, let me explain in further detail. Section 36(c)(2) does not provide statutory authority for emergency certifications to Saudi Arabia and the UAE. As a result, in each instance in which the Secretary relies solely on that subsection as the legal basis for waiving congressional review, the certification in question is invalid.

The Department has notified several of the arms sales at issue pursuant to section 36(c)(2). That subsection clearly allows the President to bypass Congress upon certification of an emergency if the sale is to a NATO or other close ally—NATO + 5: Australia, New Zealand, Israel, Japan, and South Korea, section 36(c)(2)(A)—or in relation to certain launches of commercial communication satellites, section 36(c)(2)(B). That authority does not extend to 36(c)(2)(C), a “catch-all” provision that covers sales to all other countries including Saudi Arabia and UAE. In fact, while the statute explicitly references the NATO + 5 and satellite launch emergency authority, it omits (c)(2)(C), the catchall from the scope of the emergency authority.

“If the President states in his certification that an emergency exists which requires the proposed export in the national security interests of the United States, thus waiving the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of this paragraph, he shall set forth in the certification a detailed justification for his determination, including a description of the emergency circumstances which necessitate the immediate issuance of the export license and a discussion of the national security interests involved.”

Interpretation and application of section 36(c)(2) should hew closely to the plain text of the statute and give effect to the omission of subsection (c)(2)(C). Doing otherwise would entail reading an extraordinary emergency power into the text for subsection (c)(2)(C) where none exists, which would be a departure from traditional canons of statutory construction and would significantly expand the President's authority under the AECA at the expense of Congress. The statute should be interpreted and applied to afford extraordinary emergency powers to the President only where the text clearly provides for such authority, and subsection (c)(2)(C) does not do so.

We note that, prior to a 2000 amendment, section 36(c)(2) previously allowed for emergency certifications in relation to NATO + 5 and the catchall/any other country category. The 2000 amendment added the provision dealing with commercial satellites, new 36(c)(2)(B) and, at the same time, removed the emergency authority from the catchall, (formerly subsection (c)(2)(B) and, post-2000, renumbered as (c)(2)(C).

There is a strong policy rationale for Congress to have acted in this manner.

Section 36(c) governs direct commercial sales, e.g., Raytheon to Saudi Arabia, as opposed to government to government sales under 36(b)(1). In the case of direct commercial sales, the executive branch has less insight and control over the transaction than it would if the U.S. Government were the seller and engaged directly with a foreign government. It follows, then, that Congress would be willing to allow extraordinary emergency authority with regard to NATO and a small set of our closest allies and partners, as well as in certain highly limited situations where there is a direct commercial need—satellite launches. Given that level of control does not exist for direct commercial sales, however, it also follows that Congress had a powerful incentive to narrow the scope of the emergency authority so that it no longer authorized the President to bypass congressional review via a catchall applicable to almost every country in the world.

We have heard through the grapevine that the Secretary's position may be that Congress screwed up in the 2000 amendment and neglected to clarify that the emergency authorities continued to apply to the catch 11 category. This counterargument is problematic for several reasons. It ignores the plain language of the statute; it presumes congressional error where the presumption should be that Congress knew what it was doing and intended the result absent clear evidence of an error; there is no contemporaneous documentation or statements of intent of which we are aware that would corroborate this counterargument; and it serves only the interest of the executive branch at the expense and diminishment of Congress' role in arms sales. Furthermore, the Secretary has never even made this argument to us, indicating that even he does not believe it.

We are in dangerous territory, my friends. The Secretary has moved forward, seeking to eliminate Congress's role in arms sales, based on an extraordinary emergency power that arguably does not exist in statute and for which he and his team have been unable or unwilling to provide a serious legal rationale or any legal justification whatsoever. While his position may pass muster with or even have been blessed by the self-serving opinions we have seen from the current Justice Department, it is nothing more than an executive power grab at the expense of Congress and unmoored from the law. It is our responsibility, through these resolutions, to send the clear message that the United States Senate rejects this lawless approach.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, tonight we will consider overriding Presidential vetoes to S.J. Res. 28 through 48, resolutions regarding arms sales that were the subject of a May 24 emergency declaration from the Secretary of State. I urge my colleagues to sustain these vetoes, and to consider these sales on their own merits.

I noted several key points when addressing these sales last month, and

those points remain valid today. This emergency declaration was legal, and the sales are necessary for the legitimate security interests of our partners. Rejecting these sales at this time will reward recent Iranian aggression and risk Iranian miscalculation, which will lead to disaster if Iran continues down its current path. These sales are unrelated to Jamal Khashoggi, and these resolutions will do nothing to achieve much-needed accountability for his murder or to otherwise change Saudi behavior.

We have discussed at length in recent weeks the history of Presidential emergency authorities and the fact that Presidents of both parties have used such authorities on four previous occasions. I won't repeat that discussion other than to note that this use of the authority is consistent with historical precedent. I will also emphasize that the administration has since returned to standard practice for arms sales, has stated that this declaration was a one-time event, and has committed to respecting the law and the role of Congress in this process. I expect them to honor that commitment.

We have also talked about the reasons our partners need the capabilities in these sales. Our partners have an obligation to protect the lives of their citizens and their own national interests. These sales provide critical capabilities for such protection. Their need for these capabilities has only grown in the last month, as Iran and its proxies have grown even more aggressive.

As it has escalated its use of force, Iran has so far avoided the type of provocation that would demand a U.S. response. Neither the President, nor Congress, nor the American people want war, but Iran's actions and public statements remain separated from reality. Iran appears eager to continue to test American resolve. Iran should not mistake President Trump's reasonable restraint as an indicator of any hesitation on his part to protect U.S. lives and interests. We, as the Senate, should not add to any possible confusion. If we adopt these resolutions, we risk inadvertently encouraging Iranian miscalculation.

I remain highly concerned with the humanitarian crisis in Yemen, the devastating impact of the war on Yemeni civilians, and the terrible human rights record of the Saudi Government. I am encouraged by the recent Emirati decision to end their involvement in the war in Yemen, and I encourage others to see this as an opportunity to pursue a political solution for a peaceful settlement.

I know many of my colleagues see these resolutions and similar legislation as a means to send a message to the Saudi Government. I fear, however, that the message the Saudis receive will not be the one intended. So let me take this opportunity to say to our Saudi partners that they must change their policies on human rights.

I will close by reemphasizing my key points. The emergency declaration was

legal, and the sales are needed for the legitimate defense requirements of our partners. This vote also invites Iranian miscalculation. I urge my colleagues to sustain the President's veto.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I yield the floor.

VOTE ON S.J. RES. 36—VETO

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the joint resolution, S.J. Res. 36, pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

The yeas and nays are required.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) would have voted "Nay".

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), 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 PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 45, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 231 Leg.]

#### YEAS—45

Baldwin	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Jones	Rosen
Booker	Kaine	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Leahy	Shaheen
Cardin	Lee	Sinema
Carper	Manchin	Smith
Casey	Markey	Stabenow
Collins	Menendez	Tester
Coons	Merkley	Udall
Cortez Masto	Moran	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murkowski	Warner
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Hassan	Murray	Wyden
Heinrich	Peters	Young

#### NAYS—40

Alexander	Enzi	Risch
Barrasso	Ernst	Roberts
Blackburn	Fischer	Romney
Blunt	Grassley	Rounds
Boozman	Hawley	Rubio
Braun	Hoeben	Scott (FL)
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Scott (SC)
Capito	Inhofe	Shelby
Cassidy	Johnson	Thune
Cornyn	Kennedy	Tillis
Cotton	Lankford	Toomey
Cramer	McConnell	Wicker
Crapo	McSally	
Daines	Portman	

#### NOT VOTING—15

Bennet	Graham	Perdue
Cruz	Harris	Sanders
Duckworth	Isakson	Sasse
Gardner	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Gillibrand	Paul	Warren



The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 45, the nays are 40.

Two-thirds of the Senators voting or voting present not having voted in the affirmative, the joint resolution on reconsideration fails to pass over the veto of the President of the United States.

The majority leader.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, following the cloture vote on the Liburdi nomination, the Senate vote on the cloture motion on the Welte nomination; I further ask consent that if cloture is invoked, the Senate vote on the confirmations of these nominations in the order listed at 11:30 a.m., on Tuesday, July 30, and that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining votes in this series be 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### VOTE ON VETO OF S.J. RES. 37

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall S.J. Res. 37 pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

The yeas and nays are required.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) would have voted "nay," the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) would have voted "nay," the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) would have voted "yea," the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) would have voted "nay."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), 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 PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 45, nays 39, as follows:

#### [Rollcall Vote No. 232 Leg.]

##### YEAS—45

Baldwin  
Blumenthal  
Booker  
Brown  
Cantwell  
Cardin  
Carper  
Casey  
Collins  
Coons  
Cortez Masto  
Durbin  
Feinstein  
Hassan  
Heinrich

Hirono  
Jones  
Kaine  
King  
Leahy  
Lee  
Manchin  
Markey  
Menendez  
Merkley  
Moran  
Murkowski  
Murphy  
Murray  
Peters

Reed  
Rosen  
Schatz  
Schumer  
Shaheen  
Sinema  
Smith  
Stabenow  
Tester  
Udall  
Van Hollen  
Warner  
Whitehouse  
Wyden  
Young

##### NAYS—39

Alexander  
Barrasso  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Boozman  
Braun  
Burr  
Capito  
Cassidy  
Cornyn  
Cotton  
Cramer  
Daines

Enzi  
Ernst  
Fischer  
Grassley  
Hawley  
Hoeven  
Hyde-Smith  
Inhofe  
Johnson  
Kennedy  
Lankford  
McConnell  
McSally

Portman  
Risch  
Roberts  
Romney  
Rounds  
Rubio  
Scott (FL)  
Scott (SC)  
Shelby  
Thune  
Tillis  
Toomey  
Wicker

##### NOT VOTING—16

Bennet  
Crapo  
Cruz  
Duckworth  
Gardner  
Gillibrand

Graham  
Harris  
Isakson  
Klobuchar  
Paul  
Perdue  
Sanders  
Sasse  
Sullivan  
Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 45, the nays are 39.

Two-thirds of the Senators voting, a quorum being present, not having voted in the affirmative, the bill on reconsideration fails to pass over the veto of the President of the United States.

#### VOTE ON S.J. RES. 38—VETO

The question is, Shall S.J. Res. 38 pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

The yeas and nays are required.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), 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 PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRAUN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 46, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 233 Leg.]

##### YEAS—46

Baldwin  
Blumenthal  
Booker  
Brown  
Cantwell  
Cardin  
Carper  
Casey  
Collins  
Coons  
Cortez Masto  
Durbin  
Feinstein  
Graham  
Hassan  
Heinrich

Hirono  
Jones  
Kaine  
King  
Leahy  
Lee  
Manchin  
Markey  
Menendez  
Merkley  
Moran  
Murkowski  
Murphy  
Murray  
Peters  
Reed

Rosen  
Schatz  
Schumer  
Shaheen  
Sinema  
Smith  
Stabenow  
Tester  
Udall  
Van Hollen  
Warner  
Whitehouse  
Wyden  
Young

##### NAYS—41

Alexander  
Barrasso  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Boozman  
Braun  
Burr  
Capito  
Cornyn  
Cotton  
Cramer  
Cruz  
Daines  
Enzi

Ernst  
Fischer  
Gardner  
Grassley  
Hawley  
Hoeven  
Hyde-Smith  
Inhofe  
Johnson  
Kennedy  
Lankford  
McConnell  
McSally  
Portman  
Risch  
Roberts  
Romney  
Rounds  
Rubio  
Sasse  
Scott (FL)  
Scott (SC)  
Shelby  
Thune  
Tillis  
Toomey  
Wicker

##### NOT VOTING—13

Bennet  
Cassidy  
Crapo  
Duckworth  
Gillibrand

Harris  
Isakson  
Klobuchar  
Paul  
Perdue  
Sanders  
Sullivan  
Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 46, the nays are 41.

Two-thirds of the Senators voting not having voted in the affirmative, the bill on reconsideration fails to pass over the veto of the President of the United States.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Michael T. Liburdi, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona.

James Inhofe, John Hoeven, Mike Rounds, Joni Ernst, Kevin Cramer, Ben Sasse, Pat Roberts, John Boozman, Mike Crapo, Steve Daines, John Cornyn, James E. Risch, Roger F. Wicker, Richard Burr, Thom Tillis, Roy Blunt, Mitch McConnell.

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 Michael T. Liburdi, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator



from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SUL-LIVAN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), 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 PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 234 Ex.]

YEAS—51

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

NAYS—37

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

NOT VOTING—12

Bennet	Harris	Perdue
Cassidy	Isakson	Sanders
Duckworth	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Gillibrand	Paul	Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 37.

The motion is agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Peter D. Welte, of North Dakota, to be United States District Judge for the District of North Dakota.

Mitch McConnell, Kevin Cramer, Mike Crapo, John Kennedy, Thom Tillis, Richard Shelby, James Inhofe, Rob Portman, Johnny Isakson, John Thune,

John Boozman, Marco Rubio, Cory Gardner, Steve Daines, Pat Roberts, Lindsey Graham, John Hoeven.

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 Peter D. Welte, of North Dakota, to be United States District Judge for the District of North Dakota, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SUL-LIVAN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), 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 PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 66, nays 21, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 235 Ex.]

YEAS—66

Alexander	Fischer	Murphy
Barrasso	Gardner	Peters
Blackburn	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hassan	Roberts
Braun	Hawley	Romney
Burr	Hoeven	Rosen
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Carper	Inhofe	Rubio
Collins	Johnson	Sasse
Coons	Jones	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kaine	Scott (SC)
Cortez Masto	Kennedy	Shaheen
Cotton	King	Shelby
Cramer	Lankford	Sinema
Crapo	Leahy	Tester
Cruz	Lee	Thune
Daines	Manchin	Tillis
Durbin	McConnell	Toomey
Enzi	McSally	Warner
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Feinstein	Murkowski	Young

NAYS—21

Baldwin	Hirono	Schumer
Blumenthal	Markey	Smith
Brown	Menendez	Stabenow
Cantwell	Merkley	Udall
Cardin	Murray	Van Hollen
Casey	Reed	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Schatz	Wyden

NOT VOTING—13

Bennet	Harris	Sanders
Booker	Isakson	Sullivan
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Warren
Duckworth	Paul	
Gillibrand	Perdue	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 66, the nays are 21.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Peter D. Welte, of North Dakota, to be United States District Judge for the District of North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The Senator from Indiana.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate Chairman BARRASSO and Ranking Member CARPER on their introduction of the EPW Committee's 5-year infrastructure bill, the America's highway infrastructure act.

Back in Indiana, as a member of the State Legislature, in 2017 we did what some States are doing and many haven't yet. We actually did a long-term road funding and bridge infrastructure bill. As a Main Street entrepreneur there in just my third year in the State Legislature, we accomplished things that nobody said could get done, because we made the case that for the crossroads of America, we needed to make sure our roads and bridges were going to be there in safe shape for future generations.

No matter where I go, I hear almost everyone unanimously wanting better roads and bridges. Ironically, even in a State like the Hoosier State, 70 percent of constituents wanted better roads but didn't want their taxes to go up. We had to make the case—and it wasn't hard for me to do as a fiscal conservative—that if you are in a State like Indiana and your comparative advantage is the crossroads of America, why wouldn't you want a tangible asset to be in good shape that everyone can enjoy?

We also did it from a position of strength. We run a balanced budget, generally with a surplus every year, and we passed a balance budget amendment. So it was not difficult to talk about investing in the future when you were doing it from a position of strength. In fact, this last year, we had almost a \$400 million surplus and a cash balance of over \$2 billion. Wouldn't it be nice if this place worked like that?

The bill introduced provides \$287 billion to fix the Nation's aging roads and bridges—more than any bill in history. It includes new safety programs to incentivize States to lower fatalities of drivers and pedestrians. It codifies key elements of President Trump's "One Federal Decision" to cut redtape and to reduce the time that road projects spend in the permitting line. It instructs Federal highways to address resiliency, making sure that when a road is damaged by a natural disaster, we rebuild it with modern technology that will prevent similar damage in the future.

Most importantly, it contains incentives to urge States to put more skin in the game, just like we did in Indiana, taking ownership of their own infrastructure and making sure that in

States where balance sheets are clean and economies are healthy, they don't look to the Federal Government to lead on it and they lead themselves.

This bill contains a proposal I introduced last week called the Crossroads of America Act, to provide \$150 million that will be competitively awarded to States that will bid for the highest State match for Federal dollars. This concept worked for us in Indiana. We called it the Community Crossings Program, and within 1 or 2 years, even after there was much complaining by cities and counties, it is oversubscribed. Instead of sitting on the sidelines, Indiana communities started to bid up their matches and asking for less State money through the program. Wouldn't it be nice if we had something like that here to stretch the Federal dollar?

It means that the State could approve a greater number of projects, which we have done now into the third year. More projects are being built. More concrete is being poured. More steel is being framed. And more Hoosiers are on the job. This is why this program is so important.

Combined, the America's highway infrastructure act will allow more projects to break ground, like our I-69 bridge over the Ohio River, linking northern Kentucky to southern Indiana. The EPW bill will speed up the permitting process and provide funding opportunities to a project that has been in the works for more than 15 years.

Over the next several weeks, we will continue our robust committee work, starting with a markup of the chairman's bill tomorrow in EPW. In committee, I will stress the importance of fully paying for this 5-year bill—again, unlike we do most things here—and putting the highway trust fund on a pathway to long-term solvency.

We are also going to be considering a budget bill, and for all the reasons that we know, the Federal Government should be there for its own citizens, its stakeholders, including infrastructure. We need to make sure, regardless of what happens to this budget bill, that in the long run we start balancing our own budget and that we quit borrowing from future generations and kicking this stuff down the road. Hopefully, this infrastructure bill will be the beginning of it.

Over 37 years of building a business in my hometown, one principle I have always lived by is this: When times are good, you create a rainy day fund, you pay back what you might have borrowed, and you sacrifice in the short run for long-term prosperity. Until we get back into that mentality here—whether its infrastructure, shoring up entitlements, or whatever people depend on the Federal Government to do—we are not going to be there for our own citizens.

Today, that changes with the introduction of America's highway infrastructure act. We are beginning to put

our Nation's highway system on a path of long-term solvency. The alternative, I am afraid, is another unfunded short-term reauthorization of the highway trust fund. Such a path would be irresponsible, especially after the highway bill comes out of committee this week.

We must continue investing in our Nation's infrastructure. We must incentivize States to get more involved, and we must fully offset our spending and put the highway trust fund on a responsible path to long-term solvency. That is one of the critical obligations facing this Congress.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate majority leader.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

### MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

### NOMINATION OF JOSEPH V. CUFFARI

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, viewing the awful conditions at DHS detention facilities in Texas crystalized my belief that continued tough, independent oversight and accountability from Congress and Homeland Security inspector general is imperative to change the deplorable treatment of migrants. That is why I pushed Mr. Cuffari to make two critical commitments.

First, the Inspector General's Office must continue frequent and unannounced inspections of CBP and ICE immigration detention facilities, and second, he must strongly rebuff any attempts by the Acting DHS Secretary, Director of Citizenship and Immigration Services, Acting Commissioner of CBP, or the White House to limit the inspector general's independence or ability to follow the facts of investigations wherever they lead.

The horrid treatment of children and families is the direct result of President Trump's policies, and we Democrats are committed to holding the Trump administration accountable. If confirmed, I fully expect Mr. Cuffari to live up to the personal commitments he made to me.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, in accordance with rule 23 of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee on Rules and Administration and pursuant to the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 Reform Act, on July 25, 2019, the committee adopted the U.S. Senate Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 Reform Act Regulations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this material be printed in the RECORD.

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

### U.S. SENATE CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1995 REFORM ACT REGULATIONS ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION ON JULY 25, 2019

#### 1.0 Reporting by the Office.

1.1 Annual Report Required. The Office shall prepare and submit to Congress, and publish on the public website of the Office, an annual report regarding covered payments.

1.2 Contents of Report. With regard to any employing office for which a covered payment was made in the reporting period, the report shall include—

1.2.1 except as otherwise provided in section 1.3, the amount of any covered payment made in the previous calendar year;

1.2.2 except as otherwise provided in section 1.3, the reimbursable portion of any covered payment made in the previous calendar year, if any;

1.2.3 information on the employing office;

1.2.4 each provision of part A of title II of the Congressional Accountability Act that was the subject of a claim resulting in any covered payment; and

1.2.5 in the case of a reimbursable portion of any covered payment, an acknowledgment of whether the Senator or former Senator has made no reimbursement, partial reimbursement or complete reimbursement in compliance with the requirement of section 415(d) of the Act to reimburse the account.

1.3 Reporting Periods and Dates. The reporting under this section—

1.3.1 for 2019, shall be submitted by the 270th day after the date of enactment of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 Reform Act and shall include any covered payments made in calendar year 2019 as of date of the report;

1.3.2 for 2020, shall be submitted by January 31, 2020, and shall reflect covered payments made in calendar year 2019 and not previously reported; and

1.3.3 for each subsequent year, shall be submitted by January 31 of that year and shall reflect covered payments made in the previous calendar year.

2.0 Reimbursement by Senators of Amounts Paid as Settlements and Awards.

2.1 Initial Notice. Within 5 business days of a covered payment that includes a reimbursable portion of any covered payment, the Office shall provide written notice to the Committee on Rules and Administration and the Senator or former Senator who has an obligation under section 415(d) of the Act to reimburse the account for the reimbursable portion of any covered payment of the date the covered payment was made and the amount of the reimbursable portion of any covered payment.

2.2 Agreement to Reimburse.

2.2.1 Within 30 days of a covered payment, the Senator shall submit a written agreement to the Office specifying the manner in which the Senator will reimburse the account for the reimbursable portion of any covered payment.

2.2.2 The agreement to reimburse shall designate—

2.2.2.A amounts payable through payments directly from the Senator, withholding from the Senator's compensation and transfers from the Senator's Thrift Savings Fund; and

2.2.2.B the timing of those payments, consistent with the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 and subsection 2.2.3 of these regulations.

2.2.3 All payments under the agreement to reimburse must be made within 270 days of the covered payment.

2.3 Notice of Agreement. Within 2 business days of submission of the agreement to reimburse, the Office shall provide a copy of the

agreement to reimburse to the Committee on Rules and Administration and, if the agreement specifies withholding, the Senate Disbursing Office.

2.4 Failure to Enter into Agreement to Reimburse.

2.4.1 Should a Senator fail to enter into an agreement to reimburse within 30 days of the covered payment, the Office shall notify the Committee on Rules and Administration and the Senate Disbursing Office within 2 business days.

2.4.2 After receiving notice pursuant to subsection 2.4.1, the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Senate Disbursing Office and the Office shall determine a reimbursement schedule for the Senator within 60 days of the covered payment.

2.4.3 The Office shall provide a copy of the reimbursement schedule to the Senator within 2 business days.

2.5 Changes to Reimbursement Agreement. Nothing in these regulations shall prohibit a Senator from making additional reimbursement payments. If the Office receives additional reimbursement payments from a Senator, the Office shall adjust the agreement to reimburse and provide notice pursuant to section 2.3.

2.6 Garnishment or Other Collection of Wages. Pursuant to section 415(d)(4) of the Act, at the expiration of the 270-day period which begins on the date of the covered payment, the Office shall transfer any remaining reimbursable amounts to the Secretary of the Treasury for garnishment or other collection of wages as permitted by the Act.

2.7 Final Disposition of Reimbursement. The Office shall provide the Committee on Rules and Administration with a copy of the certification that reimbursement is complete pursuant to the Act, or a copy of the transfer to the Secretary of Treasury under section 2.6.

3.0 Definitions.

For the purposes of these Regulations, the following terms shall have the meaning specified—

3.1 Account. The term “account” refers to the account described in section 415(a) of the Act.

3.2 Act. The term “Act” refers to the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995.

3.3 Covered Payment. The term “covered payment” refers to a payment from the account that was the result of claims alleging a violation of part A of title II of the Act.

3.4 Employing Office. The term “employing office” refers to any Senate office described in subparagraphs (A) through (C) of section 101(a)(9) of the Act.

3.5 Information on the Employing Office. The term “information on the employing office” refers to, in the case of an award or in the case of a settlement where reimbursement is required under section 416(d)(3)(C) of the Act, the name of the employing office. In the case of a settlement where reimbursement is not required under section 416(d)(3)(C) of the Act, “information on the employing office” refers to the employing office as described in subparagraphs (A) through (C) of section 101(a)(9) of the Act.

3.6 Office. The term “Office” refers to the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights.

3.7 Reimbursable Portion of any Covered Payment. The term “reimbursable portion of any covered payment” refers to the portion of a covered payment for which a Senator is required to reimburse the account pursuant to section 415(d)(1) of the Act.

#### TRIBUTE TO DICK HISER

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, today I am pleased to recognize Dick Hiser, who is being inducted into the Wyoming Agri-

culture Hall of Fame. Every year since 1992, Wyoming has recognized individuals who have made substantial contributions to agriculture in our great state. With nearly 60 years of involvement in the agriculture community in Wyoming and beyond, Mr. Hiser is well deserving of this honor.

A native of Saratoga, WY, Mr. Hiser spent the early portion of his career working for the University of Wyoming as an extension agent in Carbon County. During his time in this position, Mr. Hiser led the Wyoming 4-H program in Carbon County to much success. He was critical in helping Carbon County students succeed, encouraging their efforts in everything from judging livestock to earning valuable academic scholarships. He is remembered by many in Wyoming that participated in the 4-H program for always being willing to share his knowledge and experience with the younger generation so they could be successful on their own journeys in the agriculture industry and beyond.

Fortunately for Wyoming, Mr. Hiser's contributions include not only his unwavering commitment to youth programs, but Wyoming's ranching community as well. Many know him for his stalwart commitment to sustainable and high-quality cattle and remaining true to his three goals: ensuring cattle were functional in their environment, structurally sound to compete in the marketplace, and would grade well once prepared for final sale.

This commitment to Wyoming's agriculture community was reflected in Mr. Hiser's many successes in national cattle shows like the National Western Stock Show and the Arizona National Livestock Show. He has also been recognized as an outstanding alumni of the University of Wyoming College of Agriculture and is honored in the Carbon County 4-H Hall Of Fame. Mr. Hiser has dedicated much of his time to agriculture interest groups across the State, including the Wyoming Livestock Board, Wyoming Beef Council, Wyoming Stock Growers Association, and Wyoming State Board of Veterinary Medicine.

In addition to his tremendous contributions to the agriculture, education, and 4-H communities in Wyoming, Mr. Hiser showed what it means to be a truly upstanding member of the community while serving as a Carbon County commissioner.

Mr. Hiser's values, dedication, and work ethic exemplify the Wyoming way of life. I want to extend my congratulations to Mr. Hiser and thank him for his service and years of hard work. Mr. Hiser truly lives the Code of the West, and I am proud to have the opportunity to recognize his achievements as an inductee into the Wyoming Agriculture Hall of Fame. Wyoming is well served by his lasting and continuing contributions to our great State.

#### TRIBUTE TO JIM WILSON

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, each year, I come to the floor to recognize someone from Wyoming whose commitment and service have made a real and lasting difference to the State's agricultural community. This year, I would like to tell you about Jim Wilson.

Many people know Jim as a rancher. Together with his wife Terry and his daughter Billie Jo and her family, Jim raises high-quality Wyoming beef in Hot Springs County. If you ask Jim, however, he will tell you he works to grow better grass to grow better beef. Like his mother and father, Willard and Maycle, before him, Jim and his wife have built a thriving operation that sets the bar high for other Wyoming producers.

Most people know that Jim wears many other hats too. After developing a strong herd of Saler-cross beef cattle, Jim went on to lead the national breed association. He served for a decade on the Hot Springs County Hospital Board, was part of the Wyoming Livestock board at a pivotal time for the State, and has spent countless hours leading meetings for local agricultural and conservation district groups. His work has not gone unnoticed. The list of awards recognizing the Wilson family and their incredible stewardship of Wyoming's precious natural resources is long, and the awards are widely varied. Jim has spent his life improving water, soil, forage, and genetics for the future.

Not all of the accolades, however, belong solely to Jim. For many years, Jim has supported and mentored young people across the State to learn, live, and grow in their agricultural pursuits. He has inspired many and has watched them achieve great success. Like his father, Willard, Jim volunteers to judge at county fairs and encourages young producers to be engaged in State associations. Put simply, Jim is a mentor who leads by example.

When he served as president of the Wyoming Stock Growers Association, Jim kept his sights set firmly on the future. As the association approached its 150-year anniversary, Jim knew the association would soon be in the hands of the next generation of producers. He worked to draw younger producers in to build an association that combines experience and innovation to make the association stronger. When Jim's presidency concluded, he became chairman of the 150th anniversary campaign that sought to raise \$1.5 million before 2022. We all know that, when Jim Wilson sets his sights on something, he cultivates and leads an unstoppable team to get the job done.

Working in agriculture is not simply a job. It is a vocation, a way of life, a calling for which Jim, his wife Terry, their daughter and her family are incredibly effective ambassadors. They share their struggles and their victories, they look for creative solutions,

and they inspire others to act purposefully. They know there is a better future ahead, as long as good people are willing to put in the work to make it happen. There is no question Jim has put in the work.

In a few short days, Jim Wilson will be honored as one of the 2019 inductees to the Wyoming Agriculture Hall of Fame. He joins the elite ranks of other incredible individuals who have forever changed the future of this way of life in the great State of Wyoming. Thea Nuckolls said it best when she said her late husband JW "saw Jim as a model of integrity, having a spirit of generosity, the heart of humility, and a devoted family man."

It is with great appreciation and honor that I rise today to recognize the incredible contributions of Jim Wilson. My wife Bobbi joins me in congratulating Jim and his family on this well-deserved honor.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### SESQUICENTENNIAL OF MCKENZIE, TENNESSEE

• Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I rise today to acknowledge and honor the city of McKenzie, Tennessee's sesquicentennial anniversary.

McKenzie has come a long way since her first settlers followed the Natchez Trace to the tall grasses and fertile soil of western Tennessee's "Barren Lands." What started as a cluster of fiercely competitive trading posts flourished into a bustling center of commerce with the arrival of the area's first railroads. The city withstood family rivalry, natural disasters, and the ravages of the Civil War, until it was finally incorporated by the State of Tennessee on January 22, 1869.

Today, the roads are paved, and cattle no longer roam the city square, but McKenzie's residents still live and work with the same inimitable volunteer spirit as those who fought for their homes and livelihoods through two great fires, a yellow fever epidemic, and the Great Depression.

Congratulations to the Honorable Jill Holland, Mayor of McKenzie, the members of the McKenzie City Council, and most importantly, the people of McKenzie. I ask my colleagues to join with me in wishing them 150 more years of progress and prosperity.●

##### RECOGNIZING THE URBAN AFFAIRS COALITION

• Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I wish to celebrate the Urban Affairs Coalition in recognition of their 50th anniversary. Founded in 1969 as the Philadelphia Urban Coalition, the Urban Affairs Coalition works tirelessly to tackle a number of diverse issues that immediately affect communities throughout the Greater Philadelphia Region.

A robust group of organizations, the Philadelphia Urban Coalition was

founded after the assassination of Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., with the goal of solving their communities' social and economic problems. In 1991, the group merged with the Urban Affairs Partnership to create the Greater Philadelphia Urban Affairs Coalition and in 2010 shortened the name to the Urban Affairs Coalition. They have managed over \$1 billion of social investment since their founding.

Today, the Urban Affairs Coalition consists of over 75 organizations working to achieve unity among government, business, neighborhood, and individual initiatives to improve the quality of life in the region, build wealth in urban communities, and solve emerging issues. The coalition works towards this mission in three different ways: backing nonprofits through fiscal sponsorship, capacity building, and professional development; working to improve life chances for the youth and young adults; and providing economic opportunity to low-income households, working families, and disadvantaged businesses.

Through their extensive work, the Urban Affairs Coalition helps children and young adults climb the economic ladder, educates the community on job opportunities and financial advice, and provides access to capital for minority entrepreneurs. The coalition is committed to supporting nonprofits by helping them run backroom operations, allowing nonprofits to focus on public service.

In addition to helping their community, the Urban Affairs Coalition recognizes local leaders at their annual banquet. They present the Doer Award, the Living Legacy Award, and the Community Leadership Award to those who make efforts to improve and support their communities. The Urban Affairs Coalition consistently looks to form new partnerships and is working to raise \$1 million in the 2020 fiscal year to create a UAC Legacy Fund, which will further support educational and charitable activities.

Additionally, I wish to commend Ms. Sharmain Matlock-Turner, the president and chief executive officer of the Urban Affairs Coalition. This year marks Ms. Matlock-Turner's 20th anniversary in her role. She also serves as the cofounder and chair of the West Oak Lane Charter School, a school in Northwest Philadelphia where 92 percent of students are eligible for free or reduced-price lunches. West Oak Lane prides itself on strong ties with higher education organizations. These relationships begin by focusing on educating the next generation of innovators. Ms. Matlock-Turner was one of three Philadelphia leaders to win a scholarship to Harvard Business School's Nonprofit Leaders' Summer Program in 2005, and she has since won awards from CASA Philadelphia, the American Red Cross, and many other organizations.

The work of the Urban Affairs Coalition and Ms. Matlock-Turner have been

crucial to providing countless children and young adults a fighting chance at a brighter future. Community improvement is their continuing mission, and I thank them for their hard work on behalf of Pennsylvanians. I wish them the best of luck on their future efforts.●

#### TRIBUTE TO THOMAS PENLEY

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the honor of congratulating Thomas Penley of Helena, MT, for his hard work representing Montana at the 2019 meeting of Boys Nation.

The process to be a delegate at Boys Nation is highly competitive, with only a few students per high school allowed to receive a nomination. Mr. Penley successfully earned a nomination to attend the Montana Boys State meeting at Carrol College in Helena. At this meeting, Mr. Penley was one of the two attendees selected by the conference to represent Montana at the national meeting.

Mr. Penley's achievements do not stop at his nomination to be part of the Montana delegation at the Boys Nation meeting. At the assembly, Mr. Penley was elected by his peers to serve as vice president of the session. This tremendous honor speaks volumes to Mr. Penley's work ethic and leadership. In the 73 years of Boys Nation, only one other time has a Montanan been elected vice president.

I am proud to recognize Mr. Penley for his continued success and wish him the best. I look forward to following all the future accomplishments Mr. Penley will achieve.●

#### TRIBUTE TO JIM TUFTS

• Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, today I would like to congratulate Mr. Jim Tufts of Exeter, NH, on his retirement, after his long, productive, and impactful career of making a difference for young people and their families throughout our region and country.

After graduating from the University of New Hampshire, Jim spent 2 years as an assistant coach at Winnacunnet High School in Hampton, NH. In 1977, he joined Exeter High School as the physical education teacher and varsity head coach of both the boys soccer and hockey teams.

Jim has coached over 1,650 games, and his teams have accumulated almost 1,000 career wins and won a combined eight New Hampshire Interscholastic Athletic Association, NHIAA championships. He has also served as chairman of the Physical Education Department at Phillips Exeter Academy for the summer school program. In 1988 he became the coach and local program coordinator of the Exeter Area Athletes and runs the Learn to Play Hockey Program to introduce hundreds of young people to ice hockey.

For 50 years, Jim has volunteered with the New Hampshire Special Olympics, which was first organized in the State in 1970 by his mother, Jean Tufts. He has served as the director of the Exeter Special Olympics Program for 32 years, and in 2003 he was named Special Olympics Coach of the Year by the National High School Athletic Coaches Association. Jim has organized students from Exeter High School and surrounding high schools to get involved as peer coaches for the athletes, making the Exeter Special Olympics an incredible community event.

It is Jim's devotion to Special Olympics athletes—and the example he has set for the athletes he coaches in all of his different roles—that has made a unique and life changing difference for thousands of young people and their families.

Jim, accompanied and guided by his wife, Leslie, and sons, Matt and Kyle, has been a tremendous asset to Exeter High School and to the entire Seacoast region. He has given back to his community in countless ways with humility and an exceptionally positive attitude. Jim has taught all of us that talent and compassion, strength and kindness, go hand in hand. His town, State, and country are better because of his example.

Mr. President, I hope you will join me in honoring a dedicated Granite Stater, Jim Tufts. ●

#### MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

##### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2019, the Secretary of the Senate, on July 26, 2019, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker had signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 504. 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.

##### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2019, the Secretary of the Senate, on July 26, 2019, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker had signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 1569. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to add Flagstaff and Yuma to the list of locations in which court shall be held in the judicial district for the State of Arizona.

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

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:02 p.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:

S. 2249. An act 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.

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

H.R. 549. An act to designate Venezuela under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit nationals of Venezuela to be eligible for temporary protected status under such section, and for other purposes.

H.R. 693. An act to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2336. An act to amend title 11, United States Code, with respect to the definition of "family farmer".

H.R. 3670. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to ensure access to appropriate temporary shelter, food, and water for individuals apprehended by U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3877. An act to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, to establish a congressional budget for fiscal years 2020 and 2021, to temporarily suspend the debt limit, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall for an event to commemorate the 400th anniversary of the arrival of the first African slaves to the territory that would become the United States.

##### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY) announced that on today, July 29, 2019, he had signed the following enrolled bills, which were previously signed by the Speaker of the House:

S. 504. 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.

H.R. 1569. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to add Flagstaff and Yuma to the list of locations in which court shall be held in the judicial district for the State of Arizona.

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

#### MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 549. An act to designate Venezuela under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit nationals of Venezuela to be eligible for temporary protected status under such section, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 693. An act to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 3670. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to ensure access to appropriate temporary shelter, food, and water for individuals apprehended by U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

#### MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and ordered placed on the calendar:

H.R. 3877. An act to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, to establish a congressional budget for fiscal years 2020 and 2021, to temporarily suspend the debt limit, and for other purposes.

#### ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 29, 2019, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 504. 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.

#### 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-2128. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Notification of Decision to Authorize the Importation of Fresh Raspberry Fruit From Morocco Into the Continental United States" ((7 CFR Part 319) (Docket No. APHIS-2015-0053)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 25, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2129. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Paper and Paper-Based Packaging Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Change in Membership and Nominations" ((7 CFR Part 1222) (Docket No. AMS-SC-18-0072)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 25, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2130. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removal of U.S. Grade Standards" ((7 CFR Part 51) (Docket No. AMS-SC-18-0081)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 25, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2131. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Olives Grown in California; Increased Assessment Rate" ((7 CFR Part 932) (Docket No. AMS-SC-18-0105)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 25, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2132. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semi-annual Implementation Report on Energy Conservation Standards Activities of the Department of Energy; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2133. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Water and Science, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Reclamation: Managing Water in the West: Annual Operating Plan for Colorado River Reservoirs 2019"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2134. A communication from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "DERA Fourth Report to Congress: Highlights of the Diesel Emissions Reduction Program"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2135. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Evaluation of PWROG-15060-P, 'Pump Suction Gas Accumulation Operability Criteria Guidance'" received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2136. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Safety Evaluation by the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation 'Materials Reliability Program: Pressurized Water Reactor Internals Inspection and Evaluation Guideline (MRP-227 Revision 1)'" received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2137. A communication from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits" (29 CFR Part 4022) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 25, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2138. A joint communication from the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to Thefts, Losses, or Releases of Select Agents and Toxins for Calendar Year 2018; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2139. A communication from the Division Chief of Regulatory Development, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Lifetime Disqualification for Human Trafficking" (RIN2126-AC20) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 25, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2140. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communica-

tions Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Children's Television Programming Rules" (MB Docket Nos. 18-202 and 17-105) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-122. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Missouri calling on the President of the United States to undertake a full and transparent investigation by the United States Department of State into organ transplant practices in the People's Republic of China, and to call for the prosecution of those found to have engaged in such unethical practices; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 6

Whereas, extensive and credible reports have revealed mass killing of prisoners of conscience in the People's Republic of China, primarily practitioners of the spiritual based exercises of Falun Gong, but also other religious and ethnic minority groups, in order to obtain organs for transplants; and

Whereas, the organ transplantation system in China does not comply with the World Health Organization's Guiding Principles of traceability and transparency in organ procurement pathways, and the government of the People's Republic of China has resisted independent scrutiny of the system; and

Whereas, traditional Chinese custom requires bodies to be preserved intact after death. With rare voluntary organ donation, however, China's transplantation industry significantly increased since 2000; and

Whereas, the 2017 Freedom House Report "The Battle for China's Spirit" states that "Available evidence suggests that forced extraction of organs from Falun Gong detainees for sale in transplant operations has occurred on a large scale and may be continuing"; and

Whereas, an investigative report, published in June 2016, conducted by human rights attorney David Matas, former Canadian Secretary of State for Asia-Pacific David Kilgour, and journalist Ethan Gutmann, estimated that China is performing 60,000 to 100,000 transplants per year as opposed to 10,000 transplants claimed by the Chinese government, which is "an industrial-scale, state-directed organ transplantation system, controlled through national policies and funding, and implicating both the military and civilian healthcare systems"; and

Whereas, China's Liver Transplant Registry System indicated that more than 25% of cases were emergency transplants, for which an organ was found within days or even hours. Wait times for non-emergency liver transplants were usually quoted in weeks. Most patients in other countries have to wait years for a transplant; and

Whereas, the Chinese government claims that 90% of China's organ transplant sources come from executed prisoners. However, the number of executions has dropped 10% annually since 2002 and is far less than the number of transplants taking place. The government has never acknowledged the sourcing of organs from prisoners of conscience; and

Whereas, Falun Gong, a spiritual practice involving meditative "qigong" exercises and centered on the values of truthfulness, compassion, and forbearance, became immensely popular in China in the 1990s, with multiple estimates placing the number of practitioners at upwards of 70 million; and

Whereas, in July 1999, the Chinese Communist Party launched an intensive, nationwide persecution designed to eradicate the spiritual practice of Falun Gong, including physical and mental torture, reflecting the party's long-standing intolerance of large independent civil society groups; and

Whereas, since 1999, hundreds of thousands of Falun Gong practitioners have been detained extra-legally in Chinese reeducation-through-labor camps, detention centers, and prisons, where torture, abuse, and implausible medical exams and blood tests on Falun Gong practitioners are routine; and

Whereas, Freedom House reported in 2015 that Falun Gong practitioners comprise the largest portion of prisoners of conscience in China, and face an elevated risk of dying or being killed in custody; and

Whereas, the United Nations Committee Against Torture and the Special Rapporteur on Torture have expressed concern over the allegations of organ harvesting from Falun Gong prisoners, and have called on the Government of the People's Republic of China to increase accountability and transparency in the organ transplant system and punish those responsible for abuses; and

Whereas, in June 2016, the U.S. House of Representatives unanimously passed House Resolution 343, condemning the systematic, state-sanctioned organ harvesting from Falun Gong and other prisoners of conscience; and

Whereas, the killing of religious or political prisoners for the purpose of selling their organs for transplant is an egregious and intolerable violation of the fundamental right to life; and

Whereas, organ tourism to China should not be shielded by medical confidentiality, but openly monitored. No nation should allow their citizens to go to China for organs until China has allowed a full investigation into organ harvesting of prisoners of conscience, both past and present: Now therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the members of the Missouri Senate, One-Hundredth General Assembly, first Regular Session, the House of Representatives concurring therein:

(1) Call upon the Government of the People's Republic of China to immediately end the practice of organ harvesting from all prisoners and prisoners of conscience, and explicitly from Falun Gong prisoners of conscience and members of other religious and ethnic minority groups;

(2) Call upon the Government of the People's Republic of China to immediately end the 17-year persecution of the Falun Gong, and the immediate release of all Falun Gong practitioners and other prisoners of conscience;

(3) Call upon the President of the United States to undertake a full and transparent investigation by the United States Department of State into organ transplant practices in the People's Republic of China, and calls for the prosecution of those found to have engaged in such unethical practices;

(4) Encourage the medical community of Missouri to engage in educating colleagues and residents of Missouri about the risks of travel to China for organ transplants so as to help prevent Missouri residents from unwittingly becoming involved in murder in the form of forced organ harvesting from prisoners of conscience; and

(5) Agree to take measures to ban the entry of those who have participated in illegal removal of human tissues and organs, and seek prosecution of such individuals should they be found on the soil of Missouri; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Missouri Senate be instructed to prepare properly inscribed copies of this resolution for



the President and Vice President of the United States, the President and Secretary of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the chair of the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, the chair of the House Committee on Foreign Relations, and each member of Missouri's Congressional delegation.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HOEVEN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 1388. A bill to take lands in Sonoma County, California, into trust as part of the reservation of the Lytton Rancheria of California, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-67).

### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BARRASSO:

S. 2302. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. JONES, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 2303. A bill to allow United States citizens and legal residents to travel between the United States and Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 2304. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to enhance efforts to address antibiotic resistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 2305. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide a consistent standard of health care to the incarcerated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 2306. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to allow for the registration of venture exchanges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 2307. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to make grants to support the study of world languages in elementary schools and secondary schools; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. LANFORD, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr.

BLUNT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. INHOFE, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 2308. A bill to intensify stem cell research showing evidence of substantial clinical benefit to patients, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 2309. A bill to require the Secretary of State to submit a report on potential benefits and impact to the United States of establishing a joint United States-Israel cybersecurity center of excellence; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 2310. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to establish a competitive grant program to repair, improve, rehabilitate, or replace bridges to improve the safety, efficiency, and reliability of the movement of people and freight over bridge crossings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Ms. MCSALLY):

S. 2311. A bill to expand eligibility for the My Career Advancement Account program of the Department of Defense to certain military spouses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

### SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

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

S. Res. 287. A resolution establishing appropriate thresholds for certain budget points of order in the Senate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. BRAUN:

S. Res. 288. A resolution affirming the importance of the long-term solvency of the Highway Trust Fund; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. Res. 289. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that socialism poses a significant threat to freedom, liberty, and economic prosperity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. Res. 290. A resolution celebrating 50 years of environmental progress in the Cuyahoga River Valley and Lake Erie; considered and agreed to.

### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 117

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 117, a bill to prohibit discrimination against individuals with disabilities who need long-term services and supports, and for other purposes.

S. 133

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were

added as cosponsors of S. 133, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States merchant mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II.

S. 153

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 153, a bill to promote veteran involvement in STEM education, computer science, and scientific research, and for other purposes.

S. 178

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 178, a bill to condemn gross human rights violations of ethnic Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang, and calling for an end to arbitrary detention, torture, and harassment of these communities inside and outside China.

S. 203

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

S. 433

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

S. 439

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 439, a bill to allow Members of Congress to opt out of the Federal Employees Retirement System, and allow Members who opt out of the Federal Employees Retirement System to continue to participate in the Thrift Savings Plan.

S. 479

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 479, a bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 569

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) 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.

S. 628

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 628, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include biomass heating appliances for tax credits available for energy-efficient building property and energy property.

S. 684

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 684, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on high-cost employer-sponsored health coverage.

S. 720

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 720, a bill to require the student loan ombudsman of the Department of Education to provide student loan data to the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes.

S. 737

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 737, a bill to direct the National Science Foundation to support STEM education research focused on early childhood.

S. 750

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 750, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the new markets tax credit, and for other purposes.

S. 756

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

S. 814

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 814, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to diabetes outpatient self-management training services, and for other purposes.

S. 880

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 880, a bill to provide outreach and reporting on comprehensive Alzheimer's disease care planning services furnished under the Medicare program.

S. 885

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 885, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to expand access to school-wide arts and music programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1007

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Washington

(Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1007, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1027

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1027, a bill to clarify the status of the North Country, Ice Age, and New England National Scenic Trails as units of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

S. 1083

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1083, a bill to address the fundamental injustice, cruelty, brutality, and inhumanity of slavery in the United States and the 13 American colonies between 1619 and 1865 and to establish a commission to study and consider a national apology and proposal for reparations for the institution of slavery, its subsequent de jure and de facto racial and economic discrimination against African-Americans, and the impact of these forces on living African-Americans, to make recommendations to the Congress on appropriate remedies, and for other purposes.

S. 1107

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1107, a bill to require a review of women and lung cancer, and for other purposes.

S. 1263

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1263, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish an interagency task force on the use of public lands to provide medical treatment and therapy to veterans through outdoor recreation.

S. 1333

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1333, a bill to amend the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012, including making changes to the Do Not Pay Initiative, for improved detection, prevention, and recovery of improper payments to deceased individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 1374

At the request of Ms. MCSALLY, the names of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1374, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the waiting periods for disability insurance benefits and Medicare

coverage for individuals with metastatic breast cancer, and for other purposes.

S. 1487

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1487, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act to create a national zero-emission vehicle standard, and for other purposes.

S. 1615

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1615, a bill to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to provide compensation and credit for retired pay purposes for maternity leave taken by members of the reserve components, and for other purposes.

S. 1757

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1757, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Army Rangers Veterans of World War II in recognition of their extraordinary service during World War II.

S. 1817

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1817, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve nutritional and other program requirements relating to purchases of locally produced food.

S. 1890

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1890, a bill to provide for grants for energy efficiency improvements and renewable energy improvements at public school facilities.

S. 1906

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1906, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide financial assistance to eligible entities to provide and coordinate the provision of suicide prevention services for veterans at risk of suicide and veteran families through the award of grants to such entities, and for other purposes.

S. 1932

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1932, a bill to support water infrastructure in Reclamation States, and for other purposes.

S. 1969

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1969, a bill to

authorize the Fallen Journalists Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes.

S. 2054

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2054, a bill to posthumously award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to Glen Doherty, Tyrone Woods, J. Christopher Stevens, and Sean Smith, in recognition of their contributions to the Nation.

S. 2062

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2062, a bill to prohibit the use of funds for the 2026 World Cup unless the United States Soccer Federation provides equitable pay to the members of the United States Women's National Team and the United States Men's National Team.

S. 2068

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 2068, a bill to prohibit the Bureau of the Census from including citizenship data in the legislative redistricting data prepared by the Bureau.

S. 2074

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2074, a bill to amend section 303(g) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 823(g)) to eliminate the separate registration requirement for dispensing narcotic drugs in schedule III, IV, or V, such as buprenorphine, for maintenance or detoxification treatment, and for other purposes.

S. 2085

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor 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.

S. 2119

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2119, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to appropriately limit the authority to award bonuses to Federal employees.

S. 2179

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2179, a bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide social service agencies with the resources to provide services to meet the urgent needs of Holocaust survivors to age in place with dignity, comfort, security, and quality of life.

S. 2185

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2185, a bill to provide labor standards for certain energy jobs, and for other purposes.

S. 2229

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2229, a bill to protect consumers from deceptive practices with respect to online booking of hotel reservations, and for other purposes.

S. 2231

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2231, a bill to establish American opportunity accounts, to modify estate and gift tax rules, to reform the taxation of capital income, and for other purposes.

S. 2253

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2253, a bill to amend chapter 2205 of title 36, United States Code, to provide pay equity for amateur athletes and other personnel, and for other purposes.

S. 2254

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) were added as cosponsors of S. 2254, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create a Pension Rehabilitation Trust Fund, to establish a Pension Rehabilitation Administration within the Department of the Treasury to make loans to multiemployer defined benefit plans, and for other purposes.

S. 2256

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2256, a bill to protect children affected by immigration enforcement actions.

S. 2279

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2279, a bill to make necessary reforms to improve compliance with loss mitigation requirements by servicers of mortgages for single family housing insured by the FHA, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 252

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

S. RES. 263

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma

(Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 263, a resolution honoring the 100th anniversary of The American Legion.

S. RES. 274

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 274, a resolution expressing solidarity with Falun Gong practitioners who have lost lives, freedoms, and other rights for adhering to their beliefs and practices, and condemning the practice of non-consenting organ harvesting, and for other purposes.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. JONES, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 2303. A bill to allow United States citizens and legal residents to travel between the United States and Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I am here today to talk about America's highway infrastructure. It is important to every State. I have just come back from Wyoming, and it clearly is important in my home State. It is important in every community. It is important in every Tribe in the country. I see that week after week in Wyoming. Our roads, our bridges, our highways, our tunnels support America's economic growth and our competitiveness. The Presiding Officer, from his home State of Missouri, knows this as well. These are an essential part, really, of everyday life for all of America.

We use the infrastructure. We use the roads, the bridges, the tunnels. We use them when we drive to work, when we head to school or we head off to summer vacation. Our economy is built on a well-functioning road system that allows products from rural areas to get transported to population centers. They are used to ship American-made products and goods from one coast to the other.

Certainly in Wyoming, we see a lot of goods coming in then being transported from the coast in California to Chicago, with truck after truck going

through Wyoming. Interstates, like I-80 in my home State of Wyoming, are critical arteries for commerce in this country. Our roads create jobs. They move products, and they keep our country running and going strong.

In 2015, the U.S. transportation system moved a daily average of about 49 million tons of freight; that is, a daily average of 49 million tons of freight worth more than \$53 billion—every single day. Our roads and our bridges have to keep pace. These systems are vital to our country, and they need to be taken care of. We must maintain, upgrade, and, when necessary, build new ones.

Since his election, President Trump has called on Congress to act on infrastructure. Last year, Congress answered the President's call by passing America's Water Infrastructure Act. He signed it into law. It passed this body 99 to 1. The legislation helped streamline major projects and helped keep communities safe. It made a significant investment in our Nation's dams and our locks and our ports and in drinking water systems.

Now is the time to do the same for our roads and for our bridges. That is why, today, I am introducing America's Transportation Infrastructure Act, and I am doing it along with my fellow leaders of the Environment and Public Works Committee, Ranking Member CARPER and Senators CAPITO and CARDIN.

This legislation will make a historic investment in our roads. It will cut Washington redtape. It will improve safety and will help grow our economy. America's Transportation Infrastructure Act authorizes \$287 billion over 5 years from the highway trust fund. Of that money, \$259 billion will go directly to the States through the highway formula funding process. This is the largest investment in America's roads in any highway bill ever passed by Congress. The legislation will help the entire country. It will ensure both rural and urban areas have access to funding.

Formula funding gives each State the flexibility it needs to address specific surface transportation needs. The formula-based approach has a proven track record of efficiently delivering infrastructure money directly to the States. America's Transportation Infrastructure Act maintains this important approach so that States will get the funds they need faster.

America's Transportation Infrastructure Act also continues successful Federal loan programs, such as the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act, which many people in the business know as TIFIA. TIFIA and programs like it get taxpayers significant bang for their buck. A single taxpayer dollar in the TIFIA program can be leveraged 40 times that much in terms of infrastructure spending.

Between new authorizations, leveraging within Federal loan programs, with State-match requirements

and likely additions from the Commerce and Banking Committees, our bill's total impact on infrastructure will be nearly one-half trillion dollars—a historic high. With these investments, it is critical for us to speed up government approvals for important projects.

Last Congress, the Environment and Public Works Committee heard testimony about a highway safety project that I am very familiar with in Wyoming—and not too far from where the Presiding Officer lives—near the interstate north of Sheridan, between Sheridan and Montana. It took a decade to get the permits but actually took only months to build. That has to stop. This was a safety project linking our States together. It was held up for 10 years because of Washington permits. It is unacceptable. America's Transportation Infrastructure Act cuts Washington redtape so projects can get done faster, better, cheaper, and smarter. President Trump has set a goal for his administration of completing environmental reviews for projects within 2 years. It is a goal that I applaud, and the policy is called One Federal Decision.

Our legislation makes key elements of that policy into law. Instead of several Federal agencies having duplicate requirements on the same project, the process is simplified because it needs to be simplified. Our bill gives States increased flexibility so that Federal approvals can get moving and so that project construction can get started. It also reduces the amount of paperwork that is needed from the States to complete a project. Our legislation gets long delayed safety projects moving faster. Washington shouldn't prioritize paperwork over people's safety, but that has happened in the past, and it is unacceptable.

America's Transportation Infrastructure Act makes road safety a top priority. It supports innovative research and technology deployment, including new construction technologies that will make roads safer and will expedite project delivery. For example, the bill supports technologies that allow construction projects to be managed digitally. That will enable project managers to better track projects from design through operation.

The Presiding Officer knows this and sees it, and I saw it this past weekend. When a car collides with an animal on a highway, the results can be dramatic and sometimes even deadly for both the animal and for the driver. Our bill creates a pilot program to build wildlife highway crossings to minimize the danger of vehicle-wildlife collisions.

Across the country, aging bridges are in need of maintenance. Our bill establishes a competitive grant program to help address the backlogs of bridges that are in poor condition. Our bill establishes a new program to incentivize States to lower the total number of fatalities with there being a special focus on pedestrian deaths, which are on the rise.

Of course, the climate is changing, and humans have a collective responsibility to do something about it. I believe that American innovation, not government regulation and taxation, is the answer to our addressing a changing climate. Our bill includes a climate change title that ensures the durability of our transportation infrastructure, and our bill provides flexible resources to help States reduce carbon emissions. It helps States build more resilient highways. We want to make sure that our roads and our bridges are built to withstand extreme weather events, like hurricanes and floods, or natural disasters, like wildfires, earthquakes, and rockslides.

The legislation also helps to reduce transportation-related carbon emissions. The very successful bill that had been signed into law previously and is expiring, the Diesel Emissions Reduction Act, is a program that has helped communities in Wyoming and Montana to replace aging school buses and public equipment. The Diesel Emissions Reduction Act helps to reduce black carbon emissions. This is one of the biggest contributors to climate change. Our bill reauthorizes this program, and it supports innovation. Carbon capture, utilization, and sequestration technologies hold the key to major emissions reductions. I have introduced the USE IT Act, along with my colleagues in the Senate, to support this important research, and it is included in this bill.

As I have stated, this is bipartisan legislation. It doesn't just include Republican priorities; it includes Democratic priorities as well. For example, this legislation establishes grant programs to help fund the construction of electric vehicle charging stations and infrastructure for other alternative fuel vehicles, such as natural gas. This provision has been a priority for several Senators, including for Ranking Member CARPER.

My priority is to make sure these vehicles are actually contributing to the maintenance of our roads. With a rapidly growing electric vehicle market, it is necessary to make sure drivers of these alternative fuel vehicles are contributing to road maintenance. Nearly every automaker is ramping up electric vehicle production. Right now, none of these vehicles pay to maintain America's roads. How can that be? The highway trust fund is funded through fuel taxes. Because they don't buy gasoline, these vehicles simply do not contribute. Yet electric vehicles do as much damage to our highways as do traditional gas-powered vehicles. Everyone who drives on our Nation's roads should contribute to the cost of road maintenance.

Our bill is bipartisan, substantial, and needs to be paid for. As the Presiding Officer knows, the Committee on Environment and Public Works doesn't have jurisdiction over revenues for the highway bill. Ranking Member CARPER and I are going to work closely

with Senate Finance Chairman CHUCK GRASSLEY and Ranking Member RON WYDEN to responsibly pay for this legislation.

In the process of writing this legislation, we have received extensive feedback from experts from our home States and from other Senators. The bill has already received broad support from groups like the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Highway Users Alliance, the American Road & Transportation Builders Association, the American Council of Engineering Companies, the National Stone, Sand and Gravel Association, the North American Concrete Alliance, and many more.

We have planned to mark up America's Transportation Infrastructure Act this week. The business meeting will be a great opportunity in which to strengthen the legislation and move this important process forward. I am thankful to Ranking Member CARPER and to all of the members of our committee for working with me on this important piece of legislation. America's Transportation Infrastructure Act will grow the Nation's economy, will improve the safety of our roads, and will enhance the quality of life for the American people.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss America's Transportation Infrastructure Act, legislation that I introduced today with the chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, JOHN BARRASSO, along with our subcommittee chair on Transportation and Infrastructure, SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, and our ranking member from Maryland, BEN CARDIN.

Our legislation reauthorizes our Nation's surface transportation laws and makes a historic \$287 billion investment in our Nation's roads, highways, and bridges. Our Nation's first highway bill was enacted just a few years after the world's first concrete highway was paved outside of Detroit, MI. Henry Ford had just introduced the Model T, and the first stop-go traffic light would soon be installed at the intersection of East 105th Street and Euclid Avenue in Cleveland, OH.

A century ago, the idea of speedy and safe transcontinental travel was beyond our imagination and even further from being realized. We have come a long way since then.

Today, more than 4 million miles of roadway and 600,000 bridges help link our country together. Some 220,000 of those miles combine to make up our national highway system. Our transportation infrastructure is essential to America's economy, to our society, and to our way of life. It connects us to commerce; it connects us to service; and, more importantly, it connects us to one another.

The sad truth, however, is that, as we all know too well, many of these roads,

highways, and bridges are in poor condition today. They have been in use far beyond, for many of them, the intended duration of their original design. A great many roadways and bridges simply need repaving, while some need repairs, and others need to be completely redesigned.

According to the U.S. Department of Transportation, approximately 20 percent of our Federal-aid roadways are in poor condition, as are 47,000 bridges. That is in large part because, for far too long, our Nation's highway trust fund has been operating on the brink of insolvency. The highway account is running at an \$11 billion deficit, and that deficit is growing.

Meanwhile, despite spending more from the fund than we collect, we still aren't spending enough to make a dent in the \$800 billion backlog of investments needed to significantly improve conditions on many of the roads, highways, and bridges that millions of Americans—all of us—use and depend on every day.

All of this has contributed to an unacceptable level of uncertainty for States, for cities, for businesses, and for families. It has prevented us, as a nation, from addressing serious challenges across our transportation infrastructure that go well beyond simply filling potholes.

For too long, we have failed to make meaningful progress in America toward improving safety, easing traffic congestion, reducing harmful emissions, and enhancing resilience. We can do better than this. The legislation that is before us today, if enacted, will help put our country back on the right track. I am excited about it, and I am grateful to everyone who has contributed in ways both large and small to the drafting of the legislation that Senator BARRASSO and I have introduced today.

While this bill will leverage badly needed investments in rebuilding our roads, highways, and bridges, it will do a lot more than that. It will help expedite the movement of people and goods throughout our country. It will support the creation of hundreds of thousands of jobs here too. It will help alleviate some of the congestion we face in urban and suburban parts of all 50 States—areas across the country—on an almost daily basis.

America's Transportation Infrastructure Act will help make real the vision of a safer, more connected, efficient, and climate-friendly transportation system, one that will endure the test of time and keep up with the evolving demands of the world's biggest economy. Our bill is a good start. Now we need to build on it and make it better.

With respect to safety, too many pedestrians and bicyclists put their lives at risk every day when they use our roadways. In 2017, there were more than 37,000—37,000—fatalities on our Nation's roadways, including approximately 7,000 nonmotorized users. Think about that: 37,000 fatalities. That is more than all of the people who live in Dover, DE, or in Laramie, WY.

After trending down for many years, in the last decade pedestrian deaths have increased sharply and are now at a 25-year high. In Tribal communities, that fatality rate is even higher. That is just unacceptable.

Our legislation addresses this carnage by investing \$2.5 billion in Federal funds per year in safety improvements and by compelling States and cities with very high rates of pedestrian and bicyclist fatalities to do their share as well.

Our legislation also expands funding for bike paths, sidewalks, and other transportation alternatives to \$1.2 billion per year. It empowers States and cities to design, implement, and manage those projects so they are better designed to fit the needs of those States and cities.

Too many Americans simply don't have safe places to walk or bike. In some cases, we build roads in ways that make it impossible for people to walk or bicycle where they need to go, be it a grocery store, a daycare center, a health facility—you name it.

America's transportation infrastructure should connect us, not divide us. Let me say that again. America's transportation infrastructure should connect us, not divide us. It should foster greater economic opportunity, not disparity.

Our legislation seeks to improve connectivity and accessibility by establishing a pilot program for States and cities to measure access to destinations like hospitals, schools, and grocery stores. Our bill also funds a program to help remove barriers, such as chronically underused highways—when appropriate—that create obstacles to access and mobility.

But an even more pressing need to address throughout America is the roads, highways, and bridges that are actually overcapacity today, where cars and trucks and their passengers sit for hours in traffic. Last year, every American driver lost, on average, 97 hours due to traffic congestion. That is 97 hours for the average driver per year. That is 4 days. It is not just a nuisance for drivers; last year, it cost our country \$87 billion in lost productivity—\$87 billion. Let's not forget that all that time we waste sitting in our cars and trucks also degrades the quality of the air we breathe, increases the cost of our healthcare, and raises the cost of the goods we buy.

Our legislation addresses this predicament by authorizing additional funding for the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program, which has been used to build carpool lanes and support a number of other alternatives to reduce congestion.

In addition, our legislation recognizes that in many places, it is just not possible to build additional lanes, so we need to address congestion by managing travel demand through innovative technology, transit, and tolling. That is why we have also created a new

program for our largest cities to provide new tools—new tools—to help address congestion challenges.

That brings us to the evermore apparent reality of climate change and its ever-worsening impact on, among other things, our infrastructure. The cars, trucks, and vans that we drive have become our Nation's largest source of carbon dioxide emissions, accelerating and exacerbating the effects of climate change and bringing with it increasingly extreme weather that we are witnessing throughout the world on an almost daily basis. For example, in Europe last week, temperatures exceeded 110 degrees Fahrenheit. And we have examples here too. We have just come off of the hottest 4 years in the history of this country since we have been measuring it, and this year looks like it is going to be the hottest yet. We have to do more than fight, and with this legislation, we will.

I am proud to announce that America's Transportation Infrastructure Act includes the first-ever climate title in a transportation bill in the history of Congress. Our legislation calls for investing \$10 billion over the next 5 years directly in programs and policies that will combat climate change by reducing emissions and improving the resiliency of our transportation networks and infrastructure.

One such program is a \$1 billion investment in charging and fueling stations for electric and alternative fuel vehicles traveling in heavily traveled corridors across America. While Henry Ford's Model T and its internal combustion engine are an important part of our country's transportation system, zero-emission electric vehicles represent our future.

Unfortunately, in most parts of America today, drivers lack reasonable access to charging or fueling stations for electric or hydrogen-fueled vehicles. Our legislation helps to address that concern by creating competitive grants for States and localities to build hydrogen, natural gas, and electric vehicle charging and fueling infrastructure along many of America's most heavily traveled highway corridors.

Meanwhile, increasingly frequent and extreme weather events continue to erode our transportation networks, and sea level rise threatens the structural integrity and longevity of our surface transportation infrastructure. We see that happening now in my home State of Delaware, along major portions of the East Coast, and in the flooding that has occurred in the heartland of our country. It has been reported in the news that in some places in America, the temperature has been so hot that the asphalt roads and highways are bubbling up from the heat. Try driving through that.

Our legislation seeks to help address these threats by investing nearly \$5 billion over 5 years in a new formula program available to all States and a competitive resiliency grant program. Both the formula program and the new

PROTECT Grants Program would support projects across America that reinforce, upgrade, or realign existing transportation infrastructure to better withstand extreme weather events and the effects of climate change, like the record-setting temperatures I have spoken of.

Let me briefly mention one other thing. Through the use of natural infrastructure, like the marshes and wetlands that protect roads from storm surges during tropical cyclones and Nor'easters, our bill also helps harness the power of Mother Nature to improve the resilience of transportation projects.

That gives you at least a glimpse of some of the exciting aspects of the legislation our committee chairman, JOHN BARRASSO, and I are introducing today, again with the help of a lot of people on our committee, throughout the Senate—Democrats and Republicans—and from all parts of this country. We introduced our legislation with their help and help from every corner of the country, and it comes from State and local governments as well.

In the coming months, I look forward to sharing more stories about how the America's Transportation Infrastructure Act can tackle complicated issues, improve our daily lives, and help us build the roads, highways, and bridges of the future.

As bright as the chairman and I are on our committee—and our very able staff members like to think we are—I am confident that our bill can be improved as it moves through the legislative process in the months ahead. As I oftentimes say, if it isn't perfect, let's make it better. As good as what we have done is—and we are proud of our handiwork—we know it can be better, and we look forward to making it better. That begins tomorrow morning at 9 a.m. with a markup in the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Before I close, I would be remiss if I failed to remind everyone that with respect to surface infrastructure, the 800-pound gorilla in the room is almost always, how are we going to pay for the improvements and the programs we all know we need? The fact is, as I have said, the highway trust fund is going broke, and, if we are honest with one another, our way of paying for it is broken too. So what should we do about it?

It is important to note that our legislation will continue to fund the State-level vehicle-miles-traveled pilot programs established in the 2015 bill. I am especially pleased, however, that our legislation also includes a national vehicle-miles-traveled pilot program—the first of its kind. I believe that user fee-based approaches are generally the best way to fund our Nation's surface transportation system and that vehicle-miles-traveled systems, which seek to ensure that all road users pay their fair share, are the future.

In the meantime, there needs to be a bridge to that future, and that bridge

will not rely on a silver bullet but on what I refer to as a lot of silver BBs, some of which are bigger than others.

With that, let me conclude by reiterating that Chairman BARRASSO and I look forward to working closely with our colleagues on the Senate Finance Committee—a committee on which I am privileged to serve—to ensure that this bill is responsibly paid for.

I have already begun to meet with several of our colleagues on the relevant committees of jurisdiction, and I am anxious to work with them and all of our colleagues as we face not just the dawning challenges that lie ahead but the opportunities as well.

Winston Churchill once said, "You can always count on America to do the right thing in the end, after trying everything else." If we pull together and work together in the House and Senate, as I believe we tend to do in the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, then we can reach that end a good deal sooner than Mr. Churchill and a lot of the skeptics might otherwise expect. So why don't we show those skeptics what we can do? A great many Americans are counting on us to do just that, and we can't let them down.

Again, I thank my staff, the staff of our Chairman BARRASSO, and the staff of Senators CAPITO, BEN CARDIN, and others on our committee for their excellent work and for negotiating in good faith throughout this year. Their spirit and dogged commitment are a big part of what brought us to where we are today.

But we all know that the introduction of a solid bipartisan bill, even when it is followed the next day by a successful markup, we hope, in committee—we must acknowledge that it is just the beginning, but it is a good start, one that we and our colleagues can and I hope will build on, enabling us and America to seize the day. I don't know a lot of Latin, but I think Latin for "seize the day" is "carpe diem," or as we say in Delaware, "Carper diem."

Thank you.

Mr. LEAHY. Today I am introducing, along with 45 Democratic and Republican cosponsors, the Freedom for Americans to Travel to Cuba Act of 2019. Identical legislation was introduced on July 25th by Representatives JIM MCGOVERN and TOM EMMER in the House.

We are introducing this bill for one reason: so Americans can travel to Cuba in the same way that they can travel to every other country in the world except North Korea, to which President Trump banned travel by executive order. Based on my conversations with other Senators, I am confident that if we were afforded the opportunity to vote on this bill, more than 60 Senators would support it.

It is indefensible that the Federal government restricts American citizens and legal residents from traveling to a tiny country 90 miles away that poses no threat to us. At a time when



U.S. airlines are flying to Cuba, does anyone here honestly think that preventing Americans from traveling there is an appropriate role of the Federal government? Why only Cuba? Why not Venezuela? Or Russia? Or Iran, or anywhere else? It is a vindictive, discriminatory, self-defeating vestige of a time long passed.

This bill would end these Cold War restrictions on the freedom of Americans to travel. It would not do away with the embargo.

Americans overwhelmingly favor travel to Cuba. The last poll I saw, a CBS poll, found that 81 percent of Americans support expanding travel to Cuba. Officials in the White House, however, have a different agenda, driven by purely domestic political calculations. They have not only rolled back steps taken by the previous administration to encourage engagement with Cuba, they have gone further by imposing even more onerous restrictions on the right of Americans to travel. As a result, the number of Americans traveling to Cuba this year is projected to plummet by half, due to the policies of their own government. And the thousands of private Cuban entrepreneurs, the taxi drivers, the Airbnb renters, restaurants, and shops that depend on American customers are struggling to survive. It is a short-sighted, anachronistic policy that is beneath our democracy.

I and others, including Republicans, have traveled to Cuba many times over the past 20 years, met with Cuban officials, with Cubans who have been persecuted for opposing the government, and with many others. Every one of us wants to see an end to political repression in Cuba. The arrests and mistreatment of dissidents by the Cuban government should be condemned, just as we should condemn such abuses by other governments including some, like Egypt and Turkey, whose leaders have been welcomed at the White House and the State Department. Americans can travel freely to Egypt, Turkey, and Saudi Arabia, but not to Cuba.

The issue is how best to support the people of Cuba who struggle to make ends meet, and who want to live in a country where freedom of expression and association are protected. Anyone who thinks that more economic pressure, or ultimatums, will force the Cuban authorities to stop arresting political dissidents and embrace democracy have learned nothing from history. For more than half a century we tried a policy of unilateral sanctions and isolation, and it achieved neither of those goals. Instead, it is the Cuban people who were hurt the most. And it provided an opening in this hemisphere for Russia, China, and our other competitors.

Change is coming to Cuba, and we can help support that process. Or we can sit on the sidelines and falsely claim to be helping the Cuban people, while pursuing a failed policy of puni-

tive sanctions. The bipartisan bill I am introducing is about the right of Americans, not Cubans, to travel. Every member of Congress, especially those who have been to Cuba, should oppose restrictions on American citizens that have no place in the law books of a free society.

## SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

### SENATE RESOLUTION 287—ESTABLISHING APPROPRIATE THRESHOLDS FOR CERTAIN BUDGET POINTS OF ORDER IN THE SENATE, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. BRAUN (for himself and Ms. ERNST) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Budget:

S. RES. 287

*Resolved,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Make Rules Matter Act".

#### SEC. 2. THRESHOLDS FOR BUDGET POINTS OF ORDER.

(a) THRESHOLD FOR POINT OF ORDER AGAINST EMERGENCY DESIGNATIONS.—

(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term "emergency designation point of order" means a point of order raised under—

(A) section 314(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 645(e));

(B) section 4(g)(3) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 933(g)(3)); or

(C) section 4112(e) of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

(2) WAIVER.—In the Senate, an emergency designation point of order may be waived or suspended only by the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(3) APPEAL.—In the Senate, an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on an emergency designation point of order.

(b) THRESHOLD FOR LARGE BUDGET IMPACT FOR CERTAIN CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974 POINTS OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A point of order described in paragraph (3) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—In the Senate, an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order described in paragraph (3).

(3) DESCRIPTION OF LARGE BUDGET IMPACT.—A point of order described in this paragraph is a point of order under section 302(f)(2) or 311(a)(2)(A) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(f)(2), 642(a)(2)(A)) against legislation that would, within the time periods applicable to the point of order, as determined by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate, cause budget authority or outlays to exceed the applicable allocation, suballocation, level, or aggregate by more than \$5,000,000,000.

(c) DE MINIMIS BUDGET IMPACT.—For a violation for which the absolute value of the violation is not more than \$500,000, a point of order shall not lie—

(1) under the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) (except for a point of order under section 302 or 311 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 633, 642)); or

(2) under any concurrent resolution on the budget.

(d) THRESHOLD FOR INCREASING SHORT-TERM DEFICITS.—

(1) REDUCTION IN NET INCREASE IN THE DEFICIT.—In the Senate, section 404(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, shall be applied by substituting "\$1,000,000,000" for "\$10,000,000,000".

(2) WAIVER AND APPEAL FOR LARGE BUDGET IMPACT IN THE SENATE.—

(A) WAIVER.—In the Senate, section 404(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, may be waived or suspended by the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, if the net increase in the deficit in any fiscal year exceeds \$10,000,000,000.

(B) APPEAL.—In the Senate, an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under section 404(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, if the net increase in the deficit in any fiscal year exceeds \$10,000,000,000.

(e) THRESHOLD FOR INCREASING LONG-TERM DEFICITS.—

(1) REDUCTION IN NET INCREASE IN THE DEFICIT.—In the Senate, subsections (a) and (b)(1) of section 3101 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, shall each be applied by substituting "\$1,000,000,000" for "\$5,000,000,000".

(2) WAIVER AND APPEAL FOR LARGE BUDGET IMPACT IN THE SENATE.—

(A) WAIVER.—In the Senate, section 3101(b)(1) of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, may be waived or suspended by the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, if the net increase in on-budget deficits in any 10-fiscal-year period exceeds \$10,000,000,000.

(B) APPEAL.—In the Senate, an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under section 3101(b)(1) of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, if the net increase in on-budget deficits in any 10-fiscal-year period exceeds \$10,000,000,000.

### SENATE RESOLUTION 288—AFFIRMING THE IMPORTANCE OF THE LONG-TERM SOLVENCY OF THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

Mr. BRAUN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works:

S. RES. 288

Whereas, in July 2019, the public debt of the United States was more than \$22,000,000,000,000, increasing each year by a Federal budget deficit of nearly \$1,000,000,000,000;

Whereas the Federal Government is facing shortfalls in several Federal trust funds, including the Highway Trust Fund, which is expected to reach insolvency in July 2021;

Whereas the infrastructure of the United States needs substantial investment in order to continue supporting the growing economy of the United States;

Whereas, according to a report published in 2015 by the Federal Highway Administration, 20 percent of the Federal-aid highways in the United States were in poor condition;

Whereas short-term extensions providing funding to the Highway Trust Fund do not provide the certainty needed by States and local governments to enter into long-term roadbuilding contracts; and

Whereas short-term extensions providing funding to the Highway Trust Fund, based solely on deficit spending, exacerbate the problem described in the preceding whereas clause and only serve to postpone solving the problem: Now, therefore, be it  
*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Highway Trust Fund should achieve long-term solvency through user fees; and

(2) any spending on Federal highway programs during the next reauthorization period that exceeds current Highway Trust Fund revenues and balances should be fully offset.

# SENATE RESOLUTION 289—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT SOCIALISM POSES A SIGNIFICANT THREAT TO FREEDOM, LIBERTY, AND ECONOMIC PROSPERITY

Mr. DAINES submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 289

Whereas Merriam-Webster Dictionary defines socialism as—

(1) “any of various economic and political theories advocating collective or governmental ownership and administration of the means of production and distribution of goods”; and

(2) “a system of society or group living in which there is no private property”;

Whereas socialism and the policies advocated by self-described “democratic socialists” have an underlying historical connection to the Marxist theory;

Whereas history has witnessed countless failed Marxist-inspired regimes;

Whereas, because of the perverse incentives and inherent flaws of the Marxist theory, socialism inevitably leads to societal rot, resulting in devastation, economic poverty, and destruction;

Whereas prominent elected officials in the Senate and the House of Representatives are self-described socialists and espouse socialist proposals;

Whereas socialist policies such as the Green New Deal and socialized medicine would—

(1) eliminate the private property rights of all people of the United States; and

(2) force taxpayers to pay trillions of dollars to implement;

Whereas Alexis de Tocqueville wrote, “Democracy and socialism have nothing in common but one word, equality. But notice the difference: while democracy seeks equality in liberty, socialism seeks equality in restraint and servitude.”;

Whereas Margaret Thatcher once stated, “Socialist governments . . . always run out of other people’s money”, and thus the way to prosperity is for the state to give “the people more choice to spend their own money in their own way”;

Whereas free-market capitalism is the greatest engine for human advancement in the history of the world, bringing more people out of poverty and into prosperity than any economic model in the history of mankind;

Whereas the United States is the single greatest country in the history of the world, due in large part to its system of government that secures the private property rights of all citizens through the genius of the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas, on February 5, 2019, in the State of the Union address, President Donald J. Trump declared—

(1) “We are alarmed by new calls to adopt socialism in our country”; and

(2) “America will never be a socialist country”: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) acknowledges that Marxism and socialism are failed ideologies;

(2) recognizes that socialism poses a significant threat to the freedom, liberty, and economic prosperity of all countries and people around the world;

(3) accepts that socialism is a failed experiment of governance that inevitably ends in misery and suffering;

(4) declares that, throughout the history, tradition, and national civic spirit of the United States, the United States has been a beacon of light shining like a lighthouse to the rest of the world, demonstrating that freedom and liberty are the surest foundation of government; and

(5) affirms that the United States should never be a socialist country.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, we are at a pivotal time in our great Nation’s history. America was founded upon the principles of liberty, the free enterprise system, the promotion of national sovereignty, and a strong national defense. Under these principles, we have built the greatest country in the history of the world. We have shown the world time and again the genius of American ingenuity and the grit of American determination.

What makes America so great is not that we are bonded by one ethnicity or one race but that we are bonded together by the idea of liberty. Montanans agree. Montanans want less government. Montanans don’t want the hand of Big Government and Washington, DC, in their pockets, making decisions on their behalf or limiting their freedoms. In Montana, we understand the principles of freedom.

However, a radical, socialist, far-left movement is growing across this country and has taken root as the new voice of the Democratic Party. My Grandpa was a Democrat from Billings, MT. I spent many days out with Grandpa fishing and hunting in certain places in Montana. I love my Grandpa dearly. But if he were around today, he would be appalled as a Democrat at some of the things the far left are saying and advocating for. The words and the actions of certain radical Members of the Democratic House highlight this new standard for the Democratic Party.

It was renowned economist Milton Friedman who once said, “One of the great mistakes is to judge policies and programs by their intentions rather than their results.”

Radical Democrats are advocating for disastrous policies that would wreck our economy under the guise of cleaning up the environment. Fantasy policies, like the Green New Deal, would be a disaster for Montana and the American people. Under this socialist wish list, Montanans and millions of the American people would have to give up their cars and air travel. Montana truckers, our ag haulers, our pilots, and the industries that rely on

them would be wiped out. What the socialists are calling for is a disbanding of our coal plants, leaving countless Montana communities in the dark and in the cold and putting many more out of good-paying jobs and putting a diverse energy sector out of business.

Above all else, to fund this disaster of a policy, it is estimated it would take \$93 trillion—that is with a “t.” Who do they think is going to pay for that? It would be Montanans, Americans, our moms and dads, our children.

Just last week in Berkley, CA, their city council banned natural gas in new homes. Whatever happened to supporting all of the above energy agenda? They are banning natural gas in new homes in Berkley, CA.

Another disastrous policy that the radical left is pushing for is this so-called Medicare for All or rather socialized medicine. They are calling for a complete takeover of our healthcare system by the Federal Government, eliminating private insurance and eliminating choice.

This so-called plan will cost the taxpayers another \$32 trillion over 10 years—\$32 trillion with a “t.” Combine this cost with the cost of the Green New Deal proposal, and the country you and I know will cease to exist. Our economy will be destroyed.

We are also seeing far-left, radical Democrats normalize crime and the blatant disregard of the law with their push for open borders. We are a sovereign nation with established borders. We are a nation based on the rule of law.

Lost in this heated immigration debate taking place at our southern border are the stories of the law-abiding, legal American immigrants who have fled socialist regimes for a chance at freedom. Some of these immigrants include the Vietnamese boat people, the Cuban refugees who fled Castro’s murderous regime, and Chinese Christians persecuted for practicing their faith. You see, in talking to these immigrants—these legal immigrants—they will tell you what socialism looks like. They will also tell you how grateful they are to have freedom here in America. They are proud to be Americans.

So we, as Americans, have a choice. One path leads to complete government control, undermining our Constitution and our American way of life. The other path is the path of freedom. You see, capitalism and the free enterprise system has done more than any other system in the world to lift people out of poverty.

As a former technology executive, I can speak to the wonders of the free enterprise system because I saw it happen firsthand in my hometown of Bozeman, MT. What was once a small startup cloud computing business, grew into a billion-dollar company headquartered in Bozeman, MT, and it transformed Bozeman into becoming one of the tech hubs now of the West. It is all because the American free enterprise system thrives in innovation, and it rewards

entrepreneurs and employees who pursue their dreams and take that leap of faith. That is what freedom looks like.

In the face of this extremism we see bubbling up right over in that other Chamber, the U.S. House of Representatives, we must stand strong for the values that made America what it is today.

Therefore, today I introduce a resolution—my resolution condemning the growing socialist movement in our country. I ask my Senate colleagues to join me in renouncing this ideology taking root in our country and to stand for freedom.

Today we make a choice—freedom or socialism. I choose freedom.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 290—CELEBRATING 50 YEARS OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRESS IN THE CUYAHOGA RIVER VALLEY AND LAKE ERIE

Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

##### S. RES. 290

Whereas the Cuyahoga River is a 100-mile-long river in the State of Ohio that flows into Lake Erie;

Whereas the word "Cuyahoga" is a combination of the names given to the river by native peoples in the region and is translated to mean "Crooked River";

Whereas, after generations of neglect, a lack of clean-water protections, and decades of industrial pollution in the Cuyahoga River Valley, a 1968 report by the former Federal Water Pollution Control Administration found that the lower portion of the Cuyahoga River had no visible life;

Whereas oil-laden debris and pollution on the Cuyahoga River caught fire 13 times between 1868 and 1969, inspiring the ignominious nickname "the burning river";

Whereas on June 22, 1969, sparks from a railroad car passing over the Cuyahoga River on a bridge ignited debris below, starting what would be the last fire on the river;

Whereas a Time Magazine article on the 1969 fire alerted the public to the extent of industrial pollution in the Cuyahoga River Valley;

Whereas Carl B. Stokes, then mayor of Cleveland, Ohio, testified before Congress and called for Federal legislation to address pollution;

Whereas, according to the Environmental Protection Agency, the 1969 fire mobilized public concern across the United States, resulting in—

(1) the enactment of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (commonly known as the "Clean Water Act") (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.);

(2) the Agreement on Great Lakes Water Quality, signed at Ottawa April 15, 1972 (23 UST 301; TIAS 7312), between the United States and Canada;

(3) the Agreement on Great Lakes Water Quality, 1978, signed at Ottawa November 22, 1978 (30 UST 1383; TIAS 9257), between the United States and Canada (commonly referred to as the "Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement");

(4) the establishment of the Environmental Protection Agency; and

(5) the establishment of the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency;

Whereas, according to the National Park Service, the 1969 fire on the Cuyahoga River helped inspire the first Earth Day in 1970;

Whereas passage of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) spurred the city of Cleveland, the State of Ohio, and a multitude of public and private partners to improve the water quality in the Cuyahoga River Valley;

Whereas public concern about pollution in the Cuyahoga River Valley and the resulting fires supported efforts led by Representatives Ralph S. Regula and John F. Seiberling to create the Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area in 1974, which later became the Cuyahoga Valley National Park;

Whereas the Cuyahoga River is now home to more than 60 species of fish;

Whereas the industrial river valley in downtown Cleveland, Ohio, known as "the Flats", has been transformed into a center for recreation and entertainment;

Whereas the Cuyahoga River transports millions of tons of material to and from local industries, supporting 15,000 direct, indirect, and induced jobs and producing \$1,700,000,000 in economic activity;

Whereas recreational opportunities are available in—

- (1) the Cuyahoga Valley National Park;
- (2) State and county parks; and
- (3) the Ohio & Erie Canal National Heritage Canalway;

Whereas the National Park Service and the community partners of the National Park Service created the Cuyahoga River Water Trail along the entire length of the Cuyahoga River to increase public access, tourism, and economic development; and

Whereas the rebirth of the Cuyahoga River is a symbol of the importance of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) and other landmark environmental laws that ensure clean water and protect the natural resources of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) celebrates 50 years of environmental progress in the Cuyahoga River Valley and Lake Erie;

(2) offers continued support for the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) and the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.);

(3) recognizes the transformation of the Cuyahoga River and the Great Lakes Basin as a model for environmental restoration;

(4) recognizes the economic benefit of the Cuyahoga River for recreation, tourism, commercial shipping, and job growth; and

(5) commits to continued progress in improving ecosystem health, drinking water quality, and wastewater infrastructure in the Great Lakes Basin.

#### CELEBRATING 50 YEARS OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRESS IN THE CUYAHOGA RIVER VALLEY AND LAKE ERIE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 290, submitted earlier today.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 290) celebrating 50 years of environmental progress in the Cuyahoga River Valley and Lake Erie.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on adoption of the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 290) was agreed to.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that 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 preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

#### RENAMING THE SUCCESS DAM IN TULARE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, AS THE RICHARD L. SCHAFER DAM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2695 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2695) to rename the Success Dam in Tulare County, California, as the Richard L. Schafer Dam.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (H.R. 2695) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

#### ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JULY 30, 2019

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, July 30; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be

approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, morning business be closed, and the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Liburdi nomination under the previous order. Finally, I ask that the Senate recess following the cloture vote on the Hendrix nomination until

2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly conference meetings.

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

---

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.  
TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come be-

fore the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:40 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, July 30, 2019, at 10 a.m.