United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2019 No. 170

Senate

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, in spite of our shortcomings, you have promised never to forsake us. In this decisive season of our Nation's history, give our lawmakers wisdom and courage. May they remember that history is a faithful stenographer who will judge their words and deeds in the shining light of truth.

Lord, provide our Senators with the grace to glorify You, as they remember You have appointed them for this moment in time. And Lord, we thank You for the courage and professionalism of the men and women in our Nation's military. We also thank You for the life and legacy of Senator Kay Hagan.

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 in morning business for 1 minute.

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

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, polling consistently shows that lowering the cost of prescription drugs is a top priority for Americans. That is why I hope we can act on this pressing issue in the coming months. A failure to act would be remembered by Americans.

This week, the Democratic House is poised to pass a bill. There are many problems with that legislation, and it doesn't stand a chance of passage in the Senate. Thankfully, we have bipartisan legislation in the House-titled ''Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act'' that President Trump supports and has a clear path to being signed into law. We need the full Senate to act on this legislation. Republicans should not want to be the party that failed to act.

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.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, VETERANS AFFAIRS, TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2020

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 3055, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Shelby amendment No. 948, in the nature of a substitute.

McConnell (for Shelby) amendment No. 950, to make a technical correction.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

REMEMBERING KAY HAGAN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, first, I was saddened by today's news that our former colleague, the Senator from North Carolina, Kay Hagan, had passed away. During her time representing the people of North Carolina, Kay was exactly that—a gentle lady. She paired an earnest commitment to public service with a friendly and collegial approach. I know Members of both sides of the aisle will fondly remember serving alongside her in the Senate, and her perseverance in the face of serious illness these recent years was inspiring.

Today the prayers of this entire body are with Kay's husband, Chip; their children, Jeanette, Tilden, and Carrie; and with all of their family and friends at this extremely difficult time.

DEATH OF ABU BAKR AL-BAGHDADI

Mr. President, on a completely different matter, on Sunday morning, we woke up to a better and safer world because one monster was no longer in it. Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi was the founder and leader of ISIS. In recent years, that made him the single most important target in the fight against radical Islamic terrorism.

His band of fanatics has committed heinous crimes, shed an unimaginable amount of civilian blood, and destabilized an entire region. ISIS has been party to a civil war in Syria that has claimed hundreds of thousands of innocent lives. They have run slave auctions of women and girls and effected a genocide of the Yazidi people.

Across a swath of Syria and Iraq, ISIS established a so-called caliphate, imprisoned entire communities, slaughtered vulnerable minority populations, destroyed priceless cultural relics, and imposed their will through brute force on anyone they deemed insufficiently pious. Across the globe,

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

Printed on recycled paper.

their message of hate has spurred further acts of violence—in Europe, in Africa, and even here on American soil.

So Americans applauded President Trump's announcement yesterday morning that a heroic mission had eliminated the chief instigator of all this violence. We owe a debt of thanks to the men and women of our intelligence community for taking grave risks, cultivating key partnerships in the region, and laying the groundwork for a swift and precise operation.

Of course, we are hugely grateful to the U.S. military personnel who executed the strike. Our Nation calls upon elite Special Operations units to take on missions of the utmost sensitivity. Their bravery and professionalism continue to make us all proud.

My fellow Kentuckians and I are especially proud of Lt. Gen. Scott Howell, a Cadiz, KY native, is currently leading the Joint Special Operations Command and oversaw this daring mission.

Lieutenant General Howell is a career Air Force pilot who has spent his career deploying with and commanding Special Operations forces. Our Nation is lucky to have this son of the Bluegrass serving where he is.

I commend President Trump, Secretary Esper, and the entire administration team for making the tough call to act on our intelligence and send U.S. Forces into the breach. That decision is never easy, but it was the right one. It was a total operational success.

This victory offers us an important strategic reminder about the value of our Nation's investment in advanced military capabilities, American military presence abroad, and deep relationships with foreign allies and local security partners. Without such factors, operations such as this become much more risky.

The name of this terrorist is now headed straight for the trash bin of history. There are other names I would like for us to remember today instead:

Peter Kassig, born and raised in Indianapolis, a former Army Ranger turned humanitarian worker in the Middle East. ISIS beheaded him in 2014. He was 26 years old.

Steven Sotloff, a grandson of Holocaust survivors born in Florida and a dual citizen of the U.S. and Israel. He was a journalist who worked with refugees fleeing the Syrian civil war. He was kidnapped by ISIS and beheaded in 2014.

James Foley grew up in New Hampshire. He spent 4 years as an embedded correspondent in Afghanistan, Libya, and Syria before his capture by ISIS. After 2 years of captivity and torture, he, too, was beheaded in 2014.

Kayla Mueller from Arizona, whom ISIS kidnapped in Aleppo in 2013. Kayla's Christian faith had led her to humanitarian work. She was brutalized by ISIS leaders and then killed in 2015, at the age of 26. This weekend's operation was code-named in Kayla's honor.

Today we remember these brave Americans and all the courageous U.S. servicemembers and DOD civilians who gave their lives to fight ISIS. In their memories, we are glad justice has been done. In their memories, we resolve not to back down but to persist in this fight until we have secured the enduring defeat of this dangerous and determined enemy.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

Mr. President, on another matter, on Thursday, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and I introduced a resolution, which quickly gained dozens of Republican cosponsors. Our resolution states two things, which are very obvious. No. 1, any process as serious as an impeachment inquiry, which seeks to cancel out the American people's vote in a Presidential election, must adhere to the highest standards of fairness and due process, and, No. 2, what we have seen on display from House Democrats has been anything but that.

Here is the way House Democrats have conducted their inquiry so far. Committees at the center of the inquiry have denied President Trump important rights and protections that President Nixon and President Clinton enjoyed. They have impeded his right to have counsel attend hearings and depositions, call and cross-examine witnesses, and even access the evidence they are producing.

Democrats are also flouting past practices that gave minority parties basic procedural rights during past impeachments. House Republicans have not been granted subpoena power, and their participation in closed-door proceedings has been severely limited.

It is no secret that Washington Democrats have been looking for a way to remove President Trump since his inauguration, but that does not remove the basic requirements of fairness and due process.

That is what our resolution makes clear. I am proud to sponsor it, along with Chairman GRAHAM.

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. President, on a related matter, Washington Democrats have been insisting that their 3-year-old impeachment journey will not keep them from attending to the people's business. Well, we will have an opportunity to find out later this week when the Senate votes on advancing funding for our Armed Forces.

You will recall that last month, our Democratic colleagues made the stunning decision to filibuster legislation to fund our national defense. They blocked resources for our men and women in uniform. They blocked the funding our commanders need to keep us safe in this dangerous time. And that wasn't enough. They blocked a pay raise for the men and women in uniform. Democrats filibustered all of this for the sake of picking a fight with the White House. Think about that. Can our colleagues be so ruled by partisan politics that they would rather leave the U.S. military in limbo than get along with President Trump for 2 minutes—for 2 minutes?

Obviously this cannot continue. Our commanders need funding. Our men and women in military need support. Congress needs to do its job. So later this week, the Senate is going to vote again, one more time, to advance defense funding. We will complete the domestic appropriations we are currently considering, including voting on certain amendments, and then we will turn back to defense. This will present a crystal-clear test: Do our Democratic colleagues mean it when they say they want to legislate or not—there is no more important legislation than this—or is their impeachment obsession crowding out critical priorities?

Imagine the spectacle if the same Senate Democrats who give lengthy speeches criticizing the administration's actions in Syria and the Middle East literally block the funding our commanders need to keep up the missions. Imagine the embarrassment if Senate Democrats filibuster funding for our men and women in uniform just days after this past weekend's heroics, just days after the whole country was reminded that our brave servicemembers risk everything every day, and their missions do not wait for Washington politics. Imagine the supreme irony if the same Democrats who want to impeach the President for supposedly delaying military assistance for Ukraine literally themselves delay military assistance for Ukraine by blocking the funding legislation.

I urge my friends across the aisle to do the right thing. The whole country knows that Washington Democrats are not members of President Trump's fan club. We get that. We understand that. But there is no reason why money to fight ISIS, money to pay and supply our servicemembers, and, yes, money for military assistance for Ukraine ought to be used as Democrats' political pawns.

Enough is enough. We need to move forward with the Defense funding bill this week.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

REMEMBERING KAY HAGAN

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, the Scripture tells us that ''the Lord is close to the brokenhearted,'' in Psalm 34:18. I pray those words are true, because we lost a Member of the Senate family today and many of us have lost a dear friend. We are brokenhearted at the news that Senator Kay Hagan passed away at the age of 66.

I spoke to her husband Chip a few hours ago, and I told him that from the

first moment I met Kay Hagan, she was special. She remained that way every day since. She was an amazing force—never loud but always strong, effective, hard-working, dedicated, principled, and just a kindhearted person.

He told me that he and Kay had just had a wonderful weekend, a dinner, a wedding, surrounded by friends and family. She even got to spend some time with Joe Biden, who was in town. Chip said she was just beaming.

I take some comfort in knowing that. In fact, it reminded me of how Kay lived her life. She was never one to let the sometimes painful realities of life in politics get her down. I knew Kay for over a decade, as a State senator, a candidate, a brilliant Senator, and a former Senator who returned to private life without an ounce of regret or ill-will.

In all that time, I never heard her once—never heard her once—complain. She was never sour, sarcastic, or dejected. She remained always to her last day a cheerful optimist, a happy warrior.

It is only one of the many reasons that Kay Hagan was beloved by Members on this side of the aisle and I believe by a great number of those on the other side as well. Boy, do we miss her.

My heart goes out to Chip, to their three kids—Jeanette, Tilden, and Carrie—and their wonderful grandchildren, of whom Kay was so proud and loved.

DEATH OF ABU BAKR AL-BAGHDADI

Mr. President, on another subject, yesterday morning it was announced that U.S. Special Operations Forces killed Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi, the leader of the Islamic State. The death of al-Baghdadi is a great victory for the safety of our country and the safety of our allies and partners. All Americans salute the Special Operations Forces who executed this mission, the intelligence community of professionals, whose work helped to enable the mission, and our allies and partners, particularly, the Syrian Kurds, who have contributed to the global coalition to defeat ISIS.

Despite this great victory, however, we must not confuse the death of this one very evil man with the defeat of ISIS. There are still potentially hundreds of ISIS prisoners and sympathizers who have escaped in recent weeks as a result of President Trump's abrupt decision to withdraw American troops from northern Syria and greenlight Erdogan's invasion. We cannot allow ISIS to regroup or gather strength. New Yorkers know all too well the destruction a small group of terrorists can cause from half a world away.

Make no mistake, we still need a plan for the enduring defeat of ISIS. They are not gone. We must include details on how we will deal with escaped prisoners. Nobody knows. These are evil people. They want to hurt us, and they can escape from the prisons, and Lord knows where they will go. But we know a good chunk of them will want to do damage to our homeland.

So far, the administration, unfortunately, has articulated no coherent plan. Its top officials, Secretary Pompeo and Secretary Esper, seem unable to find time to even brief Congress, in all likelihood because they have nothing real to say, no plan. For almost a month now, we have been requesting an all-Senators briefing from the administration on its Syria policy. That is the bare minimum we expect from the administration when it comes to major policy decisions. Yet we have had two briefings scheduled and then canceled, and we still cannot get the Department of Defense or the Department of State to commit to a time for those Secretaries to brief Congress.

According to reports, the Trump administration gave Russia and Turkey some kind of advanced notice of the raid of al-Baghdadi, but, seemingly, by deliberate choice neglected to notify the leaders of Congress, as is custom in this case.

Based on the President's remarks yesterday, it seems he may have made a solitary exception for the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. That is not what the Founders envisioned when they imagined Congress and the executive branch working together to conduct the Nation's foreign policy. It seems clear that the Trump administration is either reluctant or simply unwilling to keep Congress in the loop on its plan to defeat ISIS and protect American interest in the region. The most likely explanation, unfortunately, is that it does not have one.

This needs to change. There needs to be a plan. There needs to be some accountability to Congress. We need to hear from Secretaries Pompeo and Esper in Congress this week.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

Mr. President, now on another matter, as the House of Representatives continues to do its constitutional duty to conduct oversight of any wrongdoing by the executive branch, our Republican colleagues in both Chambers have made great pains to make its ''process'' an issue. A group of House Republicans stormed the secure facility in the Capitol to highlight the purported secrecy of the process. It was later revealed that fully one-third of those Members were already allowed in the closed hearings. Here in the Senate, Senator GRAHAM introduced a resolution with a list of trumped-up complaints about the House process, and I just heard my friend the Republican leader talk about the process in his opening remarks.

Now, I am going to say something that might surprise everyone listening out there. I actually agree with what President Trump said this morning about the impeachment inquiry in the House. The President said, ''I'd rather go into the details of the case rather than the process,'' adding, ''I think you ought to look at the case.'' The President—the President—himself is saying all this stuff about process is a diversion.

Look at the substance. We want to look at the substance. That is what the House is doing. That is what our Republican friends—those who in a fit of rage or whatever stormed the House committee room, that is what so many of our colleagues on this side of the aisle are doing, just focusing on process because they are afraid to focus on substance and how wrong it was—what the President did, if the facts prove he did it, which I believe the House is looking at.

So let's not forget the impeachment inquiry stems from a very serious allegation that President Trump pressured a foreign leader to investigate a domestic political rival. Allegations were deemed credible and an urgent concern by a Trump appointee. Allegations have been further corroborated by the memorandum of conversation released by the White House, testimony gathered by the House, and public comments made by no one less than the President's chief of staff.

We have a responsibility—a responsibility, a constitutional responsibility—to grapple with the facts in the public record and ultimately make judgments based on the merits of the case. So the President of the United States, in this case, happens to be right. Congressional Republicans in the House and Senate should focus on the details of the case rather than the process.

HEALTH INSURANCE PLANS

Mr. President, another subject, later this week, Senate Democrats will again use their authority under the Congressional Review Act to force a crucial vote on the future of healthcare protections for Americans with preexisting conditions. The Trump administration has done nearly everything imaginable to undermine these protections over the past 3 years, including by suing to repeal our healthcare law in its entirety. This vote concerns the administration's expansion of junk insurance plans, which offer ways around the requirements to cover Americans when they need healthcare most. This rule gives States the green light to use taxpayer dollars to buy junk insurance plans.

Oftentimes, the plans are so skimpy they hardly cover anything at all. They are barely worth the paper they are written on. Imagine you are the mother or father of a child with cancer and you sign one of these plans, and the insurance company says we don't have to take care of your kid for something as devastating and as life-threatening as cancer. Imagine how you would feel.

Yet our Republican friends and this administration want to give insurance companies the green light to make a ton of money and write this junk—junk insurance—and have hundreds of thousands—millions of Americans not covered for even the most important and vital of coverages.

Well, that is what is at stake this week. The Senate will vote. Republicans will have to go on record to either defend the administration's actions or protect Americans who have preexisting conditions.

I know several of my Republican colleagues publicly declared their support for these protections when they have their campaign ads going. That hasn't been the case here in Congress where Republicans have repeatedly voted against the same protections. Wednesday will be another important test for Senate Republicans.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Finally, Mr. President, on climate. On Friday, I announced a new proposal to rapidly phase out gas-powered vehicles and replace them with clean vehicles like electric cars. The goal of the plan, which also aims to spur a transformation in American manufacturing, is that, by 2040, all vehicles on the road should be clean.

We need a plan of this scale and ambition to fight one of the largest drivers of carbon emissions—transportation—which account for over one-third of America's carbon output. Scientists now tell us that, to avoid the most devastating effects of climate change, the world needs to be carbon neutral by mid-century. At the moment, we are not on track even remotely to meet that target.

So we must act urgently and ambitiously, which requires building diverse coalitions of support. What distinguished my proposal is not only its scale, but its ability to unite the American environmental movement, the American labor movement, and large automakers. Listen to who is supporting this proposal: the Sierra Club, the Natural Resources Defense Council, the League of Conservation Voters, and labor unions like the United Automobile Workers, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, the AFL–CIO, and car manufacturers like Ford and General Motors. When have we ever seen the car manufacturers and the unions and the environmentalists agree on a major proposal that will stop carbon from poisoning our atmosphere? Well, here it is.

How would this plan work? First, it would provide a large discount on an American-made vehicle when drivers trade in a gas-powered car. Second, it would provide grants to States and cities to build charging stations with a particular emphasis on low-income, rural, and underserved communities. Third, the plan aims to establish the U.S. as the global leader in electric vehicle and battery manufacturing by providing grants to retool existing manufacturing plants in the United States and build new ones in this country that specialize in those technologies.

It will clean our atmosphere, save families money; the cost of these cars will be less than the cost of maintaining a gasoline-driven vehicle, and it will establish America once again as the preeminent automobile power as electric cars become the way of the future.

Critics say that acting on climate change has cost us jobs and money. It is simply not true. My plan is actually estimated to create tens of thousands of new jobs, good-paying jobs right here in the U.S. Much as America experienced a revolution in auto manufacturing at the outset of the 20th century, America under this plan will experience a revolution in clean auto manufacturing at the beginning of this century, but if we are to reach our goal, we have to move fast. China now accounts for more than half the world's electric vehicle market, and if we don't match the level of China's commitment, we are going to miss a tremendous opportunity. We have missed too many already.

If Democrats win control of the Senate in 2020, I as majority leader will introduce bold and far-reaching climate legislation. This proposal for clean cars would be a key element of that bill.

This is about American jobs, American global economic leadership, and protecting our dear planet. Nothing, nothing could be more worthy of pursuing.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ERNST). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. GRASSLEY. In March of 2015, I began our long investigation into Secretary Clinton's use of nongovernment email for official business. Since then, I have written hundreds of letters, held hearings, and discussed my findings and concerns right here on the Senate floor. After all, the public's business ought to be public.

Today, we can add more findings to that ongoing list of Secretary Clinton's and her associates' wrongful conduct.

The other week I released a report from the State Department that finalized their administrative review of how Secretary Clinton's private server setup caused hundreds of security violations. That review found five things I am going to mention.

First, 91 valid security violations were identified and attributable to 38 individuals. That means 38 individuals mishandled classified information and were punished for it. The sanctions for a violation included suspension or revocation of their security clearance, suspension without pay, or termination, among other forms of punishment.

Second, an additional 497 valid violations were identified. However, the State Department was unable to determine who was culpable. The State Department was unable to identify culpability because some former Department employees didn't sit for interviews or because Secretary Clinton kept her server secret from government officials, so it was impossible for the Department to monitor security protocol in realtime.

The review also noted that there was a 5- to 9-year gap between the beginning of Secretary Clinton's State Department tenure when the security incidents began and when she finally turned over the emails, which she initially refused to do.

This many yearslong gap made it very challenging to determine who was culpable for every violation of regulation and law covering national security issues and the need for classification.

In total, Secretary Clinton's use of a nongovernment server for government business caused 588 security violations for mishandling classified information. Some of that classified information was classified at the very highest levels, including Top Secret/Special Access Program information.

According to the FBI, Secretary Clinton sent and received emails that contained highly classified information. It is hard to fathom how this wouldn't undermine our national security. If the average American did that, they would lose their clearance, their job, and might even go to jail.

That is what happened to Navy sailor Kristian Saucier. He took six photographs inside his submarine that exposed information classified at the confidential level. He mishandled classified information. He pled guilty and was sentenced to 1 year in Federal prison.

So people ask me: How come some people go to prison for violating classification and other people don't?

Let's go to the third point. The review found Secretary Clinton's nongovernmental server increased the risk of unauthorized disclosures.

Fourth, the review found that the nongovernment server increased the risk of security compromises.

Clinton's private server setup had been described as being so badly secured that it was almost impossible to detect who had attempted to attack it and gain access to it. Anyone could have done it.

Fifth and last, the review found that some classified information was deliberately transmitted via unclassified emails and resulted in adjudicated security violations.

Many in the press, as well as partisan Clinton defenders, have hung their hats on the State Department's finding that there was ''no persuasive evidence of systemic, deliberate mishandling of classified information.''

Take, for example, the Washington Post. Their headline was ''State Department probe of Clinton email finds no deliberate mishandling of classified information.''

Well, that headline was entirely wrong. The State Department report said: ''Instances of classified information being deliberately transmitted via

unclassified emails were the rare exception and resulted in adjudicated security violations.''

That statement clearly says some individuals deliberately transmitted classified information on unclassified systems. Those individuals were subject to security sanctions, but the State Department failed to describe who the violators were and what the sanctions were.

Those answers ought to be forthcoming. Consequently—you know my reputation—I intend to follow up. Ensuring the proper handling of highly classified information is an issue that should garner bipartisan support. This may sound like history, but there is a lesson to be learned from this history that classified information should be classified for protecting national security.

Furthermore, if government officials deliberately expose classified information on an unclassified system, why didn't the FBI find the same during their investigations?

We all know then-Director Comey refused to recommend any charges related to the Clinton investigation because the FBI could not identify the requisite criminal intent. It seems to me that deliberately sending classified information on unclassified channels is intentional conduct. Again, if the average American did that, they would be in big trouble, as I pointed out about the Navy sailor spending 1 year in prison.

During the course of my oversight activities, I acquired drafts of Comey's July 5, 2016, public statement exonerating Clinton. Comey's initial draft stated the following. This is the initial draft.

> There is evidence to support a conclusion that Secretary Clinton, and others, used the private email server in a manner that was grossly negligent with respect to the handling of classified material.

Comey also said this:

> Similarly, the sheer volume of information that was properly classified as Secret at the time it was discussed on email (that is, excluding the up-classified emails) supports an inference that the participants were grossly negligent in their handling of that information.

Gross negligence—the words used by Comey—is a criminal standard under title 18, section 793.

He later dumbed-down his statement to a noncriminal standard:

> Although we did not find clear evidence that Secretary Clinton or her colleagues intended to violate laws governing the handling of classified information, there is evidence that they were extremely careless in their handling of very sensitive, highly classified information.

And that was before he finished the investigation and interviewed 17 witnesses, including Secretary Clinton.

Director Comey never once said that some individuals deliberately sent classified information on an unclassified system. According to the State Department's findings, Comey should have come to that conclusion and made that statement.

Clearly, deliberate conduct rises beyond gross negligence. So who deliberately sent classified information on unclassified channels, and has the Department communicated this new finding to the FBI?

Just last week, I spoke on the floor about how the FBI pulled its punches during the Clinton investigation. I talked about how the FBI agreed to limit the scope of review to her time as Secretary of State. That decision eliminated potentially highly relevant emails before and after her tenure that could have shed light on why she operated the nongovernment server. It also eliminated emails around the time of the conference call between Clinton's attorneys and the administrator of her server that led to the deletion of her emails. That limitation of scope defies reason.

Lastly, the FBI agreed to destroy records and laptops of Clinton's associates after reviewing them. That is an astonishing agreement in light of the fact those records could have been relevant to ongoing congressional inquiries that the FBI knew about.

Secretary Clinton's actions caused 588 security violations and highly classified information to be exposed to an unclassified system. Some of those violations were very deliberate, but that is the first we have heard of it.

The public ought to know whether those folks involved were punished according to the letter of the law or were given special treatment. Equal application of the law without regard to power, party, or privilege ought to be the norm. With what we know up to this point, the Clinton investigation failed to hit its mark.

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.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 961 TO AMENDMENT NO. 948

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 961, as provided for under the previous order, and I ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

> The Senator from Nevada [Ms. CORTEZ MASTO] proposes an amendment numbered 961 to amendment No. 948.

The amendment is as follows:

> (Purpose: To require a report relating to the challenges that food distribution programs face in reaching underserved populations)
>
> At the appropriate place in title VII of division B, insert the following:
>
> REPORT ON FOOD DISTRIBUTION PROGRAMS REACHING UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS
>
> SEC. 7____. The Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct a study on the challenges that the food distribution program on Indian reservations established under section 4(b) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2013(b)) and other food distribution programs administered by the Secretary of Agriculture face in reaching underserved populations, with an emphasis on the homebound and the elderly, to better capture data on the population of people unable to physically travel to a distribution location for food.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I rise to support this amendment, which is an amendment that supports our Native-American communities who face food insecurity.

The Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations, commonly known as FDPIR, provides food assistance for 90,000 people in 276 Tribes across this country. Often, on Tribal lands—and certainly in the rural parts of my home State of Nevada—people live miles from a SNAP office or a grocery store. So FDPIR provides a crucial source of nutrition.

But many enrollees in the program still have to pick up the FDPIR benefits in person, and for elderly or disabled Tribal members, it is too difficult to make that trip. So I urge my colleagues to vote for this important amendment to study ways to improve access to the program for the homebound and the elderly.

I thank my colleague and fellow member of the Indian Affairs Committee, Senator LANKFORD, for his support on this important effort. We want to ensure that no one is going hungry when there is food waiting for them just a few miles away.

I thank the Senate leadership for allowing open debate and discussion of the issue facing Indian Country on the floor of this Chamber.

I look forward to continued conversations on how to help members of Tribes to thrive and to grow their communities and to chart a more vibrant future.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I encourage my colleagues to pass this amendment that has been called up and that we are going to vote for here in just a few moments. Senator CORTEZ MASTO and I worked together on this. She has been the lead on this whole issue. I am proud to cosponsor it with her.

This is a basic study of how we can make sure that the food benefits the USDA is choosing to provide and that together we are providing as Federal taxpayers to Indian reservations is actually getting to people who need it the most.

At this point, the USDA program is set up so that people have to come to a central distribution area to get access to food. Many elderly and disabled cannot go to a central distribution area to get access to food. If we are going to have a food program like this, let's make sure we are actually getting food to where people need it the most.

There are other programs that are in the Federal program right now, like Meals on Wheels and other programs that are designated, where we can partner with groups to make sure food gets there, but there are other programs, like this program, the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations, that may not be getting to where food is needed the most for the most number of people.

I think other programs will need a study like this as well. We have other child nutrition programs, for instance, that happen in the summertime, where children, just as in this program set up on Indian reservations, have to come to a central location to get access to food. Many children don't have the ability to get transportation to get food. So those individuals and those families who need the most help are facing yet another hurdle to get help.

This is a study, and I think it is the first step to make sure that what we do is done well, is done efficiently, and that the intended outcome to help people is accurately occurring.

I thank Senator CORTEZ MASTO for stepping up and for her leadership for this. I am proud to be a cosponsor with her.

I look forward to our colleagues voting for this, getting the results of this study, and actually making sure that in the days ahead, food assistance is getting to places where people need it the most.

With that, I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

AMENDMENT NO. 1019 TO AMENDMENT NO. 948

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, we are set to borrow nearly $1 trillion this year. Our overall debt is over $22 trillion.

In my office, I have a debt clock. You can see it at debtclock.org. It is spinning out of control. The numbers are mind-boggling. In the next decade, just the interest on the debt is set to exceed $1 trillion. That is $1 trillion simply wasted because we are not fiscally responsible enough to balance our budget.

There are ramifications to having so much debt. When we monetize the debt or the Federal Reserve creates money to pay for the debt, what ends up happening is it dilutes the value of our current dollars.

We have been doing that for a long period of nearly 100 years or over 100 years, since the Federal Reserve was created, and the vast majority of the dollar's value has been lost over time.

Inflation is not what it used to be, but there are still other problems. As interest grows on the debt, it crowds out other spending. So when we get to spending $1 trillion on the interest of the debt, what it is going to do is it is going to crowd out other spending. Whether you are on the right and you want more military spending or you are on the left and you want more welfare spending, it is being crowded out by the debt growing so much that interest is pushing out other projects.

What I have offered is a commonsense approach to this. Everybody has their sacred cow. Everybody has some money they want to spend somewhere. Why don't we cut every program by 2 pennies? We have a 2-percent across-the-board cut, and so what we would do is we would spend 98 percent of what we spent last year.

It is interesting that groups come in to see me in the office, and they say ''Well, we have this dramatic program, and it is to cure AIDS or Alzheimer's or diabetes, and it is going to be this wonderful project,'' and I say ''Well, last year you got $100 million; could you deal with $98 million this year?'' Interestingly, whether they are conservative, liberal, or independent, they look at me and say ''Well, gosh, yes, I think I can deal with $98 million instead of $100 million; I think we could deal with a 2-percent cut if we get 98 percent of what we got last year.''

Most of the groups that are actually invested in this and have a family member with one of these diseases think they can deal with it. Do you know the only people in the whole country who think we couldn't do it? The people you have elected. They have become so distant from you that they will not vote for any cuts. They think: Oh, woe is me. It will be so much money.

The media will say that even a freeze in spending for 10 years is a $10 trillion cut. How could that possibly be? If we spent the same amount of money next year as we spent this year, how could that be a cut?

But the media controls the narrative. The left has aided and abetted them. They say: Well, we were going to spend 5 percent more, so you cut 5 percent by not increasing the spending from last year.

That is ridiculous. They call a freeze a spending cut. If your salary is going to be the same next year as it was last year, is that a cut or is it getting the same salary?

What I am proposing is that we cut it by 2 percent. Why? Well, we would like to balance the budget, ultimately. This is just the annual budget. This isn't getting rid of the debt—not the $22 trillion debt. It is just so we quit digging the hole deeper.

For the first several years I proposed this, we called it the penny plan. We would cut 1 percent a year for 5 years and the budget would balance in 5 years. Nobody listened.

Not one Democrat cares at all about the debt. Not one of them will ever vote to cut any spending. Now, on the Republican side, they profess to care, but over half of them will not vote to cut any spending. There is a lot of hypocrisy to go around.

When I first started introducing the penny plan, a 1-percent cut would have balanced the budget in 5 years. But since we didn't do it, government spending kept exploding and growing and growing, so now it takes a 2-percent cut. This would be a 2-percent cut of everything but Social Security.

The problem is, though, nobody has introduced a bill in decades and nobody has had a vote in decades on a bill to fix the real problem, which is entitlements. So many of the people will bemoan: Oh, we could never fix it by cutting the discretionary spending, so I am not going to cut any. But that is the only thing we get to vote on, so that is what we are putting forward, a 2-percent cut. Still, in order to balance it, you would have to have a 2-percent cut of the entitlements, as well, but we might as well start with what we are doing.

Some people say: Well, government is so essential. We would cut government, and what would happen to the people who depend on it?

Let me give you an example of some of what your government is spending your money on. The National Science Foundation probably gets the award for some of the most ridiculous spending in all of your government. Even since the times of William Proxmire, in the early 1970s, they would get the Golden Fleece Award.

One of his first awards gave them an award for spending $50,000 to determine what makes you happy. It was thought to be ridiculous at the time, and then, for the last 50 years, we have continued to do it. In fact, just this last year, the National Science Foundation is still concerned about what makes you happy. They spent $500,000 this time. I guess that is inflation. They spent $500,000 studying whether it makes you happy if you take a selfie of yourself while smiling. If you will keep looking at the picture of yourself smiling—the selfie you took—is that worth $500,000? Do we not have something better we could do? Maybe we can reduce the deficit by cutting the National Science Foundation.

They also studied what Neil Armstrong said when he landed on the Moon. Did he say ''one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind'' or did he say ''one small step for a man''? They spent $700,000 of your money studying whether Neil Armstrong said ''a man'' or ''man.''

Guess what the experts said after they listened to the tape crackle, crackle, crackle, over and over again, for $700,000. They don't know. Experts still disagree on whether he said ''a man'' or just ''man''—$700,000.

We spent $1.2 million studying online dating. Look, they seem to be successful. I think it must be working. The websites are making a ton of money. Millions of people use them. Why in the world would government study whether dating sites work?

They spend $1.5 million trying to make tomatoes taste better. I don't know where that came from. They funded a book on appreciating the metric system for $188,000. There was a conference sponsored on balding for $22,000.

The Department of Commerce got into the game. They developed a digital down marker for football games for

$130,000. I think that had existed already. They spent $500,000 on a movie about the kilogram. Raise your hand if you are going to stay up tonight to watch the documentary by the Department of Commerce on the kilogram.

The Department of Agriculture provides marketing assistance for specialty crops, including Christmas trees. It turns out there are more specialty crops than regular crops. There was $50,000 given to the State of Georgia for marketing Christmas trees.

The Department of the Interior studied people's experiences with sea monsters in Alaska—$150,000. I thought sea monsters were fake news, but I guess in an era of fake news, it is difficult to determine what is really fake news. Your government spent $150,000 studying sea monsters in Alaska.

They built a parking lot at an Indian casino for $500,000. These casinos apparently make multiple millions of dollars a year, and we spent $500,000 paving a parking lot for a for-profit enterprise.

We built a self-cleaning toilet in a New York City park.

We gave $1 million to subsidize Lyft rides. I thought Uber and Lyft were doing quite well without our help.

We gave $153 million to D.C. Metro, which apparently is one of the most mismanaged metros in the country.

Let's see. National Endowment for the Arts—we spent $25,000 on a museum to Hollywood. If there is any person in the country who really does not need any more adoration—and the taxpayers to pay for adoration—it is Hollywood, but you spent $25,000 building a museum, so I guess they can appreciate themselves even more.

In order to combat homelessness in LA, we paid to put on plays. Apparently, if you are homeless, it must make you feel better to watch street performers performing a play in front of you.

We also paid to put on dances with the Cars. While that may sound entertaining, it might be that we might have other things we might want to spend that money on.

We were told every year that we couldn't possibly cut any spending. There is no way we could do it.

I put forward these spending proposals because I ran for office and said that we should balance the budget. I actually believed what I ran on. I thought I would get here, and I thought there would be momentum.

The Republicans all talked about the debt. They don't care. The Democrats are not going to vote for it. No Democrat will vote for a spending cut—never have and never will. But the Republicans will at least tell you they will, and then they don't.

What I am putting forward today is a 2-percent cut across the board. They get to spend 98 percent of what they spent last year, and we could be serious about actually bringing our budget into line. I have yet to meet someone at home who doesn't think it is a good idea, and I have yet to meet very many people here who are willing to entertain the idea.

There is a disconnect between Washington and the people. If you were to ask the people in any of the States that are represented at least by the Republican side—and I venture to say by some on the Democratic side—if you were to ask any of the people in those States ''Do you think we could live with 98 percent of what we spent last year?'' I think the people would say that we ought to do it. Most businesses or families in our country have had to deal with less money and have often had to deal with a lot less than 98 percent of their previous salary, and people do. Businesses recover all the time by having to clamp down and watch their costs, but government never does. Government just keeps spending and spending and spending.

The vote on my amendment will come up in the next few minutes, and it will be a 2-percent cut across the board, and I urge the other Senators to vote in favor of it.

At this time, Mr. President, I call up my amendment 1019 and ask that it be reported by number.

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

The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. PAUL] proposes an amendment numbered 1019 to amendment No. 948.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To reduce the amounts appropriated to be 2 percent less than the amount appropriated for fiscal year 2019)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. REDUCTION IN AMOUNT OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Each amount made available under division A, B, C, or D of this Act (in this section referred to as a ''fiscal year 2020 amount'') shall be reduced by the amount necessary for the fiscal year 2020 amount to be equal to the amount that is 2 percent less than the amount made available for fiscal year 2019 for the purposes for which the fiscal year 2020 amount is being made available.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

AMENDMENT NO. 1067 TO AMENDMENT NO. 948

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I rise today on one issue, and I promise, out of deference to my friend, who is the Presiding Officer right now, not to bring up anything about college football this past weekend. That would be for another discussion.

I rise today to urge my colleagues to take an important step to correct one of the great injustices in America, an injustice that many in this body may not have a full appreciation for because it just might not affect too many of their particular constituents. I am speaking of the injustices faced by real property owners known as heirs' property owners.

These landowners, who are typically African-American farmers and producers in the Deep South, own land that has been informally passed down within families, often for several generations, without any clear title. Sadly, that has often led to costly legal complications, prevented landowners from qualifying for Federal assistance, and, in many cases, resulted in actual loss of land ownership. This issue overwhelmingly impacts African-American land ownership, of which an estimated 60 percent is heirs' property and has created barriers to building generational wealth.

It is no coincidence that this has impacted Black landowners when you consider the challenges faced by previous generations of African Americans just to purchase their land, the obstacles they faced to obtain legal services and to have their wills prepared.

The heirs' property challenge that is facing these families today is yet another vestige of the Jim Crow era that, with some exceptions, has lasted far too long and that we must seek to correct.

These injustices have had long-lasting consequences for the families who have struggled to prove their land claims, including the untold emotional cost for those who have seen their family land taken or sold out from under them.

Because a significant portion of minority-owned rural land was passed down through generations as heirs' property, these farmers and ranchers have been unable to obtain farm numbers and, thus, access to a multitude of USDA programs. These programs are vital to these landowners, who already face significant risk and uncertainty in their work.

That is why, when I came to the Senate last year, I teamed up with my friend from South Carolina, Senator SCOTT, to work together to initiate changes that will start to help these farmers gain access to Federal aid and help us better understand the full spectrum of challenges they face as a result of their heirs' property status.

I am very proud of the fact that we secured several provisions in the final 2018 farm bill that address heirs' property. I thank Senators ROBERTS and STABENOW for their assistance. One of the biggest components that was included will allow heirs' property owners, with the appropriate documentation, to obtain USDA farm numbers so that they can gain access to the Department's programs, such as crop insurance and disaster relief.

However, that is just one of the obstacles they face today. Another provision focuses on consolidating land ownership. Heirs are often faced with issues of ''fractional'' ownership among relatives. Their own family had the fractional shares of the land that has been passed down for generations, and that increases the chances of one heir partitioning the land or causing the land to be lost due to a tax default.

Some States even require the entire property to be sold if the courts find that dividing the land would prejudice one owner.

Under these circumstances, it is no wonder that between 1910 and 1997, an

estimated 90 percent of land owned by African Americans in this country was lost due to heirs' property issues. That statistic bears repeating and emphasizing. Between 1910 and 1997, an estimated 90 percent of land owned by African Americans in the United States was lost due to heirs' property issues.

Last year, together we embarked on the journey to right these wrongs. The 2018 farm bill gave authority to the USDA Secretary to make loans to eligible entities such as cooperatives and credit unions that have experience helping minority farmers so they can relend funds to assist heirs with undivided interests to resolve ownership and succession on farmland.

My amendment that we will be voting on shortly will provide $5 million to help get this program off the ground. That is the same amount of money that is included in the House version of the appropriations bill.

This is an important next step to fulfill the intent of last year's farm bill and to help these families maintain land that is rightfully theirs. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment and continuing our efforts together to remove these barriers and right these wrongs.

Mr. President, I would like to call up Amendment No. 1067, as provided for under the previous order, and I ask that it be reported by number.

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

The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. JONES] proposes an amendment numbered 1067 to amendment No. 948.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide funding for the relending program to resolve ownership and succession on farmland)

On page 141, line 8, insert '', and of which $5,000,000 shall be available to carry out section 310I of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1936c)'' after ''2021''.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be 2 minutes equally divided between each vote in this series and that all votes after the first be 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 961 TO AMENDMENT NO. 948

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the amendment No. 961, offered by the Senator from Nevada, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), 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 result was announced—yeas 90, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 334 Leg.]

YEAS—90

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

NAYS—1

Blackburn

NOT VOTING—9

Booker	Isakson	Tillis
Cassidy	Reed	Toomey
Harris	Sanders	Warren

The amendment (No. 961) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1019 TO AMENDMENT NO. 948

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 1019, offered by the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. PAUL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I don't see the Senator from Kentucky on the floor, but I will speak briefly in opposition to it as I know many others feel the same.

His amendment will slash spending below the Bipartisan Budget Act, which we all negotiated, by over $14 billion.

To give you some examples, the U.S. Census Bureau would be $3.8 billion below the fiscal year 2020 bipartisan level, making it impossible to hold an accurate and complete count. It would severely compromise the Federal Government's ability to fight wildfires and safeguard people's lives and property. All you have to do is look at the tens of thousands of acres in California, Arizona, and Colorado to see what that would do. We have $3.6 billion to fight wildfires. He would reject those increases and then cut them by $1.6 billion. It would cut available funding for our Nation's roadways and bridges by over $1.5 billion. It would eliminate the potential of there being 19,500 new jobs and a whole lot of other things.

Mr. President, the Paul amendment would slash spending below the Bipartisan Budget Act by over $14 billion.

Under the Paul amendment, the Bureau of the Census would be $3.8 billion below the fiscal year 2020 funding level in the Senate bill. At this funding level, it would not be possible to hold an accurate and complete count.

The Paul amendment would also severely compromise the Federal Government's ability to fight catastrophic wildfires and safeguard people's lives and property at a time when tens of thousands of acres in California, Arizona, and Colorado are ablaze. The fiscal year 2020 Senate bill provides $3.6 billion to fight wildfires and access. The Paul amendment would reject those increases and reduce the amounts provided for fire suppression by $1.6 billion.

The Paul amendment would cut available funding for our Nation's roadways and bridges by over $1.5 billion, eliminating the potential for 19,500 new jobs and exacerbating the $123 billion backlog of bridge repairs and replacement of 47,000 structurally deficient bridges.

These are just a few examples of the real world implications of the Paul amendment. I urge all members to vote no.

Mr. President, if nobody seeks time, I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1019 TO AMENDMENT NO. 948

The question is on agreeing to the Paul amendment, No. 1019.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill 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 North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), 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 result was announced—yeas 24, nays 67, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 335 Leg.]

YEAS—24

Barrasso	Ernst	Paul
Blackburn	Fischer	Perdue
Braun	Grassley	Risch
Cornyn	Inhofe	Romney
Crapo	Johnson	Rubio
Cruz	Kennedy	Sasse
Daines	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Enzi	Lee	Sullivan

NAYS—67

Alexander	Graham	Portman
Baldwin	Hassan	Roberts
Bennet	Hawley	Rosen
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Rounds
Blunt	Hirono	Schatz
Boozman	Hoeven	Schumer
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Burr	Jones	Shaheen
Cantwell	Kaine	Shelby
Capito	King	Sinema
Cardin	Klobuchar	Smith
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Manchin	Tester
Collins	Markey	Thune
Coons	McConnell	Udall
Cortez Masto	McSally	Van Hollen
Cotton	Menendez	Warner
Cramer	Merkley	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Moran	Wicker
Durbin	Murkowski	Wyden
Feinstein	Murphy	Young
Gardner	Murray	
Gillibrand	Peters	

NOT VOTING—9

Booker	Isakson	Tillis
Cassidy	Reed	Toomey
Harris	Sanders	Warren

The amendment (No. 1019) was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 1067 TO AMENDMENT NO. 948

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 1067, offered by the Senator from Alabama, Mr. JONES.

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, this amendment will continue a process that was started last year in the farm bill to correct one of the grave injustices to the African-American population here.

This bill deals with heir property—property that has gone down through generations without clear title. These landowners have been denied access to USDA programs and other instances. This amendment deals with heir property. African Americans have long been denied property based on the fact that so much of it has been passed down through the generations without clear title.

They have been denied access to the USDA programs and also have lost property. Between 1910 and 1997, an estimated 90 percent of land owned by African Americans in this country was lost due to heir property issues. Last year we began the process in this Senate with the farm bill to correct that, part of which was creating a program at USDA to loan money to help get these folks back on their feet, to get them into the programs they need. This amendment provides $5 million to start that program. It is the same amount of money that is in the House bill.

I urge my colleagues to continue this opportunity to correct this wrong and right this injustice.

Mr. President, I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

Mr. CRAPO. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Time is yielded back.

The question occurs on agreeing to amendment No. 1067.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 91, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 336 Leg.]

YEAS—91

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

NAYS—1

Blackburn

NOT VOTING—8

Booker	Isakson	Toomey
Cassidy	Sanders	Warren
Harris	Tillis	

The amendment (No. 1067) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for the Shelby substitute amendment No. 948.

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

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 amendment No. 948 to H.R. 3055, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

Richard C. Shelby, Mike Crapo, John Cornyn, Roy Blunt, Thom Tillis, Shelley Moore Capito, Roger F. Wicker, Lisa Murkowski, Mike Rounds, Pat Roberts, John Boozman, Marco Rubio, John Barrasso, Kevin Cramer, Richard Burr, James E. Risch, Mitch McConnell.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for the underlying bill.

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

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 Calendar No. 141, H.R. 3055, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

Richard C. Shelby, Mike Crapo, John Cornyn, Roy Blunt, Thom Tillis, Shelley Moore Capito, Roger F. Wicker, Lisa Murkowski, Mike Rounds, Pat Roberts, John Boozman, Marco Rubio, John Barrasso, Kevin Cramer, Richard Burr, James E. Risch, Mitch McConnell.

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION, DEFENSE, STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2020—Motion to Proceed

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to proceed to Calendar No. 140, H.R. 2740.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 140, H.R. 2740, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, 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